

The West Berlin Small Shopowners Association (AGS) of the SPD demanded the expulsion of the AL from the city council, since "the Alternatives are neither mature [enough] for democracy, nor are they acceptable as a coalition partner." The AGS demand was blocked, however, by West Berlin SPD chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel, who insisted that the SPD must become "a party of emotions, of a policy which moves with the mainstream of the masses, and the masses are afraid of technology. They want conservation of nature." Vogel subsequently indicated his agreement with Lafontaine's drive to topple Schmidt and "strengthen" the SPD in the opposition.

The CDU punts

Leading spokesmen for the Christian Democrats have refused to make more than token attacks against the Greens. Alfred Dregger, the CDU's candidate for governor in the state of Hesse, where elections are set for Sept. 26, called for all parties in the state parliament to make a pact against the Greens, allowing whichever party has the most votes to form a government, even if it does not have a majority (Dregger naturally expects this tactic to yield him the governorship). Yet when interviewed in *Der Spiegel* magazine July 19 on this subject, Dregger indicated that his proposal was not "anti-Green," but is a temporary measure to bridge the time until the Greens become mature enough to be treated with respect.

"I do not want to put the Greens in quarantine," he said, "I am not the one to keep the doors closed to them. They are the ones to lock themselves out from the formation of a government. . . . I do not want to ally with the other parties against the Greens. . . . I have always been much more moderate toward them than anyone else. I do not want to lock them out; they are not extremists; they are not Nazis; they are, apart from a few exceptions, not Communists." Asked whether the Greens are enemies of the constitution, Dregger replied: "No, not at all. They adhere to a conservative utopianism with an essential concern which I share, namely, to protect nature and the landscape. I love nature like I love the arts."

Christian Democrat Walter Leisler Kiep from Hamburg also refused to attack the Greens in an interview with *Der Spiegel*. CDU demands for nuclear energy development have anyway been "too undifferentiated" in the past, he said, so it is not surprising when the Greens capitalize on popular discontent.

Lothar Spaeth, the CDU Minister President of the state of Baden-Württemberg, declared that among the Greens are "young people with good ideas," and that the Green deputies in Stuttgart, the state capital, are "especially joyful individuals who are doing their jobs, sometimes badly, sometimes well."

Soviet military chief: 'upgrade our defense'

by Rachel Douglas, Soviet Union Editor

In a 5,000-word *Pravda* article published July 12, Soviet Defense Minister Dmitrii F. Ustinov gave a view of the danger of nuclear war and of strategic doctrine in which he identified an upgrading of Soviet military posture that may be said to "tighten the hair-trigger" on nuclear war.

Ustinov drew a strategic line on which all Soviet factions converge, upon perceived threats to the existence of the Soviet state. It dictates not only a war-fighting strategic doctrine that rejects every version of "limited nuclear war" cooked up by NATO, but—under conditions of world economic collapse and brushfire wars in the underdeveloped sector—a global attempt to expand Soviet power at every point of opportunity, at the expense of the United States.

If the countervailing political impulse in the West and the developing world, a drive for a growth-centered new world economic order, were to defeat the collapse, there could still be a Soviet response of détente. But neither the military message or the political narrowness of Ustinov's survey pointed that way; rather, he conveyed the Soviet command's assessment that the world is in a pre-war phase.

Ustinov set about to justify, in military terms, the pledge made by Leonid Brezhnev in June never to use nuclear weapons first. Alluding to possible objections to this pledge from within the U.S.S.R., he asserted that even if the United States struck first, the Soviet armed forces would be capable of a full nuclear strike-back. Ustinov linked a U.S. effort to achieve a "first strike" capability to the installation of new medium-range rockets in Western Europe, the Pershing IIs that have a five-minute flight time to Moscow.

The Defense Minister's words about an "all-crushing retaliatory strike" referred to a Soviet Politburo decision that "countermeasures" against the Pershings, already threatened by Brezhnev months ago, will consist not in



Defense Minister Ustinov (l) with the late Mikhail Suslov.

merely matching the United States in existing technologies (e.g., by placing missiles in Cuba), but rather in *increased readiness for total war*. At the first detection of a Pershing launch from Western Europe, there is a full-scale strategic strike against United States weapons and territory.

In his political summary, Ustinov allowed very little room for war-avoidance as it might emerge from countries other than the United States. Sounding like the “two camps” rhetoricians of the Cold War, Ustinov said, “There are two lines in world politics—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.” And the latter, he concluded from President Reagan’s speech to British parliament in June, seeks “the annihilation of socialism as a socio-political system.”

This analysis provides theoretical justification for Soviet backing of all sorts of wrecking operations in the developing sector—as long as they appear to set back American interests. Thus Ustinov pointed to the Iranian and Nicaraguan revolutions—extremely destructive for those countries—as thorns in the side of U.S. policy and hence, according to his demarcation, “on the Soviet side of world developments.”

Excerpts from Defense Minister Ustinov’s Pravda article, translated by EIR, follow. Subtitles have been added.

The absence of real results in curbing the arms race at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s was conditioned by the latest review of U.S. military policy in favor of greater reliance on force, and cruder and more varied use of it even in peacetime. The United States moves nuclear war into the category of the possible, and under certain circumstances the expedient, and preparations for it are carried out, proceeding from the task of “taking the upper hand,” i.e., gaining victory.

From this flows a special emphasis on the creation of

a first strike capability, reducing the distance from which it would be inflicted, and removing the nuclear danger created by this policy as far as possible from U.S. territory. . . .

This arrogant imperial policy built—as the present American leaders stress themselves—on the unpredictability of Washington’s actions, naturally destabilizes the situation. . . .

Military actions beyond NATO’s sphere

President Reagan directly states that U.S. military might remain the main, and practically the sole “precondition for peace.” As President, he is prepared to use that might without wavering. It is asserted that reliable security is impossible without a reorganization of the socio-economic systems in an American way. And under this pretext, a “crusade” is declared against communism, against social progress on Earth, against social revolutions, which are defamed as “international terrorism.” . . .

In their entirety, U.S. actions are directed at creating preconditions for a struggle “to annihilate socialism as a socio-political system” (so the Pentagon writes. . .) According to Defense Minister Weinberger, in the event of war arising in any region of the world, the United States and its allies ought to be prepared for military actions outside their limits and for extending wars to other regions of the world, where the enemy may be dealt the greatest injury.

In other words, the new strategy of so-called direct confrontation has not only subsumed all the extremes of previous military tenets of the “balancing on the brink of war” type, but sharpened them still more. . . .

In light of the growing aggressivity of U.S. and NATO policy, it was not easy for the Soviet Union to assume the unilateral obligation not to use nuclear weapons first. And it is entirely natural that Soviet people, our friends, and progressive people of the world are asking themselves whether or not the right moment was chosen for such a step and whether we will not subject our people, our homeland and the cause of socialism and progress in the whole world to excessive danger with this unilateral obligation.

After all, we have had difficult historical experience with an aggressor who stopped at nothing and launched his destructive arsenal at us full tilt. Can we ignore all that?

Indeed, the above-listed features of U.S. doctrine and U.S. actions on the international scene are components of the present dangerous tension in the world. We soberly evaluate both the adventurous thinking of the Pentagon and the combat readiness and capabilities of the U.S. strategic offensive forces. If the aggressor makes first use of nuclear weapons, this will inflict incalculable calamities on our peoples.

However, the aggressor too should know that the advantages accruing from the first use of nuclear weapons will not lead him to victory. Committing a crime against humanity, he will not obtain tangible spoils. With modern detection systems and the combat readiness of Soviet strategic nuclear forces, there will be no disarming strike against the socialist countries. The aggressor will not escape an all-crushing retaliatory strike. He who invents a "flawless recipe" for waging nuclear war victoriously and counts on . . . "decapitating" the enemy with one knock-out blow, condemns himself. . . .

Washington and the capitals of NATO countries should understand clearly that the U.S.S.R., in rejecting the first use of nuclear weapons, also rejects all those who harbor plans of nuclear attack, counting on victory in nuclear war. The status of military potentials and military-technological capabilities of the sides is such, that imperialist forces will not succeed in achieving military superiority, neither at the stage of preparing for nuclear war, nor at the moment when they try to begin this war. . . .

While assuming the unilateral obligation not to use nuclear weapons first, we, of course, will take into account that there are aggressive forces in the world, prepared to gamble with the vital interests of humanity for the sake of their narrow, mercenary goals and to embark upon nuclear adventures for this. Therefore our state will continue to construct its policy and maintain its defenses, taking into account how the United States behaves. . . . Knowing the habits and character of the aggressive forces, the U.S.S.R. will maintain high vigilance and constant combat readiness of its armed forces on the level of current requirements.

Our defensive military doctrine, intended exclusively to repulse an external threat, will not be passive in nature. As always, it will rest on the inviolable foundation of Lenin's teaching about the defense of the socialist fatherland. In the event of aggression, our armed forces, together with the fraternal socialist armies, will defend socialist achievements without wavering and with all decisiveness, making use of the entire defense and economic might of our states.

At the same time, the adopted obligation objectively imposes stiff demands for further raising the combat readiness of our armies, their technical equipment, perfection of command and communications, reinforcement of the troops' moral and political steeling. It is necessary that the factor of surprise be reduced to a minimum, so that the aggressor not be seduced into the first use of nuclear weapons with impunity. . . .

The peoples of the world can convince themselves that there exist two lines in world politics—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. . . .

South Africa readies 'Israeli-style' moves

by Douglas DeGroot, Africa Editor

The government of South Africa appears to be scuttling the U.S.-led negotiating process over the independence of Namibia and is opting instead for an Israeli-style military policy against the rest of the nations in southern Africa.

What the Israelis have gotten away with in Lebanon has encouraged the South Africans to devise pretexts for military action to establish control of the entire mineral-rich region of southern Africa. "There is tremendous admiration for the Israelis' mode of operation in South Africa," said one Washington-based Africa expert, and added: "Now more people in South Africa are saying 'We're going to do it too, and what are you going to do about it?'" A British source predicted that "in three to four months the South Africans will go to war" from Namibia into Angola, and "clean the whole thing up."

The British intelligence-run Heritage Foundation in Washington is putting out the line that no face-saving deal for the mutual withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and South African troops from Namibia is possible, because the South Africans won't go with such a deal. Heritage's scenario calls for the blame to be shifted to the Angolans for rejecting immediate withdrawal of all Cuban troops, expecting the Reagan administration to "quickly point the finger at the Angolans." South Africa has over 20,000 troops in Namibia to counter the activity of the SWAPO liberation group, whose goal is the independence of Namibia. SWAPO's members seek refuge in Angola and operate from there.

"Then we will see," said a Heritage spokesman, "an independent Namibia under Dirk Mudge, with South African military support, and the end of SWAPO. If there is no agreement, there will be no SWAPO." Mudge, a member of the 10 percent of the 1 million Namibian