

silent assassination and demolition of command centers, as well as reconnaissance of strategically important information. The existence of over 30,000 such spetsnaz agents is known. They are almost always deployed in small units, but also have brigade staffs at their disposal. Spetsnaz is the acronym for *Spetsialnoye Naznachenie*, i.e., troops for special employment. It is understandable that their existence and purpose are kept secret, since Soviet deception propaganda increasingly emphasizes, that only defensive strategies are appropriate. Then follows the required demand of the peace movement for the Western armed forces to reduce their offensive weapons. That, of course, is a conscious total mobilization of the stupidity potentials of the Western public, with the aim of outright cheating. The more salient issue is the intention pursued by the employment of weapons, for the weapons themselves have no intentions at all. Weapons may be used to defend or to attack. Defense, however, is incon-

ceivable without mobility, and movement without armoring becomes nothing but a fatal sacrifice under the effect of modern weapons. The intent is to irritate the public, and induce guilt feelings among politicians when they allocate resources for weapons. In fact, the opposition parties in the parliament in the Federal Republic of Germany are in the process of coming to the view that the ostensible assault capability of NATO constitutes an obstacle to world peace. One can only shake one's head.

The continuous deluge with such disinformation, delivered free of charge from Moscow, enables many citizens to have but a hazy capacity to perceive reality. Understandably, some judgments simply presume too much specialist's knowledge. An immense specialist department of the KGB secret service invents an uninterrupted flow of new lies with special staffs scientific and a Central Committee department for evaluating the West's propensity for falling for the lies.

Afghan 'neutrality' not seen likely

by Mary McCourt

Despite the genocidal war the Soviet Union continues to wage against the Afghans, plans are being put forward for a post-Soviet Afghanistan. One such plan was presented Jan. 29-30 at a conference sponsored by the Academy of the Evangelical Church of Germany (EKD) (Lutheran) in Iserlohn and the Institute for Development Research at the University of Bochum in the Ruhr.

The Academy of the EKD, which, for 40 years, has played a central role in the attempted reconciliation of East and West, on Eastern terms, has lately devoted itself to eliminating in the Western population the *Feindbild*, or "enemy image," of the Soviet Union. The academy's contribution to this process is to sponsor meetings on such burning issues as Afghanistan, but always to promote "neutral" discussions—a method that did not succeed very well this time. It is not so easy to reduce nationalists like the Afghans to "neutral" discussion of the greatest Soviet atrocity in the world today.

The two principal speakers, Afghani "Ambassador in Exile" Dr. A.H. Tabibi and Dr. Armin Farhang of the Institute at Bochum, presented proposals for a future Af-

ghan foreign policy—strict "neutrality and non-alignment." They also proposed "homogenizing" the Afghan resistance through a representative national tribal council, called late last year by Najibullah, the head of the Soviet-backed regime in Kabul.

Yet, if the response of the Afghans in the seminar audience is indicative—they ranged from professionals who had spent 20 years in Western Europe to representatives of the Afghan political parties in Pakistan—the resistance leaders will quickly see through the proposals: Just who, besides the Afghan resistance fighters themselves, will guarantee Afghanistan's neutrality, non-alignment, and ability to govern itself?

The tone the academy wanted to give to the seminar was set by its director, Dr. Rüdiger Sareika, who noted that the last conference the academy had sponsored on Afghanistan, was hampered by a bad snowstorm. But this time, Sareika said, the "thaw in Moscow," and the mild weather in Germany would be, he hoped, "good omens" for the future.

Dr. Tabibi, who had been Afghan ambassador to the United Nations in New York and to New Delhi before the 1979 Soviet invasion, and who is involved in the U.N. Geneva negotiations, began his talk by expressing his "hope that all the statements by the Soviet leaders, especially Gorbachov, are really truth and not propaganda." He called the Jan. 6 statements by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, that the Soviets will pull out in 1988, and that the Soviet withdrawal did not depend on the transition government, "unusual comments," indicating that "we are on the threshold of an agreement," and that the Soviets were ready to leave, whatever the fate of Najibullah.

Afghanistan must have a foreign policy of neutrality

By and large, the employment of this psychological warfare poison leads to large casualty rates. The casualties are those among us with loss of perceptive capacities, people who look at things from slanted angles, who sometimes suffer from impaired vision or even partial blindness. The fatalities in these combat encounters and battles in this form of war live on as those among us who are totally blind, and saw away assiduously at the limb we are still sitting on. Despite these outrageous waves of nonsense, these years and years of outright cheating, we are still supposed to be so gullible and trusting, and simply act as if we can surely believe that these new gentlemen are far more solid than their predecessors. For the time being, as far as I am concerned, there is no security that anyone could buy a second-hand car from such people without a cart-load of well justified second thoughts!

When Khrushchov began the Party Reform in 1962, it hardly took two years, and the antagonized *nomenklatura* in

the Politburo and the Central Committee drove him out of town. His name was struck out of Soviet history. Should not the West wait for clear proof that the Soviets are now renouncing the proliferation of their ideology? We will find out soon enough. And whether the Soviets are willing to give up military superiority, without any "ifs, ands, or buts," that will become evident enough when Soviet troop strengths have to be drawn down.

West fell twice into trap

The West has twice literally fallen for the trap of protestations of good will, appeals for understanding, peace offers, promises of peaceful neighborliness. Twice the West let the Russian bear rope itself onto the back of the West, and finally collapsed under the tons of weight of the untruth. Twice within 35 years. The first time was when so-called peaceful coexistence was offered. Our oh-so-insightful professional

and "true non-alignment," he said—its policy since the 18th century. And it is essential to end all fighting within Afghanistan to ensure that it can be a "neutral country in the most sensitive area of the world."

His listeners had doubts. If the Russians ever do leave, considered unlikely by some, a "neutral" Afghanistan, after the bitterness generated by the war, is even less likely. Or, as one put it, "I fear that neutrality could end up like the neutrality of Fidel Castro," one man said. "Neutrality for the Russians."

Although very well aware that any deal over Afghanistan will be part of a global superpower deal, Tabibi made no mention of the Reagan-Gorbachov INF treaty or the rapid retreat of the United States from Europe and Asia. The interventions of even such intimate friends of the Soviets as Armand Hammer, with whom he had held discussions a number of times, was "welcome"—as was that of "anyone who might help bring about a solution."

But it is nations—in this case the superpowers—and not individuals, that make policy, Tabibi said. "We will know in two weeks if the Russians intend to go," he told *EIR*. We have already drawn up a treaty, he said.

Two critical questions remain unanswered in the Geneva negotiations, Tabibi said: We do not know how long the Soviet withdrawal will take, even if it does begin May 1; and we do not know what troops they will pull out first. If the Soviets pull out their infantry, but leave their special forces in place to the last, they will not have lost much militarily: They could continue the war whenever they wanted.

Dr. Armin Farhang proposed a "United Front" for Afghanistan, "homogenizing" the resistance, which, considering the deep divisions between the genuinely moderate resistance fighters, and the Islamic fundamentalists,

will be a difficult task. Farhang proposed that a *mumarsel jerga*, or tribal council, which will be the legitimate power ruling Afghanistan during the Soviet withdrawal and while the country is being rebuilt after the Soviet scorched-earth warfare, be made up of the resistance leaders of all seven resistance groups, leaders of the exiled resistance groups; former King Zahir Shah; two representatives from each community within Afghanistan; and delegates representing officials, women, and the nomads.

The resistance must continue as long as any Soviet troops are in Afghanistan, Farhang said; therefore, a military committee must be formed immediately to ensure that the resistance can fight more effectively. No Soviet troops can remain, as "advisers" or under any other guise, and the pre-1979 borders must be reestablished. There are reports that the Soviets want to retain the Wachen corridor, but this is completely unacceptable, he said. U.N. troops, including some from Islamic countries, must be used during the withdrawal period to prevent chaos, and while the Afghan security and military forces are reorganized and rebuilt.

Such proposals did not spark much controversy, but the question of how—and by whom—Afghanistan would be rebuilt, did. Dr. Farhang called for a U.N.-sponsored international consortium to finance "technocrats" to run the reconstruction of the country. But few in the audience found rule by technocrats a good idea. There is one way to rebuild Afghanistan, one man said: The Russians must pay war reparations. Another called for an international tribunal to try the Soviets for war crimes.

Plans for reconstruction are vital, but, as some of the commanders of the moderates among the resistance fighters realize, plans for building effective fighting forces and keeping them under arms are even more essential.