

## Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

### State Dept. covers for Soviet aims in Angola

While the Soviet Union is pouring billions in arms and military materiel into Angola to prop up the regime there and secure a strategic grip on southern Africa, George Shultz's State Department has announced that it is actively discouraging any U.S. action in the region except "negotiation."

State Department Undersecretary for African Affairs Chester Crocker told the House Foreign Relations Subcommittee for Africa on Oct. 30 that any move by Washington that could be perceived as threatening to the Angolan regime "should be discouraged." He was referring specifically to the Pepper-Kemp bill to give \$27 million in humanitarian aid to UNITA, the main anti-government group.

Why should any action be discouraged? Because the MPLA has indicated a "willingness to negotiate." Period.

The Soviets have pumped over \$2 billion in military aid into Angola in the last year alone, most of it to build up offensive military capabilities, including expensive, sophisticated helicopters, offensive air capabilities, and anti-aircraft and radar equipment. This has augmented the presence of over 35,000 Cuban troops and advisers who have propped up the pro-Soviet MPLA regime and are poised at any point to make a move south through Namibia, conceivably to confront the Union of South Africa. Massive Soviet and East bloc logistical support is also being supplied to the SWAPO terrorists in Namibia and the African National Congress in South Africa.

The Soviet military designs received a setback during the summer, however, with the repeal by the U.S. Congress of the Clark Amendment, which had prohibited U.S. aid to contra forces. But Shultz and company are now mobilized to reverse this, in the service of the Trilateral Commission's "New Yalta" deal with the Soviet Union.

The State Department has found support for its policy from unscrupulous Wall Street circles. At the congressional hearings, José Sorzano, president of the Cuban-American National Foundation, testified that U.S. oil interests are playing a vital role in propping up the Soviet-Cuban presence in Angola. "Senator Proxmire noted," he said, "that the profits of the Cabina Gulf Oil Company provide 'hundreds of millions of tax dollars in revenue to the communist leaders of Angola.' This revenue goes to support the Cuban troops in Angola and the Soviet and Eastern European advisers."

The State Department's Crocker defended the refusal of his agency to put Angola on a "communist nations list" on the grounds that U.S. business with Angola is so brisk—in the order of \$1 billion annually—and that declaring Angola communist would prevent the Ex-Im Bank from channeling dollars into that country. As it is, Ex-Im guaranteed a \$130 million loan earlier this year as part of an overall \$350 million loan package from the United States.

University of Southern California International Relations expert Gerald Bender testified on just how eager the Angolans are to get U.S. business—and how eager Wall Street, in turn, is to help subsidize the Soviet designs for that region.

Bender said: "At a recent New York luncheon, Angolan President

José Eduardo dos Santos was highly praised for the business-like manner in which his government conducts its relations with American firms. Many of the dozens of businessmen who attended the luncheon, hosted by Chevron and Bankers Trust, were impressed by dos Santos's straightforward and non-rhetorical answers to their questions. . . . In fact, tough economic austerity measures that are being followed to further reduce Angola's relatively small international debt would comfort any IMF official, despite the fact that Angola has not yet joined the International Monetary Fund or World Bank."

### Schroeder's farce on Namibia

Representative Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.) is doing her own part to support the Soviets' southern African scenario, by introducing a bill to prohibit U.S. business exploitation of mineral and other natural resources of Namibia.

The bill would give the notoriously pro-Soviet United Nations Council on Namibia legal powers over U.S. jurisdiction—a blatantly unconstitutional move.

Schroeder's bill was introduced, she said, because of the presence of 75 U.S. firms that are exploiting the resources of that country. But in reality, as Namibia expert Marion Smoak confirmed in congressional testimony, there is not one single U.S. firm engaged in mining or extraction work in Namibia. The list of companies Schroeder referred to included the likes of Coca Cola and McDonald's only. Those companies may indeed be a menace to the Namibian people—but not in the way Schroeder contends.