

and the United States.”

LaRouche said that what he, Ponto, and Schleyer were independently proposing “was a classical development which would have frustrated that kind of nonsense, and in which the strategic mineral resources in that part of the world would be used as a lever to foster the classical form of economic development, and political social development for the entire region in a cooperative venture.”

LaRouche recalled that a meeting between Ponto and himself, based upon their “convergence” on nuclear energy, southern Africa, and related Third World development—the classical conception of positive industrialized sector aid to provide development opportunities for developing nations—had been scheduled for the week following Ponto’s assassination.

Economic development is key to freedom

“That problem, which was posed then, comes to the fore now,” LaRouche said. “Shall we have a meaningless sort of freedom, which ends in bloody tribal fratricide, and Dionysiac chaos, or shall we provide to the people of an Africa already threatened with the worst onslaught of the HIV pandemic, shall we provide Africa the means of coming out of the mess, and obtaining at large what black Africa has been denied for thousands of years of the slave trade, beginning with the Dravidian slave trade preceding the Phoenicians? The right to a genuine internal positive economic development and the political and social stability and progress which goes with such development?”

“Ponto was trying in 1977, and he was murdered. I was trying then, I’ve been trying since. What we did, variously, people like Ponto on the one side and my friends and I on the other, are the efforts we have made to that end, to be thrown aside? If so, then the Soviets of 1977, the backers of the Baader-Meinhoff gang, will have won, and all of southern Africa will be turned into bloody, Dionysiac mass murderous chaos, from which no one, black, white, will benefit.

“Let us honor people such as Ponto and Schleyer from 1977 and let us be able to look in their faces, so to speak, the memory of their faces. We haven’t forgotten. You had a moral commitment to Africa. We haven’t forgotten. As we develop the triangle of economic power in Central Europe through integration of the economic potentials of Czechoslovakia, East Germany, West Germany, France, Austria, and so forth, we shall not forget Africa. We shall provide it what pioneers such as Ponto and Schleyer, the martyrs of such a cause, attempted to commit Europe to provide to southern Africa in particular.

“I recommend this message to the attention of Mr. Nelson Mandela, so that he and others will know that there are people in this world who understand and who are committed to a result which we prefer were measured finally by the grandchildren and their grandchildren of today’s living generations, both in Europe and in Southern Africa.”

Namibian freedom: a test of stability

by Jeffrey Steinberg

With Independence Day scheduled for March 21, the climate in the southern African nation of Namibia is one of enthusiasm and optimism. Many of the fears among the German settlers who make up the core of the white minority population in the South African colony-turned Africa’s newest nation have been dispelled in the past months by an attitude of cooperation on the part of the leadership of the South West African Peoples Organization (SWAPO), the Anglo-Soviet-sponsored black nationalist movement that waged a 20-year guerilla war against the South African-backed government. That mood of cooperation, fueled by the recent events in Eastern Europe

style constitution, out of which emerged a power-sharing arrangement drawing in all segments of the population. The successful constitutional assembly made an early independence day a reality.

Some senior officials of the former provisional government in Windhoek, which will soon be replaced by a constitutionally elected government, believe that the Eastern European events, combined with the rapid pace of reform in the Republic of South Africa, culminating in the release of Nelson Mandela from prison, has afforded Namibia an opportunity to carve out a path of independence largely free of outside interference.

Danger of genocidal war

At the same time, these sources point to the outbreak of intensive fighting in Angola between liberation forces of UNITA under the direction of Dr. Jonas Savimbi, and the Soviet-backed MPLA regime in Luanda as a possible trigger for a nationwide destabilization that could easily spill over into Namibia.

For the past month, MPLA forces, once again backed up by Cuban troops, have been engaged in a full-scale offensive against the UNITA stronghold of Jamba in southeast Angola. The assault on Jamba was launched when a severe drought delayed the rainy season, allowing MPLA armored units to move into the area. At the point when the offensive was launched, Dr. Savimbi was on a tour of Western Europe. He abruptly canceled his meetings and returned to the front line.

As the fighting reached levels unseen in three years, the rainy season began. MPLA forces became bogged down, and according to regional sources, UNITA was able to capi-

talize on its superior irregular warfare capabilities to defeat the MPLA onslaught. However, as the result of the levels of fighting, UNITA significantly depleted its stockpiles of arms. The sources were unable to confirm whether or not the Bush administration has yet made good on its commitment to continue arming UNITA, particularly with Stinger missiles, which have effectively neutralized the MPLA air force.

In the midst of the MPLA offensive, Fidel Castro announced that he was putting off his withdrawal of Cuban troops, which had been a cornerstone of the Angola-South Africa-Cuba Brazzaville Accords of December 1988, under which Namibian independence was approved. Over 20,000 Cuban soldiers remain in Angola. Furthermore, some regional military experts have voiced concern that several hundred combat-trained Cuban pilots who left Angola but simply took up temporary assignments in South Yemen, could be brought back on short notice. The inexperienced MPLA pilots who replaced them reportedly have been ineffective in air strikes against UNITA positions during the current battle around Jamba.

Sources in Windhoek say that the first real test of SWAPO's independence from its former Soviet bloc supporters will take place on Independence Day, March 21. It is expected that the Angolan regime will seek permission from the Namibian government to allow MPLA forces to pass through Namibian territory in order to encircle the UNITA stronghold from the south. Such a two-front attack, up to now always prevented by the presence of South African military units along the Angolan-Namibian border, would radically alter the military situation for Dr. Savimbi, and would jeopardize the fragile basis for the entire regional peace arrangement.

It is here that the Windhoek observers underscore the outside factors. They believe that, left to their own devices, the SWAPO leadership, who will dominate the first independent government in Namibia, will seek to retain the peace and stability that has characterized the past six months of elections and constitution drafting, and will focus on rebuilding the country's flagging economy. Outside forces hostile to such a course—both in the Soviet sphere and in the Anglo-American domain—could wreak havoc if they successfully shape the agenda.

As *EIR* has warned repeatedly over the past year, British circles associated with Tiny Rowland's Lonrho represent one major source of such potential interference. (See *EIR* series, "The 'Tiny' Rowland File," Nov. 3, Nov. 10, Nov. 24, and Dec. 8, 1989.) Following Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher last year, rumors spread throughout the Windhoek business community that Rowland and South African Harry Oppenheimer of the Anglo-American Corporation had proposed a series of looting schemes to SWAPO head Sam Ujoma, which would have turned over virtually all of the raw material wealth of the country to the two British multinationals.

Was PanAm 103 an 'allowable casualty'?

by Jeffrey Steinberg

In an exclusive interview published in the Jan. 20 newsletter of *Middle East Insider*, Dr. Jim Swire, the chairman of U.K. Families Flight 103, which represents the families of 35 British nationals who were killed on Dec. 21, 1988 when the Pan American World Airways jetliner was blown up over Lockerbie, Scotland, offered the observation that the massacre may have been an "allowable casualty" based on an agreement between the American government and the Ayatollah.

"It does begin to look suspiciously to us, as though there may have been some tradeoff, about which we would know very little. One can imagine a scenario, where someone like President Bush—who, as we know, has released some \$60 million to Iran, [and] has paid some \$30 million for the Iranian Airbus [shot down by the *USS Vincennes* in July 1988] would wish not to have any obstruction to his attempts to repair relations between the two countries.

"For all we know, it may be that some Iranian source whispered in somebody's American ear: 'Look, we are not going to get anywhere until we have revenge for the Airbus.'

"It could be American policy, that no special steps should be taken to prevent that from happening, in the interest that better relations between the two countries could be established. . . . [With] the number of warnings that we now know about, coupled with the total lack of sensible response to those warnings, it is hard to believe that it could just be incompetence.

"One begins to wonder about whether there was some positive reason why it was deliberately engineered to occur in this way. It is all supposition, we cannot prove it, but we are certainly bent on trying to get to the truth, because none of us accepts that the death of members of our families is a reasonable price to pay for any diplomatic or economic advantage which may have been gained by any country through the disaster happening."

A 'Dr. Strangelove' scenario

As far-fetched as Dr. Swire's hypothesis of "allowable casualties" might seem at first blush, a precedent in fact exists for precisely such a callous tradeoff of lives for global balance of power diplomacy.

In 1958, at the point when the Anglo-Americans and the Soviets were working on forging a post-Stalin set of global rules of engagement, Dr. Leo Szilard (who was popularized