

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

population that is white, is closely allied to South Africa.

Unless the Reagan administration pressures South Africa to abandon its hopes of regional military dominance, South Africa is likely to become a marcher-lord on behalf of the Global 2000 outlook: securing raw materials for the Anglo-Saxons and depopulating the Southern Hemisphere of dark-skinned "useless eaters."

U.S. endorsement of this policy in southern Africa would be a disaster for both Africa and Washington, D.C. Africans have always considered the United States the only hope for the development of Africa, since the Africa policies of European countries have rarely challenged policy guidelines established by the anti-development "Empire Faction." What is needed is an economic-development commitment as the basis of U.S. foreign policy in the region. That would entail an end to apartheid.

Namibia talks

A group of five Western countries—the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, and Canada—has been negotiating with SWAPO (which is recognized by the U.N. as the official representative of the Namibian population) and SWAPO's African backers on the one hand, and with South Africa on the other. The negotiations have proceeded by fits and starts; the U.S. administration should not have included the colonially-minded British and French, or the duplicitous Trudeau government, while Bonn is irrelevant unless it returns to the African economic development plans of Jürgen Ponto of the Dresdner Bank, who was murdered in 1977.

For the United States, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester Crocker and roving ambassador Vernon Walters continue to be the central figures in the Namibian negotiations.

But Crocker avowedly espouses the Global 2000 policy line. British policy conduits such as the Heritage Foundation are hoping that the new Secretary of State, George Shultz, "will leave Africa policy up to Crocker, as Haig did." As for Walters, who has criss-crossed southern Africa in recent months, returning to Luanda July 21, he is reportedly closely connected to the European neo-fascist monarchist circles who formulated Global 2000 and run the Tradition, Family and Property butchers in Ibero-America.

Crocker has been putting out the line that a negotiated settlement will lead to elections in Namibia by March 1983. A South African delegation was in Washington in late June, and discussions began July 6 in New York between the five Western nations and SWAPO. The only real issues involved, according to a Washington-based Africanist close to Crocker, "are the Cuban troops in Angola and whether the Savimbi

operation gets dismantled or is left in place in Angola." Jonas Savimbi, who runs an extensive counterinsurgent operation inside Angola against the government, is supported by South Africa as one of their "cards."

Mass murder

In Mozambique, South Africa is sponsoring an armed operation of about 5,000 tribal members. 80 percent of Zimbabwe's foreign trade passes through South Africa, and the disturbances in Mozambique prevent Zimbabwe from increasing the amount that could pass through Mozambique, thus giving South Africa more leverage against Zimbabwe.

Southern Mozambique has been described by Washington sources as the most likely target for a southern Lebanon-style attack by the South Africans. An earlier attack into this region by the South Africans in early 1981 drew no comment from the Reagan administration, prior to Crocker's confirmation.

According to African sources, there are 5,000 elite Selous Scout counterinsurgents from Rhodesia prior to that country becoming independent, that are now in South Africa to be used in countries in southern Africa by the South African government. In addition, recruits for South Africa have come from Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique to carry out dirty tricks and chaos operations in their countries of origin.

Internally, South African policy has become equally vicious. South Africa has just announced its intention to give a few strips of land to a tiny neighboring country, Swaziland. This will serve as a pretext for the P. W. Botha government to expel nearly a million people of the reputedly same ethnic origins as the people of Swaziland. In the words of the South African Minister of Cooperation and Development (which deals with policy for the black part of the population), Dr. Piet Koornhof, this is only a policy of "bringing together people who belong together," and he has reportedly announced intentions of carrying out similar kinds of activities inside South Africa, forcing people not essential for the economy as presently constituted to be dumped in what the South Africans call homelands or bantustans, which are reserves for the black population. The homeland population has grown by 3 million in the last decade, and there is almost no prospect of employment at all.

South Africa is currently in its deepest recession since the 1930s. The slump in gold prices and the highest inflation in 50 years have led to record central-bank borrowing to meet balance-of-payments deficits. This will certainly lead the South African government to speed up the process of pushing blacks out of white South Africa into the impoverished, disease-ridden homelands.