

Korea reflects 'militarized' U.S. policy

Editor's note: Americans sometimes seem a near-sighted lot. Most of us understand the intimate interrelationship between domestic politics and economic factors (the incentives, rights and restrictions of labor and business). Few of us, however, extend that understanding to the world scene, where American military commitments and foreign political policy safeguard U.S. investment overseas.

U.S. foreign-policy "experts," military leaders and business spokespersons encourage this naivete. But U.S. troop deployment or political and financial support for certain groups and individuals in other countries exert a potent influence over the "business climate" in those nations — the labor conditions, investment incentives and creation or stimulation of markets.

One such nation that has a particular significance for Oregon is South Korea, the second-largest buyer of this state's exports and fifth-ranked source of its imports. In a two-part series beginning today, Tim Shorrock analyzes America's relationship with Korea as representative of a recent "militarization" occurring within U.S. foreign policy. Shorrock, a graduate student in Asian Studies, and member of the Korea Information Action Project, specializes in Korean political economy.

By TIM SHORROCK
For the Emerald

When Jimmy Carter was elected President in 1976, he pledged to withdraw American ground forces from South Korea within five years and to work towards improvements in South Korea's human rights situation. Since that time, a significant reversal has occurred in U.S. policy toward Korea.

The troop withdrawal has been put "in abeyance" until studies can be

completed of "recently revealed" increases in North Korean military strength. Carter is also planning a June summit meeting with South Korean President-for-life Park Chung Hee, which the State Department says will avoid discussion of human rights. Both events mark a departure from earlier policies of gradual military disengagement from the peninsula and avoidance of personal contacts with the U.S.-supported dictator.

The decision to shelve the troop withdrawals coincides with what I would call the post-Iran militarization of U.S. foreign policy: reliance on a more overt military role in protecting the last few American client states and ensuring the steady flow of oil from the Middle East. Recent indications of this policy include:

- the Egypt-Israel "Peace Treaty" and the American agreement to act as "protector" of that peace and military supplier to the two former enemies now emerging as the new police force of the region.
- the sending of military advisors to North Yemen.
- the conclusion of a military bases agreement with the Philippines. In a March 21 letter to U.S. Rep. Lester Wolff, chair of House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Carter pointed out that the importance of these bases was "not limited to the Western Pacific but extends... to much wider areas of the Indian Ocean and the entire Middle East."
- increased military aid to Thailand.
- plans to reinstitute the draft.
- statements by Carter's advisor Brzezinski — and government-funded studies — on the feasibility of "limited nuclear war."
- statements by Defense Secretary Harold Brown and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger on American deter-

mination to use force if necessary in the Persian Gulf.

While the above events have occurred over a period of six months, seen together they reveal a more direct role of the military in U.S. foreign affairs since the collapse of the Shah.

How is this policy reflected in Korea? First, 1979 military aid is more than the total amount South Korea has received for the last five years. Last year Congress voted \$800 million in military aid as compensation for the now-delayed troop withdrawals, and in March of this year the House International Relations Committee approved \$322,750,000 worth of "security assistance" to Korea. Despite well-documented violations of human rights by the Park government and the Koreagate bribery scandal, the latter appropriation did not draw a single dissenting vote. Congressional sentiment clearly opposes any form of withdrawal.

Second, as part of a five-year, \$5.2-billion arms acquisition program, the U.S. is increasing the number of tactical aircraft and advanced weapons systems in South Korea, including F-16 jet fighters and Trident nuclear submarines. Furthermore, U.S. Department of Defense plans to strengthen reconnaissance activities on the Korean peninsula, which has been designated one of four "potential emergency scenarios" of the 1980s.

Third, in anticipation of this scenario, a joint command of the South Korean and U.S. military was created in Seoul last November. In March the combined forces took part in "Team Spirit '79," a "defensive" training exercise involving 140,000 troops. Considerably larger than last year's "Team Spirit '78" (which until then was the largest peacetime exercise ever staged by American forces overseas), the recent maneuvers took place at a most delicate time — during

the first North-South Reunification Talks held in six years. Both North Korean officials and the Japanese Foreign Minister criticized the military exercise as ill-timed.

Finally, despite the rapprochement with China and the talks between North and South Korea, administration spokespersons have, in recent weeks, increased their rhetoric about the threat of war and instability in Korea. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, for example, said March 1 that "our most immediate security concern in Northeast Asia is focused on the Korean peninsula... Neither the United States nor our South Korean allies can relax their vigilance."

At a time when a decrease in such rhetoric would be helpful to the reunification process, the U.S. — ably assisted by the South Korean government — is doing everything it can to create a sense of crises. Officials have attributed this "vigilance" to "new" intelligence that "revealed" increased North Korean armed strength. While the North clearly has a formidable army, its strength in numbers is more than offset by the combination of F-16s, anti-tank missiles, SMART bombs and nuclear weapons in the South.

As the business magazine *Far Eastern Economic Review* recently remarked, "Carter's claims that the new assessment has altered the strategic picture in Korea should be taken with a grain of salt. Very little has altered — except U.S. political perceptions." Unfortunately, those perceptions may be leading towards a new Cold War — and closer ties with U.S. client states.

Tomorrow's article will take a look at the economic stakes for the U.S. in South Korea, and why those closer ties are deemed necessary for both Park and the U.S.

YOURS

'Feels sorrow'

"The Daily Immorald" (4/20/79) disturbed me in many ways, but I feel more pity, sorrow, and embarrassment than indignation. Except for a few tasteful exceptions (particularly the Trojan ad), it was a scatological offence, little more than transferred bathroom graffiti, and representative of an ebb in journalistic standards. But, most tragically, it was a pathetic abuse of both the privilege of communication and the delicate art of satire.

Instead of being therapeutically irreverent (a la Swift, Twain, etc.) and conscience-quickenning, it was recklessly irreverent, largely irrelevant, and crass — a catalogue of banality more worthy of tears than laughter, for its main "humorous" device was to mutilate sexuality (that which is ordained for beauty through spiritual unity, compassion and commitment between husband and wife) into something ugly and common. Hence, dignity is dethroned and license reigns over an artless anarchy that enslaves those seeking "liberty" from prudence.

A much ignored book by a much ignored author says, "... for whatever overcomes a man, to that he is enslaved." (2 Peter 2:19). The *Daily Immorald* was overcome. This particular instance is not isolated; it is indicative of a culture that purifies the priceless by market-

ing the intimate for profit and cheap recognition.

To what are we enslaved?

Douglas Groothuis
Senior, philosophy

'A grim day'

A grim day has fallen upon the University of Oregon. Governor Victor Atiyeh has been chosen to speak at our graduation. A symbolic day when we are being sent off into the real world, our words of inspiration to carry us through the tough times ahead, the model from which we are to mold ourselves stands for everything that we do not.

Oregon has always been a progressive state with Eugene in the forefront; yet the Class of 1979 is being subjected to the most conservative speaker the commencement committee could possibly think of.

Alternatives are many. Among the frontrunners are Emily Ashworth, Jim Weaver, Barry Lopez, Lloyd Marbet, and Ken Kesey. The inspiration these people could share with the Class of '79, the new ideologies, the hopes for the future, and the sheer relevance of what they have to share would far outweigh anything our Governor could ever hope to convey.

We do not feel the choice of Governor Atiyeh for our commencement speaker is representative of the wishes of



the graduating class. Therefore we strongly urge those students graduating in June who are dissatisfied with this choice to sign the petitions requesting a replacement for commencement speaker.

Jim Stratton
senior, recreation and park management

Cathy Johnson
senior, recreation and park management

Amy Esping
senior, anthropology

Atiyeh address

In connection with the anxiety among some students that they may hear things during the commencement address that they don't agree with, Mr. Jock Hatfield suggests that the appointment of Governor Atiyeh was my doing and that it was due to his being governor. "This is no excuse," he declares.

Strictly speaking the appointment was not my doing and I was certainly very far indeed from asking Mr. Hatfield to excuse it. My own belief that

when the evidence is properly assessed the use of lethal herbicides and nuclear energy sources will be seen to be grievous folly does not seem to be a reason for preventing the governor of the state from addressing the state's most important community.

A.K. Weatherhead
professor, English

(Editor's note: Weatherhead was chair of the University Assembly committee that recommended to University Pres. William Boyd the selection of Atiyeh as commencement speaker.)