

ARNEW-APN-12-4  
Aida Parker  
news letter

# THE Aida Parker Newsletter

Issue No. 57

May 21, 1985

## Anti-divestment lobby getting their act together

**SOME good news at last. Showing more foresight than most, the SA Foundation has just hosted what is arguably the most high-powered investigative team of US Conservatives ever to visit SA: 14 men and women representing groups and media with a combined voice to something like 45 million Americans. These conservative chieftains, natural defenders of the free enterprise system, have taken a hard-nosed look at the anti-SA divestment campaign, getting it into perspective, assessing the implications for the US itself.**

*They talked to the country's top businessmen and industrialists, to politicians, to trade unionists, to Blacks both of the right and the left. Their conclusion? That SA is far from being the economic pushover projected by the proponents of divestment; that Conservatives, especially those in Congress now supporting punitive anti-SA legislation, should cool it. Main message? SA instability will benefit only the USSR.*

Their combined voices should have

major impact. The group comprised: Howard Phillips, chairman, Conservative Caucus; William Keyes, chairman of the Black Conservative group, BLACKPAK; Rear-admiral Clarence A Hill; Mrs Jacqueline McGregor, who opposed anti-SA activist Harold Wolpe in the 1984 elections and is currently Executive Director, Inter-Governmental Advisory Council of Education; Allan Ryskind, Capitol Hill editor, *Human Events*; Ed Neilan, Foreign Editor, *The Washington Times*; Ed McAteer, President, the Roundtable and one of the founders of Moral Majority; David Fazio, National Chairman, Students for America; David Miner, candidate for chairman, College Republican National Committee; Dr Gary North, chairman, Institute for Christian Education and Editor, *Remnant Review*; David Balsiger, Executive Director, Ban Coalition; Joel Skousen, Chair-

man, Conservative National Committee, Inc; Neil Blair, President, Free the Eagle; Yvonne Borie, Legislative Assistant, American Legislative Exchange Council.

How do they view SA's response to the divestment campaign? In a hasty farewell interview at Jan Smuts Airport tour leader Howard Phillips told me: "It is encouraging to see there is a change of attitude. The advice that you should not directly involve yourselves in fighting the campaign in the US was very, very bad. If you are not prepared to enter the witness box, Americans automatically tend to assume that you are guilty. You've got to get in there, present your case, let the Americans know that if this succeeds, you are not the only ones scheduled to get hurt, that they themselves will also pick up a lot of the flak.

(Continued on page 6)

### In this issue

<b>Soviet weaponry .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mozambique's anniversary .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Nkomati Accord .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Machine gun soccer .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Libyan hit squads .....</b>	<b>8</b>

ANY student of financial markets can tell at a glance that the current agitation against South Africa has reached the political equivalent of the hysterical or "blow-off" stage. It now constitutes an extraordinary popular delusion on the scale of the South Sea Bubble, the Mississippi Scheme or the Great Tulip-bulb Mania in 17th century Holland. In such situations, facts are irrelevant — temporarily. But it is well to remember how far from reality we have strayed. SA does not remotely threaten American geopolitical interests. Unlike the Soviet Union, it is not a relentlessly hostile superpower with thousands of nuclear warheads trained on the US. It has not systematically sought to subvert the American political process, nor even to assassinate a pope. It has, in fact, been a consistent and valuable friend to the US. And it is not conquering Afghanistan. Right now, as you read this, Soviet troops are killing Afghan men, women and children — already over a million out of a total population of some 17 million, with a further 3 million driven into exile.

There is no parallel to such savagery anywhere in the world — except perhaps in Ethiopia, where another Soviet-backed regime is exacerbating a

famine to starve into submission its secessionary northern provinces. Not even the emotional view that racism is the supreme evil can explain anti-South African agitation. According to the Netherlands' Institute for the Study of Plural Societies, more than 60 countries practice some kind of racial discrimination, sometimes in spectacularly gross forms. Ultimately the agitation has no more to do with SA than speculative frenzies have to do with intrinsic values.

White South Africa is simply a convenient outlet for purely domestic American political pressures: racial antagonisms; the left's need for a cause to rally round; the professional politicians' need for something to feed to the civil rights lobbyists that will not impinge upon their constituents. The poet Byron once described a dying gladiator as "butcher'd to make a Roman holiday." The peoples of South Africa, it appears, are to be sacrificed for a few points in the opinion polls. Yet, as two social satirists in "Beyond the Fringe" pointed out a couple of decades ago, "Eating People is Wrong." — Peter Brimelow, writing in the prime US financial journal, *Barron's*.



# Build-up of heavy Soviet weaponry

**NATO strategists are monitoring the build-up of heavy Soviet weaponry in Angola and Mozambique with growing concern. Latest arrivals, according to topflight intelligence, include the A version of the formidable MI-24 assault helicopter, extensively used in Afghanistan by the Russian occupational forces. Flown to Maputo and Luanda in Aeroflot freighters, these will probably be piloted by Russians, Bulgarians, East Germans or Cubans.**

Additionally, according to a report issued last month by Angop, the official Luanda news agency, Angola's Marxist MPLA regime is to buy six assault helicopters and four patrol choppers from France for US\$45 million. These will be the first of 25 helicopters to be purchased by Angola — which the Red Cross reports has areas of famine as bad or worse than Ethiopia — from the Mitterand Government.

Hardware already massed in Angola and Mozambique includes highly sophisticated radar networks, advanced missile systems, battle aircraft, tanks and heavy artillery. In air strength terms, there are now more than 200 frontline aircraft deployed along SA's northern borders. Latest CIA estimates are that 44 MiG 21 jets have been delivered to Mozambique alone. Bearing the Nato codename, Fishbed, the MiG 21 flies at 1 250 km/h and is roughly on par with the Mirage III fighter of the SA Air Force, though not so well equipped.

Against this intimidating back-

ground, both Pretoria and Washington would do well to re-examine an assessment of the military threat to SA published in 1980 by Soviet defector, Dr Igor Glagolev. He foresaw two main possible Soviet plans for action.

One he termed the "Zimbabwe model," where UN or other alleged "peacekeeping" forces would be installed in SWA-Namibia or SA, permitting the massed entry of pro-Soviet forces and, with or without "free" elections, toppling the established government. The second plan (and the one he considered most likely to apply to SA) he called the "Vietnamese model." After "peace negotiations" or even "peace agreements" between the relevant frontline states and SA, assault forces from Angola and Mozambique would suddenly invade and conquer the Republic with the help of the ANC and other pro-Soviet terrorist groups.

"That is exactly what happened in South Vietnam in 1973-75. The 'conciliatory' attitude of Samora Machel,

and the simultaneous concentration of offensive *materiel* and forces in Angola and Mozambique, suggest preparations for this scenario. The purely defensive strategy of the US and South Vietnamese forces in Vietnam proved fatal. These forces, with their superior navy and air force strength and tremendous fire power, could easily have occupied North Vietnam and replaced the aggressive communist government there with a peaceful, pro-Western one.

"Instead, the allied governments allowed the North Vietnamese aggressors to infiltrate and attack South Vietnam year after year under cover of 'peace negotiations.' It was a losing strategy from the start. Wars cannot be fought endlessly. If a government decides not to win an ongoing war, it must lose it. The present SA strategy is largely defensive. The main aggressive forces in Angola and Mozambique are only infrequently (and the governments of those countries, never) counterattacked.

"Sooner or later these aggressive forces, backed by the USSR and Western liberals, will subvert and conquer South Africa unless the latter adopts more decisive action. A Communist takeover of SA would have catastrophic consequences for the whole free world. The Soviet leadership would use the enormous mineral resources of the region for a major increase in its hard currency reserves, and for new strategic offensives against free countries."

**INSIDE BOSS**, journalist Gordon Winter's lurid exposé of "dirty tricks" allegedly perpetrated by SA's old Bureau of State Security in Britain, is still making costly waves for its publishers, Penguin Books. In the tenth consecutive action lodged against Penguin, former PAC executive member Matthew Nkoama, now living in London, has been awarded R30 000 damages for "gross defamation" in the London High Court. No other book in Penguin's history has involved more litigation than *Inside Boss*.

Even before it hit the bookstands, actress/model Patty Patience sought a High Court injunction to prevent publication. Within days of publication, SA exile Ben Turok lodged a writ for libel. Hefty damages have been paid out to photo-journalist Stanley Winer; to Malawian journalist, Musosa Kazembe; to Nana Mahoma, a PAC founder — and, more recently, to former Conservative MP, author and prominent London businessman, Harold Soref. Oliver Tambo's wife, Adelaide, former Liberal MP Peter Bissell and

Barney Zackon, yet another SA exile, have received formal retractions for allegations made in the book.

Few in the know have much sympathy for Penguin. In 1961 the company knowingly employed Cape Town-born Ronald Segal, a long-time member of the inner circle of the ANC, as an editorial adviser. Soon afterwards, a special series was created for him: the Penguin Africa Library. For years afterwards, this served as one of the ANC's main intellectual fronts.

Ironically, to his considerable annoyance, Segal was not consulted on the purchase of *Inside Boss*. He would undoubtedly have rejected it, fearing it gave away too much about the ANC's revolutionary/terrorist activities and its support personnel. As it was, he accused Penguin of a "gross error of judgement" in printing the book, describing it as a form of "cheque book journalism." Penguin, a subsidiary of the London *Financial Times*, is one of the biggest publishers in the world.



**THE best political advice ever given was that of Machiavelli to the young Prince: "It is better to be feared than to be loved." Like some of our own *mea culpa* brigade, the US State Department has long rejected or ignored that. Still filled with the ideological offspring of Vietnam and believing that the exercise of American power is almost always immoral, State generally has committed the US to policies of appeasement, accommodation and the search for "peaceful co-existence." By so doing it has surrendered dozens of countries to Moscow. Millions of people have died, often atrociously. Many millions more have become unwilling communist captives. In the end, to quote Pat Buchanan, detente has proved far more perilous to the West than cold war.**

For Washington, at least, that phase could now be ending. The powerful Heritage Foundation, providing the major intellectual input into the Reagan Administration, is clearly girding itself to challenge State. In the second of its "Critical Issues" series, designed as blueprints for the restructuring of flawed or faltering US national policies, Heritage advocates a much more positive US foreign policy agenda, with appropriate long- and short-term techniques for dealing with the rival superpower.

### Creative

In his introduction to the work, entitled *Confronting Moscow: An Agenda for the Post-Detente Era*, Bruce Weinrod, Director of the Foundation's Foreign Policy and Defence Studies, says the fact that the US is becoming increasingly conservative, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the persisting Polish crisis and the unmistakable Soviet military build-up have jointly led to an emerging renewed consensus on the nature of Soviet policies. There is general agreement that (1) the world is a dangerous place and (2) it is even more dangerous because of the ideology and international policies of the USSR.

It is further agreed that there is great need for creative thinking about ways of dealing with the USSR: and that, as the most powerful free nation, the US has a particular obligation to conduct a coherent, purposeful and active foreign policy, with clearly defined perceptions of its own role in the world. Such policy should be geared, not merely to hold-

ing the line, but to prodding the Kremlin towards ending expansion internationally and moving towards reform at home. Immediate objectives should be: 1. Actively countering USSR expansionism; 2. Maintaining strong defence, as the Soviets respect strength and simply exploit signs of weakness; 3. To accept that one of Moscow's most effective elements in world strategy has been direct or indirect support of in-

oust Soviet-aligned Marxist regimes in the developing world. "What is needed is the kind of low-cost commitment which the Soviet Union has undertaken in support of anti-Western insurgencies for three decades."

While limited resources prevent the US from committing forces in all areas in which US interests are threatened, such forces are not necessarily required. In many areas threatened by

## Detente is a bigger threat than cold war

surgencies against vulnerable pro-Western governments in the developing world.

Expanding this theme, Richard Shultz, a Research Associate, at the National Strategic Information Centre, warns that "the spectrum of actual and potential low-intensity threats to US interests appear broader today than ever." His suggested counter-strategies: 1. To place the Soviets on the defensive by assisting anti-Marxist insurgencies where appropriate. 2. Use new technologies to defend against terrorism, while taking the initiative with such tactics as infiltrating terrorist groups. 3. Emphasising psychological operations and civic actions, as well as military tactics.

Dealing with ways of putting Moscow on the defensive, Stephen Morris, a researcher at the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California, Berkely, proposes assistance of various kinds for pro-Western, pro-democratic forces struggling to

Soviet expansion, there is abundant highly-motivated manpower. What is required is American arms and training. He cites four insurgencies where US assistance could make a difference: Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia and Angola.

"Unita is probably the most successful anti-communist guerrilla movement in the world." US military aid could swing the tide of battle in Unita's favour, but is prevented by the Clark Amendment. Morocco and Saudi Arabia have given generous support to Savimbi. The US should encourage other sympathetic countries to provide military and economic aid to Savimbi. He ends: "The containment of communism in its various forms of military threat has been, and should remain, a moral imperative for the US, as leader of the free world."

Heritage invites comment from interested parties around the world. APN subscribers with suggestions should write to me.

**A new arc of crisis is opening up in North-East Africa. In the Sudan, the recent US-linked coup leading to the overthrow of Jaffar Nimieri has not only solved nothing, but has created critical new tensions. The transition government is already breaking up and the communists, violently suppressed by Nimieri in 1971, are re-surfacing in strength. While maintaining a low political profile, the communists are intent on regaining their previous dominant position in the trade union movement. They are expected to work hand-in-glove**

**with the Sudanese People's Liberation Army under Colonel John Garang, who has recently re-activated military operations in Southern Sudan. Garang's expressed aims are to create a "people's democracy": that is, a communist-style dictatorship under the aegis of Libya, Ethiopia and the USSR.**

**Sudan, the biggest country in Africa and also the predominant Red Sea power, is strategically too important for the US to stand aside in all this.**



## Asides... and affronts

NO question: South Africans are deeply worried. Never have I known so many of our fellow countrymen, Black and White, so anxious to do their bit in correcting the world view of our much-maligned homeland. Almost daily I get visits or phone calls, people asking what they, as individuals, can do to help put the picture right. Well, I have before me a splendid example of citizen action. Quite recently, the Australian Financial Review carried a distinctly strange article by one Peter Robinson, containing a minor element of fact, plus large doses of wild speculation: not untypical of current warped Australian thinking about this country. One paragraph carrying numerous blatant untruths stood out:

"The reality is ... that violence to any aspirations of human dignity is the daily norm for most inhabitants of SA. They require official permission to move about their own country; they are directed to the areas where they are permitted to live (usually windblown, dusty, barren strips of land); they are labelled according to the kind of work they are allowed to do; they are forbidden any political rights; severely restricted in freedom of speech; subjected to a lifestyle deliberately aimed at inculcating in them and their children a White view of their inferiority and exploited ruthlessly by officially-sanctioned renegades of their own race ..."

That, of course, should have been answered and exposed by an active and motivated SA Department of Information. Instead, it was left to a private South African to answer these gross distortions:

"While it is doubtless true that the onlooker sees most of the game, a political commentator in a distant land must of necessity rely on secondhand information, which he then digests and evaluates. He is thus denied the opportunity of first-hand observation and discussion and his pronouncements, delivered with an air of oracular aplomb, must of necessity be subjective. The prophets of doom in SA have been vocal for the past 37 years, ever since the Nationalists were voted into power. The country's growing successes and advances in the economic, military and social spheres have lent increasing hysteria to their doleful chorus.

"I am the first to admit the shortcomings of my people, the Afrikaner. True, as Mr Robinson remarks, they are a 'tough and hard race,' but they are also somewhat dour and inarticulate, believing that deeds are more important than words, hence the distressingly low standards of our information, propaganda, call it what you will. We tend to adopt the attitude, 'this is what we are like, this is what we are doing, like it or lump it,' and we are notoriously lacking in finesse: unlike our critics, many of them highly professional propagandists, like Mr Robinson himself.

"A highly placed American businessman complained to me recently that we were rotten salesmen. 'You have a first-class product, but you promote it like it was some sort of snake-oil and are worried lest the cops run you out of town.' So I don't blame Mr Robinson in the least for his biased and gloomy views. I would, however, ask your readers to believe that things in SA are not half as bad as made out. For one Bishop Tutu, who rails unceasingly against the government and has only limited Black support, there are two other Bishops, Moekena and Lekganyane, who represent many millions of Black churchmen, and who co-operate with the authorities.

"President Botha recently addressed a gathering of some 2 million of Bishop Lekganyane's followers, by invitation, and received a rousing reception, much to the dismay of the assembled media, no doubt hoping for showers of tomatoes. Certainly SA has problems, but they are not insoluble, and to dismiss the country, the giant of Africa, as a spent force heading for 'a tragic maelstrom of bitter racial confrontation' is to play directly into the hands of the prime instigator of chaos, the USSR, which is most certainly not 'sitting and watching.' This she is presently doing in Australia, using innocents such as John Maitland and Bob Graham, until the time comes for her to take a more active part in your affairs. As she will, make no mistake. There is more to SA than radical Blacks and prophets of doom, just as there is more to Australia than flies, beer cans and bloody-minded unionists!"

**WHY** did SA agree to negotiate the Nkomati Accord? Was it because Pretoria believes it easier to deal with weak, corrupt Marxist regimes than potentially stronger free-enterprise, anti-Russian Black neighbours? That awkward question is asked in a *Wall Street Journal* editorial. I quote: "Rioting in South Africa has transfixed the American Left, and State Department efforts in the region have been playing in part to US domestic politics. The result is further damage to millions of Black Africans who have other things to worry about. In Mozambique an insurgency called Renamo is making astounding strides against Samora Machel's Soviet-backed Marxist regime.

"State's response? To seek increased aid for Machel. The Africa desk argues that Machel is making 'interesting' overtures to the US and that Renamo has a checkered past. Renamo may indeed have had an initial push from the former Rhodesian intelligence, as its critics maintain. But it couldn't have staged its highly visible sabotage of recent months had it not tapped genuine domestic support. State ... last year helped SA and Mozambique strike the Nkomati Accord deal. This puts the US on the wrong side of all sorts of divides.

"We've been suckered into backing an unholy alliance in which SA and the USSR jointly prop up bloody and sometimes deranged local tyrants with little popular support. The negotiators from Marxist Angola and Mozambique have predominantly been non-Black holdovers from the Portuguese Communist Party, whose intrigues in Lisbon put these governments into power in the first place. All the more shame that State has wound up supporting what some Black Africans see as a White man's cabal to keep them under Marxist oppression."



# Machel's anniversary very depressed

**NEXT month marks Mozambique's tenth year of independence. Unlike June 25, 1975, most locals will commemorate the anniversary in depressed and chastened mood. Ten years ago a euphoric Samora Machel strutted the world stage, with brave talk of creating an African Red Empire, a continent of communist satellites, from which would spring a "New African Man." Obviously, the USSR and East Germany were only too willing to assist towards the realisation of this ambition.**

*In the event Samora a decade later rules over a ruined and starving people, over an economy shot to pieces by his primitive ideas of Marxist-Socialism, with the whole grisly, tottering edifice propped up by an unlikely coalition of the USSR and its satellites, together with the US and SA. And, what's more, with all parties in this incongruous union jointly and energetically dedicated to the destruction of the anti-Marxist, pro-Western, pro-free enterprise Mozambique Resistance movement (Renamo). That irony is not lost on US conservatives. Comments over the last month from some of America's most influential publications:*

Branka Lapajne in *The Washington Times*: "Would the US militarily or otherwise support a totalitarian, Communist dictatorship against pro-US, anti-Soviet liberation forces? Such a question would elicit immediate and resounding hoots of laughter and ridicule. After all, Communist regimes are the antithesis of America's political system, with its free elections, freedom of speech, religion and assembly, a free press and multi-party system. But would such a question be so ridiculous? In early 1945 Franklin Roosevelt signed the Yalta pact which virtually guaranteed Soviet enslavement of millions of East Europeans.

"In June of that same year, nearly 3 million refugees, prisoners of war and displaced persons were forcibly repatriated to the USSR by American and British armies, where they faced certain death or imprisonment. From 1960-62, the US supported UN military action on behalf of Communist Patrice Lumumba in his battle against the pro-Western, pro-US Moise Tshombe, thus ensuring the communisation of the Congo. In Mozambique today the US stands once more upon such a precipice, ready to assist not anti-Marxist allies, but the totalitarian, Communist regime which oppresses them.

"This new policy, involving grants of

US\$40 million in US taxpayer money to the faltering dictatorship of Soviet puppet Samora Machel, increasingly threatened by Renamo, is being pushed by Secretary of State George Shultz and Dr Chester Crocker. Has schizophrenia struck at the highest level of government? Mr Reagan has repeatedly declared that the US supports all people striving to achieve self-determination and freedom, while attacking the evils of totalitarian regimes. Yet here he proposes assisting just such a totalitarian regime to defeat its enemies.

"Listening to statements by State Department officials, one would think that Mozambique was a democratic pro-Western ally, threatened by Communist rebels and insurgents, rather than the Soviet satrapy it is. Hopes of achieving Mozambique's non-alignment with this aid is as naive as hoping that a leopard will change its spots if given a few sacrificial lambs. No Marxist Leninist regime has ever changed its political system or withdrawn from the Soviet sphere of influence for the sake of Western military or economic aid. Mozambique will not be the first.

## Support

"If President Reagan truly seeks to support those fighting against the tyranny of communism, he should start with Mozambique and veto the State Department's astonishing moves to aid Samora Machel and his Communist regime. Failure to do so will only confirm to pro-Western governments that the US cannot be trusted to remain a faithful and staunch ally of its ideological friends.

Political commentator Tom Bethell, writing in *US National Review*: "Mozambique, a country governed in all but name and figurehead (Machel) by the Soviet Union, is fighting a losing war against an indigenous force — Renamo — that is dedicatedly anti-communist and has been, at least till the State Department appeared on the

scene, pro-Western. The Reagan Administration's simultaneous attempts to fund indigenous forces fighting a Soviet-supported government in Nicaragua and to fund a Soviet-supported government fighting indigenous forces in Mozambique illustrate the remarkable confusion in US foreign policy.

"Frelimo took over the reins of power in June, 1975: the beginning of Mozambique's 'long plunge into a political and social nightmare,' as former Frelimo member Artur X L Vilankulu has written. The Nkomati Accord, routinely described as Reagan's 'one diplomatic triumph in Africa,' has plainly failed. Renamo flourishes in all ten Mozambican provinces — and the ANC offices remain open in Maputo. The country itself is at a virtual standstill: no electric power in Maputo, rubble-strewn streets, empty shops and an almost unanimously hostile population.

"Samora has a personal bodyguard of Cubans and East Germans armed with Soviet automatics pointed at his potential assailants, but in fact pointed at the back of his head. This is one of the more sinister and under-reported aspects of the Soviet empire. Machel is firmly locked into a hierarchy of terror and cannot escape it even if he wants to. If he deviates any more than is needed to reach into Uncle Sam's pocket, he risks having his head blown off. That, undoubtedly, is how Machel perceives it. He surely knows that his counterpart puppet in Angola, Agostinho Neto, died (under unscheduled surgery) in a Moscow hospital.

"Have the Soviet's neglected Machel's 'interests'? The European trinkets that he covets are somewhat more expensive than those furnished by the 19th Century African explorers, but we can imagine they keep him happy: expensive tailored suits and uniforms from London, two pink Rolls-Royces to date. Like Neto, Machel drinks heavily. The Russians provide him with crates of the best Scotch and are no doubt only too happy to do so. Less understandable is State's desire to foot the bill.

"Has the new policy borne fruit? Frank Wisner admits that the level of Soviet assistance has actually increased. And ten days after Reagan signed State's request for military aid to Machel, Radio Maputo announced a 'Joint Communique with Mongolia' expressing the support of both states for 'the people and government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in defence of the April Revolution.' Not much progress so far, evidently ...."



# US student leaders show the way

**US conservative student leaders are doing a better job in combatting the anti-SA divestment campaign on the campuses than South Africans are doing themselves. One of the most forceful anti-divestment strategies is that mounted by the Washington-based Students for a Better America. In an action blueprint, *Keeping Jobs in South Africa*, this group gives detailed instruction to conservative students on how to mount a counter-campaign against those radicals seeking to force universities to sell off all stock in all companies doing business with SA.**

The document, signed by Steve Baldwin, says: "For various reasons, the left has decided to make SA disinvestment the No 1 issue on university campuses in 1985. One reason for this is the Nkomati Accord, in which Mozambique agreed to withdraw support from the ANC, the Soviet-backed terrorist organisation supported by the US left and the disinvestment lobby. Apparently, the disinvestment crowd is eager to weaken SA's economy now — thus strengthening the ANC's hand, before it loses further political support.

"The disinvestors are fake human rights groups. Freedom House, a human rights group based in New York City, ranks 26 African nations, mostly socialist dictatorships, as more repressive than SA. What they seek in SA is a form of government — Marxist — which would be far more repressive than what exists today. We have the moral high ground on this issue but the left has been successful in claiming that they do. So we must frame the issue carefully and properly. Point out that our position is pro-employment, pro-peaceful reform, and anti-terrorist.

Apartheid is indefensible but a government installed by Marxist terrorists would be worse."

Baldwin then outlines a wide range of proposed action. After listing all the major organisations in the US where information material on SA is available (interestingly, this does not include the SA Embassy), he adds: "Ask the disinvestment organisers if they support the ANC. If they say yes, use their statements in your literature. Keep free of partisan groups but reach out to all students who are truly concerned with SA workers. Your coalition should be called something like the 'Coalition to Preserve Jobs and Progress in SA.'"

## Action

He stresses that activity is useless unless the coalition can get their message across to the University Regents. "Initiate a letter writing campaign directed at the Regents. Not only should you get students to write letters but also local businessmen, especially those affiliated with businesses targeted by the divestment crowd. Get on the agenda of upcoming Board of Regents meetings and have a pro-investment presentation.

Be prepared to answer difficult questions."

He advises: "One strategy which is very creative and hard-hitting can be called the 'Imitation Strategy.' Many universities, unfortunately, have investments in banks and corporations doing business with the USSR and other Iron Curtain countries. Since it is obvious that repression in those countries makes SA look far freer, it is very logical that if the university is to withdraw from a country with limited repression then, to be consistent, it would have to withdraw from countries which practice total repression. Point out that the Soviets are racist in addition to being repressive.

"Minorities, such as Jews, Orientals and Christians are persecuted. Blacks are not allowed to be Soviet citizens. This strategy may take up a lot of time but it will definitely attract publicity. If you think this is what you have to do to win the war of ideas on your campus, go for it. If you want to take the imitation strategy to an even more complex stage, organise another coalition aside from the Soviet disinvestment coalition. This one should be headed by women and should call for disinvestment from those countries which practice severe discrimination and apartheid against women — namely the Arab countries.

"These countries forbid women from entering certain places, ban them from most jobs, pay them less and inflict upon them all the abuses Blacks endure in SA. This tactic will increase the amount of countries involved substantially, as all corporations dealing with gas and oil would be implicated. To recognise abuses against women will again put the Regents in a position they will not be comfortable with."

# Anti-divestment lobby acts

(Continued from page 1)

"To get this off the boil, you've got to get over to Americans that their own self-interests are being threatened; that they are being sold a political pup of very considerable dimensions. The SA point of view is not being well-framed in the US. In Cape Town we had a four-hour meeting with representatives of every political party represented in Parliament. Without exception, right across the board, they oppose divestment 1 000 per cent. Contrary to what is projected here, there is plenty of sympathy for SA in the US. You have to

capitalise on that, spell out all the time this country's economic and strategic importance to the free world. But that's something you've got to do yourselves: defend yourselves, fight for yourselves, put your own case."

## Message

Allan Ryskind, who knows SA well, said that the message he had picked up and would relay to his readers is that apartheid, presented as the prime motivation for divestment, was fundamentally dead. But he felt SA still suffered one crippling disability: no one had

been able to give him a clear vision of where the country was going.

One final point from Howard Phillips: "A number of people told us it was too expensive for SA to keep up SWA. It will be a lot more expensive if the Marxists take over..."

**Any businessman requiring background material on divestment, should contact the Institute for American Studies, Rand Afrikaans University, tel (011) 726-5000.**



# Soccer match won by machine gun fire

**LETTER FROM AUSTRALIA.** Colleague Michael Barnard, political columnist, the *Melbourne Age*, writes: Perhaps you missed the recent "friendly" soccer match in Sierra Leone between Freetown's East End Lions and a visiting team from Gambia. As the London *Daily Telegraph* tells it, all went well until just before half-time, when the local army unit fell out with the local police on the touchline. "Punching escalated into brawling and finally both sides took to their machine guns, the army in one goal and the police in the other. A number of people were injured and some killed."

Magnificently unperturbed by all this, Freetown's *Daily Mail* duly reported events in straightforward soccer parlance in its sports section, triumphantly headed "Lions Tounce Gambian Hawks." True, towards the end of the account the *Mail* did let drop that "players of both teams had to abandon the half-time pep talks by their respective coaches as fist-fighting degenerated into dangerous shooting" and that "half the 50 000 fans fled for their lives as security men toyed with terror weapons on the field of play." "But," the *Mail* added in a stoical attempt to bring its priorities quickly back into play, "the match itself was a thriller."

Point of this little story is not that Black Africa can hold its own against European civilisation, even if only in the matter of soccer violence, but that

the Freetown *Mail's* blithe attempts to ignore or downplay embarrassing facts is unhappily symbolic of much intellectual thought in the West today. Indeed, leftwing liberal reasoning seems particularly susceptible to the Freetown *Mail* virus. Nowhere does this appear more evident than in the frequently unsophisticated levels of Australian debate.

Example: In all the welter of material on the 10th anniversary of the fall of Saigon, and in all the sporadic debate on Vietnam in those ten years, I cannot think of one prominent Australian left-liberal who even tacitly admitted that events following the communist victory turned out differently from those so recklessly promised. Not one acknowledgement (even in the face of confirmation from the North Vietnamese) that far from being a spontaneous guer-

rilla movement autonomous to the South, the Viet Cong was a carefully controlled instrument of the North.

Not one honest tear over the horror of the boat people. Not one guarded acknowledgement that only the most terrible totalitarian repressions could have forced hundreds of thousands to sea in flimsy boats, many to suffer an agonising death. Not one flutter of conscience over the brutal reality of the "re-education" camps, or of the Marxist legacy in Laos and Cambodia. The right in Australia has not been so tardy in facing fundamental lessons. As a body, it readily concedes that the war was abysmally prosecuted on several counts, especially at the political executive level when public treachery towards our serving soldiers started to become a "moral" virtue at home.

But the Freetown syndrome is manifest in other ways. Just look at the countless words of leftwing indignation about South Africa, from Treasury benches to pulpit: then measure these against the mere trickle of condemnation for, say, Soviet terror in Afghanistan. Yet it is in Afghanistan, not South Africa, that about 1,2 million civilians (plus 50 000 *mujahadeen*) have been killed in a Soviet-sustained war, and it is from Afghanistan, not South Africa, that a record 3 million refugees have fled in the space of a few years.

South Africa, by contrast, has a continuing problem with Blacks trying to get in.

ONE of the most widely read books of all time is *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Written in 1788 by Edward Gibbon, it sets forth the ten basic reasons why that great civilisation withered and died.

These were: 1. the undermining of the solidarity and sanctity of the family, the basis for sound human society. 2. Higher and higher taxes, eventually so crushing that they killed off the old virtues of work, thrift and self-reliance. By the time of Emperor Antoninus Pius, who ruled in the 2nd century AD, the top-heavy Roman bureaucracy was already taxing the middle class out of existence. 3. The tyranny of state control of the work force and production, which means that "nowhere could one find initiative or free labour." 4. The spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people. The mad craze for pleasure, with sports becoming ever more important, entertainment

ever more decadent, brutal and immoral, grew greater every year. More than one observer noted that Rome was rushing, laughing, to its doom. 5. Inflation ate away at the social fabric. The Roman coin, the dinarius, was cheapened and debased by one emperor after another. Once 94 per cent silver, the dinarius by 268 AD was little more than a piece of junk containing only .02 per cent silver. (Sound familiar?) 6. The building of great armaments when the real enemy was within — the decay of individual respect, discipline and dignity. 7. The decay of religion, with faith fading into mere formality, losing touch with life, losing power to guide people. 8. Race dilution occurred by marriage with inferior strains. 9. Intellectuals were gripped with disenchantment and the feeling their civilisation was not worth while. 10. The once all-powerful Senate became impotent and lost control of the situations. The old system of gov-

ernment was destroyed and the new one, with the realm now under two, three and even four Caesars, was unequal to its enormous task.

"All these accumulated symptoms meant paralysis, so that when the barbarians poured across the weakened borders, there was not sufficient of the old Roman pride, energy and enthusiasm to drive them back. A morally strong and righteous people might have recovered and rebuilt, but these disasters only reinforced the growing despair of a desperate people. The old oak was rotten long before the barbarians surfaced. By the 5th Century AD the Roman Empire, the greatest military state in antiquity, had disappeared — and when it was gone, the world was plunged into darkness and despair, slavery and poverty. That 'history repeats' has an ominous meaning in the light of the above." — US philosopher Tom Anderson.



# Libyan hit squads in wave of violence

**COLONEL Muammar Gaddafi's Libyan hit squads have renewed their campaign of violence against Libyan opposition figures who have taken refuge in Western Europe. On April 6 a Libyan national shot and killed Gebril Denali, a prominent opponent of the Gaddafi regime, in a crowded shopping centre in Bonn, West Germany.**

Denali, aged 30, had previously told West German authorities that his life had been threatened by members of the Libyan People's Bureau (read Embassy) in Bonn.

## Assassinated

A West German woman was seriously wounded in the attack and a third victim, a West German man, was slightly injured. The assailant, a 29 year old Libyan, was arrested by a Bonn policeman who witnessed the attack. Similarly, the Swedish police are investigating the murder of an Iraqi which apparently took place in an apartment rented by a Libyan diplomat.

In Cyprus, a Libyan opposition figure was assassinated in the same week. According to West European po-

lice reports, some 15 Libyan opponents of the Gaddafi regime have been assassinated in Rome, London and Athens since 1980, nine of them in a wave of killings which took place between March and June, 1980.

Gaddafi has repeatedly warned that Libyans who leave the country for political purposes will be hunted down and killed. Gaddafi has never disguised his belief that terrorism is an appropriate weapon for dealing with those whom he considers opponents.

In addition to Libyan opposition figures, he has publicly endorsed the use of terrorism against the US and Israel. Given his mercurial disposition, he could easily expand the targets for Libyan-supported terrorism to include any group or nationality which displeased him.

## It's over

PRESIDENT REAGAN and his communications chief, Pat Buchanan, last weekend hosted the annual White House Correspondents' Association bash. But the soiree's real star was humour-meister Mort Sahl, whose devastating monologue hit the libs where it hurt. Mort parlayed the Dems' conduct during Campaign '84 into a possible combat scenario with libs at the helm. "Follow me, men, we should be losing soon." Question: "What do we do, sir?" Answer: "Shoot the wounded." Mort then conjured up a dialogue between PLO-backer Vanessa Redgrave and right-thinking megastar, Clint Eastwood. Intones Vanessa: "What have you done for the revolution?" Clint replies: "The revolution? Haven't you heard? It's over. You lost." — *Washington Inquirer*.

## Not enough

THEY shoot too many pictures and not enough actors. — Walter Winchell.

## Saudi problems

SAUDI ARABIA is in financial difficulties. Impossible, you may say. Not so. The Saudis have long been backers of the Iraqis in their unending war against Iran. Iran now seems to be getting the upper hand. Cutbacks on oil production have hit the Saudis hard and they are unable to withdraw their mighty deposits from the US lest they cause a run on the dollar and the institutions which hold their money. The multinational banks which hold this Saudi money have loaned it to Third World debtor nations, who cannot repay. Do you see the problem which the Saudis have? This could easily spell a growing financial problem for Saudi Arabia and growing unrest within the country as belts have to be tightened. Further, the likelihood that the Iranians will soon effectively control the Gulf (supported by the Soviets, who will eventually instal their puppet) and oil supplies moving from that area. Uncertainty breeds panic and that is what is being seen with oil prices. Those who speak about \$10-\$15 oil do not understand the game. I have repeatedly said that the floor will be \$25, give or take a dollar or so. — Allen Keyte's *World Affairs Review*.



## Banana judge

THEODORE ROOSEVELT on US Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes: "I could carve out of a banana a judge with more backbone than that."

## All not lost?

IF you can't answer a man's arguments; all is not lost. You can still call him vile names. — Elbert Hubbard.

## Referendum

MOROCCO is to spend US\$1 billion on arms over the next five years. In the meantime, the Moroccan Parliament has asked the UN to supervise a referendum on the Western Sahara and so, hopefully, bring an end to the nine-year old conflict with the Polisario Front.

## Worldwide alliance of freedom fighters

RECENT SA visitor Lew Lehrman is proceeding apace with his plans to bring together the leaders of anti-communist resistance forces from Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia, Mozambique and Angola. Lehrman, leader of the powerful *Citizens for America* and regarded as a strong potential candidate for the US Presidency in 1988, is seeking to establish a worldwide alliance of freedom fighters. His next step, according to *US Review of the News*, is to move toward the formation of a Liberty Council on which the leaders of South Africa, Britain, Israel, Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay and a host of other Conservative nations would be represented. "If President Reagan can evade his staff, he will be present at the founding of the Liberty Council."