

Geneva talks by provoking factional strife among his opponents. Both men are attending the talks.

Smith's security forces have attacked members of the Nkomo organization in black townships near Salisbury, and blamed the attack on members of the Muzorewa group. The explosion of a bomb which killed one in an office of the Nkomo organization in the front-line state of Botswana on Nov. 19 is believed to be part of the same covert operation.

Vorster:

"No Black Majority" In South Africa

Nov. 13 — *The following article by Eric Silver appeared in today's issue of the British newspaper, The Guardian.*

There is no black majority in South Africa, according to Dr. Vorster, the South African Prime Minister, in an interview with a correspondent of the Israeli newspaper, *Mah'ariv*.

He has taken an uncompromising stand against any significant change in his Government's apartheid policy. In his view, there was no black majority in South Africa. There was a white majority and alongside it a mass of black workers who had abandoned the places where they had political rights to work in a white country. Their jobs gave them the privilege of receiving wages, but nothing more.

Dr. Vorster made it clear he would continue to oppose any change in this conception and any far-reaching concessions that would encourage political demands by the black population.

The "Communists and Liberals in the world demand a reform under which everyone receives the franchise. This would imply black rule in South Africa. I reject this demand and will continue to reject it. Over the past 10 years, I have held more meetings than all my predecessors with black leaders. They know my answer to their political demands."

Dr. Vorster also refused to rescind the racial separation in transport services, restaurants, bathing, and holiday resorts. He argued that there was discrimination throughout the world, but that in other places it was concealed.

Notices restricting certain places to whites only were being removed wherever apartheid was no longer necessary, he said. But the government was not prepared to force anyone to serve a mixed clientele where there was opposition to it.

Racial separation, Dr. Vorster insisted, derived from the desire to avoid conflict. It was based on the will of the population.

To the evident embarrassment of his interviewer, the Prime Minister tried to draw comparisons between South Africa and Israel. "You are placed in a situation of a graver crisis than South Africa," he explained. The interviewer asked whether he believed it possible to maintain minority rule indefinitely if it were not based on the consent of the governed. Dr. Vorster replied: "The Arabs don't consent to Israeli rule either."

The Israeli interviewer argued that Israel's Arab citizens constituted a minority and that there was a great difference between the rule of the majority over a minority, however reluctant, than between the attempt of a minority to force its rule on a majority.

When he asked Dr. Vorster about the inroads made by communism in Africa, the Prime Minister commented: "They want to destroy South Africa just as they want to destroy Israel."

The interviewer contended that there was a basic difference in that the U.S. was committed to Israel's survival, while its reservations about South Africa's domestic policy raised the possibility that the republic would be abandoned by the West. He asked whether the Government in Pretoria ought not to consider the possibility of reform so that it would be more acceptable to the West.

Dr. Vorster replied: "Only a fool disregards the opinions of others. But only a fool shapes his policy in line with the wishes of foreign opinion. You too have a policy of your own. Would you relinquish it if all the world demanded it of you?"

He finally rejected the view, sometimes expressed among white South Africans, that even without the transfer of power to the blacks there was room for extensive economic reform, such as the abandonment of apartheid in jobs and in the wages paid.

Why Wall Street Still Wants to Wipe Out Angola

Nov. 20 (NSIPS) — In an intensified campaign to retake control over southern Africa — even at the cost of a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union — Wall Street and its allies, flunkies, and mercenaries have opened a barrage of military assaults and hysterical propaganda in the last week and a half targeting Angola as Enemy Number One in the region.

While the situation in white-minority ruled Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), is a convenient "target of opportunity" for a confrontation, the People's Republic of Angola is a uniquely and mortally dangerous enemy to Wall Street's control over southern Africa. The unambivalent commitment of the ruling Popular Movement (MPLA) government to a Marxist worldview, and their concomitant rejection of Fabianism, black nationalism, and "African" socialism — synthetic ideologies which have polluted African politics since before World War II — has already had a powerful influence on the pro-socialist leaderships of other countries and liberation movements in the region. The recent tightening up of the MPLA party structure in Angola, and the Angola-Soviet Friendship Treaty signed in early October make destabilization of the MPLA government close to impossible and leave aggression as the only way to "neutralize" Angola.

After several days of lying "warnings" in the Western press of an imminent Angolan-Cuban-SWAPO assault on South Africa's illegally held colony of Namibia, South African Defense Minister P.W. Botha raved that his army would "hit back hard," into Africa in response. Since the South Africans have already fabricated stories of border violations from Angola, they would obviously have no compunction about fabricating some "Tonkin Gulf incident" to which they would "have to respond."

The Sins Of The MPLA

In an interview with the daily *Jornal de Angola* on Nov. 11 — first anniversary of Angola's independence — President Agostinho Neto made clear his Movement's political philosophy, virtually unique in Africa: "the so-called African socialism is a disguise behind which the bourgeoisie enriches itself, neocolonialism fortifies itself, and imperialism helps itself." Neto affirmed that Angola was committed to a policy of progress and social advancement, and that the best cadres in the Popular Movement now form the nucleus for the party which will direct this process.

Neto's, and the MPLA's, abiding hatred for the various racial-

socialist and Panafricanist ideologies — which have long plagued African politics and ensured that the “radicals” posed no threat to Atlanticist control of the continent — have been explicit since the late 1950s, when the MPLA told CIA agent and bloodthirsty racist “radical” Frantz Fanon to go to hell. Fanon, who had approached the Popular Movement with a plan for a “cleansing” bloodbath in Angola, subsequently took his insane ideas to the CIA-founded National Front (FNLA), who enthusiastically carried the idea out and gave the Portuguese the excuse for a bloodbath in which tens of thousands were killed, including a large part of Angola’s leftist intelligentsia.

In the early 1970s, the Popular Movement refused to even attend the “Fifth Panafrican Congress” held in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, denouncing it as racist.

The Popular Movement began the political consolidation of their hegemony over Angola well before the war against South Africa, Zaire and their expeditionary forces was won. This consolidation has been explicitly based on transforming Angola into a modern industrial nation in the shortest possible time, and the groundwork for this has been laid by purging the MPLA of various agent factions, including Maoists and “Trotskyists,” this latter controlled by Ernest Mandel’s “Fourth International” operation in Belgium. This has been accompanied by the rigorous political education of the MPLA’s best cadre and the transformation of what was formerly a united front into a disciplined, centralized party.

This tightening up is to be followed by a literacy and education campaign for the population in general, officially launched on Independence Day and modelled in part of Cuba’s enormously successful campaign in the early 1960s.

The Angolan government has also taken decisive steps to ensure the physical security of the country. In October Angola became one of the five countries outside the Socialist bloc to friendship treaty with the USSR, which includes mutual defense. In addition, the Angolan army under Defense Minister Henrique Carreira, is being transformed from a guerrilla force into a modern army with the logistical and military capability to fight a conventional war.

Campaign Of Lies

On the authority of the South African government, and of some alleged refugees displayed to newsmen by that government, British, South African and American newspapers have, for the last fortnight, been running grisly accounts of alleged Cuban and FAPLA (Angolan army) atrocities in southern Angola against the South African-controlled UNITA counter-gang and the Ovimbundu tribe. On Nov. 15 the *New York Times* sanctimoniously editorialized that “...the Cubans have

laid waste many villages and sent thousands of people fleeing across the border into Namibia...” In what amounted to a declaration of war against Angola, the *Times* came down on the side of South African flunkey and UNITA head Jonas Savimbi. “On the face of it, (Svimbi’s) fight against the Marxist government and its Cuban army seem hopeless, but no outside interests have a license to tell the Angolans that they have no right to continue their struggle for the freedom they seek.”

Savimbi’s so-called freedom struggle includes several massacres, unreported or hidden under the classifieds in most Western papers, of whole villages in central Angola. These provoked the Angolan government to move in and mop up Savimbi’s thugs, a project now successfully completed, according to East German Radio on Nov. 18.

On top of the fabricated horror stories, the Western press has also changed its characterization of the MPLA government. *Newsday’s* Ernest Volkman, in that paper’s Nov. 15 issue, described the MPLA as “...the pro-communist faction that controls the government...” — a typical characterization intended to imply a thoroughly transitory nature to the Angolan government. Volkman’s article, like those in the *New York Times* and other papers, also tries to deny UNITA’s parentage, claiming that they get their support from China without mention of South Africa.

Not all the Western press, however, is quite so stalwart in their push for war against a close Soviet ally — a direct provocation against the Soviets themselves. The *London Times* on Nov. 13 broke ranks on the atrocity story to comment: “none of the refugees (displayed by the South Africans to credulous newsmen — ed.) was wounded during the flight from Angola, raising doubts about some of their more lurid claims of atrocities.”

Various newspapers are also warning that the “Cuban expeditionary force” in Angola may be redeployed, either to Namibia or Zimbabwe. At the same time, Rockefeller’s flunkies in the region are launching provocation after provocation designed to strain the limited military resources of the African frontline states and force them at least to call in advisors trained to handle sophisticated anti-aircraft and anti-tank weaponry, for example, to combat the repeated Rhodesian massacres of Mozambican civilians in the last month.

The ground has already been laid for a “Cuban missile crisis” over such an employment of “outside” military personnel, typified by the *Johannesburg Star* Nov. 4: “It could also happen that the Soviet Union, deeply interested in peddling influence in Africa, may seize this chance (the Rhodesian transitional period — ed.) to make southern Africa a new testing ground, in the way they tested the untried President Kennedy in Cuba in 1962.”