

THE EGG BREAKERS

Counter-Terrorism in Sub Saharan Africa



Jacobus Kotze

The Egg Breakers - Counter-Terrorism in Sub Saharan Africa

By Jacobus Kotze

Copyright 2013 Jacobus Kotze

Obooko Edition

Obooko Edition, License Notes

This is a legally distributed free edition from www.obooko.com. The author's intellectual property rights are protected by international Copyright law. You are licensed to use this digital copy strictly for your personal enjoyment only: it must not be redistributed commercially or offered for sale in any form.

ISBN: 9781301987337

If the foundations are destroyed,
what can the righteous do?"

Psalm 11:3

Index

Specific meaning of words

Chapter 1 The way it is

A religious war?

Chapter 2 Message to my readers & indemnities

Chapter 3 Terminology

Counter commercial espionage

The poppy production issue

No need for abbreviations

The Analyst

Paymasters

Egg Breakers

Informants & Sources

Spymasters

Station Chief

The most important function of an Agency is not espionage

Communication is king

What is the difference between information and intelligence?

What is spying legally?

Cut-outs and safe houses

Disinformation

Counter Terrorism v Counter Insurgency (aka COIN)

A body count is unimportant in counter-terrorist operations

COIN is not conventional war

Tactical versus Strategic

Can the Jihad be classified as a "just war" in law?

Chapter 4 Why is Africa suddenly important?

Chapter 5 Why are you not obtaining the information you need in Africa?

What resources do you have already?

Your diplomats have no credibility

Your carrot in aid money is a wasted resource

Money creates resentment

Why your aid money is working against you!

Why do you arm your friend's enemies?

Appeasement

You cannot train those who knows more than what you do

What about the Police?

You don't understand COIN operations

We are different

You lack credibility for you will not stay

Chapter 6 Historical counter terrorism operations in Africa

Kenya

Rhodesia

South Africa & Namibia & Angola

Counter-terrorism during Apartheid

What did we learn?

Chapter 7 Understanding the terrorist mentality

Grouping of terrorists

Home goal myths

Dirty Bombs

Terrorists are not mental cases

How educated are terrorists?

Female terrorists

Dehumanising

Fanatics

There is no warning

What age are terrorists

Dress code

State terrorism and private terrorism

Chapter 8 The way forward

About the Author

Connect with the Author online

Extract from K's book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#)

Extract from K's free eBook [*Your Worst Enemy*](#)

Extract from K's free eBook [*The Circle of Life*](#)

Extract from K's free eBook [*Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer*](#)

Specific meaning of words

Before we continue I need to explain the meaning of certain words used with boring regularity in the following pages. The list is by no means complete.

Afrikaners mean the White Africans living in South Africa who speak a curious form of Dutch or Flemish called Afrikaans, (of which the Author is one). Charmingly direct people, they were never impressed with the English (colonial masters having fought two wars against them (First and Second Anglo Boer Wars) and three with them (World War One, World War Two and Korea). Most of their forefathers were Dutch, French and German and not a single Afrikaner will admit to having any English blood in his veins. They still take a very dim view of the war crimes committed against them during the Second Anglo Boer War, where 26 000 (by some accounts as many as 30 000) women and children were murdered by the English in concentration camps. Two million of the original five million Afrikaners have emigrated from South Africa since 1994 for reasons which have nothing to do with racism and everything to do with economic freedom.

American Patriot means the authors better half and soul mate. An American Patriot who works for the U.S. Navy and the motivation for all his books. She is very smart, beautiful and cute.

ANC means the African National Congress. A once banned liberation movement and now the current South African Government! They are and will be the biggest political party in the South Africa for the foreseeable future.

Angola means a country just north of South West Africa in which the terrorists established armed bases to launch attacks from. Because of that its southern part was invaded by the SADF and a semi-permanent occupation took place. One of the top ten oil producers of the world it is today slowly claiming its rightful place after being destabilised by South Africa for two decades. It also has the largest military budget in Southern Africa for some reason.

Apartheid means the political system in South Africa from 1948 to 1994 whereby black South Africans were denied political power based on race. If one was not white, you were denied the vote, and the Nationalists had very specific

idea of what "white" meant. It was a "crime against humanity" and it caused a long lasting low-intensity civil war in South Africa, which sometimes exploded out into the open. Nothing good can be said of that system as it was based on farming and misguided Biblical principles, not natural justice or equality before the law. It was bound to fail as it did, but not before it nearly destroyed South Africa and took tens (some say hundreds) of thousands of lives. It was evil, and I will never defend it. This book is most certainly not a defence of it.

ARMSCOR means the South African armaments industry, which had created nuclear weapons by 1978. It supplied needed armaments to South African security forces. Today it is known as DENEL and it is still a big player on the international arms market.

Casspir means the landmine-proof armoured vehicles used by the SAP. It is the forerunner of the U.S. MRAP project, and is still reckoned to be the best anti-landmine vehicle in history. However, being widely used by the SAP and SA Army during Apartheid, it became a symbol of oppression and was discarded by the new government as quickly and cheaply as possible. India now has the most Casspirs in the world.

COIN means *counter-insurgency* operations done by the Security Forces of a country whilst in uniform against an enemy (terrorist) who most often also wears a uniform. It forms a small part of counter-terrorism and in this book we have the view that COIN is always done in rural areas like the bush or veldt and not in cities. It is never done with tens of thousands of troops and conventional troops are rather useless at it.

Conscripts mean the white South African men called up to perform two years Army (or Navy or Air Force) duty during Apartheid and yearly camps afterwards. This was mandatory after school but could be deferred whilst at University. If the flood of books after 1994 is believed they were all long haired liberals smoking marijuana trying to duck the system which is utter rubbish. Very few were against national service and moral mostly high. The conscripts did excellent work in all arms besides the submarine service and air crew which were left to the professionals.

Contact means to engage the enemy with the intent to kill him. Also known as a *firefight*, it refers to a classic terrorist versus Security Forces clash. This would be the term used when the clash took place in rural areas. Both sides usually wore uniforms or other identifiable clothing / weapons. The word is mostly associated with the Rhodesian Bush War.

Counter-Terrorism means all the tactical and strategic methods used by a government to combat terrorism against its citizen in general. It includes COIN and the Egg Breakers or intelligence gathering in general. Counter-terrorism is never in isolation but always a multi-level approach and quite complex. It also includes black propaganda and counter-espionage. Anything done or used to hunt a terrorist down or prevent him from doing his dastardly deeds is counter-terrorism.

England means the British Empire or the United Kingdom in more modern times. The word is used in the general sense to describe all English nationalities including the Irish & Welsh and Scots. Also referred to as Britain!

Fatherly talk means to sort someone out. It is not always physical but most often that happened too. Police speak. The same for taking a fatherly interest in someone!

Fireforce means the concept of dropping crack helicopter borne or parachute dropped troops onto terrorist gangs during COIN operations whilst being commanded from the air with helicopter gunship support. During the South African Border war the same concept was called *Romeo Mike* operations. *Fireforce* is Rhodesian Bush War terminology.

He also means she there being no difference in equality of the sexes under law as it should be. Being a man I usually use the male persona in my books but it is equally applicable on the improved specie too.

Insurgency means an organized rebellion aimed at overthrowing a constituted government through the use of subversion and armed conflict in the rural areas of a country wearing an identifiable uniform.

Kenya means the East African country where the *Mau Mau* insurgency took place in the 1950's. The Colonials actually won. Strangely enough this conflict is largely forgotten in the West even if it took place after the Malaysian one.

Koevoet means the elite South African Police COIN unit which only operated in the remote northern parts of South West Africa called the operational area or Ovamboland. Technically they became part of the South West African Police Counter Insurgency Unit (SWAPOL COIN) and wore SWAPOL camouflage uniforms instead of SAP gear. As with all elite units they had a choice in weapons and uniform and mixtures were quite common. This unit became legendary, killing 90% of all terrorists during the war in that particular area. The Army killed a lot more to the north of them, so it is more accurate to say that they killed 90% of the remaining whom escaped the Army. Today they are much vilified due to their success and there are many good books to read about them. Despite fake parachute wings sold on the Internet they were never airborne qualified, and were experts in mechanized warfare.

Long haired liberals mean the White supporters of the Liberation Movements with liberal views and much disliked by the SAP. Most were highly educated and very outspoken in their condemnation of the Apartheid State. They were very brave, and attracted much attention and hostility for their views from the Security Branch. In this book the term is also used to describe current liberals who have taken human rights to such absurd lengths that lynch justice is now occurring. It is not meant as a derogatory term. Police speak.

MK means the armed wing called Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) under the political control of the ANC consisting of South African exiles. They fought a terrorism war since the early 1960's against Apartheid South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies of Mozambique and Angola. Soviet and Communist China trained and supplied they were not necessarily communists themselves and very brave men and women who kept on fighting against all the odds.

Muslim or Islamic radicals mean anyone who in the name of Allah commits terrorism against the West because of religious intolerance. Not all are members of the Al Qaeda group or so called Taliban. Consequently this description

encompasses all of the above and is also loosely described as terrorists. Naturally one man's terrorist is another's freedom fighter or rebel.

Malaysian Principles or Malayan Principles refers to the counter-insurgency which took place in Malaysia after the Second World War where the idea of establishing safe hamlets for the population took place. Further small teams of Special Forces (that is where the strictly wartime SAS was resurrected) were used with friendly locals to track the insurgents down and kill them. From this came two doctrines. One, to use hamlets everywhere else where counter-insurgency took place (it never worked again for reasons discussed in this book) and two, it established the British Army as the premier counter-insurgency force in the world. The principles did not work well in Africa and the British Army most certainly was not considered the premier counter-insurgency force either. That title went to the Rhodesian Army and took over by the South Africans afterwards.

Nationalists mean the politicians and members of the now defunct National Party who created Apartheid and refused the black vote. They also created the myth of "*swart gevaar*" and "*rooi gevaar*" which means the threat of black South Africans against the white South Africans supported by the reds or communists. No doubt that they believed their own propaganda and thought of themselves as honourable but misunderstood men. The word is meant to be derogatory in this context.

Rhodesia means a country just north of South Africa now known as Zimbabwe. A former British Colony it declared unilateral independence (UDI) and fought a vicious counter-insurgency war until 1979 when the Lancaster House Agreement betrayed it to become a (failed) and despotic one party state which cannot even feed its own citizens or have the money to hold "free" elections. This is where SAP COIN learned the tricks of the trade and many ex-Rhodesians joined the SAP as Instructors. Apartheid never existed in Rhodesia.

Rhodesian African Rifles means the crack the black infantry battalion of the Rhodesian Army. Trained as paratroopers late in the war they frequently acted as fireforces. For obvious reasons they never went on external pre-emptive

strikes and worked only inside Rhodesia. Many joined the Seleous Scouts who did operate externally on occasion.

Rhodesian Light Infantry or RLI means the crack commando unit of the Rhodesian Army. All white and parachute trained they were used as fireforces and on external raids. They were the preferred enemy of SAP COIN when met in a bar on leave since they were very well-known for their boxing abilities during such occasions. I believe the RLI holds the record for most static line combat parachute jumps in the world. Many jumped more than 60 times and on occasion 4 times in one day which is a record which will not be easily broken. They typically used the Dakota or DC3 for such jumps.

SAAF mean the South African Air Force who is the second oldest Commonwealth Air Force in the world and most definitely not in the world as is often stated. Operationally they had an outstanding record during World War 2 and Korea. Later on they worked closely with the excellent Rhodesian Air Force gaining much COIN experience. The two Air Forces had the British Royal Air Force (RAF) as a common forefather so understood each other very well. As such they often shared squadrons and technology. The SAAF used French Mirage (F1 and Mirage3) fighters as well as other aircraft like the Canberra bomber, Super Puma helicopter, Frelon and Alouette3 with great success. According to some publications they have today only three fighter pilots left for their new SAAB Gripen (most in storage) fighters. Is quite funny if true.

Sabotage means the deliberately destroying and or damaging something with the aim of terrorism to destroy the State.

SADF means the South African Defence Force consisting of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Medical Unit. A thoroughly professional Defence Force made up of willing and superbly trained conscripts/national servicemen. It was the most powerful Army in Africa, and despite the rumours nowadays, it hadn't lost a battle since Tobruk in 1942. Its systems and traditions closely followed the British Army. It fought in World War One, World War Two, and Korea with distinction. Today it is known as the SANDF (South African National Defence Force), and not even rated regional power. This is not a bad thing, since a strong Army (in Africa) is always a threat to the elected government. They are today

deployed as UN peacekeepers in Africa - something that many South Africans view as a luxury the country simply cannot afford.

SAP COIN means the South African Police Counter-Insurgency Units. These were specialised Units trained and used in counter-insurgency operations during the war. Their members wore camouflage, and looked like soldiers to the untrained eye. Clashing with SAP COIN generally meant certain death for a terrorist, and SAP COIN was always spoiling for a good punch-up. The SAP Special Task Force (Special Forces Unit and SWAT) as well as Anti-Riot Units formed part of SAP COIN.

SAP means South African Police and the National Police Force of Apartheid South Africa between 1913 and 1994. Highly effective and of a para-military nature with military ranks, training and discipline as oppose the SAPS more civilian orientation which replaced it after 1994. It had 130 000 heavily armed men and women spread all over South Africa during Apartheid. The author was a member for six years.

Security Branch or Security Police means the much-feared South African Police Unit dealing exclusively in state security matters such as treason and terrorism investigations. They ran counter intelligence operations and were a unit apart from the rest of the SAP, who they treated with disdain and a distinct lack of respect. At one point they even murdered their own members to cover up crimes committed in the name of the Apartheid State. They were undoubtedly very effective, and penetrated completely the Liberation Movements. I also use the word "Special Branch" which is the original English (UK) term for them. They were seen as the cream of the crop, and it was a great honour to be selected into their closed ranks. The Author was never part of them.

Security Forces means the uniformed members of the government be it Army, Navy, Air Force or Police. Collectively speaking all formed the opposition forced to the terrorists.

Seleous Scouts means the pseudo terrorist group disguised as trackers in the Rhodesian Army. A true Special Forces Unit they introduced the concept of using turned-terrorists as pseudo terrorists to find genuine terrorists for the fireforces

to kill and reconnaissance. At one stage they were responsible for 80% of all internal kills which shows how bad the situation became because of a lack of manpower (largely because South Africa withdrew its SAP COIN Units unilaterally).

Singular means plural where needed and vice versa depending on the normal use of the words contextually.

South Africa means the super power of Africa situated at the southern tip. Sometimes referred to as Apartheid South Africa as it was during the COIN Operations discussed in this book!

South West Africa is a country just to the north of South Africa but on the west side next to the Atlantic Ocean. This is where the counter-insurgency war started and is today known as Namibia. It was governed by South Africa via a League of Nations mandate between 1915 (effectively) to 1989. Before that it was a German colony. Apartheid existed up to 1989 being under South African control. Its northern border with Angola is called Owamboland or the operational area where most of the counter-insurgency took place.

Spoor means tracks or to find the terrorists spoor to track them down. Afrikaans.

Terrorism means the use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political or religious or other aims. Thus insurgency may be part of terrorism. In this book we also see terrorism as acts of terror not committed in the rural areas whilst wearing civilian (non-uniform) clothing.

The Egg Breakers mean the shadowy men who deal with the terrorist on the ground. It reflects to the principle that eggs must be broken or destroyed before the good in it can be used for food which is good for all. Hence the same as the communist principle of *the end justify the means* though it was Machiavelli who said it first hundreds of years before communism.

The Great Game means espionage in general and is a term which that greatest of writers Kipling first used more than a hundred years ago. Gathering information on terrorism is espionage and denying information or negating the

threat is counter-espionage in simple terms. Obviously it is not a game at all and the theatre of real life which is a harsh and unforgiving place.

The theatre of real life means the events happening in life which may sound too strange to be true but often is. I borrowed the term from that great author known as John le Carré whose espionage novels still stands way above anything else which you may read today. It is the closest thing to reality which you will ever read without being in the great game. I think I read his "*Little Drummer Girl*" 52 times but then I was banished on a mountain with nothing else to do.

The West means America or any country involved in the war *against* terror. Also meant as in cold war terms the countries against communism!

Urban terrorism means terrorist activities inside cities or towns where different counter-terrorism tactics is used like house penetration where you storm inside a house or whatever and kill or arrest the terrorist as you see with HRT or SWAT. It includes rioting and the subversion of authority.

War on Terror means the global war on terrorism which started after the 9/11 attacks. In this book we use the words war on terrorism as a better description.

You mean the reader or in a broader sense Westerners. This book is written primarily for those who are interested in counter-terrorism in Africa and not for the terrorist who will find nothing of value to him here.

Chapter 1

The way it is

Some of you may wonder why a middle-aged former lawyer will write a book on counter-terrorism in Sub Saharan Africa. The fact is I was always interested in this subject ever since my days in the South African Police Force Counter Insurgency Units in the 1980's. Likewise through the next 20 years I travelled and worked in Africa where you tend to notice things and meet with people who have interesting stories to tell and the most unlikely backgrounds too. I heard all the covers and none were convincing enough for us who grew up in Africa and know her ways well. We also know who is who in this world and accept it with tolerance and a few grains of salt as all being part of the great game.

It is a well-known fact in the world of espionage that many businessmen who travel in places where their government Agencies has an interest in will afterwards have cup of tea with the *Egg Breakers* (as I call the field operatives) to talk in general what is happening it that area. Most businessmen will also not be so unreasonable to refuse a free lunch but there is an obvious difference between observing and active spying which should be common-sense to most.

Not that it matters for if caught you may well miss your connecting flight for three days and two hours whilst desperately trying to explain what a big misunderstanding the whole thing is and that indeed you have never seen those *Egg Breakers* in the picture before even if it certainly looks like you in the picture talking to them over a cup of tea in Dubai. And no Madam, I am really not from Armenia of all places and cannot speak Arabic but Afrikaans (and English when it pleases me) which admittedly sounds guttural to the untrained ear so please stop kicking my shins for no reason at all! And no I don't care if you are not impressed by my manhood as it is freezing in here and us Africans are used to heat so please turn down the air-condition also while you are at it. Thank you so much Madam for making my comfortable cell even colder and impressing you even less. I will next time say I am boiling hot and will you turn the aircon on please. Perhaps if you were less threatening and more lady like in appearance you would have been more impressed for us African men have a certain and may I say much deserved reputation you know! And worse than all that please

give my clothes back and stop feeding me laxatives for I am not a drug mule as your x-rays should have told you already and I know drugs is not what you are interested in but the picture with me or someone who looks like me. Oh yes and let me sleep please for I think it's been three days since you allowed me any and I am afraid my training tells me my usually nice if slightly obnoxious personality will soon change as is the way when you suffer from sleep deprivation. I may then get really obnoxious and regret it afterwards for your bodyguards are tough looking lads and been giving me the evil eye for days now.

But alas she convinced herself that if she shouts at you in Arabic long enough you may by the grace of God somehow understand what she says and confess to drinking the altar wine and whatever else is needed to gain peace. Finally she reminded me of my old sergeant major, bless his soul, whilst we took unwelcome and unasked for turns to count his teeth when he roared like only a true drill sergeant can a few inches from your face about a horrible fly who decided to relax on your pillow without your permission just as he walked in for his weekly inspection of all times. Just empty noise reeking of garlic and horribly uncultured Gauloises cigarettes smoke in-between whilst you wonder if and when they will use your body as an ashtray once they appreciate you cannot tell them about those pictures without opening another can of worms which they really should not know about for their own good never mind yours. And you make a mental note to kick the (you know what) out of that *Egg Breakers* for allowing themselves to be photographed with you if you happen to survive this uncalled for attention.

So you keep at your *Shaggy defense* by denying and denying and denying hoping that the Brits don't arrive for no-one can resist their polite ways which is terribly effective since they simply don't ask questions without knowing the answer. Probably from our colonial times we Africans find it very hard to be disrespectful with the polite men with the standard British accent who looks so concerned and at the same time will do whatever is necessary to hear your views on Queen and Country and the late Mr Churchill and it better be respectful too for they know exactly what to do to you if not and you need *re-education* so to speak. They frightened Herr Hitler and the Duke of Wellington before and

once burned the American White House because it pleased them to do so. How do you expect us to resist?

So is life in the theatre of the real if you are lucky. If unlucky it may be a lot worse. We Africans used our own version of waterboarding since the South African Police Force was first created and commanded by British Officers in 1913 and called it a "*tjoep*" or to be "*tjoeped*" since we were colonials and regrettably did not think of such a fancy word first. Still it worked remarkably well with Mr Terrorist and we graduated to using silk covers which cannot (so it is said) be inhaled and found it the Victims lungs afterwards by an overeager coroner who may then be impolite enough to wonder aloud in court why as if you should know the answer. Man probably worked for the Chinese silk trade before being arrested my Lord!

Yes we know all the tricks and a few you never heard off when it comes to Police brutality in the words of the long haired liberals and the seeking of information for the honest detective trying to solve his case with a nice confession which granted he politely invited Mr Terrorist to give voluntarily before *tjoeping* him into one since they both knew the truth anyway and there is no need for unpleasantness. The difference is that we do not easily admit to such things in the world press and don't need to for we tjoeped them also when suspected of communist and other long haired liberal views. They sort of knew already and frankly expected that kind of behaviour from us Africans or so they said anyway. They all chatted in the end.

I can tell you that having an obnoxious female interrogator on your back is guaranteed to take care of any notions of adventure for the next few months for you may not be believed in your earnest explanations and suffer a few more (read a lot) blows for the cause which up to then was not so serious to you being fairly neutral to America's problems in life.

Usually though, after such unpleasantness, it is kiss and make up time even if only for appearances sake with sincerely false apologies all round. You walk away much more educated in the wicked ways of domestic intelligence services who obviously suffer from a lack of humour and take themselves way too seriously. They evidently also don't know that all Muslims, Jews and most

American males are circumcised and since you are not it strongly indicate that you cannot be one of the above honourable species and thus may not be a radical at all but will now certainly think about becoming one. Oh yes you get a lifelong distaste if not active dislike in all domestic Agencies too for they are all the same. Overzealous and on the wrong track mostly!

Many men turned much more active to get payback or you would if you have my type of personality and blessed with a brain like an elephant which never forgets and distinctly remembers the next two weeks on every toilet known to man being unable to contain yourself for longer than eleven minutes at any given time. Luckily this was before the time of the underpants bomber and people gave you a more sympathetic smile for your obvious discomfort than it would have been afterwards. You may even be tempted to call your own external *Egg Breakers* to regain your lost self-respect as you tend to have time to plot revenge whilst on every toilet known to man every eleven minutes for two weeks. Yes you do and that is why torture is never a good idea if the victim survives. It creates much resentment and makes ordinary men do things which are distinctly extraordinary.

Historically this is what happened with Mr Greville Wynne when he acted as link between Soviet GRU (Military Intelligence) Colonel Penkovsky and the Brits after the good colonel approached him in Moscow. He was arrested but not executed as is alleged Colonel Penkovsky was for we simply don't know for sure what exactly happened to him. Many believe he was a double agent and the whole operation a masquerade and others say he was burned alive in a cremator. Whatever happened he was an exceedingly brave man as was Greville Wynne who answered the call of duty and then had to explain for months what a big misunderstanding took place. He was also not believed.

What is more interesting is that that great Soviet double, Kim Philby, said that it is never the top businessman who gets involved in the great game for he has too much to lose and the influence at home to be able to tell the *Egg Breakers* to try their luck somewhere else. It is the average Joe who answers the call and if you think about it Philby had a point. It is always the average Joe who stands up to be counted when push comes to shove. He cannot get a deferment of the draft

as the richer kids did during Vietnam and no doubt in other wars also and thus he is more patriotic and go where his government tells him to go. Perhaps his values are better being a simple man who knows what is wrong and right. Academic explanations are just empty noise to him. He still believes and is known as the salt of the earth or the silent majority.

The problem with assisting any Agency today is that the moment you are seen in any way shape or form with anyone who is remotely connected to terrorism (on both sides) you are flagged or tagged in a computer somewhere and denied visas or placed on hold whilst some wanker somewhere decide about your fate by cross checking whatever was flagged. He usually does not have the means available to him to do a thorough job and so many are refused entry on the very doubtful grounds. It happens a lot to Africans much to our disgust.

Strictly from a counter-terrorism view this reluctance regarding visas shows a serious lack of understanding how the great game works and is a home goal in more than one way. I would have thought it would make more sense to grant the visa with a smile and when the suspect arrives in the destination country to see who he contacts and thus uncover his network or intentions. You may even arrest or grab him without the need for the *Egg Breakers* to do so in a foreign country and interrogate him at your pleasure at place like Guantanamo Bay and others. Denying him is the same as warning him which is plain silly and putting him out of your reach.

This idiotic blanket refusal of visas also creates much animosity amongst Africans who tend to feel their skin colour or religious beliefs played a role since no-one from the Embassy would be bothered to explain the real reasons. Such behaviour is called *discrimination* and a very big no-no in Africa and everywhere else in the civilised world. It harms your war against terrorism for it most certainly causes that fellow to keep quiet on whatever he knows or will know in the future for he remembers the insult. Neutrality is very bad news to you. You simply cannot afford the population not to inform you or terrorists or forthcoming attacks. It works in the favour of the terrorist and not you! That is the first rule of counter-terrorism. Get you networks in place so that neutrality does not bother you.

Occasionally it may even go further that you are approached by your domestic counter-terrorism Agencies (mostly on behalf of the others) to explain why you were seen with someone who they think you should not be seen with. That is fair enough I suppose. In most parts of the world (America excluded) the domestic intelligence men have no power or arrest and you would be in your rights to keep silent and treat them with aloofness. However that is silly. An honest man has no need for a lawyer and my advice is to always co-operate and tell the truth for it most probably based on a misunderstanding which can be settled over a cup of tea on why your name is flagged on some list.

Generally these lists contain 98% of names which should not be there and it works in favour of the terrorist. It is classic examples of overkill because of the myth (yes a myth) of the often stated believe that "*A terrorist has to succeed only once and the Agencies must not fail all the time.*" This myth places an intolerable burden on the Agencies who naturally then tend to be more sure than sorry and as a rule they refuse an entry visa or delay it as long as possible which is the same thing. It is politically motivated and sounds so good to the public that it is often repeated by the fat long haired liberal politicians and their more conservative arch-rivals. As Dr Goebbels said "*If a lie is told often enough it will be believed.*" On the other hand it floods the security officers with unnecessary work and reduces its value as a defense line to almost nothing. Without clearer policy lines at some stage it will bite you! You are losing valuable potential assets and not being very clever about it either. How else will you roll up established networks? Electronic intelligence only goes that far.

A religious war?

It would be of no use to deny that the War on Terror is anything but Muslim versus Christian. It is not about the traditional values in democracy versus fascism. Or even communism versus capitalism as we got used to in the cold war which now looks like the good old days sometimes. This war is religious based and all the nastier because of it. *Per se* it is a difficult book to write as I have many honoured Muslim friends and clients and nothing personally against Muslims.

In fact, I like and respect the Muslim religion as being both practical and straightforward. I took the time to study the Holy Quran and found much which pleased me as it made good sense and I would advise you to read it also before you state your opinion on Muslims. As a faith it has mostly good points and the vast majority of Muslims are excellent individuals who dislike the radicals as much as we do. Logically not all Muslims are radicals. That is important to remember and the same with Christians. Not all are evil or your enemy. Most just want to be left alone to carry on with life and your chances of converting the one to the other is rather limited. This book is not an attack in any way or form on Muslims and not a reason for you to go out and feed them pork or be disgusting in other less obvious ways. Rather try to connect with them and you will be surprised to find much love and respect and traditional values which I personally admire.

As a rule they don't drink alcohol which is a good thing and treat their wife or wives with much respect and tenderness. The many wives I spoken to was not only happy but content with the way they are treated by their husbands. All said to me let it be known this is their choice of lifestyle and not one which they want to give up for another foreign religion. You may also be surprised that none of these women were uneducated or unaware of what their Western sisters get up to. All of them took great offence against people who think they are victims and in subjection. Having worked with very smart female Muslim lawyers in my time I can vote for this. This is their life and they are content with it and want nothing else. We have to start accepting that our ways may not be everyone else's ways and they may not like us for whatever reason. Why do we always need to be the good guys I wonder?

As with all people they do fall in love and out of love and are actually very much like you and I in most aspects. Their strict ways in Sharia law is for them to defend for I cannot but it must be respected being the laws they subject themselves to. You really cannot point fingers at all just because they have a few bad apples who decided to use terror against you in the misguided belief that it is the right thing to do. Or attack Christians in their communities just because they are Christians as happens all the time in Pakistan and Egypt to name but a few because they heard somewhere that the Prophet Mohammed

was insulted. Usually they then find out that in fact it did not happen and all the unpleasantness uncalled for. It is of course duplicitous in the extreme for I wonder what the reaction will be if Christians do the same to Muslim in say a place like New York and burn their houses down whilst chasing them around just because they are Muslims. Or if the Christian countries ban and burn all copies of the Holy Quran at the airports as is done with the Bible at Saudi Arabia and probably others too. Will the average Muslim fellow sit back and say nothing? Somehow I doubt that. I am sure that wonderfully incompetent organisation known as the United Nations will immediately issue their usual condemnations looking concerned and hoping that America will keep on paying their ridiculous salaries (very much higher than any American civil servant will ever earn). I really hope never to hear it.

Terrorism is always from the more radical element and is not limited to religious principles but also to the left and right of the politics of the day. It is my contention that *all* terrorism is despicable and whatever the cause it stays a crime and should be treated as one. This is very important for it means terrorism is not a military problem but a police one with military support when needed and we will speak of this in great detail. Note that in no successful war on terrorism did the body count mean anything. It is more important who you kill that how many and sometimes when you kill them.

For myself, I was born into the Christian faith and believe in the Christian God. I say this in all my books and I will not change nor back down on my views. I demand the same respect from Muslims and even atheists towards my faith as I give to theirs which is considerable. This is a serious subject and very sad that both religions prophesize peace and still we find ourselves with the problem of radicals who decided to attack each other. In a perfect world we would let each other be and be happy as we did for centuries for we can learn from each other as indeed we have without the need for violence.

However, we are not in a perfect world and I think sometimes willing to bend too far on our principles which is wrongly seen as weakness for if it comes down to *out-and-out war* the Christian countries most certainly have the military capability to destroy the Muslim ones when they please and not if they please. It

cannot be denied unless you are dangerously over optimistic and willing to make a fool of yourself in public with plastic fighter planes and photo-shopped pictures on the Internet. We know better than that. You may be able to fool your own citizens but not the world. And in this day and age *nuclear reactor research* is rather silly. You can buy a fully working model from any number of countries and have no need for "research." Why re-invent something which is relatively old technology dating back to the 1950's. No-one will take you seriously and that is a common problem in this world which I saw in my police days too...that silly excuse you thought off just a few minutes ago...we heard it all before! That is also why you seldom lie your way out of court. There is nothing new in law.

Be that as it may I learned something else from my travels. The lines are drawn and the hounds of hell about to be released if we are not vigilant. Nothing what happened in Iraq or Afghanistan in the last decade is a patch on what will happen in the future if the terrorist gets hold of weapons of mass destruction and succeed in using it against the West. To put it mildly another successful 9/11 attack will not bring America to its knees but a million deaths will start payback which this earth has never experienced before. Thus it is every man's business to be involved. Neutrality is not good enough for your own survival.

Chapter 2

Message to my readers & indemnities

In this book we discuss counter-terrorism in Sub Saharan Africa from a historical viewpoint to see what worked in the past so that we can learn from it. We also take a look at the difficulties faced by the West when collecting information (also known as intelligence) here for they are not getting the information they should even if they are not aware of it in many cases. I dare say something very bad must happen first before they will take it seriously enough.

I concentrated on Sub Saharan Africa because all indications are that the threat will be move south for the simple reason that the North is already under heavy scrutiny. The nature of terrorism is to swim like a fish with other fishes in an effort to hide and with Israel around having established networks in those countries the terrorist will not last long though they may do something spectacular for a short while. That is the theory and it is quite possible that I will write a follow-up book on North Africa. At the moment I feel the lack of knowledge on Sub Saharan Africa is greater and thus this book which you are reading now. I am sure that some of my views will be controversial for you but it is the area in Africa I know best.

This book is not meant to be an academic work and claims no such status though I am able to prove what I say if challenged for I do a considerable amount of checking my facts before writing it for you to enjoy. If you read my other books you will know I find academic answers boring beyond belief and very difficult to understand. Quite possibly because I fall asleep after the first three pages and though I have huge respect for the Academics it is not for me being my family's black sheep so to speak.

Academic answers may impress my date (never did and my American Patriot is much smarter than me anyway) but in real life it is of debatable use. Thus we will stay away from it as a far as possible and get to the practical as is my way and try to make the subject less boring than usual. For the same reason I stayed away from Arab & other names which no-one except an Arab can pronounce and useless statistics without purpose. I deliberately did not discuss any particular

operation in detail for several reasons. One, it may be detrimental to the *Egg Breakers*. Two, it deserves a book on its own and three, the time is not right for the war is on-going. Perhaps in 20 years from now the stories will come out and we can all enjoy it. As such this is not a history book either but may be a forerunner for one.

The opinions in this book are mine and mine only. The famous English Judge, Lord Coke, once said "*I may be wrong, in fact I frequently am wrong, but I am never in doubt.*" This summarizes my feelings about life in general. I do not claim to be always right (my American Patriot is known as Mrs Always Right most of the time and she is mostly) but I seldom have doubts and will always make a stand. Sitting on a fence is pathetic in my eyes and neutrality favours the terrorist. So it is dangerous too for he feels the same. Either you are with him or you are not. There are really no grey areas here but a lot of grey areas in law when it comes to terrorism. However, the lines are drawn and most know instinctively which party they favour.

I must admit though having doubts on whether this book should be written and particularly by me of all people for I like the shadows and I have no doubt that there are many others better qualified who could have done a better job. Regrettably they did not I made the choice to carry on and I hope you find enjoyment reading here. I thank you for taking the trouble.

A topic like this is bound to cause a few raised eyebrows from various official and non-official organisations. You may be sure I asked no-one's permission to write this book but I did ask a few former higher ranking *Egg Breakers* to read it independently. Surely I made the changes they required to ensure operational security and other reasons. Something which I personally think is taken way too far by the professionals. Very few documents are actually as secret as they think it is and over classification since the word "*top secret*" was invented is the norm. Half of the time it is for other reasons like impressing the fat politicians with "*secrets*" and obviously to protect empires. Proving this is impossible.

I also use terminology as it was during the time of the incidents described in this book. For instance where we talk of the classic counter-insurgencies in Rhodesia and South Africa during the 1960's to 1989 I call the freedom fighters *terrorists*

and it should be read in that light. One man's terrorist is always another's liberation hero depending from which side you look. This is not the time or place for political correctness which at any rate belongs to a general looking for a pension and the weak politician. Both are contemptible. Interestingly those very same "terrorists" went on to become Governments of countries. In Rhodesia they became despotic power crazy thugs and ruined their country. In South Africa and Kenya, not at all, democratic principles are still respected up to a point. Which shows you that you never know how it will turn out and much depends on the men involved and how they react to power. There is no way a man like Nelson Mandela would have turned out to be a dictator. But one Robert Mugabe did! So how is that explained by the learned men? I just don't know.

My main concern was that I don't accidentally start a fire for counter-terrorism in a closed world for outsiders and I have no doubt that my pet hate, the long haired liberals, would love to have full details of the techniques described in this book to shout to the heavens about brutality and worse as is their silly way of doing things. Why they do so I would not know for several reasons and it puzzles me for although I heard their rhetoric many times I feel they miss the point completely. Firstly, they forget that they have that right to shout to anyone silly enough to listen only because of the Military and the *Egg Breakers* who keep them (also) safe from the Evil Ones who will not tolerate such ungratefulness. Yes, Mr Long Hair Liberal, I would love you to shout your garbage in a place like North Korea, or quite a few African States I can mention and see how long you last before you run to the nearest Marine to save your sorry butt.

Secondly, please wake up to the fact that you cannot eat scrambled eggs or any eggs without breaking an egg first which is a violent act towards the egg (protected by your human rights in theory). It is an unfortunate side effect that terrorists do not abide by civilised rules whether they disguise their actions as a holy war or whatever and it *must* (not maybe) be countered physically and not only with words and useless treaties. Simply put, words will not break their bones quickly enough to cease to be a danger to your way of life. During such times people die and they do not get up for act 2 either.

In the theatre of the real the lucky ones just die and others are tortured for information before they die. It is the way it is. Whilst you may think you take the higher moral ground with your loud condemnations you actually don't for you are a hypocrite for enjoying the results of the broken egg but crying about the broken egg at the same time. You cannot have it both ways in the real world and keep your credibility. This should be obvious but is not! As an example look at the movie stars who are suddenly against firearms but have no problem using it in to great (read financial) effect in their movies. Some of my readers may not be aware of this but it is well-known that everything you see in a movie is there because it brings free publicity to the manufacturer who pays excellent money to have it exposed. I drafted those contracts myself in the past so I know.

As a consequence if you want credibility and respect you need to practise what you preach and ban these products in your next blockbuster. Anything else is moral cowardness and people like me will see through you and write things you don't may want to hear. Since I am not a serving member of the *Egg Breakers* I will say it in my books also and defend my views in any court of your choice. The publicity alone will make it worth my while.

In my view these type of statements are not only undermining the efforts of the braver men (than the ones making it) who break the eggs but have absolutely no understanding of the nature of the beast you are dealing with. A terrorist must be dealt with as a terrorist and not a normal human being for he is not one. He placed himself quite deliberately on the wrong side of humanity outside the usual rules of war. After all, his purpose is to *terrorise*.

I am reluctant to say so for I hoped those days were passed us but it is sometimes necessary to use the same tactics to be effective. Be glad it is not you who make these decisions and you still have the freedom to shout you nonsense to the heaven and wherever else it pleases you. You should know being smart that it is moral cowardness to criticize when you have nothing to complain about to begin with for most of these fellows live in a style and place unimaginable to 99% of the population.

They are very strange and no doubt will continue to be. For instance they complained for decades about nuclear weapons when that very same nuclear

weapon kept them from speaking German or Russian or Chinese today. It killed no-one (after the Second World War) and guaranteed the peaceful conditions for you to criticize the Military and your own easy way of life without having the moral guts to emigrate to your communist paradise (in the old days). Today I am not sure where their paradise is for most are atheists as well! Why is that I wonder? If it is so bad in your *Land of the Free* then why not vote with your feet? Go then and experience the real world where you obviously want to be. Perchance you refuse because you always knew that you would not be allowed your cr-p in a communistic (meaning any non-democratic) country?

Verily there is none as blind as those who don't want to see. I would love to hear their boring explanations and so I hope would my readers for it would be vastly entertaining to hear why they do not follow their often loudly stated convictions in real life. Surely you have all the answers ready! Convince me I am wrong for I know I am not always right. Explain to us why you play leading roles in action movies with (gosh) guns and explosions! Or a military leader with (gosh) guns and explosions if you are so liberal that you cannot stand it!

Paradoxically the *Egg Breakers* do what they do in your name also. Yes deny it please and emigrate in disgust to the paradise in your head amongst the clouds where such things are not done. A place where no 9/11 happened and all terrorists are gentlemen who tell us everything we need to know without fatherly persuasion to do so. A place where there is no threat against our way of life and or right of existence if you are an Israeli. A place where your academic cr-p is actually appreciated! You cannot for it is a dream world.

The *Egg Breakers* do what they do for your right to exist in a world where you are not seen as a liberal with good intentions but a non-Muslim to be killed on sight. Go and wave your Bible around in even a friendly Muslim country like Saudi Arabia and see what happens. Or better, go there and tell them you are an atheist and that Allah, the Most Holy, does not exist. It will be vastly entertaining for us who knows what we are dealing with and will not disrespect another man's religious beliefs with idiotic statements even if it makes vague academic sense to you. I say the *Egg Breakers* deserve a lot more respect and appreciation if not your praise which I understand you will never give being

against your convictions. That is fine also. Each to his own! No *Egg Breaker* I know places any value on your opinions in as much as I know you place none on mine. At least you have a viewpoint which I respect even if I don't understand it.

I really do not have a pre-supposed agenda when I write my books despite the sometimes nasty accusations from the few who took great exception in reading such baloney (they used other distinctly un-academic words). To them I say let there be peace for you opinion will not change my views and I think of myself to be the average Joe with conventional ideas. If that makes me a conservative then it does but I certainly have decidedly liberal views on the death penalty and equal rights for all. Though I often poke a finger in the direction of the fat politicians and my pet hate, the long haired liberals, this must not be seen as enough reason to classify me to the far right of society for I am not. You could not be more wrong to do so.

** It is quite remarkable that the few distractors were from both the far right and far liberal which place me right in the middle with the Average Joe where I want to be. On this point though we need to be careful never to use the words "fighting fire with fire" for such actions is usually done without any thought on the consequences. It means to me you lost the moral high ground when you try to justify your actions with such words. It is almost as silly (my word for stupid) as Mr McNamara's doctrine of "graduate response" in South Vietnam.*

It all goes back to your cause. If your cause is *ab initio* wrong, like we had with Apartheid here, then it does not matter what your arguments are, you stay wrong in my eyes. Many tried to defend the State authorised murders and torture afterwards with the words "*fighting fire with fire*" but it stays *murder and torture*.

As far as politics go I have no heroes and hold all politicians in equal contempt which they so thoroughly deserve. Still have to meet a single one, except Mr Nelson Mandela, who impressed me in any way shape or form. I lost any feelings of patriotism when I realised I served evil in Apartheid South Africa out of loyalty. We really believed we were right and the rest of the world wrong as I tried to explain in my first book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#). It shows you how treacherous politicians are for they are as shrewd as the gods

they serve. As an amateur historian I wonder if there is any war in existence which was not created by their idiocy and personal failures. Even this one on terrorism is because some people decided to play at politics instead of preaching the true faith. You simply cannot convert a man if he does not want to be converted. It is that simple.

Despite my frequently stated scepticism and admonitions on human rights I do believe that human rights are a good thing when it is not taken too far by our long haired liberals. Everything in life taken too far will cause an unnatural balance and disturb the neutrality of law which is dangerous and has entirely predictable consequences as natural justice step in to equalize it. In law it will lead to xenophobia and lynch law. Truth to be told it is happening right now in Africa and it is wrong, very wrong, to attack a man just because he is a foreigner. Or because he looks different from you or have different sexual desires or speaks with an accent! We forget it was the immigrants which made America a great nation to the benefit of all by bringing new skills and ideas. However, as my American Patriot pointed out, the foreigners should then become citizens holding the ideas of the country they are in. Unfortunately that is not happening here nor dare I say, in her tribe.

I feel that as long as the immigrants stay in the law they should be made welcome. The problem however starts when they are illegal and I don't have the answers to that one except to say that the law of the country must be respected and abide by. Get legal or get out and stop abusing the system for grants and asylum. That is why you are lynched even if you yourself may be innocent others are not and it is no use to deny the obvious.

In the Military if you stay too long in a foreign country it will lead to your soldiers being seen and treated as *occupational forces* which are never welcomed anywhere by the ordinary folk. Even if they are highly disciplined and there to assist they will be unwelcome after a very short while and be attacked by the man on the street. This will happen even quicker when they foolishly try to convert you to a strange faith and deflower your women or criticize your way of life all the time. That is why the Great Indian Mutiny started and we can learn

from history even if we don't seem to. We make the same mistakes over and over again.

At this point I must say it is quite possible that you are new to my style of writing and I accept that my sense of humour may not always amuse you. Much of what I write here is tongue in the cheek for life is never overly serious to me though the message in my books is. Terrorism at ground level where you smell the blood and pick up the bodies is as serious and disgusting as it gets. It is not a joking matter. For my faith I do not apologise. Long ago I decided to approach life on my own terms which are subject only to God who I fear very much indeed. Whatever I do in life is to His honour and only because of His grace. I claim nothing to my own endeavours. This is also why I spell satan with a small S if he should feature in my books which are not often. That hideous creature will not be honoured by me in any way and thus does not rate a capital S in my books. And I don't care if it is grammatically incorrect. I do the same with banks which I call your *worst enemy*. Each to his own! We all have our peculiarities in life and me more than most. It is my way. I have no wish to offend you though and I hope you find nothing to take offence with.

As with all my previous books I say I am not a writer by profession and I certainly claim no recognition as an Author. I apologise for any grammatical errors in advance. English is my second language and this book is written in South African English which is not the same as American or what is known as the Standard English. Since many of you reading here are American I tried to give the equivalent American terminology where needed.

I ask that if you enjoyed reading here and feel the need to donate then please contribute to any American Veteran Organisation or your choice. That honours my American Patriot who I love and works for the U.S. Navy. She is not only beautiful but way smarter than me as well. As in all my books I thank her for her support and love and above all, scissors.

** I am very sad to say she died, age 41, on 21 May 2014 after a short (unexpected) illness. I will always love and cherish her and we will meet in heaven one day. God knows best. On request from many readers I wrote a [short tribute](#) to her which is available online.*

Regards & best wishes,

K

Chapter 3

Terminology

Espionage is as old as prostitution and we often read in history of spies and spymasters who did great deeds or were equally great villains depending on your views. There is not a single empire, from the ancient Chinese and Egyptians to this day which did not have an efficient intelligence gathering apparatus as part of central government. It really is your first line of defence whether you want to know this or not. In general they are a lot more effective than what the liberal (anti everything good) media tells you. Remember only their failures reach your ears and it is seldom that a good movie is made about actual events and still are reasonably accurate. It is also always done decades later for obvious reasons.

I think it was Miles Copeland, an American Intelligence Officer and delightful Author, who wrote that he needed to read spy novels to understand what the fat (my word) politicians meant when they asked questions on about his world. It seems that what the professionals understand from certain words is not what the public and Hollywood does. To prevent similar misunderstanding I thought we should take a closer look on the jargon for counter-terrorism always involves espionage in some way or another. Where needed I put the American terms also.

Counter commercial espionage

Not all spying is on behalf of governments or even involve a government funded organisation which is the idea which most have of spying. You also find commercial spying called industrial espionage which is directed against business secrets and know-how. It is a major unrecognised problem in Africa for all companies and not only large multi-nationals.

For some reason most overseas companies just don't get it that this type of thing can happen in Africa too and not only in China or Europe. I keep on saying and I am sure it is irritating that it is morally wrong and dangerous to relax your ways when in Africa because it is Africa. It shows racism and disrespect on another level even if I am sure it is unintentional. My advice for whoever wants

to listen is always not to ever relax your standards. Whatever you heard it is never necessary to pay bribes for instance and when you do so you open yourself up for abuse. You can read of this interesting topic in my book [Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer](#) which is available free of charge.

I remember back in the late nineties we launched privately funded operations against the counterfeit goods which flooded the market and caused much anguish to the trademark holders. Sadly it still does for they have not suffered enough to understand it cannot be stopped by conventional law. That time will come when they understand my ways are better but anyway. Immediately we picked up that the way it entered the country showed classic cold war spying techniques in cut-outs and front companies with third (read tenth) party distribution. The money trails was also professionally disguised and we were in fact quite impressed. It did puzzle us for greatly before we got to the truth.

Turns out former Eastern European spymasters went commercial and used the same techniques which worked so well during the cold war to make money. I can tell you we were quite glad to find that out because we wondered if they were deliberately trying to destabilise our economy. However, it was just business for them and we all had a good laugh over it in one of their many gentlemen's establishments so to speak. The things I did for clients! Must say the food was good and the company excellent. Learned a lot from those old spymasters. Wonderful people to be sure.

** This was way before I met my American Patriot. Today I will refuse because of respect towards her.*

More seriously we also found a link between counterfeit-goods and terrorism as terrorism in those days did not and do not today (mostly) enjoy State funding. Thus they needed money and this was one of the ways they were obtaining it. Despite our evidence we were not believed when we reported it. Interestingly I think the same happened in America during those years with the drug trade and conventional weapons in Colombia but I may be mistaken.

The poppy production issue

I understand from the many people I talked to during my travels that the poppy (opium which later becomes heroin) trade in Afghanistan is funding terrorism and did so for decades. Conceivably I am too cynical to agree that it may not be just criminals as we always thought. As far as I can see this is a weapon of mass destruction for it causes billions damage to a country besides the families which it destroys.

From a terrorist viewpoint it certainly makes a lot of sense to be paid well to destroy your enemy by your enemy. It also gives the peasant farmers an income and guess who is then not telling you where your terrorists are? Peasant farmers as we know are not part of the social elite you are mixing with, but the elite don't have the knowledge you need and thus rather useless as a source.

Interestingly is that Burma, now call Myanmar or something is the second largest producer after Afghanistan who dominates the market. What does this tell us? Firstly both have corrupt governments which pretends (for it is nothing of the sort) to be a friend to the West. Secondly their actions present a clear and present threat which must be responded to and I do not mean attack them. There are much better ways and you need to be clever about it for it is not a military problem. Leave the Military alone to do what they do which is not police actions.

To be honest most of the times I feel that almost everything you did after 9/11 was wrong from a counter-terrorism viewpoint but certainly it was not morally wrong to attack the countries you did attack. I respect your intentions and do not subscribe to the silly conspiracy theories about President Bush (43) being part of an oil mafia or something etc and thus attacked Iraq because of the money to be made afterwards. We even had a rumour in Africa that the fight was about a woman which is plainly ridiculous but shows you how quickly something spread around. And no-one believes you embassies when they deny something for they have no credibility in Africa as we will see in the next chapter.

As a matter of fact I will never believe that a U.S. President is not an honourable man doing the best he can under circumstances which makes him grey before

his time. The conspiracy clan are utterly ridiculous and dangerous with their silly views which never stand any scrutiny and should be ignored.

** My American Patriot flatly disagrees with the honourable part (Watergate etc) but as a citizen I feel she has more right than me to be critical. We agreed to disagree as I know what is good for me.*

We forget that the direct result of the attack on Iraq and Afghanistan was the Arab Spring and I hope an *African Spring* will follow soon enough. It was nice in Africa when we realised that the West is willing to say to the dictators "*come on and let us waltz on my terms only.*" So in that regard it did the world a favour and put the fear of God into the dictators for a short while. Also remember that President Bush (43) and Mr Blair (another unnecessarily abused man) did not know at that stage about the lack of weapons of mass destruction. It is anyway a rather silly (my word for stupid) argument to deny that terrorists will be very dangerous with such weapons and will use them if they can get hold of them. Thus I have no problem with the actual invasions. It is what happened afterwards which is bad for counter-terrorism in my view.

The Military, as much as I respect them, is not the logical solution to terrorism for all terrorism is a crime in some way as I said before and will say again. Thus you need to use police methods backed-up by the Military to stop it. It is the only way but it is the hard way of doing so and thus not popular for those looking for quick solutions. Sending hundreds of thousands of soldiers into a country (after the initial invasion) shows to me you have no understanding on the deviousness needed to combat terrorism. By doing so you played right into the hands of the terrorists and they are winning the propaganda battle because of it. Your own credibility is very low whether you want to hear it or not even though you are winning.

History tells us that the Allied Armies in Germany after the Second World War demanded the safekeeping of all weapons the moment the surrender was signed. They backed it up too and any German who was found disobeying faced the death penalty. Indeed quite a few were executed as suspected members of the almost non-existent "*Werewolves.*" So we had a historical precedent and we did not remember it. Most certainly the planners failed miserably to plan for the

protection of the population after the Iraqi forces (no threat to begin with) was destroyed. We can only hope this will never happen again and that the lesson learned will not be forgotten.

You also don't need to be a counter-terrorism expert to understand that an occupational force will always be extremely unpopular and be attacked by the very people they are trying to protect. Worse it costs billions of totally unnecessary money you can ill afford to keep the troops operational. Furthermore it generated a new wave of terrorists as the mistreatment of Muslims came out even if it is indeed isolated cases and not your policy to do so or even untrue for they don't care. It is news and good news for them must always be bad news to you. There is no way that your black propaganda will assist you in unfriendly press.

There is so much you can do differently with the poppy trade. It is not impossible to scientifically prove that a specific drug comes from a specific region in a specific country. Being a supporter of unconventional ideas I say attach the same market value for every drug delivery found from that country in their local assets in your own country. They support the trade by not doing enough (read anything) to stop it and thus pose a national security risk to you.

You have that right to hold them responsible under International Law. I would include the medical and other social expenses which federal government and whoever else has to treat the addicts in this claim and have everything of value attached. They will soon enough get the message and once that is done you legalise drug use and drop the bottom out of the market and charge punitive import tax on it. At the same time refuse all medical assistance to drug users and let them die in the peace they want. Another way is to destroy the crops from the air as you did with Agent Orange in Vietnam and I am told is very possible to do. Certainly the Rhodesians did the same in their war but that was to reduce hiding places.

Obviously it will never happen and thus it will be business as usual. A few drug addicts (in relation to your population) will keep on costing you billions and the long haired liberals will give us many well researched academic answers on why you should feel sorry for them and their ultimate suppliers. As you may imagine

I have zero sympathy with the drug addict and believe the real Victims is his loved ones. You can read that in my short article called *The Drug Addict Pattern*.

** It saddens me to see how much it is downloaded since it shows the need it greater than what I thought.*

The weak point in the terrorist onslaught against you is his drug trade. Logic tells me it is impossible to hide the poppy fields for it is not a jungle but quite open. He also has to associate with criminals and criminals make excellent sources of information. Especially if you arrest them not on drug charges but treason which carries almost automatically the death penalty. Supplying drugs is a form of economic sabotage which is nothing new and happened for centuries already. We know it happens with normal agriculture trade also. For instance satellites monitor the wheat production of other countries to see what they will need to buy in foreign currency from you. You do not negotiate blindly at such meetings and squeeze them dry.

On Industrial espionage the available statistics (for what it is worth) tells us that Germany loses up to 87 billion dollars per year. That is roughly 30 000 job losses. Since America has an economy five times bigger than Germany the maths shows us American losses at a staggering 435 billion and about 150 000 jobs every year which is terrible in any language. A quick calculation shows me that 410 Americans loses their job every day because industrial espionage is not taken seriously enough.

A major part of my speciality, forensic law, is counter-commercial espionage where we try to prevent commercial secrets from being stolen. Our approach is to conduct a thorough security overview to see what is in place and more importantly if it is followed as it must be to be effective. As a general rule we find that even the best known companies fail to have even basic pre-cautions in place. And even if in place they fail to implement it which is the biggest nightmare for any security officer at that level. They would do things such as using the same passwords for everything and the old 1234 number as their passwords. If not that then it is their birthday which is even worse and easy to figure out. Luckily most network experts now force changes once a week but

strangely enough none of the network engineers were ever vetted for security purposes.

How silly is that now. You put all your information in a man's hands that you know nothing about and even worse do not check on now and then to see if his lifestyle corresponds with his income or what he copies from your systems. For silly reason which I fail to understand you just trust and trust and trust for it is Africa and such things obviously never happens here. As with all things in life it is difficult to persuade them to be more careful until they lose money and contracts and people are fired because of it. Then all is well for a week or two until the bad habits start again. They also have no clauses relating to commercial espionage in their contracts from a legal viewpoint for it is something which the mainstream professionals never heard about outside the realms of a Saturday afternoon movie.

I could go on and on but as interesting as this is it is a subject for another day. It keeps us busy enough if we can be bothered for there comes a time when you say stew a bit and we have better things to do than to repeat the same message.

I am not convinced that industrial espionage is not terror related for it is well-known that in the cold war a large part of the Soviet Union efforts were to obtain parts they needed for their military industry. So why not here also I ask? I came to the conclusion that the so called "*Al Qaeda Training Manual*" was written with Syrian and or Egyptian security officer's assistance for the examples are all to do with Israel. So my question is who trained the Syrians and or Egyptians in the cold war? The Soviets! And who specialised in stealing industrial secrets? Pupils tend to follow their teachers.

No need for abbreviations

You will note in this book that I never use the words "CIA" or "MI6" or "NSA" or whatever well-known organisation for the simple reason that we are looking at counter-terrorism in general in Africa. I feel there is no need to refer to any particular Agency or Organisation or security apparatus or service as they call themselves. All use essentially the same terminology and for the purpose of this

book I will simply refer to them as "*Agencies.*" Note please I do not refer or otherwise imply to any specific Agency and no assumptions should be made from the use of this word for I most often do not mean the American one. Where necessary I identify the particular Agency by name but it is only descriptive in general and not an in-depth analyse for obvious reasons.

I must admit that I admire the professionals greatly as human beings. That story of Military Intelligence being a contradiction in terms is liberalistic cr-p. You will find exceedingly clever lads in both the Civilian and Military Intelligence ranks with advanced college degrees and very open-minded to new ideas. To think otherwise makes you a long haired liberal in my eyes. They deserve more respect than what they get from the press and anyone else with an opinion based on a sincere lack of knowledge. You know what Clint Eastwood said about an opinion? Everyone has one. I remember him putting it a bit more directly than that but I am sure you know what I mean.

The Analyst

We know that once the information gathered from the field or satellites are received it goes to analysts who try to make sense of it. They have quite good software to assist them during this process. We use the same during investigations on crime-syndicates and it shows the patterns very clearly. As a method of hunting terrorists it is excellent. Likewise it shows who called who when from where and also money transfers between the different suspects which is revealing in itself. When you link that to terrorist profiles you have a pretty good idea who should be considered risks and further attention.

No doubt that it is entirely possible to make deductions or even predictions from the data received from the field. It is actually expected for the data will be utterly useless if not so used. For example we know that before a suicide bomb explodes the mobile towers traffic near specific Mosques increases dramatically. We also know that the explosion will generally happen on a Sunday which is a Monday for Muslims. It still does not tell us where though unless we have a source inside the group to tell us. All these signs must be analysed to get a clear picture. The biggest problem here is one of time. It takes time to get to all the

data into the software and good analysts burn out from overwork. They are in great demand and absolutely essential.

As a universal rule no analyst will be allowed anywhere near the field of operations for he knows too much and no man is able to withstand torture forever. If you read the so called "*Al Qaeda Training Manual*" you will find a nice chapter of torture. It is allowed under their rules and no doubt happens frequently enough.

Historically, during the Second World War, it was recommended to hang in for 48 hours before giving in little by little dragging the process out as long as possible. Some held out much longer. It was also proved beyond any doubt that women agents could and did resist a lot longer than most men. These were truly exceptional humans for it is known that some captured agents would hold their breath in the cells until they passed out which is inconceivable to us mortals. Unfortunately in their view they would then resuscitate as the willpower failed with the blackout. You can read about this in Peter Churchill's excellent books or his wife's (afterwards) code named Lise.

Paymasters

Certain Agencies have much more money than others to spend on networks and information and thus do so at an astonishing rate. However money is not an equaliser and some of the lesser spenders have much more prestige in Africa. Money as you will see is a double edged sword.

We talk about funds or funding in this sense and it may be secret funds which only mean you don't need to declare it to parliament (Congress) like any other state department with yearly audits. Governments go about this in different ways and the British external intelligence organisation (MI6) for most of its life was denied to even exist and thus the budget unknown. Truth to be told they are not a serious player when it comes to funding and almost always pursues its cousins to pay for joint operations and the sharing of information.

The person handling the funding in the field is called a paymaster and it is always cash. Obviously the paymaster must be protected against robbery and cannot always insist on signatures. Thus a lot of trust is placed on them. More so

than with other officials of equal rank! The other problem is weight for money is heavy if you have enough of it. Getting the cash through the airports is also a problem and hard to explain so it may arrive via diplomatic bag or special courier. Obviously in countries where you control the airport it is not such a big deal.

Egg Breakers

I refer to all field operatives as *Egg Breakers* though it is technically wrong for some is intelligence gatherers only and others more action orientated and in the business of breaking eggs so to speak. Rarely do you find that specie that is able to do both so they usually complement each other. It is not a common name in the trade and a bit of personal witticism of mine which I do not wish to explain to you in writing and ask you to bear with me in this regard. To illuminate to you the difference between intelligence gatherers and genuine *Egg Breakers* I use the following example from history.

When Nazi-Germany overran France and West Europe in 1940 MI6 lost their existing networks on the ground being stuck on their island unable to re-activate them. They found it quite difficult to rebuild the networks since everyone thought they would make peace as common-sense indicated they would. Mr Churchill however refused in the hope that his family (American mom) will save him which they did in the end and the rest is history.

There is no doubt that Hitler's declaration of war on America after Pearl Harbour saved Britain. Without it America would have focussed solely on Japan and not (also) Germany. I wonder what Mr Churchill would have done then for he was an exceedingly clever fellow most of the time.

In the beginning of that war Britain lost a lot of prestige from a European viewpoint having been thrown off the continent so to speak and few could be bothered to help the losing side as they were at that stage. The French in particular had issues with the non-return of the British Army after Dunkirk where it was clearly assumed that they would come back to France to keep on fighting.

That as we know happened only four years later with massive American and Canadian assistance and 70% of the German Army & Air Force rather busy on

the Eastern Front thousands of miles away. This refusal to return immediately was one of the main reasons why the French surrendered soon after Dunkirk. They realised that they were alone and tried desperately to gain permission from London to capitulate unilaterally (against their treaty of mutual assistance). Something which is not mentioned in many history books and the words "*Marshall Petain and Vichy France*" will always be seen as a disgrace. So too does "*Piere Laval and Admiral Darlan*" for the English speaking world.

There was also the naval incident at Mers-el-Kébir about which I heard the French mutter about 70 years later with much anger. As history proved Admiral Darlan did keep his word and the French Fleet away from the Germans and thus the fleet action proved unnecessary except to show the cousins that the old Lion still had a mighty navy. Having said that, Mr Churchill did not know that at the time and could not know it either nor take chances with combined French, Italian and German fleets overwhelming the Royal Navy as could have happened under better leadership. That would have led to a genuine invasion against which I personally think the English would have successfully defended themselves. I read General Montgomery's anti-invasion plans and I think the matter was far from settled. Be that as it may it took real moral courage from Mr Churchill to give that order but it did the *Egg Breakers* no good at all.

An interesting side "*what if*" of history is the usefulness of the entire French Navy to the Allied cause at that stage. What would have happened if they joined the Free French? As we know they did not and many historians think it would have placed a lot more stress on the logistics needed to keep foreign war ships equipped and operating. So it is probably for the best anyway though the destroyers would have helped against the U Boat threat but only if equipped with British radar and tactics.

There were practical problems also in re-establishing the networks in Western Europe. The available means of communication in those days were much more limited than even a few years later. Radios fitting into a reasonably sized suitcase were almost non-existent and pigeons tend to fly back to where they came from. Thus London based pigeons could and were used but they first had to be airdropped by parachute from London to be of any use as a method of

communication. It was very difficult to contact London even if they stayed loyal and even more difficult for London to contact them. In the end the first agents dropped blindly which took real courage.

The use of couriers and free travel was severely restricted so Lisbon became the hotbed of espionage in Europe and a book called *Casino Royale*. In real life an agent actually lost his money to a German agent and had to way lay him so to speak to steal his money back. It was quite funny.

Many of the subsequent networks were communist inspired and with Stalin in the German camp at that stage the communists refused on orders from Moscow to assist the Allied cause. This created almost a civil war in France after D Day and a small mutiny between General Eisenhower and Free French General Leclerk who decided Paris will be liberated sooner rather than later and went off on his own after hoarding fuel to do so for weeks. An episode which American General Patton greatly admired when he found out as he was also known for waylaying other army's fuel for his own needs. This incident shows how unreliable reports are as genuine statistics for the historian. Such lies would never work today for the intelligence software will immediately flag the discrepancies.

MI6 (known as 6 in the trade) lost two reasonably senior men at *Venlo* in 1939 which made the existing networks believe they would be betrayed since the Germans had them in a concentration camp and presumably getting whatever information they had from them. Both survived and it is still unclear exactly what they revealed if anything. Apparently one of the two worked with the Germans which caused much ill feeling. Anyway, such an occurrence was bound to create uncertainty and reluctance to join an existing (blown) network.

Lastly and most importantly, because of a lack of money if not out and out political interference before the war made 6 reluctant to have networks inside Western Europe being friendly nations. Their main efforts were against communism and in the Empire to prevent nationalism. An Indian lawyer called Gandhi got a lot of special attention and so did a forgotten South African organisation called "the ossewa brandwag." A former policeman and boxer called

Robbey Leybbrandt would later cause a lot of trouble in the colony of South Africa working for Germany.

As such 6 were not in a position to gather information inside the occupied zone and had to rely on code-breaking and radio intercepts (signals intelligence) which they did with their usual brilliance. The world now knows of Bletchley Park and Ultra which some say makes the Allied Generals less impressive since they had inside information on the other side. I don't agree with that statement because German Generals did not always follow orders and thus negated Ultra completely. For example that great tank commander Field Marshal Rommel attacked and withdrew regularly as he saw fit and not as ordered from Berlin. That alone made him totally unpredictable or very predictable for attacking was his second nature. He gave the Allies a tremendous fright when he attacked at the Second Battle for Tobruk in 1942 whilst Ultra indicated he will hold his position catching everyone off guard so to speak. But not for long as history proved.

It is always amusing to me that most English speaking people know the German Generals by name but not their own except for the very top men. It is a great injustice for if you took the trouble to study the allied commanders you will understand their brilliance. Field Marshall Montgomery for one was a lot smarter than what some think and his staff work superb. He clearly foresaw the post war troubles with the Soviet Union in Western Europe more than what General Eisenhower did. That story of a narrow pencil like thrust to Berlin is a myth. What he wanted and did not get was a reverse Schlieffen plan back into Germany which would have stopped the creation of East Germany. He did save the Baltic States from the Soviet Union.

* *"Sacrilege" says my American Patriot for obvious reasons.*

As much as I like to talk about history what is important to us is that General Eisenhower really liked and admired the work done by the Office for Strategic Services (OSS) and this would reflect later on as President in his refusal to commit uniformed troops (besides advisors) in Vietnam. He clearly understood that COIN is not done on divisional strength which is something which later

Presidents clearly did not and kept on escalating the war with entirely predictable results and thousands of lives lost.

The question is who gave them that bad advice? To re-enforce failure is plainly irresponsible and shows a deplorable lack of leadership all around. It is the first rule of life. Know when to walk away and have the guts to do so. History will remember you for that or you will be known as the fool who re-enforced failure.

The code-breaking efforts saved 6. Many historians say if it was not for this aspect 6 would not have survived after the war as a department for they contributed almost nothing else. It also came out later that they were thoroughly penetrated by the Russians at this stage and we think of the Cambridge ring as an example. This had terrible consequences after the war which we don't need to go into now. There are enough brilliant books on them and I personally greatly admire Kim Philby not so much for what he did which is reprehensible but that he could play the system as long as he did. From his viewpoint he did brilliantly and we should learn from history that loyalty is never to be taken for granted.

The loss of the networks was not the biggest threat to 6 but the way in which Mr Churchill saw their role and intelligence in general. He wanted them to become saboteurs which are but another name for a terrorist depending from which side you look at it. Being only information gatherers this idea did not please them at all. You have to appreciate there is quite a difference between the two. One wants to watch and see what happens and the other wants to blow things up regardless of the consequences afterwards even if it destroys the network so patiently build for years.

It is very much the same outlook between domestic intelligence (MI5 & FBI etc) who strive to catch and arrest the foreign spy whilst 6 and their counterparts are not the least interested in catching any spy. They are the spies who gather the information and have grave misgivings over the spy catchers. The two don't mix well and I personally like the devious ways of the typical 6 type much more than the straight laced back domestic lads. We have more in common.

Out of all this came SOE (Special Operations Executive) created only for the war and disbanded after the war to "*set Europe ablaze.*" They were the ones who went behind the lines in civilian clothes to sabotage whatever they could find and to train the resistance to help them sabotage things. On the side they also gathered information and build networks to assist the coming D day landings. They did this very effectively with the help of Jedburgh's who parachuted in to assist hours before D day. The Jedburgh's operated in uniform though and would be protected by the Geneva Convention if caught though with the *Commando Order* that may also be touch and go.

** The sabotage was a lot more effective and unimaginably more cost-effective than carpet bombing. One group destroyed more trains in three months than what all the Allied Air Forces combined could do in one year.*

SOE's secondary task was to train and leave behind groups of resistance fighters in case the Germans invaded the Islands and the government fled to Canada as was the plan. Since they operated from Baker Street in London they soon referred to themselves as the *Baker Street Irregulars* or *Ministry of Irregular Warfare* etc. Their existence was a very closely guarded secret and a few agents who failed training or were otherwise found wanting was kept under lock and key for the duration. Their biggest problem was the lack of serious codes because they had to depend on 6 for that who failed miserably with their general lack of interest and other commitments. This led to that wonderful poem by Leo Marks called "*The Life that I have*" which I quote in my other book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#) being used as a onetime code. As a poem it was written for or about Marks fiancée who died before her time and then used by Violet Szabo who would also die before her time in Ravensbruck concentration camp. It is one of my most favourite poems ever.

Hitler considered SOE agents to be thugs; which is a compliment I suppose. Certainly the professionals at 6 also looked at them with bewilderment and the Americans copied them directly with the OSS from which the modern day CIA derived. This was a very wise choice in my eyes for you need both skills in the theatre of life and especially in the war against terrorism.

Informants & Sources

The word "*informant*" is much abused. Probably because it refers to someone who betrays his mates to the police and have a negative connotation attached to it. In counter-terrorism we talk of a "*source*" which is seen as a little bit more honourable. This fellow is usually not of the criminal class (but may be) and in a position to be able to give intelligence (information) to his handler (the field operative to whom he reports) on whatever they are looking for, in our case terrorists.

The U.S. Agencies talks about an "*asset*" but we prefer the word "*source*" in this book for reasons which are colonial and historical. *Assets* also may refer to friendly forces like in "we have a carrier close by" which got nothing to do with a source of information. It is doubtful whether all sources are assets anyway. Many are a nuisance to be honest and only after money and a green card for them and all 55 of their extended family which is plain silly. Principally however it is the same animal meaning someone who has access to the information we want and access is indeed everything.

The best source in the world means nothing when he loses his access. A classic example is where he is transferred to another department and cannot refuse the promotion without drawing attention. In counter-terrorism it often means he died a violent death. Thus anyone who has access becomes important to the Agencies and the approach to him varies greatly. Some are trapped into assisting but this is not recommended as being counter-productive. In todays enlighten times it may also be difficult to get enough dirt on him. Others are paid enough to do so though money never plays as big a role as some think. Many volunteer for whatever reason which may ideological or religious or plain revenge. All dislike to be seen with the *Egg Breakers* for it may draw unwanted attention which may later haunt them.

They are never trusted as a group and have very little access or knowledge of the actual Agency he reports to or who else may be a source and the clever ones make sure they don't know. It happens a lot that he works for a different Agency as the one which he thought he did for it is murky and a man's accent means nothing. In any case the Agencies share information all the time and he has no idea what happens to his information.

As a general rule no human being is ever classified as completely trustworthy. You just don't know and people change all the time. Hence all information must be painfully checked and re-checked. Just because a source was always right in the past does not mean he is right now. It is known that the lies of two Iraqi sources (later defectors) caused the weapons of mass destruction myth. Why the Agencies fell for it is another story.

The relationship between the handler and his source is one of mutual trust and the best handlers are typically above 45 years of age. You need mature men who tend to listen more than talk and are able to relate in some way to his source. Without that connection between the two the source may and frequently walk away. I wish the Western Agencies would realise I mean it when I say grey hair is more respected than long hair in Africa. It is just the way it is and a brash young female operative will never have the same effect even if she is exceedingly good which they frequently are. I mean no disrespect for you know by now I consider the improved specie superior to my own. It is just not our culture.

Sources don't take kindly to be sold to another Agency or even another handler internally who they don't like or trust for whatever reason and it may be for a very silly reason for outsiders. However as his life depends on his judgment this is non-negotiable to many. As understandable as this is it is not a perfect system for too much loyalty is a bad thing from any viewpoint.

It also means that if the something happens to handler for example he retires or are transferred his networks may be lost to the Agency. Therefore there always need to be a backup handler who is introduced once only. Something I note many forget to do and I wonder again why. This is basic field craft but because it is Africa the standards are relaxed and not followed. You will hear me complain of that all the time for it is hurting you and no-doubt costing you valuable sources. We are not as silly as you think we are and many of the sources are intelligence officers themselves. They expect better and taking risks with lives because of laziness does not go over well.

It is the first lesson in source handling that he should never know how important or unimportant his information is whilst still feeling appreciated. Often he is torn

apart with dividing loyalties to his handler and the people he betrays for he knows intellectually something bad will happen with them in the future. Most are paid a steady income which is not always given to them though they may see statements of it or even a medal if it will help him feel better. A sudden large amount of money that cannot be explained may betray him and is thus inadvisable for he may be killed and then you lose your access which is more important than his life. Yes, it is a cynical game.

The other problem is that special rewards may make him take unnecessary risks to get to the big money. The amounts paid depend on his level of access and how desperately the information is needed. It is known that a lot of money, millions, was paid to sources in the hunt for the top radicals and still is. I am not sure if that is not counter-productive in the sense that it raised the expectation and attracted all sorts of shysters to earn a quick buck. It may also have flooded the analysts with worthless information which is to the advantage to the terrorist who likes blurred vision on your part.

Note this is not the same as paying someone to be a warlord which is pure evil. With warlords we talk of big money and many millions are involved to pay for his gang (they are not soldiers or even mercenaries in the normal sense of the word). The tax payer's money given to him is mostly stolen via corruption for you will not be able to give me one audit on what was done with the money after given to the warlord. Don't tell me it is ridiculous to expect accountability for that is simply a bad excuse which will not stand scrutiny. It is your money and your rules and you are able to put your own paymaster in his organisation to give you every oversight you need. But you don't because you are either lazy or incompetent or you simply don't care. All of which is reflecting less than adequate standards of behaviour and makes you treacherous to work with!

It is ill advised. Why you would support and fund warlords I would not know for it is never a good idea to begin. Are we wrong to think it shows desperation on your side? It always comes out and it always bites you for supporting terrorism for these warlords are not exactly angels by nature and will do evil things with your support mostly against the local population who are your main source of information. In law it makes you an accessory to whatever they do besides the

propaganda victory to the terrorists who wisely points out you are as unscrupulous as they always said. How do you defend yourself against the truth? The impression is created you would rather want us to fight against each other on your behalf because you will not do so for reasons which we don't need to understand. This is very bad for source recruiting as it shows bad faith to us.

We all know for we read history that your multinational companies fought on both sides of the Second World War. We saw your allies (UK) sent men to both sides of the African wars. This type of behaviour strengthens the suspicions and conspiracy theories which we know is nonsense but simple folk may not. Once you armed and paid one warlord who is to say you did not do the same to another and thus causes a civil war with all that goes with such evil? It is called *destabilisation* and a very nice tactic too. We used it ourselves now and then so we know all about it.

It is one thing to use Green Berets on a bona fide training mission and another to establish a private army to kill on your behalf. Providing leadership for allies is no problem but that is not what you did in Iraq or Afghanistan as we all know. Trying this in Africa (again) will explode and cost you in ground level sources. It will be a major propaganda victory for the terrorists and morally wrong. Remember there is always someone somewhere willing to believe the absolute worse off you.

Another type of source is one of influence. He may not have the information we want but since he is the head of the police or whatever he may influence decisions to suit you. Many politicians fall under this category and they are well paid on the side. We know who they are by looking at the ease they get visas and where their children studies which is always in the country controlling them. Some idiot thought that would be an excellent cover (reason) for them to go there and meet with you in private. It is not difficult to figure it out and we did figure it out.

I say that as the social elite they have almost no access to information on terrorists for they move in other circles where the terrorist is not hiding. So whatever use they are to you are negated by this simple fact. It is also extremely sad that you have so little confidence in your embassies that you have

need for this type of thing. You are sending a message to us which are not good for your cause at all.

You would be extremely naive to think that journalists are not fed scoops and other information from the Agencies from time to time. Most journalists are seen as agents of influence and indeed they are. They are able to influence many and no doubt can cause an election to swing to whoever they support which is why the conservatives are always claiming the media is left wing liberals. Of course if not left wing liberal they must be right wing racists for daring to be different from the mainstream media. Somehow none is ever in the middle where you expect them to be and the best advice is taking whatever you read in the news with a large grain of salt.

Nothing in life is ever as bad or good as you think and whatever a politician says is suspect until proven correct. You need to be cynical and judge for yourself and not to be a sucker. What angered me personally most about my rol in Apartheid South Africa is that we trusted our leaders, religious ministers and journalists for decades because they had grey hair and were well educated concerned fatherly type men who had all the smooth answers. Whilst it must be acknowledged that some did indeed believed their own propaganda they misled and misguided the rest of us into serving evil under patriotic notions as you can read in my book *Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*. The lesson is that you must always look at both sides and make up your own mind. Do not blindly believe just because it is printed or on television or on the Internet. Use your brains to good effect and be your own man even if it makes you eccentric. It is better than being duped by lesser men than you and left in the lurch afterwards whilst they enjoy their nice pensions.

Spymasters

A spymaster is the top handler for a lack of a better word. He may be directly involved with the very best of sources or with a bunch of handlers who report to him. As far as importance goes he is as important as it gets for he knows virtually everything in his area (also called a desk). Throughout history a few became notorious for example Cardinal Richelieu of Three Musketeers fame. We never see them on ground level and would be extremely reluctant to be

associated with them anyway. The higher you get in any organisation the smaller the community around you and thus the easier you are identified.

I will even go so far as to advise you (the spymaster) to stay away from Africa all together and especially your embassies which are monitored around the clock as well as all the airports and other entrance points. We have face recognition systems everywhere as do you and will pick you up immediately. Killing or capturing you would be very nice for terrorists and it is a matter of time before they become aware of the importance of doing just that. Remember they have the active support from many former (or not) Arab intelligence officers as we can deduct from their training manual. They know the tricks of the trade as well as you do.

We may also be penetrated and probably are and so may you. You know if even 1% of our domestic lads are radical sympathisers for I do not wish to say they are more than that they will pick up your presence and spread the word to their mates. It is a numbers game. I worked out once that if you work for a company with 500 000 employees worldwide with a 1% penetration then it mean that the terrorists have 5000 people inside that organisation at all different levels and countries reporting to them. It is rather depressing.

We tend to concentrate on intelligence gathering on the terrorists but never appreciate they may be running their own counter operations on us for they certainly have access to experience people who know how to conduct such operations. They also have the money and they have the sympathetic sleepers world-wide to activate if needs be. Yes we expect them to take pre-cautions in the same way our domestic Agencies do against leaks and attacks from our side. But almost no-one I spoke to seriously considered the obvious. That you are more penetrated and may have moles inside you and are actively playing the game. This shocked me for we know of the isolated instances in the military where soldiers turned on their own. It is well documented and very sad.

We also know of the *blue on green* incidents which will get worse as long as you are willing to sacrifice soldiers for political necessity and fail to disarm anyone close you (which I understand is impractical). But this is something else entirely. Think about it for this war is long not over and will continue for many years

hence. Moles and penetration is inevitable. So are agents of influence which we already experience with television stations who always seem to have the scoops which are to your disadvantage. How do they get it? Why can it not be traced back to its source? More importantly where are you agents of influence to counter the allegations? Do you really think a denial from your Embassy is enough?

Station Chief

Station Chief is the term used for the senior intelligence officer in a country and he usually have diplomatic cover. In the old days the British Passport Control Officer was known to be the local egg breaker and with the Soviet Union it would be either the ambassador's chauffeur or third commercial attaché. What they call themselves today I would not know for I think they should be used as a red herring only and leave the job to the real *Egg Breakers* who are all illegals. The diplomats have very nice covers which they cannot explain in less than ten words which are a dead giveaway and deadly sin.

A cover means simply the legend which disguises you as an intelligence officer. It is only as good as your knowledge of the cover meaning if you pretend to be a mechanic you better be able to know how to use a spanner other than a murdering tool. Most covers are not good enough because of the fixed idea in the West that things are relaxed in Africa. They also tend to live beyond what the cover indicates they should and have no obvious source of income.

Illegal and legal refers to the way you as an intelligence officer are in the country. Some, like the diplomats are accredited and enjoys diplomatic immunity. Not that is will save them for many African domestic Agencies will not be really bothered by it and may still carry on with their interrogations. The terrorist will most certainly do what is necessary.

Illegals are not linked in anyway with the diplomats and enjoy no protection whatsoever. He is almost always denied by his Agency though behind the screens a swop may be arranged and frequently is when caught. However it is also known that many are left to rot in jail for the politicians doesn't care. They just want scrambled eggs every meal and cannot be bothered about the rest.

Almost all *Egg Breakers* are illegals which is the only practical way. The best of them in history which I can think of is that great communist illegal Richard Sorge (PhD) who saved the Soviet Union and it may be argued won the war against Germany for the Allies.

He predicted that Japan would not attack the USSR from behind when Germany was at the gates of Moscow thus releasing the Siberian division from the Manchurian border to the western (Eastern for us) front who gave the German Army their first shock of the war. He was executed by the Japanese after several attempts to swop him was refused by Stalin. As a matter of interesting side history he also started as a corporal in the German Army and was wounded in battle but became a communist whilst Corporal Hitler was scheming on fascism in hospital. Seems like it was a dangerous rank for society in general!

Historically an American station chief was captured (kidnapped) in Beirut in the 1980s if I remember correctly and killed after a while. It shocked the intelligence community when America failed (as far as we know) to take revenge and we can only hope that attitudes changed since then. The Soviets, under the same circumstances, killed every single terrorist involved and not in the quickest way either. Hence they have never lost a station chief in that country again. I think such methods are absolutely needed in the theatre of real life for it establishes the ground rules for everyone which is a good thing. There is no need for unpleasantness when it is clearly understood that beastly ways will be accommodated in return. There is much to be said about violence and the Israeli tit for tat system. We Africans respect such behaviour.

A network is the loose description of all sources put together to form what is called a network. When operating they are divided in cells which mean they have no access to each other and never in contact with each other. Thus they are expendable. If one is rolled up the next is still going on. Some also refers to it as a "*ring*." Probably the best known was the so called "*Lucy ring*" in Switzerland during the Second World War. They vary greatly in size.

The most important function of an Agency is not espionage

All Agencies have a fundamental function which no-one knows off and that is to talk to each other behind the (discredited) diplomats who are nothing but a squawking box for official views. Understandably the *Egg Breakers* know who is who and it very possible (happens all the time) that they give unofficial messages from their governments to each other. This shows the absolute trust placed in these men to correctly carry that message to his people without twisting it around which may lead to worse misunderstandings. Many times during an international crisis these men keep the peace for they simply do not play games when delivering these messages. It is an unbreakable if unwritten rule.

They may even ensure that the other side knows they are telling the truth by not removing listening devices where they know that the other side is listening in. It happened with an African embassy in London where the Africans called the Soviets to sweep it for bugs suspecting the Brits were listening to them. They were right. The Soviets found the bugs, let the listeners know they found it, and then left it in place. They wanted the West to confirm independently what was said. It kept peace.

There is a story regarding the *Lucy Ring* we mentioned before that it was used as a funnel to convince Stalin that the Ultra intercepts is worthwhile to listen to since they are coming through a trusted source. However that is dismissed by most historians. We forget that the Russians are pretty good code-breakers themselves. They probably had their own Ultra going as they captured many more enigma coding machines on their front as what the West ever did.

Communication is king

Logic should tell you that for information to be useful it must be given to the *Egg Breakers* in some way and if not quick enough it may become unusable anyway. Historically you will read of the so called letter box which simply means a place where you as the source leaves your message for the egg breaker to fetch later on. These days it is not really in use anymore as technology mostly replaced it. An email address is used for one to link in and leave a message and the other to read it and leave another message. Obviously the problem is that all Internet traffic is monitored so the best way is still a face to face meeting.

Mobile phones and text messages are also used but once again you would be very foolish to think that Africans do not have the means to track and record these conversations for they do all the time. Whilst fast and useful they are also dangerous to security.

Many advise encrypted burst transmissions via satellite of which the technology existed for decades. Problem is if you are caught with such equipment you will have serious problems to explain it so I am rather doubtful about its use. However, and we recommend this all the time, using good commercial encryption software is neither illegal nor hard to explain under counter-commercial espionage measures. It can be broken of course but it is better than nothing and will at least buy time.

What is the difference between evidence and intelligence?

Both are information and are basically the same thing but it depends on what you use it for. Some Agencies, the horrible domestic ones, try to obtain information which is also to be used as evidence in a court of law by following the Laws of Evidence when gather it. That means statements under oath and obtaining it in a legal way which means no waterboarding or other fatherly talks (officially).

It is the only way to do things unless you want to live in a police state which I am sure you don't want to. No civilised society has need for secret police and if they have it they already failed. Note please that an egg breaker is not a secret policeman at all and have no powers of arrest or function in his own country except to plan his next move. Simply put all *Egg Breakers* works in other countries but your own for this very reason. Local terrorists are dealt with the domestic Agencies.

The law is used to great effect in the evidence gathering efforts which includes letters to Internet giants to investigate and probably follow suspicious traffic. As long as they stay within the parameters of the Act I have no problem with that though I believe the long haired liberals will disagree. No doubt they see this as an invasion of privacy and blah blah blah. In law there are very few absolute rights and the good of the public more important than the individuals.

Interestingly, as I am writing this book I noticed that an American judge declared this method to be unlawful so I am not sure what will happen now as American law in general is rather weird to me. Theoretically there is a legal duty on any person or company to report treason or attempted treason. That alone should be enough to check the accounts when certain words trigger the alarms.

Whilst I understand the need for a proper balance I have to ask how many more must die for the sake of a silly human right called privacy above all. Would you rather have your emails read or have your country blown-up into submission? It is known everywhere that DHS routinely monitors dozens of websites including Facebook, Twitter, Hulu, WikiLeaks, MySpace and others for certain words which constitutes a threat against America. I also believe many of the websites where you are directed to when researching terrorism is government false flag fronts. If not, they should be.

My attitude towards the domestic authorities is that you are most welcome to read all my emails and talk to me when you please if something about me bothers you. An honest man has nothing to hide and I think many of my readers will agree with me in this. There is no need for unpleasantness or silly games and much bigger fish to destroy.

With intelligence gathering we collect information which we have no intention to use in a court. So the Law of Evidence does not apply but the information is still cross checked by analysts to see if it is correct. This means that we obtain the information in any way we can, legally or illegally. As long as we get what is needed to protect you from attack and worse all is fair and within the rules. Most go further to differentiate between raw data which comes in from the field and only after it is classified and cross-checked it becomes useful intelligence. As you know or suspect the Agencies liaise with each other and many insist to see the raw data but that creates problems for it may reveal the source and is generally denied or should be.

** Which is why this Snowden fellow got it wrong! He obviously does not get the egg breaking principle. Good luck to him too for in a different age he would have been a dead man walking.*

What is spying legally?

As you can imagine there is a lot of different definitions and the U.S. uses the following: "*the act of obtaining, delivering, transmitting, communicating, or receiving information about the national defense with an intent, or reason to believe, that the information may be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation.*" The rest of the world looks at it in much the same way.

Spying is such an ugly word that we prefer the term "*intelligence gathering.*" Spies are seen as hostile agents and our own is called intelligence officers or egg breaker by me. The word "*agent*" almost always refers to another Agency and not always with good intentions. Obviously my view is not from the domestic lads who like to refer to themselves as *Agent So and So*. For me it has a very bad connotation and as explained somewhere the two don't mix well having opposing outlooks and totally different jobs to do.

Is it always treason to spy? No, it depends on citizenship for you must be a citizen of the country to be legally able to commit treason. If you are spying for a foreign government against your own country you are seen by law as a traitor and treated accordingly and the death penalty is usually imposed. Further the law looks at your passport and is known to stretch the definition of citizenship. For example the notorious Lord Haw Haw was hanged for making treasonable broadcasts on behalf of the Germans during World War Two. The legal technicality which got him condemned was that he carried an English passport at some stage in his life even if he was American and a naturalised German by the time he committed the offence.

This is a harsh world and very unforgiving. Take note that it does not matter if the receiving government is considered a friendly nation or not in law. Many tried that defense from Anthony Blunt to Jonathan Pollard in more recent times. Of course Professor Blunt was never brought to trial having made a deal which included immunity from prosecution.

During the same war the Germans created foreign legions for anti-communists (and probably fascists also) to join the fight against the Soviet Union. They were

grouped under the Waffen SS of which the Charlemagne Division for French men was the most famous. I think one their members won the last Knights Cross of the war in Berlin of all places defending Hitler's bunker. It is said that 18 of them was executed by the Free French whilst prisoners of war by the order of Free French General Leclerk. They made the mistake of asking him why he was wearing an American uniform (the Free French was equipped by America) when he asked why they were in German uniform. This was a war crime for it is not the same as being a spy without a uniform and if the other side won Leclerk would have hanged. I dare say many war crimes took place against the defeated nations which were swept under the carpet as is the way it is when you lose the war.

Cut-outs and safe houses

The term cut-out refers to a courier and by design they don't know whatever they are carrying or who they contact. It is an obvious safety precaution to protect everyone in case one gets caught. The excellent movies about that fellow who drives across Europe transporting (always) a pretty girl in trouble would be seen as a courier in this world. Everyone seems to advise a non-flashy look for the *Egg Breakers* but interestingly enough some of the historical best *Egg Breakers* were indeed everything but that. We think of Dusko Popov (Tricycle) as an example. What work best is being yourself and whatever your cover demands is the best.

When meeting each other in a public place there is not enough time or enough security around to debrief the source properly. You will be surprised how much information waiters pick up for they are not noticed as being part of the scenery so to speak. Same with the housemaids and cleaners who always have access where they should not and is never properly vetted because it is Africa and you don't need to take your usual precautions. Mark my words it is going to bite you.

It is entirely possible that a safe house is established by renting it through a front company or person where the two can meet for a few hours or days. It can also be used as an area of operations but is never mixed. Bringing a source into your own world will eventually kill you. No source can ever be trusted not to turn on you at some stage.

In Africa many of these safe-houses is next to an airstrip in a game reserve but it can be anywhere hidden amongst the other places. It is almost never a fortress as seen in one silly movie featuring South Africa during the Soccer World Cup of 2010 capable of withstanding a determined attack. It must be said barbed wire (electrified) with controlled access and cameras is pretty normal and standard in middleclass African houses. Many doors are reinforced and many houses have safe rooms against robbers and murderers. Bullet proof cars are also common enough but a purposely built fortress? Nah, not in real life!

Disinformation

I remember hearing a story during our own times that a young firebrand who created a lot of problems was incapacitated by dropping a false (it was forged) receipt for services rendered to the security Police as an informant amongst the crowd he was addressing. He almost died in the ensuing accusations which followed and was never again a factor. All Agencies are guilty of this type of behaviour which is well within the rules. That is why you sometimes read someone is accused of child pornography which is vehemently denied by the person involved and later proven to be nonsense. Many times this type of misleading information is planted to discredit the opposition.

The best known example is man who never was or *Operation Mincemeat* in 1943 where a body washed up in fascist Spain with the military plans to invade Sardinia whilst the actual attack was on Sicily. Did it work? Well we don't know for it depends whose history you read. The Allies says yes and the Germans say no and it is a matter of much debate and ill feeling between historians. For this book we can agree it was a good idea none the less.

I believe what worked much better because of the longer exposure given was the so called "*soldiers radio stations*" broadcasting from Britain during the Second World War and is known in the trade as black propaganda where you think you are listening to your own but in reality it is all make belief and you are listening to the other side. By using very cleverly asked questions and discussions it creates doubt in the mind of the target group listening to it. It is almost certain that in the war of terrorism Islamic scholars are used (whether

fake or real) to provide both sides of the argument to listeners under Western control.

By law such actions is prohibited for the American Military to do so within the U.S. but most certainly not outside the borders or via foreign newspapers and radio stations. As nice as this sound it may backfire and when it does it is usually more embarrassing than any good which came of it. Especially where racist or religious intolerance were used the exposure is a home goal. I doubt if it is possible to change the views of a radical but I believe the non-radical may be influenced before he becomes a radical. As we will see in a later chapter it takes up to a year and more to change a man into a radical terrorist. This means you have ample opportunity to prevent it.

The theoreticians discern between grey propaganda where no-one claims to be the source and white propaganda which is known to everyone to be from the enemy but sounds so good being reasonably truthful that people listens to it. Many established stations are part of this effort and native speakers are used as it would sound strange if the announcer speaks in another accent.

The Rhodesians being exceedingly clever people took this one step further and created the Selous Scouts which was in effect a regiment of former-terrorists operating as terrorists to see who is nice to them from the local population and creating absolute havoc with the real terrorists who just could not figure out who to shoot and who to greet. You can imagine how it feels when you think you met with your own and to find out differently when they kill you.

Counter Terrorism v Counter Insurgency (COIN)

As a starting point we need to be clear that counter-insurgency or COIN is not the same as counter-terrorism at all. There is a huge difference between the two. What is happening and happened in Iraq and Afghanistan recently is not COIN and it is interesting how certain words always come back with each generation to trouble us and we never learn from history.

Back in the early 1960s the word COIN was very popular and then after Vietnam it went away having bad connotations so to speak and conventional war was the in-thing. Before that it was used in Indo-China, Malaya and Algeria and too

many other countries to mention. Now it recently came back in Iraq and Afghanistan to the American public with the publication of the new Army manual on the subject which I read with much interest as in Africa it never went away. Suddenly everyone was talking of COIN as if it was supposed to win the war of terrorism being the magic bullet.

There were many different attempts from about 1726 onwards by military leaders and theorists who tried to describe exactly what is meant by COIN. They are all correct and many adopted their views to the modern day of their era. I have no intention to quote all of them and discussing in great detail the finer points of each for this is not an academic work. Besides that I agree with all of them in principle and see no reason to quibble with the obvious.

In simple terms it comes down to military operations by the Security Forces of a recognised government to suppress and prevent the armed overthrow of the recognised government by insurgents who attack government forces and structures. If it goes on long enough it may become a civil war which is mostly conventional in outlook. Crucially COIN take place only in rural areas and the terrorists almost always have a distinctive uniform on. It is never in the cities for that would be urban-terrorism and almost always without a distinctive uniform from the terrorist's side.

We think of the many COIN wars on the African continent which the West mostly ignored as being unimportant and local nationalist movements which indeed they were. First we had Kenya and the *Mau Mau rebellion* (1952 - 1960). The Rhodesian (now known as the failed state of Zimbabwe) Bush War (1966 - 1980) and the South African Border War (1974 - 1989) all of which we will look at in greater detail in another chapter to see what we can learn from history.

As Africans we are the only experts on this field in Africa as we understand the local conditions and grew up with it. We know exactly what worked and why it worked and our kill ratio was hundreds against one which is unique in warfare. However, our opinion is rarely asked. It seems to me that everyone except the African experts were consulted and tapped for information even if they had almost no practical experience in Africa. We never learn from the past and always tend to make the same mistakes. Many Western countries tried their luck

in Africa and all had to withdraw at some stage and note please I did not say with their tail between their legs. I mean no disrespect and in fact said that the decline and fall of the British Empire was a very bad thing for Africa in my book [*The Circle of Life*](#) as they got replaced by the racists in the south and the dictators in the north. Both species were very bad news for the man on the street.

Military wise we think of the unfortunate events in Somalia in the early nineties which should never have ended the way it did because of political interference. But did and let the radicals to believe that America is weak and could be attacked at will. It sent the wrong message and confirmed to the local Africans that you will always withdraw when a few men die. Thus your manhood were questioned and found lacking.

We think of the successful rescue operations in Siera-Leone by the British Army and of the French in Mali right now which sent the right message up to a point. It certainly confirms what I said before much to the agro of some African generals. Once the professional Western soldiers get stuck in there is not much which Africans can do about it but please don't make the mistake of thinking all Africans are bad soldiers who will run away just because you are approaching. You may be in for a big surprise and it very much depends who you take on.

Historically the African soldier proved throughout two World Wars and other conflicts that with the right leadership and training they are excellent. In this regard we think of the Rhodesian African Rifles and the South African 32 Battalion and the crack Nigerian Regiments. The problems came when the officer corps decided to play politics. We think of the British Empire in Kenya and everywhere else. We think of the French in Algeria. We think of the Belgians in the Congo where mercenary Colonel Mike Hoare and his men intervened with the help of Belgian paratroopers and thus saved hundreds of lives from the most horrible treatment you can imagine.

We think of the absolute failure in the West regarding to the State of Katanga in the 1960 and again in Biafra in 1967 where genuine democratic nations were forced into subjection by Western neutrality. There was no apartheid in those places or communism. It is one of the strangest episodes in Africa. Most

humiliating we think and feel for the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique who left in indecent haste after 350 years of rule and betraying their own citizens to much maltreatment afterwards. They did not deserve that and plunged South Africa into an ill-advised invasion of Angola destabilising that country for the next 25 years. It also cost Rhodesia their independence for a despotic failed state called Zimbabwe.

A body count is unimportant in counter-terrorist operations

COIN operations are never done with large military forces. It is where relatively small groups of uniformed personnel walk or ride patrol in the rural areas of a country trying to find the insurgents in various ways by tracking spoor or relying on locals to tell them where the terrorists or insurgents or freedom fighters (depending on your view) is. Once found a clash occurs which we refer to as a "contact" (armed contact with the enemy) and by doing so eliminate the threat which usually involve air support for the security forces. From this we can deduct that COIN is always done in bush or veldt and not in cities as I said before.

When in cities it becomes urban-terrorism where different tactics is used like house penetration where you storm a house or whatever and kill or arrest the terrorist. In American you talk about SWAT or HRT in this regard but technically arrests and hostage rescue may not be the first objective.

We also use different terminology where during COIN a terrorist is an insurgent but in counter terrorism he stays a terrorist. A contact is not the same as a shoot-out between police and terrorists. It all depends on where and what happened. It stands to reason that the insurgent cannot survive if he is not actively supported by the locals for once the Security Forces which may be policemen or soldiers find him he is going to die or be captured and treated as a criminal and hanged.

He may also of course escape but in our wars as a general rule most gangs (what we called them) were wiped out to the man and none survived to go back. I often admired them for coming back and why their moral did not collapse during it for it must be bad to know once you cross the border you are a dead man walking far away from medical assistance.

Another way to explain the difference between COIN and counter-terrorism is what the Israeli's did after the Munich Olympics Incident in 1974. They created a team of men and hunted every terrorist involved down and killed them. As you can imagine they were operating in different cities in different countries and not as uniformed members of the security forces. From the viewpoint of the terrorist and their supporters this is murder (and state sponsored terrorism) for no attempt was made to arrest them and besides no authority existed to do so anyway. I see it as classic counter-terrorism because they obtained justice for an attack on civilians.

Counter-terrorism is thus something else than COIN. It refers to the actual methods used by governments to stop the terrorist from doing his dastardly deeds on a tactical level wherever he is. Consequently COIN may be part of counter-terrorism operations but so will assassination or water boarding. All is based on information gathering. It is absolutely crucial to have your networks before you start any counter action to negate the terrorist as a threat which as is known includes assassination by the *Egg Breakers*.

In urban-terrorism the terrorist is typically the aggressor which gives him an unfair advantage and operational initiative which is also called a force multiplier. This must never be allowed. With good intelligence it is possible to take the war to him and kill him before he kills you. Accordingly many die during clashes with the police and *Egg Breakers* who actively search for him.

During COIN it is called a pre-emptive strike and may involve a couple of thousand men invading another country to destroy terrorist bases. The Rhodesians called it a "*raid or externals*." Such action gives you the operational initiative which keeps the terrorists on the run and put the fear of God in him for he simply doesn't know when the Security Forces will arrive to kill him.

Where *Egg Breakers* are involved the worrying legal question is who decide who dies without trial? How do you prevent it from becoming a free for all as is said happened in Vietnam with the Phoenix Program? This type of authority comes from the President. The buck stops with him. I cannot imagine such decision being delegated much lower for it is rather serious. It is always a screw up of

note when lower rankers start to think in this way and murder is the logical consequence of it.

In our own recent history we had two units, one Army and one Police, which carried out assassinations for the Apartheid State and very effective they were. Us serving members of the Armed Forces suspected their existence but kept quiet as we believed it was the only effective way and sort of liked the idea of eliminating terrorists without being hindered by the courts so to speak. We knew from bitter experience that that all terrorists lied in open or closed court (they admitted that after the war stopped - not that I blame them) and accused us of torture even where we had no need to torture them as many talked quite willingly being reasonable men. The "*Al Qaeda training manual*" tell us they use exactly the same tactics and are trained to automatically claim torture when captured. This will boomerang for the public soon get fed up with such allegations and others like me for instance understands that this type of thing is sometimes necessary. Either way you lose the sympathy card.

It must be admitted also that after years of war we had different values on the subject and the fact that it was murder to kill a terrorist without trial was dismissed with contempt being unpatriotic thoughts. Today my view is that it should never happen and no amount of moral justification (and there is a lot) can ever be enough to change my mind. The reason being that there are better ways and the military is allowed under law to attack terrorists wherever he is found. We saw with the raid on Bin Laden where uniformed members of Special Forces stormed the building and killed him. That is not murder but a genuine counter terrorism operation within the laws of war. No-one besides a long haired liberal will complain about such acts.

At the same time, if the skills existed, it could have been done by uniformed Police Special Forces and in Africa it is the preferred way because some police units have these skills. For instance the South African Police Special Task Force (now called something else) had the same selection rate as the more famous Green Berets and operated with Army Special Forces behind enemy lines. They could also do hostage rescue and intelligence gathering as well as any unit you

care to name. So many times it depends on who is available and trusted by the President not to let him down.

When terrorists are killed "*unofficially*" via the *Egg Breakers* then it must stay unofficial. This type of thing must never come to light being inherently murder in law no matter who you take out. This is what happened to the Israelis when they got caught in I think Norway where they killed the wrong people by mistaken identity. I feel for them for their killing technique by walking right up to the target and shooting him many times at extremely close range was absolutely designed to prevent mishaps. Also a command detonated bomb is not an act of random terror. It is designed to kill only the target and limit the unpleasantness to those who deserves it. Thus we can say the purpose was to terrorize but not terror against the general population.

From a practical viewpoint it makes no difference who pulls the trigger but the public and law have weird ideas on this. Somehow it is fine when an attack helicopter (the new Israeli favourite) launches a missile but totally wrong when an American drone does so. Why is that I wonder? Both have the same object and same human control and same political decision to terminate with extreme prejudice. I don't get it but then I seldom get academic explanations to be honest.

COIN is not conventional war

Another difference we need to speak about is the military difference between COIN and conventional war. Simply put World War 2 was conventional meaning millions of men attacking each other with tanks and air support. It refers to battle between two countries as a whole and specifically against their Armed Forces which are in uniform though of course the carpet bombing techniques were directed against civilians and it is no use to deny it. At the same time they accuracy, even with the famed American Norden bombsight used by all sides during the war since the Germans stole it in 1938 already was of such a nature that accurate bombing was virtually impossible. Carpet bombing was the only way for non-elite squadrons of which there were very few.

However the Armed Forces usually abide by the rules and laws of war. It is not well-known that General Eisenhower apologised to the German Staff in 1945 when a train full of German POW's was shut so tightly that many died of exposure and suffocation. Where an enemy soldier was found out of uniform or in the opponent's uniform as happened at the Battle of the Bulge in 1944 the captured soldiers were executed as spies and not treated under the Geneva Convention as prisoners of war. This was allowed and correct. Spies never wear uniform and soldiers never wear civilian clothing is the general rule. Conventional troops have very little use in COIN besides patrolling and standing guard. They would be very lucky to find the terrorist by chance. It is a Special Forces and specialist COIN operator's war with massive air support and good intelligence. Anything else is not COIN.

Tactical versus Strategic

To understand the difference between tactical and strategic let me quote a short paragraph from my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#): " If you do not know the difference between tactical and strategic let me give you an example which an Army Colonel gave me: Seems a young soldier decided that paratroopers' wings did something special to the ladies and thus he volunteered for the elite Army Parachute Battalion. That was the strategic objective. And when he got his wings after much blood sweat and tears he found a lady taking an appreciative interest in him in a hotel room. That is where his tactical objective started." Now you know and I will never forget the Colonel, bless his soul, who explained it so elegantly so many years ago to me.

Can the Jihad be classified as a "*just war*" in law?

There is no such thing in law as a "*just war*." That was a legal term used during the League of Nations and dropped when the United Nations came into being. Thus a holy (jihad) war as a just war is not a legal term in way shape or form. It is only a war and a declared one whether we wish to admit that or not. As far as the radicals are concerned they said so many times and openly that a state of war exists which gives you the right to kill them on sight under the rules of war so I don't understand the long hair liberal complaints when it happens. What else did you think will happen I ask?

The reverse is also true and once a war is declared the combatants are subjected to the normal rules of war as set out by the Geneva Conventions. In practical terms this should give protection to both sides enforceable by law (war criminal trials). Guantanamo Bay would then not be a war crime as is propagandised by the long haired liberals who have a point to be honest.

I suspect the problem though is that both sides must recognise the convention and apply it for it to work and most certainly the terrorists don't. Traditionally they never did and by their very nature their actions are designed to terrorise. They believe in the purity of violence as a means to achieve whatever they desire to achieve. Besides that they also need to wear a recognisable issued uniform to identify themselves as combatants. Something which would be greatly to the disadvantage of the terrorist who must remain under cover unless as we saw in COIN or as part of an insurgency when he is distinctive. Sometimes by his weapons (almost always AK47's) and sometimes not.

It must also be said that the Americans (by which I mean the coalition forces etc) abides by the Geneva Convention with very strict rules of engagement where the uniformed soldiers are involved. This leads to a lot of frustration on ground level but take note it is the only way as far as it goes for uniformed personnel. Anything else would be morally wrong but it is another weak point in using conventional troops in counter-terrorism. They are thrown into a situation which no educated man should judge afterwards. Especially not lawyers who are generally speaking ill equipped to judge anything.

The declared or undeclared war debate means nothing outside the academic circles for guess what? The war on terrorism is very real and is happening as you read. In the shadows the war is fought grimly and much more effectively than with the uniform forces. I am tempted to say that 90% should go home today and leave it for the *Egg Breakers* as they have very little effect and is a waste of resources.

Chapter 4

Why is Africa suddenly important?

I heard many times Western Intelligence Officials say that Africa is simply not important enough to be bothered with too much. That was during the cold war era and quite correct. It was not the first choice of operations and thus the lack of knowledge on how to operate in Africa beyond belief. I know what looks my American Patriot get when they realise her African is actually of the white race and there are a couple of millions of his tribe left in Africa. All white and as a group highly educated and even able to speak English now and then when it suites them to do so which is always with foreigners since Africans are respectful people. They understand your inability to speak more than one language though most Africans speak at least two.

** I was once asked by a child why I am so white when introduced as my American Patriot's "African". Yeah, you have to love the innocence of the youth. Caused a few smiles except to her mom who was horrified (unnecessary for I found it quite funny).*

I remember reading a report dating back to the middle 1970's during the Angolan troubles (civil war) where a major Western Agency described the different groups as "good guys" and "bad guys" with no insight into the groups themselves or what the leaders standing was. They simply were out of their depth and it is very understandable why. At that stage Africa was fighting within itself and posed no military threat whatsoever to the West despite all the rhetoric at the United Nations. Since they posed no threat they were not important enough to be studied in greater detail. The bright young men studied Russian or Vietnamese. Africa was well just Africa. The Dark Continent!

Africa still does not pose a military threat for the one country that had the ability (nuclear weapons and submarines) to cut the West's oil line around the Cape of Good Hope (South Africa) is not really capable of doing so anymore. Theoretically though they have the technology in their new German submarines to create some havoc if they can get close enough for their nuclear weapons is no more. As a matter of interest South Africa is the only country in the world

thus far to dismantle its nuclear weapons voluntarily and gave it to another country (USA). There are strong rumours though that not all were given but I have no idea if that is true or not since there were a lot of rumours on biological weapons also. Every now and then a "*discovery*" is in the newspapers for sensational reasons if nothing else. It is all denied anyway.

However, it is very unlikely that South Africa will be bothered to attack anyone in the near future. The once powerful Armed Forces are a not rated as even a regional force and a lack of money and pilots made its Air Force a joke. It is sadly acknowledged that they cannot attack anyone being riddled with AIDS and more generals than troops. In consequence they play soldiers at various United Nations stations which is fine with me. I would much rather have a weak army unable to stage a coup d'état in Africa than a powerful one who may get the wrong idea from history. We had enough of that type of thing in Africa.

So understandably no interest was shown by the Western Agencies but not anymore! Somalia, Sudan, Kenya, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa and Mali. All of these countries are seen to host or otherwise assisted Muslim radicals in the past or were home to serious terrorist's attacks against the West. There are many more which I don't even bother to mention.

It is well documented that in 1998 the U.S. Embassies was attacked and car bombed in Tanzania (Dar es Salaam) and in Kenya (Nairobi). Many hundreds were killed and publically the U.S. response was to launch a much derided cruise missile attack at targets in Sudan and Afghanistan I think. Some say that the Sudanese targets were anyway wrongly identified and it destroyed a large percentage of the nation's medicine making capability. Be that as it may and note not condemned by the United Nations what is less known is that since then 18 of the 21 radicals involved with the attacks is either dead or in prison. That is excellent counter-terrorism statistics. Kenya also received millions of dollars of aid against terrorism.

Sadly the attacks were not news to us living here as we long suspected it and warned repeatedly without avail about the coming onslaught which then happened. I would have preferred to be wrong in my predictions but events proved we were right.

I include my own country (South Africa) with much reluctance under the terror list as it is known that our passports somehow ended up with terrorists and phone calls were made to South Africa by the London Tube bombers just before the attack. However, and this must be very clear, no-one is suggesting it was given officially to them or that our government supports terrorism for they don't. Officially they are reasonably neutral and probably hope they are left in peace. America is not a particular friend of them since the days of the struggle.

The terrorists almost certainly got the passports via corruption which is very regrettable as it caused us to be searched everywhere and the hassle of applying for visas even to the UK whilst we are part of the Common Wealth. That is very insulting and frankly not worth going there for business. It is such a hassle that I tell clients to meet me in Dubai rather than waste my time with London. This is costing London all the money we would have spent there but who cares. Is only a few million pounds if you add up the ones who made the switch and I am sure they can afford to lose it. Dubai is so much nicer and warmer with better food.

Our own smallish Muslim community is more concerned about drugs and crime as came out in the early nineties than terrorism against the West being quite moderate. However during those unhappy days American targets were bombed which had nothing to do with drugs and crime. Clearly it may happen again in the future. A few, not only Muslims, went to Bagdad during the Second Gulf War as human shields but besides that they committed no act of terrorism and came back quite shocked by the violence of the aerial attacks. That caused a lot of cynical smirks from certain groups but I feel for them. When you are lifted off the ground in an explosion and it simply keeps on and on you grow up very fast. You may even look at the next action movie with much contempt being totally unrealistic.

Nevertheless they made a stand for their beliefs which are more than most of us do. As a threat they are negligible though the odd one here and there may take a more active role and a couple was found in Al Qaeda safe houses in Pakistan. It is known that they tried to join the radicals for training but that happens wherever a Muslim community exists. It does not make all of them suddenly radicals.

At the same time many Muslims pointed out to me that a lot of South African young Jewish men serve in the Israeli Army and it bothers them. Ever since our new government is not a close friend of Israel I have no doubt they would also be keeping an eye on them as a more serious threat than the radicals. There is an obvious difference though between a Muslim radical trained for terrorism against the West and a soldier of the State of Israel. I don't think the Jews constitute any threat.

What is of no doubt to me is that South Africa is potentially a very good place to use as an operational planning base. The infrastructure is good. The communications networks excellent. The facilities to work from as good as any and better than most. With the perceived corruption and lack of interest in radicals by the security apparatus it certainly makes sense. The problem here is what the reaction from the coalition will be if it is found that South Africans are behind a successful attack. I am sure we will be subjected to even more indignities and be chased out of Dubai also.

Traditionally of more concern to the government were the white former soldiers and policemen who most definitely were and are able to train terrorists in the use of weapons and explosives. They certainly have the expert knowledge and at one stage we were quite worried when IED explosive techniques in Iraq looked very much like our handiwork for all explosions tells a story. You are able to identify someone by the way a bomb is made for there are always clues. In this regard I must say that it is rumoured for I never saw anything in writing but spoke to a few men who confirmed it that the Iranians were taught quite a few of our explosive techniques in the 1980's during their war with Iraq. I have no idea if it is true or not but I do know Iran supplied most of our oil.

Having worked with these men for many years I can also tell you they have no wish to train terrorists and are much more honourable than most. That is not to say that a few have not gotten themselves into trouble with mercenary activities and it is well documented. Coincidentally the current South African government is so nervous of them (even after all these years) that they are constantly being investigated and reported on. It is a bit of an in-house joke amongst them who reports what to whom. However as radicals they pose no threat whatsoever.

In the rest of Africa it is a different picture. The dictators are falling and are replaced by Muslims who are not a direct threat to your way of life for even the most powerful Muslim country does not have the military power to attack the West with any chance of success. They lack the infrastructure for a pro-longed war and know it. Indirectly it is another story for once they have nuclear weapons or access to weapons of mass destruction which may be biological or bacterial they pose as serious a threat as any other country with such weapons. Many of the fallen countries possessed not nuclear but certainly biological and bacterial weapons which are a game changer for the amount of damage done is so much greater.

Even the Soviet Union knew this and repeatedly re-assured their NATO counterparts that the release of nuclear weapons (and the biological & bacterial) was very strictly controlled. Amongst professional military men the chances of an accidental nuclear war is ridiculous small. There are just too many safeguards. But not in Africa! The culture is very different with a radical fellow who simply does not fear the consequences and see death as major plus point when it happens. They are a serious problem. Once they have the weapon it would be easy to transport it in a ship to a major harbour where it will cause a lot of mayhem if it explodes. There were many rumours about merchant ships being fitted with a few very powerful weapons and deliberately sailed into enemy harbours as the ultimate bargaining chip. The crews would not even know what they have aboard. Whether this happened I don't know but I saw the plans for it dating back to the cold war.

Since the whole world now knows of tsunami's the terrorist can even explode it under the water to cause a mini-tsunami against which is very little defense. These are scenarios which are faced daily by our leaders and the reason why they turn grey in the Oval Office. It is an awesome responsibility and we really should not judge them all the time. You simply don't know what that man need to decide every day or what he knows which you don't.

Other African countries allow terrorists to stay on their territory which constitutes a clear and direct threat. With this I mean a much more subtle approach and not what happened with the Taleban in Afghanistan where they

took over the country openly. It is plain silly from a terrorist viewpoint to operate like that and will lead to their destruction when found. They can never win in open battle and thus strikes from the shadows without warning wherever possible.

Historically we foresaw the Al Qaeda problem in Africa back in 1994 already when Air France Flight 8969 was hijacked in Algeria. What is fascinating is that it was a sort of a runner-up of the 9/11 attacks a few years later as the plane would have been blown up above Paris causing maximum destruction. The idea to blow it up was probably because the terrorist was unable to pilot the plane as happened later. Luckily it was stormed at Marseille by French Police Special Forces and thus the explosion above Paris never happened.

The idea of using the aircraft as a weapon is not new. Everyone knows about the kamikaze flights during the Second World War where human pilots deliberately crashed their planes into ships. What saved the sailors was technology in *fuses* designed to explode close to the attacking aircraft and thus the threat was neutralised. Of course it takes a very brave man to keep shooting at the aircraft under such conditions. The lesson is that technology is just a means. The deed is done by man. I believe that Western Agencies places too much reliance on their superb technology. It is only an added asset with limitations which must be recognised.

The thing is no-one thought that a kamikaze attack would happen with a civilian airliner until Flight 8969 as an act of terrorism. It was so far beyond reality that it never got serious consideration. It is well-known that of all places to free hostages an aircraft on the ground is the easiest with its lack of hiding places and many clear (for the Special Forces Team) approach angles. There may be a few innocent casualties but I assure you the terrorists will die and most innocents be rescued. From a terrorist viewpoint it is not a good idea to land and the long list of successful counter terrorist operations involving aircraft support this. This aspect is in my mind one of the reasons why 9/11 took place in the way it did for America has exceedingly good hostage rescue teams.

As with Pearl Harbour afterwards it is all too easy and very wrong to blame the intelligence community for not having a crystal ball (yeah if only it was that

easy) to make better predictions on what someone as unstable (in our eyes) as a radical will do next. Suspicions are nothing unless the complete picture points in the same direction and as you can imagine it seldom happens to be a clear picture. However the way General MacArthur failed to safeguard the airfields for many hours after the attack on Pearl Harbour is something which perplexes most historians. It was not his finest moment and it must be acknowledged that President Bush (43) acted with great authoritativeness when he grounded all air traffic immediately after 9/11. By doing so he took the pre-cautions expected from a world leader under attack. You may not know this but Stalin, when Germany attacked the Soviet Union in 1941; for about *three days* had such a mental collapse that he could not function as a leader. This was despite direct warning of the attack from many different sources which he ignored. No, President Bush (43) was not found wanting from a counter-terrorist viewpoint. History will be kind to him on this aspect.

After that Marseille incident we knew it was a matter of time before communism is replaced with Muslim radicalism aimed against the West instead of Israel as was the norm. From about 1999 we noticed a vast increase in Mosques in certain African countries for no real reason and we wondered why. We also started to hear rumours of a new wave of terror based on a jihad and we reported it to the authorities. We were not believed and all our approaches, official and non-official to establish human networks in Africa to understand what was happening were denied which made me wonder if it existed already since the offers were turned down as unnecessary. Turns out it did not and our own existing networks were closed down for political reasons in 1998 leaving South Africa anyway blind.

The rapid rise of white right wing terror was of more immediate importance but the efforts wrongly concentrated on the so called white mercenaries probably because of the havoc they caused amongst erstwhile friends of the new government. They were seen as the threat whilst they were in fact no threat at all as I said above somewhere. Most of them were and still are into genuine security work and earning an income for their families. They had no desire to overthrow the elected government then and still don't being way too old and overweight. They also know that even if they succeed it will not last for long.

There is no way the world will accept a new Apartheid South Africa and right wing terrorism enjoys no support.

The whole idea is ridiculous in the extreme. As Mr Mandela said "never again." Yet it suited the politicians to enable a Mercenary Act which theoretically makes it a crime to join the British Army but not Al Qaeda. Yeah, I don't understand myself but then what do I know? My ex-wives and others these days' takes great delight in informing me that I am not very clever and in good conscience I agree with them. I am not always right but at least I know my limitation which is something I suppose. Now my American Patriot is rightly known far and wide as Mrs Always Right. I may not be that clever but am not stupid either you know. The improved specie is much smarter than us men. They have to be to survive our shenanigans.

From the turn of the century and probably even before that the domestic South African internal security organisation (called the National Intelligence Agency) was abused to spy on their own politicians and became such a joke that the external security organ (known as the South African Secret Service) created a new counter-terrorist unit under the counter-espionage desk. This unit was supposed to focus on terrorism in all its forms and shapes and truly professional in its ways. How they do it today I would not know and do not care for it is not important to our book which deals directly with counter-terrorism techniques. It does show however that most African Intelligence Agencies are open to political interference and not to be trusted as sources of information.

They likewise don't really care what the West's problems are and focus on internal matters mostly to safeguard against coup d'états. However, that is only my opinion but if correct it makes the world much more difficult to the Western Agencies for they are liaising with them as a matter of course. What value they get is open for debate and besides I don't quite understand why they bother for getting second-hand via other Agencies instead of the raw data is not recommended in this game. You simply cannot know how good the intelligence is nor do you have the means to cross check what was fed to you.

Worse than that the questions you ask betray your lack of knowledge which can be used against you and give a clear indication what you are looking for.

Historically that is how the British figured out Pearl Harbour will be attacked by Japan before it happened. They saw the questions asked by the Japanese Naval Attaches via their triple agent called Tricycle and knew off the Japanese interest in their own successful carrier attack against the Italian Navy in Taranto in November of 1940. This is known as well as the fact that they send Tricycle and all the evidence to America but was not believed. Instead the FBI published an article on how they discovered microscopic photography as a method of communication by themselves. Not really helpful that was.

Undeniably there is also much evidence that President Roosevelt wanted Pearl Harbour to take place as it did and no, it is not a conspiracy theory but historical facts coming out as the documents are released. Wireless interception played a major part in this.

Historically it says much about Mr Churchill that he actually tried to warn his family of the pending attack for it could be argued that it would have been better for the British Empire to keep quiet and let the Japanese struck. It is not his fault that Tricycle was disliked as a playboy and worse. I think the Americans learned a lot from this tragic incident and spend a lot of effort to prevent similar occurrences. Pearl Harbour it seems is not forgotten but 9/11 is. How is that possible I ask?

Since the human networks were refused technology (signals intelligence) was seen as the new miracle cure. But it was not and will never be. The reliance placed on signal intelligence proved to be less productive for at the end of the day it is the man on the ground who knows what is behind the telephone call or email or bank transfer. We missed a good opportunity and are paying the price for it now for it is always more difficult to penetrate a place after the fact. Everyone is forewarned and expecting it. We almost lost our timeslot to do so.

Chapter 5

Why are you not obtaining the information you need in Africa?

You would think that the West with its established networks of embassies and business in Africa would be able to gather information at will but from what I hear that is simply not true. They are struggling and the lack of knowledge is harming your war against terrorism. So what is wrong? Why is the information not flowing as it theoretically should be doing? After all it is never possible to disappear from the face of the earth and you should be able to find whoever you want to find. And once found do what you need to do as is your right under International Law despite what the long haired liberals say.

It was that brilliant historian, Lord Dacre better known as Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper, who observed in his book "*The Last Days of Hitler*" that there is no such thing as a missing person. You are either dead or you are somewhere and in both cases you can be found. As someone who read thousands of history books on Nazi-Germany I can tell you that book still ranks number one and well worth reading. We can learn from history and it shows clearly that no-one notorious can hide forever. When it comes to gathering information on the whereabouts of someone you need the active support of the people or community in which the terrorist is hiding.

This principle was enhanced by Chairman Mao who referred to a communist being like a fish swimming amongst other fishes meaning to integrate with society so that he can be hidden. Note I did not say hide for that is not good enough for a terrorist. He needs the support of the community in the sense that they actively protect him and that has implications on the neutrality of the community. There is a subtle difference between hiding someone and keeping quiet on his whereabouts or being neutral about it. History tells us then that a notorious person simply cannot disappear and that without society support he will be betrayed and when betrayed be either arrested or killed by the security forces. His only other choice is to renounce his ways and go over to the other side which is also good and negates him as a threat. It is as simple as this.

In today's world where money trails and all electronic communications can be followed it makes the finding process a lot easier than what it used to. You still need feet on the ground to do the cross checking and gain the physical evidence like a picture or to discover the movements of your terrorist. That is why he may one day drive into a Hellfire missile fired from a drone or attack helicopter which just happened to ambush him on his way somewhere. Or be shot dead by at close range by the *Egg Breakers* for there must be no mistaken identity. To make very sure a DNA sample of the body is required by the *Egg Breakers* on the ground where the attack took place so they are always close by. These things cannot be done from an orbiting satellite and the body cannot always be removed for later disposal. Mostly it is left at the scene as a warning to the remaining.

Logically, to gain the support of the community or society in which the terrorist lives was recognised from the beginning of counter terrorism operations. First in Malaya by the British who actually won that war by creating safe havens or villages with clear free fire zones in which the armed clashes took place. Thus the Malayan operations became the one light point in counter-insurgency for the West and everyone tried it afterwards confidently expecting lightning to strike twice at the same place. But as anyone with even the least bit of history knowledge knows it does not work like that and armies are always prepared to fight the previous war.

Sadly the Malayan principles did not work in Vietnam and will not work in Afghanistan for the simple reason that the enemy in Malaya were foreigners who could be identified as Chinese immigrants or from wherever they came. As such they never had the support they hoped for from the local community or society and could not really swim like fish. It is not well-known but Rhodesia (an African country) had a contingent of troops in Malaya from which the Rhodesian Special Air Service grew. Or that the methods of the Malayan counter-insurgency were based on Chapman Spencer's excellent book *The Jungle is Neutral* which any counter-terrorism expert must know by heart. It is that good and one of my most treasured possessions.

This is exactly what went wrong in Vietnam and Afghanistan. Fundamentally it was and are the locals taking each other on with perhaps a few foreigners in-between. Consequently there was no clear enemy to identify in any other way than ideology which is rather difficult. This problem does not exist in Africa for most of the radicals are foreigners. They come here from the Middle-East or wherever to hide for they think that it is safe for them to do. They know their money is worth something and with the corruption would be able to create new identities. They also have fairly good communication lines with access to anything which they would have in the first world and that the local Agencies would not be too interested in them as long as they don't attack their host country. All this is very true. However, they also believe they are of a comparable fish as us because some of us share the same religion.

Most certainly they are not the same and that is their weak point. Africans are laid back people and not into too much radicalism when it comes to religion. Most have an attitude of live and let live and don't take kindly to conversion. They also know what happens in the radical paradise with floggings and amputation as we saw in Mali recently which is not something designed to create good relations between the two groups. Most of our Muslims are very moderate and not into Sharia law.

Probably because of the lack of knowledge for I would not like to call it arrogance the West don't seem to get it that Africans are as well informed with newspapers and the Internet as any other country and more than a place like North Korea for instance. It is a relatively free society and most can read and write and make their own deductions. Therefore you will be surprised that the lack of knowledge is more on your side about us than us on you. We take you as seriously as you take us which means not very much.

The other important mistake was that you supported a corrupt government in Vietnam and Afghanistan with no interest to govern for the people and by doing that voided the first doctrine of COIN doctrine. In fact you have a bit of a history in doing that in Africa too and it creates resentment. Simply put your traditional approach is designed for failure. I hope that you will not take offense for some of

my observations in this chapter will make the long haired liberals cry which is always a delightful sound to someone as conservative as I am.

I have nothing against my American Patriots tribe and think it is quite clear in all my books. However I fail to understand a lot of their actions. So bear with me please if you are an American who stumbled across this book...I am not your enemy and speak with malice towards none.

The first wake-up call is to understand you have very little credibility in Africa and you are not particularly well liked or respected either. Why is that you ask for are you not assisting wherever you can and had done so since the 1960's on a scale which is mind boggling?

What resources do you have already?

To answer these questions we need to look at business as usual. In other words what you are doing now and ask what resources you have already and take it from there to get to a solution. The short answer is that you have quite a lot of resources in Africa and had so for decades. Historically the route followed to create an official presence in an African country is to establish a diplomatic mission later to be upgraded to a full embassy in the form of your accredited diplomats. This you did since the 1960's and even before that. You are in most countries and logically should be well versed in gathering information on terrorism. But you are not. This is wake-up call number two.

Let me point out the obvious to you that you are targeting the wrong people as your sources. The radicals are not in government circles but amongst the common Joe on the street who know who and where they are. They cannot hide. We saw that in history. Bribing the social elite meaning the rich and government will bring you nothing of value and let us look at this statement for I admit it is a harsh perspective. In effect I am telling you your embassies and NGO's are *useless* as a source of information on terrorism in Africa.

Your diplomats have no credibility

The one thing I warn against in all my books and briefing on how to survive as a hostage in Africa is not to put too much trust in your local embassy. Experience

showed me time and time again they are (to put it kindly) less than useful during a time of crisis. Whenever something goes wrong they wring their hands and play the innocent wondering what to do.

Business wise being "*neutral*" diplomats they will not become involved easily nor make a stand on your behalf and anything which is remotely different from drinking and eating is too much trouble for them to attend to. As rubber stampers and talking cr-p at parties they are exceedingly good. I hope that in a time of terrorism they may be more useful than which is their norm but I would not count on it. They are also controlled from the country where they come from and as a unit has no operational freedom whatsoever which explains the lack of action. All this is understandable for they exist to create harmony and have to act like this. As rubber stampers they are exceedingly good and I suppose in a time of crisis they may even be more useful than which is their norm. I certainly hope so for your sake.

Embassies are the first places which will be attacked by the sometimes not so innocent mobs. Which means it may not be possible to keep them open as a source of information anyway so they only work in times of peace. History shows us they are very quick to run to the nearest carrier suitcase in hand which is entirely understandable. What is not is the fact that they often then leave documents and evidence behind which may kill their sources. This is utterly unacceptable and makes it impossible for a source to trust them.

Worse than this is that they have no credibility under the normal folk and is seen as part of the government elite sitting in their well protected (typically) embassies with not a single idea of what is actually happening doing business as usual. Since they only mix with other diplomats and their government counterparts the scope of their information is extremely limited and utterly useless to find a terrorist. They are being spoon-fed to your disadvantage.

Even if someone wants to report a terrorist none are accessible for it is impossible for ridiculous security reasons to gain access to them unless you are one of the elite in which case, as said, you are rather useless as a source of information on terrorist groups. There is a wrong idea that in Africa you must know someone important to get things done and thus the focus on the social

elite. Let us see what I say about that in [Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer](#). I quote with your kind permission: "*Many times I listened to "ex-whatever Forces" lads who thought they could bend the rules or break the law it with impunity to "sort things out for you by travelling to the country and kick some (you know what) on your behalf."* They always convince my client that their ways is the quick solution and the only way to do things in Africa or rather to get things done in Africa. Be warned. Their plans never work and always lead to serious embarrassment for you. They are incapable of delivering what they promise and how will you get a refund from them when things do go wrong? They may not be able to deliver but they are tough men and not to be disrespected by asking for your money back. They may even turn of you in such a case and work with the Intelligence Agencies to trap you.

Yes it happens all the time. It falls under counter-terrorism. I worked long enough with the cloak & dagger brigade to know that they are thoroughly penetrated and will sell you out whenever the need arrives. Cannot blame them. They trust only their own (which you are not) and charity starts at home. Usually it is nothing but a scam and win or lose they keep the many thousands of dollars paid in advance. And your Corporation is now tainted with the mercenary stigma for Africa dislike mercenaries intensely. They are as a rule jailed and executed. It is a dead end job so to speak.

It is a fact that all South African citizens are prohibited by law to act as mercenaries and thus the Intelligence Services keep good watch on them all the time. Thus by law any South African (easy to know by his accent) is unable to offer such services. You are breaking the law besides all the other legal problems you will face with conspiracy charges. This falls under the well-established legal doctrine of common purpose which I read the other day much to my amusement came from the old Apartheid State. I always thought it came from Roman times 2000 years before the Apartheid State but what do I know? Journalists are obviously cleverer in law than me.

Point being the law will not be on your side and nor will the media. You will be crucified and hounded for life for your own country will also dislike you. Stay away from them. I explained above we can assist you to trace and track the

money and attach property etc. There is no need for such silly ventures. That day and age is gone!

The right people or connection syndrome

This one is used all the time on foreigners or in other words on you. It is a wonderful scam and not quite the same as the mercenary syndrome but a variation on it in the sense that here you are put in contact with "Mr Important." Indeed he may be important but he is useless to help you in my experience and I am friends with a few presidents who needed assistance in the past. He is typically too busy protecting number one which is himself. They don't come cheap either for they know they are important and play it for all it is worth.

Everyone in Africa claims to know the "*right people*" who will sort things out if they are only paid a few dollars which then become in for a penny means in for a pound. They will keep on taking your money and achieve nothing and what can you do about it afterwards? Nothing! Are you seriously going to court to reclaim your bribe money? You cannot approach the court with dirty hands by law. I know it sounds good to hear that there is no need for long court cases and you know we try settlement and arbitration as alternatives. But there is no such thing as short cuts in law. Everyone knows that. Why would it be different here in Africa?

Most will say to you they "know the president and can arrange a meeting for you to sort things out" Or any other influential politician will do under this scam. Or a general which is two a penny in Africa and seldom of any great importance! Or a man famous for what his family did decades ago. Let us think about this for a second. What will it help you to see or pay the president? It is not the answer as many seem to believe. The man is a politician and that makes him *ab initio* untrustworthy in business in my eyes for he has other interests and you are just another foreigner trying his luck. He owes you no loyalty besides what can be bought and who says you have the biggest wallet?

It is silly to think that in this day and age a president is able to commit corruption with impunity and to pay him to sort someone out or to smooth the way is called corruption. It is a crime and it will cause a lot of problems when it

comes out and it always does. Journalists do not live in fear and expose these things all the time. Then his enemies start asking questions in parliament and he may survive (they often do) but you will not. You don't have that type of protection and your good name is contaminated forever.

It says in the good Book you cannot build a house on a sandy foundation for it will fall down with the first rain. How can a politician who is scrutinized from all sides and probably out of power soon be of any assistance to you? It is one of the myths which carried over from the last century when things were indeed very different. Not anymore.

More importantly in practical terms how do you pay this fellow without it being traced? Most if not all Corporates try to hide the bribes by paying consultation fees to his advisors. Or into his wives' accounts in London or other family in Zurich. Or they create a Trust somewhere. Or they give cars and other valuables which are disguised as a lease or birthday gift. Remember it must all be declared by law by them and audits are indeed done now and then. I assure you that Africa woke up to that one many decades ago and it is the first accounts checked in any corruption investigation. A life style audit catches them all and then the tax laws (draconian) come after them and you. Your Government will not protect you for you committed a crime. There are other untraceable ways to reward someone which I am not mentioning here. Cash is always foolish."

On embassy security I wish to point out it is indeed necessary and attacks do happen and we all know of the unfortunate Libyan incident and others before that. So yes it must be taken seriously. My concern is the lack of access to what is known as a "*walk in*" source. In other words a guy who has information you need but cannot get it to you. Yes there are websites and telephone hotlines but please remember that the typical terrorist lives amongst simple folk who may not have access to such means of communication. Thus he cannot warn you and his only other option is to approach his own security organs which do what? It gives you second hand information you cannot verify and the edge of the local boys over you. You lose both ways and most often the source will simply shrug and walk away.

It also creates a bad impression, one of fear, to hide all the time inside the Embassy walls. I often hear you being ridiculed because of it and it is said the terrorist explains it as simple cowardness combined with the stigma of the social elite enemies of the people you mix with all the time. It is not doing your credibility any good.

Your carrot in aid money is a wasted resource

The carrot you use is always *aid money* in whatever form or shape for we are talking collectively and not of any specific fund. It includes the well-known NGO's that follow soon afterwards and undoubtedly are full of honourable long haired liberals (and others) trying to make a difference. Hence we have every NGO racket and scam known to man operating here with your tax payer money for most do not really have private funding. If they did there would be no need for pressure groups in Washington and no fancy offices either. It is always amazing to me to see how the volunteer workers are abused into miserable conditions whilst the fat cats sit in their luxury offices at home. Worst is they don't even realise why we smirk about it.

Research for a previous book showed me that 90% of the money is used for administrative purposes. Being long haired liberals I doubt if they would anyway be willing to give you information on terrorism. Normally for such people their own country's safety is much less important than to be seen to be a goody two shoes. I pray I am wrong in my observation.

Money creates resentment

Money never plays a major role in source gathering operations as some think. Most defectors or informants have other motives far beyond money though we cannot deny that money can buy whatever else you need. The informant should be rewarded financially but you know that if money is his first consideration then you have a bad source that may lie to you to get more money. Worse is he may take money from the other side also having already proved he has a price.

Flashing money attracts attention and annoys the rest of the players who simply don't have your budgets and resent it. They will sell you the wrong information for they know you cannot possibly cross check what you get and they know you

will pay handsomely as the stories of bags full of cash reached us. We know it is happening and happened. You are not doing yourself any favours with this attitude of "*look what I can buy.*" Money to a source is a reward. Not a way of buying a soul. Arrogance will bite you.

Why your aid money is working against you

You are undermining your own counter-insurgency doctrines. The whole doctrine of counter-insurgency (which encompasses counter-terrorism) is based on two non-debatable legs which are so important that without both you will lose the war and it would be better for you to then withdraw to where you came from.

The first leg is **non-corrupt leadership** for the people by the people. The theory is that the Military can buy time (unfortunate word choice) for the fat politicians to sort their nonsense out so that the Military may withdraw. In other words, to govern in such a way that the terrorist will receive no further support for his cause or his cause disappears all together. Obviously so will he. Being a minority without a cause open for betrayal which is what you want. This actually happened with the so called "*Weatherman Movement*" in your own country so in practise this is indeed possible but only if the government you support is genuinely legit. But you don't usually support legitimate governments. Historically you supported corrupt government in Africa and still do which sends all kinds of wrong messages.

We think of Mobutu Sese Seko in Zaire (now called the Congo again). We think of Idi Amin in Uganda. We think of almost every other country in Africa with a military president or one with despotic notions which you supported for reasons we fail to understand. At the same time you failed to support Biafra and before than Katanga both of which was pro-democratic and Western orientated with no Apartheid or anything negative. What message do you think that send to us? That you simply don't care? Or that you don't practise what you preach? Or that you are incompetent?

Make your choice for we believe all of those reasons. What else can we think? At least with the communists we knew what they want. Same with the Muslim radicals! We know what they expect from us and what their version of paradise

is. With you we have no idea for you speak something and do something else when push comes to shove. We don't understand you.

You will not be able to show me one country with an Al Qaeda problem in Africa which has non-corrupt leadership for the people by the people which is what you say you want to see. I say there is not one and still the West pumps billions of aid dollars to them for what reason? I really fail to understand why you would want to do business with people on governmental level who are open to bribery (another word for aid money). Surely they are not the type of people you wish to be associated with? Remember you are quick to say we associate with terrorists. Well my dear reader, why should we not say then you associates yourself with corrupt governments and thus make yourself part of the problem and not the solution? Do you not understand how that damages your reputation and create disrespect amongst ordinary folk towards you? The folks who have the knowledge you so desperately need.

Then again then you would not know this for you listen to your ambassadors (all long hair liberals) who get their information from where? Their counterparts in the local government! And if not from them then from the receivers of the aid! Do you really think these sources will tell you the truth and then have to work for a living instead of taking you for a ride? Perchance they may be benefiting from your kindness and as such have an excellent reason to tell you what you want to hear so that the money taps are kept open. After all they were playing you since the 1960s and it is sort of a way of life by now.

Business as usual as we call it with much bitterness.

Let us test what I say in real life. At that wonderfully incompetent organisation called the United Nations, did these countries support you? Or did they uniformly condemned you and paid lip service to your request in the form of information to save your citizens lives? I think we know the answer to that one for we regularly change channels when we see the bizarre attacks on you with boring consistency. And you just sit there taking it which tells us Africans you may not be as strong as you would like us to believe you are. Either that or your manhood is corroded and you cannot be respected. Both of which does not make

you a winner in our eyes. Then why should we make ourselves vulnerable to your cause?

How many of the begging third world nations supported your war on terrorism the way Mr Blair and the UK did. A country which suffered much abuse and terrorist attacks because of their support and loyalty towards you, a former colony, through the years and will do so for the foreseeable future! Clever people say that a man's actions speak louder than his words and it is true. Anything which is not deeds is academic cr-p. Let us not close our eyes for the sake of political correctness when it comes to your survival.

Are you that naive to believe the money and aid is not (mostly) stolen and that third world aid is nothing but a scam? How much more evidence do you need before you realise you are taken for fools and worse. As I said in one of my other books ([Your Worst Enemy](#)) show me the infrastructure which your aid built in the last 60 years? There is nothing except swollen accounts in Swiss (or other) banks and worse I think in many cases the aid is used against your own Armed Forces and citizens.

I know how violently we in the Armed Forces turned on the super pop group *ABBA* (my favourite) when we heard a rumour that some of our terrorists were found with food donated by them. We reacted even worse when we found out that probably the best album in the 1980s, *U2's The Joshua Tree*, donated the South African royalties to our enemies and banned the album immediately. Of course both these groups supported freedom fighters from their viewpoint and no-one is denying that Apartheid was indeed a crime against humanity or their right to do so. I am merely using this as an example on how aid can end up in a place with which your constituency may not agree with. Also the time honoured point that one man's terrorist is another's hero.

Now the big question which you don't seem to understand. What message does it send to a nation, not the fat politicians, when you blindly pump money into the select few only and then keep on increasing it? Think about this for that is the root cause of your lack of sources on ground level even though you may not want to hear it and you want to believe you are doing good. Africans support a winner and a hand wringing fool who is easily parted with his money for decades

is really not seen as a winner but an idiot to be abused. They laugh at you as being weak and nothing but an *ATM* (the actual name Nigerians refers to Ex-Pats - *automatic teller machine*). The saying is "*well if you want to give me money I will take as much as possible.*" Who can blame anyone for such an attitude?

This is one argument you cannot win for if you know or suspect you aid money is stolen or let us be nice and say abused then why do you not rectify the situation as any honourable man will do? Your lack of action in this regard means two things to us. **One**, you are too scared or corrupt yourself to stop it and **two**; you shrug and say "*well different standards apply in Africa and it is the way it is.*"

The second answer is designed to cause resentment to us for it shows racism and moral cowardness and a serious failure of leadership on your part. We are waiting for the day that you will say "*yes we are as strong as we look and you will not take us for fools any longer.*" Such a view will be greatly respected for Africans respect a strong man. Always did and always will. I say in my book [*Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer*](#) do not relax your standards in Africa for there is no need to do so. Yes we have our poor which are very poor indeed but we also have lawyers, doctors, universities and infrastructure which in some fields are better than yours. For example our human rights culture is much more advanced than yours in terms of labour laws and equality for the sexes as we recognise same sex marriages in law.

On this subject we also had sceptical views on homosexuals as a security risk and then realised that the only reason why they were a security risk was because of the social stigma attached to it making them vulnerable to blackmail. The stigma (in law anyway) disappeared when the law was adapted to stop the discrimination. And you know what, the world did not stop turning and nothing much happened except a few jokes on why they also got divorced which I am not putting in writing. Seems like the prophets of doom were once again wrong in their predictions and (gulp) the long haired liberal's right! Religion has no place in law and it is a matter of time before the rest of Africa follows our lead.

In most African countries the death penalty is scrapped from the law books and the list goes on and on. Medically the first heart transplant ever was done in South Africa in 1969 already and you inherited our landmine technology to save

your soldiers and aid workers. On other military equipment our G5 howitzers is still the world leader and it would be silly to believe its extended range is only 59km. That is for the export versions.

Technology wise we used frequency hopping radios in the 1970s already and our locally adapted Kfirs (Cheetah) outflow the much vaunted F15 Strike Eagle on exercises. There are many more samples but let us not get side-tracked. Hear what I say to you for I speak from experience as cross- jurisdictional expert when it comes to standards in Africa. The moment you pay a bribe (relaxing your standards) you opened yourself to continuous blackmail in the future. We Africans respect a man who says no way and stick to his principles and I guarantee you at some stage your reputation will be such that you will be respected and the pressure will stop. Give in once and we will take the whole arm never mind your hand. We see that as weakness to exploit.

Why do you arm your friend's enemies?

I often say in my books that Africans respect grey hair above all. With that comes loyalty. So it puzzles us beyond belief when you start giving sophisticated weapons to countries against the wishes of your oldest friends.

As an example (and I don't particularly dislike the Egyptians one way or another) you recently gave Egypt aid in the form of F16 fighters and I suppose training how to fight with it. I read that Abram's tanks (almost as good as the Leopard 2) are part of this process and hundreds of millions of dollars in aid. In this case you cannot even say "*well they bought it and it kept American jobs*" for it is given for free as far as I understand. The Egyptians are not paying one dollar for it but the American tax payer who is already under pressure (don't dare to deny the obvious) is paying for another nation's military. How nice is that now?

Every night we see on the news grey haired men with concerned faces speaking in serious tones about your record levels of debt (made to save us whilst being the world's policeman) and we worry that you crash again as you did in 1929 and 2008 for that will bring us down with you. We pray for your leaders and rejoiced when a black man became president. And then you just carry on to give

billions away including sophisticated weapons to a nation who is a sworn enemy of your only true ally in that region called Israel.

How is that possible that you cannot understand you need to survive for us to survive? You have that responsibility on you for when you sneeze the rest of us get bronchitis. Take your money and heal your own citizens we say. It is understandable and no reasonable man will condemn you for such wise action. The common African Joe doesn't see your money anyway. It makes no difference to us but it does anger us to see you being taken for fools. We looked up to you once as the Land of the Free and now we wonder if you are the land of the fools? Intellectually we understand that your intentions are good and honourable. That cannot be denied as is not denied. Aid is occasionally needed and much appreciated but aid given willy-nilly without regard to the return on investment is irrational and is pro-longing your war on terrorism. You cannot afford to do business as usual anymore.

Verily, I don't understand politics and am glad I am a simple fellow for I would hate to try to explain this line of thinking which proved disastrous right from the beginning when President Roosevelt decided to trust Stalin and expecting nothing in return as a sign of good faith during the Second World War. Yeah, we know how that one turned out and I am not belittling Mr Roosevelt before you get upset for I admire all U.S. Presidents as being very exceptional men. Regarding Mr Roosevelt there is much evidence that he woke up to the nature of the beast in the end and even more suspicion of a communist spy inside his personal advisors who may have influenced him in the beginning. He was also a very ill man at that stage. I wish however that the Russian Historians will at least acknowledge that America's contribution to the war effort did play a major role in their victory over Nazi-Germany. It is a grave injustice to ignore it.

I ask myself. What is the worst what can happen when you get this aspect of abused aid under control? When you say "*right guys, from now on no money unless...*" Experience at very high level in African governments tells me you will have them begging you for money which places you in a very strong position to bargain to the best return on investment possible. I would say that would lead to a very agreeable treaty (for once) to your electorate and will change the face of

Africa for the aid will be used where most needed for everyone involved including you in times of emergency.

I say again, there is nothing which angers the common African more than corruption for the few chosen ones. You can easily become a hero by cutting out the NGO's and government interference and doing it yourself.

Did this happen before? Yes, who do you think build and operated the Panama Channel for the benefit of all mankind? A fat NGO from Washington DC? The Panama government perchance? No Sir, it was the U.S. Military who has a reputation to get things done properly when allowed to do so. They got stuck in and the world benefited then and they benefit now. Then you decided for whatever reason to relinquish your control in 1979 (only physically done 20 years later).

Will that bite you in the future? I hope not but if it does it would be justice for your actions against Britain and France with the Suez crisis (1956) when they tried to intervene to safeguard the Suez channel for all mankind from over eager African nationalists. The same one with the nice F16's and Abram's tanks.

The other day I read the memories of Civil War General Schofield (Union) who was the man who decided that Hawaii should become part of the United States many years later in case your history teacher failed to inform you. He made the comment that any West Point graduate (note any and not a specific one) will be able to take over the government in any of the South American States and do a better job than what the politicians would. You know what? History showed us it is still a good idea. Those Civil War Generals were men amongst men. I always say to my American Patriot that I have yet to learn more about honourable behaviour by just reading their memoirs. They had very clear direction for some reason which I am still trying to discover. Perhaps it had to do with unwavering belief never to stain their uniform or code of conduct.

As I always say we can learn from history. For instance what did General Sherman do when he found *landmines* planted in front of his army and it wounded one of his officers during his march to the sea? He made the Confederate prisoners remove it by walking them in the front as first targets. He

also threatened to hang the Confederate officer responsible for planting it. Yeah, problem solved in a practical way from a man whose nature embodied the word honour. As I said in another book, my American Patriot is a Southern Lady; I don't have patriotic notions to Union Generals and am not an American myself. Thus my praise is given objectively.

What else can the beggars do to you when the money stops? Kick you out of their countries? Theoretically yes but no, won't happen for that would take away the money carrot forever and they know it for historically they tried that many times before. It is called "*nationalisation*" or in plain English theft. Is always a recipe for utter disaster! Did not work then and will not work now.

It is an empty threat in law. All the shareholders need to do is to attach and sell the responsible dictators assets which are always in another first world country who generally enjoys good relations with you and will follow your courts orders. It really is no big deal and allowed under International Law. With the billions stolen through the years you will have more than enough to attach to satisfy any judgment for you losses. Now if he really wants to play hardball there is something called the international criminal court which you support financially. None of the dictators want to face real justice and all of them have something to face. He and his horrible family can be arrested when they leave their own country as they will for they absolutely love to shop in places where the warrant of arrest may be executed.

Otherwise you can do what you did to a fellow called Noriega in 1986 and use your powerful military to fetch him for the courts. Who is going to stop you from doing so? It is a classic counter-terrorism operation to snatch someone for a fatherly talk. For once the long haired liberals will even praise you. Yeah I know I am cynical. The word will spread quite quickly about the new ball game and dictators will bend forward and backwards to accommodate you for they know what happens when a good man get angry enough to say enough is enough. Unfortunately they also doubt that you are serious when you say these things for history showed you back down more often than not. This makes you a weakling in our eyes for if you proof unwilling to fight back we make our own conclusions.

It is your money in case you forgot so *you are the boss*. Where else in the world never mind business have we heard of such weak behaviour? Your leaders, as much as I respect them, is failing you beyond belief.

Appeasement

At the risk of repeating the obvious let me say again. Your lack of taking responsibility for your own aid money smacks of the biggest failure in the 1930's called *Appeasement*! Yes the curse word which made an honourable man like Mr Chamberlain a villain and caused 60 million plus deaths in the war which followed because of moral cowardness.

All you are doing is to make the corrupt leaders richer and the people who are your best informants angrier. So they decide it is business as usual and they withdraw into their homes keeping quiet and cannot be bothered when you are attacked to warn you as civilise people would do. As far as they are concerned you are only concerned with corrupt officials and not them who really need assistance to learn how to fish and not how to be kept in subjection. I say again that neutrality is simply not good enough in the war on terrorism. Neutrality suits the terrorist a lot more than his targets for he is always attacking unless you get him first. Thus he has operational initiative which is a force multiplier. This must be negated. I have a feeling that history will not be kind to the aid givers despite their undeniable good intentions. It is sad.

The other method you use to penetrate Africa is where a *military training team* arrives to re-train the local armed forces. That is their secondary profession for we know their real purpose is to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the trainees and to identify future sources of either information or influence. Some may even be invited back to your dictator school in Georgia. The one in Fort Benning which trained no less than 11 blood stained dictators since 1948. Luckily it seems Africans have not yet woken up to this opportunity. This is how the game is played and we also understand your need to dump your second-hand conventional military equipment on us for that creates the need for the instructors and forces us to buy spare parts at inflated prices from your big businessmen with political influence. We will also then need to retrain our pilots and air force mechanics or better rent ex-military air force ones from you so that

they can either sabotage our equipment as happened during the Rhodesian Bush War or tell you our readiness state. It is an endless circle of deceit and a waste of resources for several reasons.

You cannot train those who knows more than what you do

Regarding training missions it may be necessary in many African countries but not in all. Obviously this depends on where you are but in a place like South Africa you will find serious opposition to your training teams as they simply feel they don't need nor want you. They are despite their lack of current warrior inclinations still professional enough not to need you.

In other countries the military is feared for all the wrong reasons and history proved that once you left the military goes back to their ways of looting, raping and killing with a few coup d'états in between. You are not going to change that mind-set. Most Africans don't want nor need a powerful military for these reasons. Your idea of training them is good in theory but useless in practise for your record is not impressive at all. What happened in Georgia in 2008? The Russians destroyed your trained Georgians troops with an ease which bordered on contempt. What do you think will happen once you leave Afghanistan? I foresee the radicals taking over again as happened in South Vietnam when you left. All that lives and money wasted. Currently you are losing more men on green on blue incidents than from the actual war. What does that tell us about your abilities?

With all these historical failures can you blame us for paying lip service to your Green Berets? Remember it takes an expert to recognise another and we don't see expertise in you regarding African conditions. What we see is arrogance and an over reliance on technology. We also think your troops are soft and cannot fight without their creature comforts. Perhaps we are wrong (I hope so) but that is the impression and you need to get your image sorted out if you want our assistance. Africans back winners.

Be aware that most of the military men I spoke to before writing this book wanted to stay with the British at RMA Sandhurst. Our Armies are mostly based on the British tradition for the last 120 years. They also point out that you have

your Head Quarters for your African Command in *Stuttgart* which is a town in Germany. This is an insult to Africans. It shows to us that you are not serious.

Your equipment is not suitable for Africa and never will be being designed for other more important theatres. As an example let us look at your standard anti-landmine equipment which is *sine qua non* on any African COIN operation. You had almost nothing until recently as is proved with the formal independence of Rhodesia in 1980 when the Rhodesian Army found the "*landmine proof*" Land Rovers of the British Army monitoring force totally inadequate to say the least. It was in fact death traps and they soon borrowed the modified Rhodesian ones which actually worked.

The same happened when UNTAG arrived in Namibia in 1989 and had to implore us for landmine proof vehicles which they then painted a horrible white colour much to our disgust. Almost all of your current anti-landmine vehicles are based on South African technology which we perfected and used since the 1970's. I recollect how we laughed at your attempts in Vietnam to landmine proof your vehicles with sandbags. Something from the Second World War and of very little use! Mark my words your fancy weapon systems will break down. Not even the much more rugged Russian equipment used during the cold war lasted so why would yours? Maintenance is the mother of all problems in Africa because of the lack of skills and parts and conditions. Nothing destroys credibility quicker than equipment failures for we know what worked before and what is now not working. So the feeling is, right or wrong, what can you possibly contribute?

What about the Police

There is another element usually forgotten in your planning. The fourth arm of any African country's Armed Forces is its Police. Most are armed with assault weapons and very accomplished in COIN operations and have nothing in common with your hometown ideas of a Sheriff Department. The levels of violence faced every day in Africa by the police would be seen as war in other countries. That is one of the reasons why they are so violent. It is survival and they do survive.

In reality 90% of all terrorist kills in the South African Border War was by the Police COIN Units and not the (bigger and better equipped) Army. Being the reigning experts on local conditions it is rather ridiculous to bring trainers from overseas to African Police Forces. The average Western cop has no idea or clue what they get into and I discuss it in much greater detail in my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#). With your permission I quote as follows: "Tribalism was a problem in those days. Especially in the rural area two villages or tribes may attack each other and we had to preserve law and order. It was not difficult to understand what happened as the survivors would tell us. Many villages were destroyed but they normally used only traditional weapons. Even today an elderly lady may be seen as a witch and killed with her hut burned down with her. These things happen in Africa and you can read about it on the Internet if you wish. Such murders are not difficult to investigate as the culprit does not see such an act as murder but as a pre-emptive strike. He cannot really understand why the white Policemen arrest him for that and the courts take this in account when sentencing him. He just doesn't know better.

That is another reason why I find the training of the new Police Service by outsiders so absurd. They have no idea what Africa is about and never will be. With all respect, being a copper in Manchester or wherever for twenty years means nothing in our mean streets. You will see more violent crime here in one month than what you saw in ten years that side. You are not an African and thus know nothing of our ways. How can it be any different? And of course the reverse is also true. Letting us loose in Manchester will reduce the population dramatically and the long haired liberals will cry foul."

The point is unless you are an African meaning you lived here and grew up here you cannot be expected to understand us. That is a serious weakness in gathering information.

You don't understand COIN operations

The biggest reason why most ex-professional military men in Africa will not assist you is because we honestly believe you don't understand COIN and will not deviate from the way you are doing it now. It is one of the continuous debates amongst us on why you are following the route you are. This makes us

very reluctant to trust you with information for we became a bit cynical. I say this with much respect but whilst counter-insurgency may be a revived principle to American Generals it is not to the rest of the world. What you are doing right now in Afghanistan is entirely wrong in our view when you refer to it as COIN for whatever it is it we know from many decades of experience it is not COIN and will never succeed. We are not the least impressed and see it as a waste of resources and lives.

The second doctrine of counter-insurgency is that counter-terrorism is all about surgical strikes and intelligence on where to strike. Nothing else! The mathematics is very simple. Identify the threat, find the threat and neutralise the threat. The conventional lads are only good enough (and I mean no disrespect) to guard strategic points and to do a few patrols in the hope of finding (by chance) a few terrorists to shoot. Without intelligence to back them up they have no other function except to be attacked and so that left spoor is left for us to follow afterwards since no terrorist known to man can fly above the ground.

We made bonfires and prayed religiously every night before dinner to be attacked during the night. Alas, we were seldomly attacked but the Army lying in complete darkness were. Since we listened in on their radios we would rush off and steal their spoor the next day much to their disgust. Once on that spoor it would be almost certain that at some stage a clash will occur leaving the terrorists dead and us pleased.

We got so experienced that we could track from moving vehicles and the Rhodesians tracked from out their helicopters during the 1970's already which is simply astonishing. Apparently they used the shadows to see trails through the savannah which is very possible when at the correct angle relating to the sun. It could only be done between 10am and 15h00. They also used tracker dogs (marked with day-glow) controlled via radio from a helicopter and the dog could the run and track at his own pace which is very much faster than what a human can run. When the terrorist is found the troops is offloaded and commenced killing them being fresh and highly motivated. They also taught us the value of airborne command and control.

No counter-insurgency was ever won with a body count and I wonder what kind of pressure was put on you to get into that game for no-one is falling for that. Historically, in our own counter-insurgency wars we had a kill ration of hundreds against one and we still lost as you are losing right now. Thus the answer is not how many kills but who you kill. It is not a blunt instrument but a rapier to remove the cancer inside a community without destroying the community. To do otherwise will lead to an escalation beyond your control which will work in favour of the terrorist who knows this also. They see it as victory when you lose the initiative and start driving around in brigade strength on sweeping operations angering the locals with accidents which are bound to happen. You also open yourself for IED attacks. This failed in Vietnam where you called it "*search and destroy*" and it will fail again now and in the future. Do you know that if you are not on the road the IED cannot get you? Think about that next time when you send your young men out on patrol.

We saw it time and time again in our own wars that a body count is useless. The more you kill the more martyrs (struggle heroes in our terminology) you create and the more the violence escalate until you flood the area with soldiers and call it "the surge" or whatever fancy word you can think off for publicity reasons for there is nothing new under the sun and everything new comes from Africa anyway according to legend. All your "*surge*" does is to present more targets and the much increased chance that the common soldier loses his self-control and commit offences against the very population you wish to protect as we see in the newspapers is happening. Surely it is predictable that such behaviour will create more martyrs and more anger and more escalations. It is a spiral you just cannot win and then you make a pact with satan to bullsh-t the rest of the world to believe you are winning at COIN. We are really not as silly as you think we are. When it comes to COIN operations we know more than what you do and our track records are much better than anything you ever did. We can learn from each other and the knowledge is available.

These large scale operations also cost you billions which you don't have in unnecessary military expenditure which is exactly what the terrorist wants. He wants you to keep on spending and use that as a force multiplier against you. He is winning this aspect. He knows it is very difficult not to throw money at a

problem and almost impossible to stop doing so without the electorate complains about a "*down scaling of jobs*" and "*leaving us open for attack*" and whatever crap the opposition politicians can think off to make life difficult for you. It is the nature of the dirtiest game in history called "*politics*."

From the outside, without being involved, we see perhaps more clearly what you do. In a parody of words contributed to that great man, President Reagan "*Open this gate and bring your troops home*." I say again, if you need hundreds or thousands of troops to stabilise one country you lost the war already and would be better off to withdraw them as a lost cause and go home. You may not want to hear this but some folk don't want to be like you and certainly will not become like you no matter what you do to them. They will resist and keep on resisting knowing your politicians will not allow you to wipe them out. What then is the use of staying on? We tried the same thing on a much lesser scale in Apartheid South Africa. Despite the rumours to the contrary we never acted deliberately outside the laws (silly as they was) of the day and those who did and got caught were severely punished. We were not allowed to shoot and kill indiscriminately and I assure you if we were Apartheid would still be alive. You cannot fight a war with one hand tied behind your back for whatever reason and you are bound. Both hands almost.

The other side is not bound like that. Either you do the job thoroughly with overwhelming strength or you stay home. With your Special Forces you can always return and kill whoever needs to be killed without staying around. Or the *Egg Breakers* can do it if you want it done clandestinely. Or your much vaunted drones. You don't need the Marines to suffer losses every day and make your war even more unpopular than what it is. It is moral weakness in our eyes to stay on and a waste of resources.

Worst case scenario what if the terrorist succeeds in another 9/11? Will it bring you your knees? No. It will make almost no difference to you besides outrage and of course the deplorable loss of life which goes with such an attack. It will take a lot more than 9/11's to bring a country as big and powerful as America to surrender to a terrorist. This negates the often said saying that "*the terrorist have to succeed only once and the Agencies may not fail ones*." I say it is a

myth and a wrong understanding of what terrorism is. Let me explain what happened in history.

In the 1930's the saying was that "*the bombers will always get through*" and thus appeasement came into being. Do you know that every single nation, Britain, Germany, Japan or whoever you care to mention, in a time of war, when bombed, stood together and did not suffer a serious lapse of moral as expected by the bomber barons. Based on this principle the defending air forces made it a difficult and costly as humanly possible for bombers. At one stage they lost so many aircrews that they could not replace them and soon the RAF switched to night bombing. You kept it up for you used your bombers as life bait for the German fighters which in turn were attacked by your P51's. That was the real reason behind the bomber fleets.

I say the same principle should be remembered in your War on Terrorism. Accordingly I know it is cynical to say this but even if the terrorists succeed with another 9/11 it will not be that serious in the bigger picture. Unless they have weapons of mass destruction which they currently don't have they cannot really do more than pinprick you. That is what we need to concentrate on. Keeping those weapons away from them at any cost and remember biological and bacterial weapons are much more cost effective and available than nuclear ones.

Stop giving the terrorist the boogie man status they don't have. Doing that create fear which is what they want and for you to keep on spending like you are doing now. The more fear is created by the idiotic newspapers the more followers they get which is to your disadvantage. They are not that good and the threat they bring is very limited without weapons of mass destruction.

Nothing could have stopped 9/11 as it was way out and unexpected but what happened afterwards was a nightmare of ill-advised decisions which strengthen the terrorists in many ways. The invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan was necessary for many good reasons. Staying on was plain silly and failure to prevent the conventional weapons from ending in the wrong hands was a massive failure of command.

What about the notorious waterboarding and Guantanamo Bay? Yes, also necessary in the theatre of real life but it also recruited many more radicals. I have no doubt the terrorists are a bigger threat these days than what they were before 9/11. However they are much less threatening which is the key. Your defences increased dramatically since 9/11 and it is entirely possible to ring fence your country rather tightly against them. It will not be easy for them to do another 9/11 and it is proven by history in the last ten years. They did not succeed in general terrorism but draw you into an ill-advised occupation of two countries.

You know what is nice about the Israelis? They are *predictable*. Attack them in any way shape or form wherever and you know they will come after you. Does not matter if it is physically or in books or on the Internet! They will react and use their world-wide networks to find you to have a fatherly talk with extreme prejudice. Why do you not have the same reputation?

We are different - accept it

Logic should tell you that each theatre of operations is different and our African ways are not your ways. What worked elsewhere most probably won't work here and I wish the Western Agencies will wake up to that fact before it is too late. You look different being very white and even if black you cannot speak the language and you most certainly don't understand our culture of respect and violence. We are as much capable of cruelty as the next fellow but generally we respect elders so as a people we are as complex as you. Don't underestimate us as you tend to do or send a *woman* to talk to us for it does not have the same effect as a grey haired overweight man whether it is said aloud or not. She will be treated with much respect by the social elite and laughed off by the rest who has the information you need.

Your foreign accent makes you a danger to yourself despite whatever idiotic covers your superiors thought off. When we ask you a question from your business card and you cannot answer in less than ten words what you do we know who you work for. We have access to the Internet and will research your company including all the directors before we meet with you. The biggest mistake your *Egg Breakers* make is that you cover is either too good to be true

or it is non-existent. Both will send warning messages and let me tell you, if you research companies long enough, you get a feeling which ones are for real.

Why try to be a fish when you are not one to begin with? Re-inventing the wheel is a waste of resources. Learn from the best (Israelis) and become Irish tennis players for a while or get more creative is my advice for what it is worth. Use the locals better than what you do now and stay away from the official apparatus if you can for they cannot be trusted. And whatever you do don't stay longer than what you need to. Get in and get out or meet in Dubai where everyone meets. It is dangerous for us to be seen with you.

You cannot swim like a fish if you are not a fish and the hardest fish to catch is the smallest one so your nets to do so must be in place by the time that you need it. Currently it is not and your overreliance on non-human assets is going to bite you in the future.

It may surprise you but not all Africans want to be a green card holder or live in Western cities which are alien to them. I am a highly educated man but idea of living in a place like New York with my American Patriot frightens me for it is alien to me. I am not a fish in New York if you understand what I mean. From what I saw on television they are tough people those New Yorkers and I prefer the open savannah a lot more than high rise towers and millions of people rushing off somewhere. In Africa I know what I am doing for this is where I was born. There is nothing in this place which I cannot or have not dealt with before. I know my ways are effective here but I am not so sure about your place and no desire to find out the hard way either. I say again, we are not like you and frankly have no desire to be either. Thus your offer of living in the West is not what everyone wants and it is a known fact that most defectors actually miss their countries enough to want to return even if to a certain painful death.

Not all Africans like Westerners whether you want to hear it or not. Many dislike your ways and your right to be the world's policeman. Like any other person most want peace and freedom to carry on with their lives and traditions which they feel they are not getting from you. Wake-up to the fact that some people will never like you and resent you. It is not unique to Africans. This causes inherent trouble for any outside operation but so what. Use the locals to gather

what you need and stop reinventing the wheel by trying to be an African fish. Accept we are not the same you will never be liked nor will you ever fit in.

Don't be so naive to think we cannot intercept your electronic messages or crack your codes. You may be surprised because once again you treat Africa differently from the rest of the world because of arrogance (I hope not).

The remaining legal source is the foreign businessman and many big businesses like oil companies and mining conglomerates might already be in the country. As I said in my other book [*Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer*](#) they are not always seen as anything else but parasites. There is a wave of anger against them which is seen in the terrorist attacks and labour unrest. Africans feel they are only taking our minerals and not giving enough back in infrastructure whilst paying lip service to the masses because they have the (unpopular) corrupt governments bribed. They really need to work on their image or they will be replaced by the Chinese who are rapidly becoming the new kings of business in Africa. The time for "robber barons" in Africa is long gone.

However, the sad fact is that *none* of the above perceptions are true. From my own legal consultancy I saw them bending backwards to be fair to all but their messages is not going through simply because they use the social elite as the messengers and not the local tribal elders whose word means much more. Once again they target the wrong people. It is not the social elite who are blowing up your pipelines Sir - it is the common man on the street you don't associate with!

Others like security companies are seen as fronts for intelligence Agencies which no doubt some are and thus in certain countries a local retired general officer must be part of their board of directors and they are subjected to very strict laws. It is a murky world where no-one really knows who works for whom and where the actual loyalty lies though it is probably not with the company. They are tolerated for the locals inside these company's works for the local Agencies so it is a merry-go-around of making some extra cash on the side. As one senior (retired) intelligence officer in Nigeria told me it is state sponsored welfare and you are being milked. It is just business as usual for us.

A rarer scenario is where things are really bad (like in Sierra Leone and Somalia a few years ago) and your Military arrived with overwhelming force which is the only way. Because of the distances involved and logistics this will mostly be done by carrier groups with support from Europe or other friendly countries if you can find the non-existent facilities not built with your stolen aid money. I dare say you will take their objectives easily for there is no African country able to resist entry for longer than a week during the invasion phase except the South Africans who have new German Type 209 submarines which are quiet enough to penetrate your submarine defences. They also have the expert knowledge to do so having operated submarines since the 1960's.

It is a highly unlikely scenario but theoretically possible and I know of quite a few submarine commanders who swore they took pictures of your carriers (fat juicy targets in their language) without being detected and one showed it to me when I challenged him. He keeps it in his Bible for it means that much to him. It is his favourite possession. As with terrorism the submariners need to succeed only once but unlike terrorism sinking the carrier is a game changer to your plans. The threat from the ultra-silent Diesel-Electric boats is very real and they all know about your submarines which work with your carrier groups. Apparently because of overwork they are not as silent as you think. Or perhaps you underestimated Africa?

My point is it that it is not a matter of just sailing in and hope for the best. You may get an enormous surprise if not acting like the professionals you are and to do that you need information which is accurate and up to date. You need to know where the submarines are and who is commanding them. Remember they use the British system of *perishers* which is better than yours.

Granted though chances are good though that you will achieve what you want to. Accordingly Africa is open for attack (at will almost) as long as overwhelming force is used which is a political decision. This is not rocket science. I remember at school I was called to the headmasters' office to explain my "*communist views*" having said in class that the South African Defence Force will not survive two weeks of actual conventional combat against the USSR for the simple reason that they had thousands more tanks and men. Besides that they had many

thousands more MIGs and would gain air superiority once our Mirages were shot down since no pilot is Superman himself being only able to fly when in a flying machine. I may also have said that our own army *did not do very well in North Africa meaning Tobruk*. Worse than that I said *the New Zealand Maoris were better soldiers*.

** Maoris were not considered white folk and thus this statement was seen as sacrilege.*

The headmaster was not impressed and talked about the inherent superiority of the white man in Africa. This was silly for I pointed out that Russians are white people which I would have thought was rather obvious for a grown man. May I say he got insufferable for some reason and chased me away with a warning to stop being "clever" and that *"he for one does not live in fear of Russians even if I did."*

I think now if he was blessed with more brainpower he would have been afraid. Having read the entire collection of books written by that wonderful German writer Heinz Konsalik of the Russian front I was frightened of the Soviet Union. History told me that the Russians defeated Germany on behalf on the allies and moreover did so within four years whilst us (the British Empire) got nowhere in the first three years and were chased around like headless chickens by the panzers. The German Generals opposing the Russians were the best tacticians in the entire war and not all their defeats could be due to manpower alone. It puzzled me hugely for men like Erich von Manstein, Hermann Hoth and Walther Wenck were better panzer commanders than the more famous (to us) Rommel. The sheer scale of the conflict in the Eastern Front was so far beyond anything we experienced that it is not comparable in any way shape or form. For instance we talk of great pride of the 998 field guns firing at El Alamein but that was nothing to the 35 000 at Berlin three years later.

** My American Patriot flatly disagrees. As far as she is concerned Erwin Rommel was almost as good as George Patton. Honestly, we agreed to disagree for I consider Omar Bradley to be the best of the senior American Generals. The things we discuss before bedtime!*

Simply the average Russian soldier did not surrender as quickly as say the French did and capable of terrible things when provoked or not. I also knew they were sympathetic for some reason to our own terrorists in supplying them with weapons and training. Unlike the adults I also knew the West would probably for reasons I did not understand save us if it came to open conflict. That was my first lesson in survival which comes naturally to all Africans. Don't have any faith in the West. Being about eleven years old I immediately afterwards had a fatherly talk with the teacher's pet for informing on me which brought me another invitation to explain *my beastly and violent ways* much to my regret. Thereafter I made sure the pet did not dare to complain again which was my first practical lesson in terror I suppose. He should be grateful for the life lesson and I started to dislike all male teachers.

The fact is I was right then and am right now. The fat politicians simply don't understand the awesome power a modern carrier group has or the rattlesnake ways of the ordinary marine in combat. No African country will be able to resist too much but it is another story when you stay for you will have another Mogadishu as the population will turn on you for they look at things long-term and will follow who they see as the eventual winner which I am sad to say to you is not you from our viewpoint. Do not ever commit your Military in Africa for more than a short mission with very clear mission parameters. That means get in and get out on a surgical strike as is the way with counter-terrorism. Anything else is plain crazy talk. Unless you are willing to bankrupt yourself you will never subdue a whole nation.

Don't even try to disguise your military mission as a United Nations force for they have no credibility whatsoever anywhere never mind Africa. In all honesty they are seen as a joke. A very bitter joke for their failures is mind boggling and my advice to anyone who is in danger in Africa is to run past the wankers in blue berets and into the closest South African Security Group. There you will be treated with respect and be safe against anything which Africa can bring to the party. They will evacuate you or get you safety to your embassy if it still exists.

You will not stay because of inherent political weakness

All Africans know that your Military will not stay despite whatever promises your Ambassadors make. We are not as silly as some think and made the correct deductions the recent history from India, the fall of the British Empire and others in Africa, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan at some stage in the very near future. We know your Military will go home and leave your supporters behind to face the music alone once the last Galaxy is loaded and is not the least impressed by it. That is also why everyone jumps in to cash in as much as possible when the going is good and hope to be the lucky few who gain political asylum in Canada which is known as the easiest country to abuse for that kind of thing. From there it is also easy to penetrate the Land of the Free.

Consequently our wise elders advise neutrality and their people to ignore you which is the same thing as neutrality. But neutrality as we know is the last thing you need when hunting terrorists. You need the people to want to help you. And to get them your whole game plan must change. I have no doubt that your intentions were and are indeed praiseworthy and it saddens me to see how things went wrong and is still going wrong. At the same time I have no illusions that this book will influence the fat politicians (all long haired liberals) positively even if they could be bothered to read it which I doubt. Perhaps that is also good.

** This chapter caused a lot of angry letters. I say again, I speak with no malice and it is the way I see it. My opinions are not that important but you really should take a close look at yourself and wonder why you are upset. This book is read at Military Academies in 5 Countries according to emails I received so perhaps the message will get through.*

Chapter 6

Historical counter terrorism operations in Africa

As we know COIN is part of counter-terrorism and it is not unknown in Africa. It started decades ago already and there are many examples we can look at but I thought to restrict us to Kenya, Rhodesia and South Africa for the purposes of this book. They all have a few things in common.

The first is the government forces all lost the war politically in the end because they could not win against the rise of nationalism and world opinion. Thus their initial cause was defective and this is the biggest problem when faced with counter terrorism for you simply cannot defend the indefensible with the military. Simply put if your cause is not supported by the locals you will not win though you may be able to suppress them for a while. What this conclusion means to an Army who is predominantly Christian and finding itself in a prevailing Muslim country today you can imagine for yourself. It is an impossible situation unless you destroy every man woman and child which we know you will not do. Thus you could never win in Iraq or Afghanistan after your initial successes.

We have to ask though what is meant by winning COIN and as you can imagine this is one unnecessary quarrel. Do you win if you stabilised a country and killed who you wanted to kill and got a sympathetic government to your cause installed? Yes I would say so but not if that same government then turn on you or is defeated by its original enemies a few years later. However at the stage where you accomplished the above you won. You should then leave.

Did you lose if the terrorists became the new government because of their popularity amongst the voters even if they lost every single battle? Yes, I would say you lost. They have the political power and can do what they please and will do as they please to your detriment. There is no way past this and we can make a familiar deduction from it. The President must (not should) never commit the Military without knowing what he wants from them and what happens afterwards. Don't tell me this is not possible for it is and it is a rather simple formula to work out. The strategic parameters must be very clear and precise

and must never be deviated from. The moment you complete your mission objectives or find out it is not possible without committing much more resources you should leave. Generals throughout history had a tendency to build empires and always demand more soldiers. Somewhere the President must draw the line and regain control. Historically this happened in the First World War when Lloyd George, the English Prime Minister, starved the Western Front of men deliberately. He saved millions of soldiers by doing so. Of course it is all politics and the blame game. No President wants to be known not to support the Military and be open for attacks as being weak. On the other hand he should not be taken for a ride by the Military either.

The tactical objectives may change as the war progresses and you know the saying that all plans go to you know where when the first shots are fired. That is very true. For instance you may need to occupy another hill etc but strategically the object never changes. Get in with overwhelming force and do what you decided to do and get out. That is the only way when you commit conventional forces.

What is winning a war on terrorism? This is another question all together for remember COIN is only part of the war and in very specific circumstances. You created what you call COIN or an insurrection by not leaving and not planning properly. To stop the COIN failure is extremely simple. Withdraw your troops and let them kill each other if they wish. Why not? From a counter-terrorism view it is always good when the terrorists fight with each other. It is called destabilization.

I think people forget that as we stand now America is not in itself in a COIN war and will not be for the foreseeable future. No radical is roaming around in the country-side being chased by the Security Forces as happens in COIN. The enemy is not within your borders conducting an insurgency against you and you live in relative peace with each other. What the terrorists are doing is to act in classic terror fashion against you from the outside trying to get in or close enough to do serious damage. Historically this has always been the case. The events of 9/11 just brought it more to the forefront. If so then it is all about counter-terrorism to prevent the above and COIN rather unimportant.

I say again that your terrorism threat is generally from the outside and the few radicals on the inside are a police problem which you should be able to deal with. That is why the FBI and DHS exist and it is not rocket science to combat domestic terrorism. Being done for decades already! It is certainly not new.

All in all, if you look only at the statistics of Al Qaeda leadership killed or otherwise neutralised America is winning this war hands down. You are not losing the war on terrorism though you took a knock on what you call COIN and the rest of the world think is occupational forces. So you have to be shrewder with your operational plans and stop giving yourself a hard time. The fact is that another 9/11 did not happen. It was prevented on more than one occasion.

The fact is that America is much harder to subvert than what used to be the case. Yes as I said before the threat is still there and new leaders are taking over but crucially the threat they pose is much diminished because the barriers are so high. The lesson is that complacency will be your worst enemy but get away from the myth that the terrorist needs to exceed only once. Another 9/11 will not bring you to your knees. It is all political mumbo-jumbo which has to do with elections as I explained to you before.

It will be a rather hopeless case for the terrorists if you stop destroying your economy with reckless spending and bring your troops home. What can they do if you refuse to play by their rules and carry on killing them on sight? Nothing for they lost the initiative! They cannot get to you (homeland USA) to attack you so they are reduced to slinking around in their third world countries fearing the reconnaissance satellites and drones and *Egg Breakers*. There are no troops to kill with IED's because the troops are in the States and if they want to terrorise the locals please do so. Those very same locals may then just be willing to talk to the *Egg Breakers* about the strange fish in their midst. Yes I know I am cynical but counter-terrorism is rather cynical.

Do you now lose your place as the world's policeman? No not at all. You can still intervene when needed but not by staying on to become targets. Get in and get out. Simple as that! Furthermore the time has come for the rest of the world to take more responsibility for its own problems. Why should you carry the

burden alone? No-one asked you to do so but they will if you stop. Then they will beg you and be nice to you which are to your advantage.

Do you then leave the terrorist to rebuild and grow strong again as most would say? Well, let us look at history. During the Rhodesian War and many others it was custom to watch and see how the arms dumps and training camps develop. Once fully stocked and almost trained a pre-emptive strike was made destroying it and the human material. That is allowed under International Law. There is nothing preventing you from doing the same for you can strike at will almost wherever you please with your carrier groups. It is a force multiplier by attacking only when it is worth your while to do so. It means you regained the tactical initiative. Why play at the terrorists rules all the time when you don't need to? So the answer is no. Not at all for remember the *Egg Breakers* are still operating behind enemy lines. It is only your conventional forces who are withdrawn and your homeland security upgraded.

Secondly these countries were never defeated military wise in the field and killed many hundreds of trained terrorists for every one of their own. Very much the same as your own situation where on numbers alone you are the victor and destroyed the Taliban as a regional force! They did this consistently for almost two decades using almost no resources when compared to what you have. It is all about using your resources effectively. Numbers means nothing. Results do.

Two out of the three countries had no assistance worthy its name from the capitalist countries whilst the terrorists had massive support from the Soviets and at varying phases Communist China. This included training, arms and logistics and it included tanks though old it was better armoured and armed than the security force's infantry fighting vehicles (IFV) which knocked them out almost at will. I am sure we can deduct that this means the training was better for the Security Forces as is yours and besides, no country would willingly assist the terrorists anymore for they know exactly what America will do to them.

My intention is to give you a brief overview of each war. We can learn from history. I deliberately make no judgement on the merits of which side was wrong or right for it is of no interest to us in this book. We want to see what tactics worked and which did not. As with all wars both sides had a point and

both sides committed atrocities. All of the so-called terrorists or communist-terrorists as the Rhodesians called them became the elected government at the end. In Kenya and South Africa they are sticking to democratic principles doing much better than expected. In Rhodesia they became a failed despotic state called Zimbabwe. It is life.

Kenya

The words "*Uhuru*" and "*Mau Mau*" struck fear in many white Africans for decades which show you how a little known uprising in Kenya affected Africa. It took place between 1952 and 1960 and independence was soon thereafter (three years later) granted from Britain though it is denied that the two events had anything to do with each other.

The war or insurgency never had much public support being tribal based and more of an insurrection than anything else. What makes it important is the word "*uhuru*" for it became sine qua non for African independence by armed struggle if needs be. The very word raises visions of violence and brutality and fear.

As a military conflict it was insignificant with very low casualties despite the recent claims of hundreds of thousands dead which is plain silly and proved wrong afterwards. I read that 32 white colonialists died which is deplorable for all deaths are it is less than what is murdered every day in South Africa (all races combined). Official British figures indicate that 11 503 Mau Mau insurgents were killed while British military losses were fewer than 200 and there is no reason to doubt these figures. It was not written 60 years ago to fool you now and for a lack of better evidence this is what stands as the figures.

Bizarrely enough the words "*Mau Mau*" was never used much by the Kikuya tribesmen who lead the insurrection and it came apparently from the Europeans who referred the insurgency as such between themselves.

As with all conflict the two sides have widely different views on each other with the colonials considering the insurrection to be nothing short of tribal barbarism and an attack on whites because they were white. Racism thus and worse a return to tribalism as in the days before the British arrive with their benevolent views. The tribesmen certainly disliked the idea of white farmers taking over

their lands and the broken traditions and had much to complain about. No doubt that racism played a role from the white side too (why is it so hard to admit racism exists under all groups?) Whether the Mau Mau had an independent Kenya as motive is debated but logic tells me it must have been important as being the ultimate freedom.

Since the insurgents had no heavy weapons or access to it they attacked at night striking hard and fast before disappearing into the bushes using knives and homemade weapons. They made sure that they attacked isolated farms and villages only. As with all insurgents they knew attacking the Security Forces in open battle would be their end. These tactics is not an indication of weakness or because they did not know any better but simply the best for the existing conditions.

I am always a bit astonished when people say "*oh that's very unfair and cowardly*" etc. Surely you don't expect the other side to make it easy for you now do you? After all the African learned a bit after the disastrous Battle of Omdurman in 1898 where the Mahdi's in Sudan stormed the entrenched maxim machine guns of the British Army with entirely predictable consequences. It was wholesale slaughter and many wounded were executed afterwards. As a matter of interest the Geneva Convention was first signed in 1864 which made this a war crime.

The insurgents had a good intelligence type of operation going and knew who was loyal to them or the British and acted accordingly. This was probably because their leaders were educated men well able to read and write and make logical deductions. They understood the value of an informant against their own interests. Conflict wise they not only brought the fight to the white colonials but also attacked loyal black Kenyans which became the norm in all other insurgencies. With terrorism neutrality is never good enough for any side. If you are not for us you must be against us or you will be is the motto.

As you can imagine the British Government (of those days, not today apparently) was not going to sit back and allow disorder in their colony though (as always) the politicians did not understand the threat as quickly as the military did and ignored the warnings. The final straw was when a white woman

was knifed to death and a loyal chief assassinated soon after. They then declared a state of emergency which gave them wide (read draconian) police powers of search and arrest which they used. This should always be remembered. Whenever a state of emergency is declared the powers with it will be used and abused. It is the same with a terrorist having a weapon of mass destruction. He did not obtain it for storage somewhere. He will use it.

The Kenya Colonial Police and British Army started to hunt the tribesmen down and arrested the top leaders or who they thought were the leaders. That as you will agree was a good starting point in theory. You cut the head off but as is the norm in these things the real radical ones escaped and went underground or in this case to the bush to continue the fight. It also created much anger under the innocent ones which is also understandable.

Now as an African I should perhaps explain to you that uprising between tribes in Africa in those days was not a big deal. Every now and then two tribes would attack each other about real or imagined insults and the Police were well able to sort it out. A few tribesmen would be hung for murder and then life carried on pretty much as it always did. Whenever a white person was attacked and killed it immediately escalated for the colonialists were very much less in numbers than the locals and could only keep them in subjection with force and divide to rule. They knew that the moment the locals banded together they would be in serious trouble and so it turned out.

Nationalism was the key. Not communism though the socialist nature of communism makes a great deal of sense to the average African. His tribal background is based on socialism so it is not new to him. Nevertheless it would be very wrong from your to assume that because they accepted communist assistance that they were also dedicated communists though some were and still are. As a general rule Africans are Africans first and foremost and then whatever nation they come from. Only thereafter is ideology important. Like all men they like the idea of making money more than anything else.

Indeed uniquely to the Mau Mau insurgency communism was not a factor at any stage. The Soviets and their allies never supplied weapons or training. Nor did the Mau Mau leave Kenya. They were chased around within in the country and

had no need to re-infiltrate as happened with the other insurgencies. This also meant they could not escape and were doomed.

The Security Forces conducted sweeps in the city of Nairobi arresting whoever else may be involved to ensure that the remaining insurgents don't have any physical support for food and medicine etc. Out in the tribal lands (rural areas) they gathered more than a million tribesmen into villages as per the Malayan principles we spoke off before. This type of thing never works well for the Security Forces for it creates a lot of resentment so many fled into the bush to join the insurrection. Strangely enough we saw the same pattern in Portuguese Mozambique twenty years later. It is not possible to follow the Malayan principle in Africa and it never worked well as we will see. Africa is simply too big and the costs of such villages too high.

The British very shrewdly as is their way started a land reform plan to negate some of the grievances. However at the same time confiscated cattle from the remaining tribesmen as punishment for alleged but unproved loyalties to the Mau Mau. Now I can tell you that taking Africans cattle for whatever reason is seen as a declaration of war in our society and this caused the insurrection to grow with escalation of violence on both sides. Never take an African's cattle and do not stare into his eyes all the time. It is rude. We are not like you and don't like it.

The Security Forces reinforced themselves with overseas battalions and the crack Kings African Rifles under white officers. They also created a Special Branch of the Kenya Police to focus on intelligence gathering who soon had a network of willing and unwilling informants taking private revenge by pointing insurgents out from behind the safety of a mask. No doubt many were not insurgents but with a score to settle.

One aspect the government did right was to ensure that all white policemen could speak the local languages. The Rhodesians also did that and so did the Indian Army before all this. Still today the British Officers in a Ghurkha Regiment speaks Urdu or something to their men. This point was one of major failures of the South African effort. We believed if you assault someone long enough he will be able to speak Afrikaans and in all honesty it worked well enough for a long

time. It also caused many to join the liberation movements so it was a home goal in the end.

One of the constantly used British tactics against wayward tribesmen in the Empire was the use of the Royal Air Force (RAF) to bomb the natives to submission. This started soon after the First World War in what is today Pakistan and continued where needed as a cheap alternative to ground sweeps. Thus it is no surprise to find them doing the same in Kenya with differing amounts of success.

Like always the problem was to find the insurgents camps and with the technology of the day mark it accurately for bombing and then to bomb accurately. Almost a thousand insurgents were killed in this way and it did cause disruption so it was not a complete waste of time. Leaflets and other psychological warfare drops were also made from heavy bombers which certainly looked like the wartime Avro Lancaster's but in fact was Avro Lincolns. Understanding the difference is historically important because the myth of indiscriminate carpet bombing took hold afterwards and we still read with much delight the sworn statements to this effect. Obviously someone wants sympathy and a nice retirement fund from a liberal judge and jury. Forgive me if I am cynical but as an African I saw it many times before and no doubt will see it again. We are rather good at this kind of thing and the West always fall for it for the western long haired liberals are always willing to believe the worst of their own and the best of us. It is hilarious.

There is not a war or insurgency in history where human rights abuses do not occur from both sides. Even with the best intentions and best trained forces in the world it is bound to happen and it always comes out. It is sort of expected. A lot of fatherly talks took place between suspect insurgents and the Security Forces to classify them as insurgents or helpers or sympathisers. It cannot be denied but to call the methods used or the jails a "*gulag*" is plain silly. It shows to me a political agenda instead of accepting the obvious and a serious lack of knowledge on what a gulag is.

Historically the closed thing to gulags the British ever imposed was against the Boers where 26 000 white women and children, all non-combatants, were slayed

in concentration camps during the Anglo Boer War of 1899 - 1902. Most died of hunger and disease caused by overcrowding and it is a war crime of note which probably caused Apartheid as I explain in my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#). I assure you that the Afrikaner has still not forgotten nor forgiven which makes it unlikely that they will assist the Brits in any way with the knowledge they have on counter terrorism operations in Africa. This is a problem for you since they know a lot being everywhere and is seen as Africans. They are the main African fish in fact.

The methods used by the Mau Mau were barbaric in any language despite the denials today. They would invite someone to take the oath to joining their insurgency and if refused slowly strangled. If suspected to be an informer his tongue would also be cut out. This is murder in any country and the government responded with public hangings of the guilty to prove a point I suppose.

** Knowing something of hangings I can tell you it is quick and painless and scientific. Your neck is broken and your bowels emptied which is why some are made to wear nappies during the process. Medically your heart may still beat for a few minutes (usually does) which is why the courts say you will "hang by your neck until you are dead dead dead, may God have mercy on your soul." So you hang until it stops beating and no, if the rope breaks you are not automatically reprieved. You will be hung again though in history that was seen as a divine intervention and may have led to some being pardoned. And yes of course a public hanging is gruesome but do you really think strangulation is better? I know which one I prefer if given a choice but it brings us to another point of importance which is sometimes lost during counter-terrorism discussions.*

Do you have a defence in law to say well the terrorists did worse atrocities than us and because of that we responded in kind? No, not really. The legal defense of tu quoque is based on the *Principle of Unclean Hands or the Waggoner Doctrine* in American Law. In plain English it refers to the times when the pot calls the kettle black. It is not a complete defense in law to say "yes well, I did that but so did you. And since we both have dirty hands this case should not be in front of the court." Consequently it is no excuse to say "yes well, the terrorists murdered their Victims and now we followed suite." When it comes to war

crimes it plays no role and that started at the Nuremberg Trials for the question is "*did you act in your beastly manner sir*" and not why you did so. It is an objective test on whether you did act beastly or not. Your reasons are unimportant. Thus it is useless to say the terrorists did this and so did we. It is not a defense.

As with all law it is more complicated than what I say it is in my books but it is not rocket science and never will be. At the same Nuremberg trials the German U Boat Commander Doenitz (and last Fuhrer) could not plea *tu quoque* for unrestricted submarine warfare whilst it was known that the U.S. Navy sank 99% of the Japanese commercial fleet under exactly the same circumstances. He got ten years and served about eleven for the year spend in jail during the trials did not count. At the same time, at a later trial, the famous German Special Forces Commander Otto Skorzeny was allowed to use the same defense of *tu quoque* at his trial for using American uniforms at the Battle of the Bulge because the allies also did that on occasion.

Yeah I have more than 20 years' experience in law and wrote three books on it but I am honest enough to say I fail to understand it most of the time. Correspondingly I have serious doubts of the legality of the Nuremberg trials to begin with and I am not alone. Many more qualified jurists and academics than me said the same through the decades but I do not dispute its need.

** As Africans we know that the chances of one of leaders of the West being charged in the international criminal court are very unlikely even if deserved. This makes us wonder about your motives when coming after our own leaders. The law is not neutral on this level which is wrong.*

Other methods used by the Mau Mau included all known methods of torture and the cutting off of limbs and mutilation before and after death. Burning alive and deliberate blindness inflicted by gouging the victim's eyes out also happened and it made no difference whether the Victim was male or female or of whatever age group. Particularly the massacre at Lari in 1953 the level of brutality was exceptional even for Africa. This led to revenge attacks by many Africans and soldiers serving with the British Security Forces.

By 1960 the Mau Mau was destroyed and we learned a few lessons. First was that no terrorist can survive for long without the support of the local population. They tried to overcome this by acting even more barbaric than what the normal rules and laws of war allow and sometimes it worked but here it did not. They were regularly betrayed by the locals.

Secondly the terrorist cannot operate in isolation and must be supported from the outside with arms, intelligence, training, money and food. Without that he has to live like an animal trying to survive life which is a major weak point to be exploited by the security forces.

Thirdly good governance prevents terrorism which is the same as to say that corruption will lead to terrorism at some stage as the locals become fed-up and takes up arms to start a new revolution. It only needs one good charismatic leader to do so. Too little reform too late is useless. It is either all the way or it is not.

Fourthly that in Africa racism always plays a part in any terrorism if different race groups or tribes are involved. Whether the same can be said between Muslims and Christians I simply don't know. I suspect that attitudes will harden as the war continues for it is human nature.

Fifthly airpower is limited to intelligence. Striking randomly is a thorough waste of time and money and creates more insurgents.

Rhodesia

It is always interesting how the same conflict is referred to by different names. As you know by now I have an interest in the American Civil War and soon found out that the same battles had different names depending on whether you read the Confederacy or Union books. Not that it matters for it is remarkably interesting nonetheless and most books were kind enough to give both names. Thus even I could understand that the *First Battle of Bull Run* is also known as *First Manassas* etc.

* "Makes us unique Honey" says my American Patriot. Who am I to argue?

In Africa though the very war itself often has different names and so it is with the *Rhodesian Bush War* which is also known as the *Second Chimurenga* or *Zimbabwe War of Liberation*. All depending from which side you are looking at it. It took place between 1964 and the end of 1979 when Britain contentedly surrendered a successful pro-Western country with no Apartheid to become the failed state called Zimbabwe today. This was despite the fact that during both the First and Second World War Rhodesia, a small British colony, suffered per capita more losses than any other Empire colony on behalf of Britain. The average Rhodesian were more British than the British and up to the very end held onto their British Army traditions in rank and regimental structures. At one stage the superb Rhodesian Air Force proudly held the title Royal Rhodesian Air Force and effortlessly operated wherever needed in the Empire.

Thirty three years later Zimbabwe still had only one president for he by hook and by crook won every single "*free and fair*" election which the Zimbabwean Army arranged for him to win. What happened and is happening to the law abiding white Zimbabwean farmers being violently chased of their farms which they bought legally is nothing short of genocide and will be seen in history one day for what it is. Nevertheless as we all know racism from blacks on whites is a long hair liberal impossibility and cannot happen and thus it is not happening and thus no use to complain about it. It is always the other way around seemingly and I wish that non-Africans would wake up to this simple fact. Racism is racism. It has no borders and no right to exist anywhere and is disgusting. All man is born equal and stays equal whether he is rich or poor or white or black.

There were in essence three different combat groups during the war for this was much more than a mere insurgency. On the one hand we had the small Rhodesian Army and Air Force it being a landlocked country and no Rhodesian Navy ever existed. Collectively we call them the security forces. Against them were the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and Zimbabwe African People Union (ZAPU) both political parties with military wings which we will call terrorists as it was during those days. They were divided into mainly Shona speaking tribesmen with ZANU and the Ndebele (who is nephews of the more famous South African Zulu nation) joining ZAPU. Tribalism once again!

Both terrorist groups received continuous and considerable support from the Soviet Union and Communist China as well as the states surrounding Rhodesia. The West helped by introducing sanctions which only effect was to create a home grown arms and whatever else is needed industry in record time. Their southern neighbour South Africa got involved when it recognised that exiled ANC (African National Congress - South Africans) assisted the above terrorists. Consequently it sent three groups to help the Rhodesians and also assisted economically to bust the sanctions. However in the end they also betrayed Rhodesia for a failed concept known as "*detente*."

The first assistance to arrive was the South African Police (to arrest the South Africans fighting for the terrorists) who found themselves in a shooting war totally unprepared for COIN. To their credit they learned quickly for the Rhodesian training methods were brutal and to the point. It gave rise to their first-rate (some say infamous) Counter Insurgency Units (SAP COIN) which would greatly trouble terrorists for the next twenty odd years. At one stage there were close to 2000 South African policemen cum light infantry in Rhodesia. This may not sound as much to you who may be used to tens of thousands of men but they made a serious difference to boost the manpower problems. The problem with them was that they stayed only for 3 months tours of duty which was deliberate to increase the availability of trained men. However it takes more than that to become an expert fighter though all in all they did very well.

Secondly the South African Air Force arrived as air support in the form of Alouette 3 helicopters with pilots and gunners working with SAP COIN or so they said for they got themselves involved with whatever was needed. As a result it was not unusual for them to fly Rhodesian troops on combat missions. For appearances sake they were nominally part of SAP COIN. They supplied their own maintenance crews and other flight crew such as navigators to the Rhodesians. A lot of cross training took place between the two air forces for it must be remembered they knew each other well having had the RAF in common. They also went on bombing mission together.

Thirdly South African Army Special Forces known as the Reconnaissance Regiment worked with the Rhodesian SAS (Special Air Service) and formed a

separate troop doing external raids and reconnaissance. This was kept secret for many years.

The Rhodesians were founder members of the rebirth of the British SAS in Malaya. It is said that at any parade held at the British SAS Regiment in the UK space is left open for the Rhodesian SAS who is sadly no more. They joined the South African Army after Rhodesia became the despotic failed state of Zimbabwe and created a new Reconnaissance Regiment. Incorporating a whole Regiment of Special Forces from another country is unique in military history but unfortunately it did not work out well. The South Africans were never on the war footing and bothered by their own war as much as Rhodesia was and the two groups did not always see eye to eye. Thus many left after their contracts expired and became security experts all over Africa. You can still find many working as contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan.

** They once gave me the fright of my life during a raid or attack on an "independent" homeland but you can read about it in my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#) if interested. I say to today I only survived because they knew I was no threat despite being in uniform and armed.*

The Rhodesian war started with isolated attacks on white farms and the planting of landmines to disrupt the Security Forces and whoever else detonated it. At first the internal local population was on the side of the Security Forces and reported all terrorist activities to the excellent Rhodesian Police called the British South African Police or BSAP. As we said before it was mandatory for all white officers to speak the local language which helped considerably. They treated all terrorism as a crime scene which was also brilliant for it made it then possible to gain an understanding how the conflict developed by matching the bullets expended by the terrorists to the attacks. Consequently they would know that a particular AK47 was used in which previous attacks where. All this showed the terrorists movements clearly. This is something which should be done in the current war on terrorism if not already. With the computer assisted analysts of today this will show patterns which is of tremendous assistance to counter-terrorism.

What made the terrorists unique is the sheer numbers involved. By July 1979 thousands of terrorists were inside Rhodesia and thousands training in Tanzania, Ethiopia, Libya, North Korea, USSR and Communist China. At one stage there were fears of a conventional attack with tanks etc against Rhodesia who always suffered heavily from a lack of manpower. Partly this was due to politics and the white man's unwillingness to arm black citizens and train them. Looking back that was a mistake for the black regiment (Rhodesian African Rifles) were violently anti-communist and fought well under their white officers. They could probably have armed twenty times more.

Rhodesia being surrounded by her enemies on all sides except a small strip in the south (South Africa) was always vulnerable for attack and could not safeguard her borders with her severe lack of manpower. Consequently the terrorists started to infiltrate more and more and building up arms caches and attacking white farmers where they could. They also made sure that the local black population did not betray them by orchestrated brutality beyond belief. Since the Rhodesian Police kept first-rate files on each incident the trail of torture, rape and general bestiality is very well documented. On the other hand the terrorists also showed surprising compassion in isolated cases which is normal to African wars. No African is a born bully and the inbuilt respect for law and order and grey hair is not easily taken away. It needs a communist or fat politician to take away the principles of Ubuntu which is natural to all Africans.

** Mr Mandela described Ubuntu as follows: "A traveller through a country would stop at a village and he didn't have to ask for food or for water. Once he stops, the people give him food, entertain him. That is one aspect of Ubuntu, but it will have various aspects. Ubuntu does not mean that people should not enrich themselves. The question therefore is: Are you going to do so in order to enable the community around you to be able to improve?"*

Once inside the country the terrorists or rather those who survived, created bush camps or bases from which they trained locals to be terrorists. Many of these locals were youngsters (between 9 and 16 years of age) who acted in an entirely predictable way by becoming nasty gangsters in their communities. This destroyed the age old tradition of respect for elders. Therefore we had a war

different from what we saw in Kenya. Firstly, the terrorists received training from the communist countries and weapons and what not outside Rhodesia. Secondly, they used neighbouring countries as springboards for their attacks which prompted many pre-emptive strikes which is allowed under International Law but did the Rhodesian reputation nothing good. No matter what the Rhodesian government said the terrorists were believed by the international liberal press.

South Africa would have that same problem in 1978 when their elite paratroopers attacked and destroyed a terrorist base called *Kasinga* in Southern Angola. Up to this day it is believed and celebrated as an attack on unarmed refugees which it certainly was not. The Author at that stage was at school in Katima Mulilo in the Caprivi (part of South West Africa or Namibia as it is called today) and as revenge for the Kasinga attack the terrorists fired *Stalin Organs* and other artillery at the town killing ten soldiers a few months later. We can learn from this. If your media relations are not correct you will not be believed no matter what you do.

Thirdly, the Rhodesian Army and Air Force (Police also) was superbly trained but small in numbers. Much smaller than what South Africa and Britain in Kenya could muster. They also could not recruit from the South African Army and many who did volunteer were returned to the Military Police as deserters.

** This still does not prove to me that you need hundreds of thousands of men in COIN. You only need enough to actively hunt the terrorist down based on intelligence. Driving around aimlessly is rather silly and counter-productive.*

They made up for numbers with sheer professionalism and most of their units became famous. We think of the Rhodesian Light Infantry (RLI) who was later trained as paratroopers and became a commando regiment. These men once made four combat jumps in one day which is unique in warfare. They had to for there were simply not have enough helicopters available so they used old Dakota's (DC3) left over from the Second World War. It is said one was actually used at Arnhem and certainly I know off at least one older warrant officer who first jumped at Arnhem in 1944. The lack of parachutes forced each soldier to recover his parachute for the next jump which is also unique in a way and part

of the logical planning. They learned not to waste anything which is a good tactic in any war and saved millions in foreign currency.

Every time they hit the ground they killed terrorists and would then be picked up and taken back to the airfield where the Dakotas waited for the next jump. I spoke to men who did up to 60 combat jumps in this fashion and it must be remembered the terrorists had access to heavy machine gun and cannon (ZSU 23-4) anti-aircraft weapons which they used fervently against the Dakota's of which there was no more than seven at any given time. The static line jumps took place at 600 feet which is rather low when loaded with equipment. Thus a reserve chute was unnecessary and replaced with more ammunition.

The RLI was an all-white unit and the best book to read on them, if you are interested, is *"Fire Force - One man's war in the Rhodesian Light Infantry"* by Chris Cox. His follow-up book *"Survival Course"* is even better in my view dealing with his troubles when he returned to civilian life. Many foreigners joined the RLI from the paratrooper regiments in their own countries bringing their skills with them. All had to redo selection and were paid the same as any other soldier in the unit. It was not a get quick rich scheme but they did become men amongst men.

** The Rhodesian Army had recruiting posters saying "Join the Rhodesian Army and be a man amongst men." It was one of the best phrases of the war and widely remembered today.*

The *Fireforce* concept is one of the Rhodesian War best known experiments and comes down to the rapid deployment of troops from helicopters or as static line paratroopers to where the terrorists were. They would form stopper groups to cut the escape routes and in a straight skirmish line attack the terrorists using *fire and movement* all the time. Much of their training revolved upon the double tap method of shooting which I can tell you is a no mean feat with the heavy calibre 7.62 NATO (.308 American) FN rifle they used. The recoil is much more than that of an M16 or AK47 but the advantages of the heavier bullet penetrating the thick bush without deflecting far outweigh the lighter bullets of the AK47. Double tapping like that is done with both eyes open and must be

learned for it does not come naturally. It works well and is good for conserving ammunition which must be carried.

They also trained long and hard at shooting at fleeting targets in a bush lane which is excellent fun to do. Remember they had no fancy dot sights which we see today and the average contact between the two groups was closer than what you think. Never more than 30 yards because of the bush conditions which made it difficult to see further during the rainy season and they learned to see through the bushes which is an acquired skill. These techniques were good soldiering and they were rather fit men well able to move fast over long distances.

Fair enough you say but why is this different from any other war where vertical deployment took place? Numbers mostly and the fact that these troops were not used during fireforce duties for anything else but fireforce! They would live on the airfield next to the dedicated helicopters or para Dakota's and be used as shock troops only. As a rule they would mount up at very short notice (minutes). Go in and then come back and do so again. The concept also introduced the K Cars or killer cars which simply refers to an Alouette 3 helicopter with a side mounted 20mm cannon which when firing always seemed to push the helicopter sideways. It is a marvellous sight to see and hear and the gunners soon learned to use airburst to great effect for killing terrorists and would deliberately fire into stones or trees to do so. Experience showed that to shoot into soft ground or directly into the terrorist was not effective enough. Artillery and aerial bombing followed suite for it must be remembered that the terrorist is either in a trench or on his stomach behind a tree or in a hollow. Thus airburst worked the best.

** Some gunners said to me the 4 barrel machine gun contraptions they build (four MAGs) worked better than the 20mm.*

Furthermore the command of the contact was from this very same gunship helicopter with backwards facing Army officer sitting next to the pilot who would deploy the sticks of men (four men with one having a light machine gun) around as needed to cut the terrorists off. The airborne commander had to be able to work more than one radio at the same time and his tactical understanding of the nature of COIN and the terrain outstanding to prevent catastrophe. Facing rearwards actually gave him a much better view strange as this sound. The

sticks deployed in four separate Alouettes called Z-cars or G-cars for some reason thus making it 16 men on the ground only in the first wave and then returned with the second wave if needed. With para drops more men would be on the ground than with helicopters though never enough and the odds something else.

To do it well you need crack troops who by their very nature are always spoiling for a punch up. It was not unknown to be outnumbered 2 to 1 inside Rhodesia and on externals (outside Rhodesia raids) up to 50 to 1 which also turned military wisdom on its head. Remember the terrorists were not unarmed or ill trained tribesmen as in Kenya but the best of what the Soviet Union and Communist China could produce armed with Strela anti-aircraft missiles and the usual first-rate AK47 & RPD light machine guns all terrorists seem to acquire. They also had good heavy machine guns in 14.5mm (.5 inch) calibre against low flying aircraft and anti-personnel defence at their bases and mortars. No doubt their Russian advisors planned the base defenses in great detail. Something we saw in Angola later on as well.

The whole concept revolutionized COIN and is the ultimate force multiplier for it integrated air and army in a single closely knit unit and fire forces almost always made contact with the terrorists which is the number one desire of COIN. To find the enemy and kill him! How they found the enemy is discussed a bit further on. Regular troops did standard patrols in the hope of finding the terrorists or their spoor which if reported and followed would bring the fire force lads to the gang to do the killing. This caused much anger when the spoor was "*stolen*."

** We lived to steal the Army patrols spoor whenever we could. Intercepted their radio calls all the time just for that.*

It is a remarkable fact that the voice control procedures of the Rhodesians were above and beyond anything ever experienced in warfare because of the lack of radio chatter. They never seemed to say more than what was absolutely necessary and kept the airwaves open for genuine emergencies. A mere contact with terrorists was not seen as much of an emergency but an everyday occurrence. This tactical radio control is not the same as the circling fixed wing aircraft used as a radio relay system which started earlier in the war and I think

called "Telstar." It was also very possible that a slower propeller aircraft would accompany the helicopters during the fire forces attack to either mark the bombing spot for the fast jets (if needed and available) or give fire support on request.

What is remarkable about the aerial fire support is the lack of time between bombing runs and the attack from ground forces. Anything longer than one minute would be severely frowned upon and give the terrorists an unfair advantage. The marking aircraft always attacked from the opposite side from where the fast jets (Hunters) would come in for the strike to divert attention away from the strike. The safety margin between the troops on the ground and the terrorist positions once marked by smoke (white was the best) was sometimes less than 100 feet or 30 meters with machine gun fire and slightly more for cannon and bombs. This is absolutely remarkable for the 1970's.

There was no fire support artillery on mountains or the shelling of suspected positions as used in Vietnam in any of these wars. I read somewhere that the Americans shot 15 *billion* (yes not million) pounds of shells during the Vietnam conflict. Of that 80% was on what was called *harassment and interdiction fire* or in other words into the blue yonder without any idea who or what it will hit. This is no way to win counter-insurgency and a total waste of money and effort. You really should only fire artillery in direct support of troops in actual combat. Nor were any washing or smoking or non-field craft practices allowed. Because the patrols were rather small men had to ensure that they could move around unseen. For more details on COIN training and operations please read my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#) where I dedicate a whole chapter to it.

The Rhodesians also introduced a technique of *frog leaping* by which I mean they would leave a small tracker team on the spoor and then jump ahead for a few miles in the general direction where they thought the spoor was going to by helicopter. Pick up the spoor and then do the same until they covered enough (read vast) distances to find the terrorists to kill them. This made the follow-up operations much more deadly than trying to run down a fast moving terrorist (highly unlikely). The terrorists could and were ambushed by the Security Forces

which was another unique point for most Western Armies are ambushed by the terrorist which indicates bad COIN tactics to begin with. Being ambushed should anyway be to your advantage for that brings you in contact with the terrorist and your superior training gain the overhand.

The Rhodesian Air Force developed a technique called *visual reconnaissance* (as against photo reconnaissance) where they tracked spoor from the air. They could distinguish likely (read actual) terrorist bases by looking at the number of toilets and the paths to it for African men do not (in rural areas) share a toilet with a woman. Accordingly if only one toilet area exists it would be logical to deduct that there were no women and children which meant terrorists most likely. They also flew low over a tribal trust lands and counted the villages where no-one waved at them as is normal when an African see an aeroplane being an honest man with friendly intentions. When not doing so they knew the terrorists were there watching the reaction of the people.

You would not believe this but in none of the wars we deal with in this chapter was body armour ever issued nor requested being too heavy and cumbersome. Nor were helmets (Kevlar today) as only soft hats were used. All you needed was water (a lot of training was spent on conserving you water) and ammunition which better be used to good effect. The rest was up to the individual and most wore shorts and short sleeves with vellies which is a type of shoe made of leather and no socks. Nor were men drafted into units one by one but whole units at a time which kept the moral of the troops high. So there was no such thing as a FNG and no female combatants either. On this subject I have no problem with a female combatant. If she wants to be soldier and able to do the job then let her be in her chosen profession. She should have equal rights as does the female terrorist. It is rather ironic that the terrorists are much more enlightened on this subject and female terrorists are common enough.

** My American Patriot likes the idea of female combat soldiers but then she would. "It is only fair" she says. I would not like to see her particular in such conditions but I learned to keep such opinions to myself.*

From my own time in SAP COIN I can tell you we absolutely could not believe the need for M16s at full automatic as we saw in the Vietnam training films we

got from somewhere and use as examples on what not to do. Such a waste of bullets was a big no-no and unheard of. We were not impressed and the idea of drug use laughable. Would have arrested anyone trying that one!

Certainly I never saw any drug use in any of the units I served in or worked with. If it happened it was very rare which brings me to another point. You will note I keep on saying that all terrorism should be treated as a crime scene for the simple reason that whatever a terrorist does is a crime. However there is another reason. Simply with another force involved in the after contact report the chances of false body counts is zero for the Police will not lie for the Army. We know that the body count in Vietnam was dramatically increased to such an extent that some historians simply refuses to believe any of the official reports. Some even say that My Lai was not an isolated incident but (almost) the norm where civilians were killed at will. I would not know but I do know that a body count is unimportant in COIN and no pressure should be placed on the soldiers to create a positive body count. It is rather simple to understand that one body should equal one weapon. If not, someone is lying and the problem with that is wrong statistics. You may then think you are winning but you are not. You are bullsh-ting yourself. Body count is nothing but political cr-p.

One Reconnaissance Unit which spring to mind is the *Rhodesian Seleous Scouts* which was probably the best use of pseudo troops in any war. They used black soldiers and turned-terrorists to act like terrorists and operate in the rural areas as terrorists. This made the locals think they were terrorists and it brought two immediate factors to light. One the local population hardly ever to never reported their presence which made the Rhodesians think that the locals were thoroughly indoctrinated against the government. I say think because it may be possible, as hard as it is to swallow, that many locals actually supported the terrorists because they liked their policies of nationalism and not only fear.

In our own war we were always told that the terrorists lacked ground support but that was simply not always true in Rhodesia or in South Africa. Some kidnapping did place for new recruits. No doubt. But these days I wonder if we did not become a victim of our own propaganda. As I said in my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#): "Any idiot can figure out that the parents

of children who joined the Liberation Group will not tell the Army and Police that. Naturally he will say the child is kidnapped and so the lists grow. And what do you think the child is going to say if rescued? That he went willingly so that Mr Policemen can arrest him? Funny enough the same kidnapped youngsters voted for the same kidnappers afterwards. I wonder why?

I also think these days we lost the so called "*hearts and mind*" campaign. Do you really think you are winning your "*hearts & minds*" games when terrorists groups become thousands of men and woman in strength? Did that not indicate that they are perhaps more popular than what you thought? This should have been our wake-up call but it did not for the kills were so much we thought we did an excellent job."

Thus the non-reporting of what the tribesmen thought were genuine terrorists must have been very disturbing. We now know that many were promised the white farm land as a reward with the coming redistribution of wealth. That promise which is standard in all insurgencies is so abused that you can only laugh bitterly when you see the few social elites getting richer and richer and the masses poorer. We lost in South Africa probably more than two million jobs since freedom and in Rhodesia, now the failed despotic state of Zimbabwe it must be close to 80% and people are dying of hunger there. They came streaming south and they are most welcome too for you will not find in Africa better articulated and educated men and women. Really good people to be with!

In any counter-insurgency the main problem for the Security Forces is always to find the terrorists. Once found his chances of being killed are very good for obvious reasons. The use of air support and relentless pursuit will always count in the attackers favour. The Security Forces also had access to excellent medical care which the terrorist could only access if captured. Since we can learn from history I identified the following methods to find the terrorist.

First, most of the contacts inside Rhodesia were orchestrated by the Seleous Scouts who would meet with other genuine terrorists groups and identify their whereabouts to fireforces. The success rate was outstanding. The SAS also did the same with small teams. Though useful it is limited to the area in which these men operated at any given time. For the reason of the lack of manpower

available the Rhodesian Special Forces often attacked and killed the terrorists instead of leaving it to be done by conventional forces. It is very interesting to see how they adapted to the different phases of the war. They were also used extensively outside Rhodesia in the rural areas of neighbouring countries like Mozambique because they followed the terrorists to their bases no matter where they were and destroyed it.

This is one of the unique features of the Rhodesian War. The terrorists were able to establish bases both inside Rhodesia and outside in neighbouring countries. The support they had materially from the Soviet Union was indeed massive and lavish. This never happened in the South African Border War. The terrorist never succeeded to establish a permanent base in either South Africa or in Namibia where the war was fought. Note the difference between a temporary base where you sleep over and a permanent base from where you operate for months if not years. It is not the same thing and the word "*temporary base*" has a specific meaning in COIN.

Secondly, the Rhodesians also placed a signalling device in a small civilian FM radio which after being stolen by the terrorists as they robbed a store gave a signal to home on to. By triangulation it is rather easy to pinpoint their movements which led to their killing afterwards. It was called a "*bird runner*" or something and is based on the old Trojan horse concept. Interestingly, it sent the signal even if switched off.

** There is also a rumour that poisoned clothes were left at the shops to be stolen by the terrorists when they robbed the place. I have no idea if it is true or not.*

Thirdly, information or intelligence collected and build up by the Rhodesian Police (Special Branch) and Central Intelligence Organisation who acted as their spies. I said it before and it is important enough to repeat. The Rhodesians approached the terrorism war as a crime and every incident as a crime scene. This is crucial for the database they build up and certain police officers became legends in their own time having had much success during interrogations without the need for waterboarding techniques.

You should know that the questions asked betray your knowledge or lack of it clearly to the suspect or interrogatee. It is very possible that a suspect will crack and work with you when he thinks or have reason to believe that you know everything. It happens all the time and so it was. This is one of the points we can learn from. Treat every incident like a crime scene and collect the evidence in the proven systematic way which we know works. Remember everything a terrorist does is a crime in some way. A false passport or planting a bomb or kidnapping! All these things are a crime. Note I am not saying the end result or objective is to arrest him or hand him over to the courts. This has to do with finding him and interrogating him so that you can find his mates.

Note how they approached the problem inside Rhodesia with *police methods* and outside with external reconnaissance by Special Forces and with the intelligence service worldwide. It worked well enough to copy for they destabilised Mozambique (a country on their eastern border) by creating another terrorist group called RENAMO or MNR (Mozambique National Resistance) who waged a respectable insurgency against the communists who replaced the Portuguese for the next twenty years. South Africa took over the support of RENAMO after Rhodesia was betrayed to become the despotic failed state of Zimbabwe.

The Special Branch also caused much internal strife within the terrorist's ranks with their own black propaganda efforts. It took the war to the terrorist which is always a good thing. The leaders ran away many times when they suspected the Rhodesians are around (very wisely says I for the Rhodesians were every bit as obnoxious as their English cousins).

Fourthly the use of aerial reconnaissance which were both visual and photo based. We described before that they found a way to visually see terrorists hiding places in the bush and this it seems is a lost art today and without immediate attack a useless exercise also. However that with photo reconnaissance led to many deaths of terrorists. Computer support these days will indicate all and every change.

Thought-provoking is that one pilot suffered from a mild form of colour blindness which made it possible for him to see through the usual camouflage where others could not. The same technique was used during the Second World War

and it rendered normal camouflage useless. Today, with the electronics available in most attack helicopters this would not be a problem.

** The best book written on the Rhodesian Air Force if you are interested is "Winds of Destruction" by Group Captain Petter-Bowyer and well worth whatever you pay for it. Simply a wonderful read!*

Fourthly, the terrorist betrayed themselves by attacking the Security Forces or isolated farms. That always betrayed their presence and besides the terror is actually a home goal. When you have strong and aggressive Security Forces the follow up which will happen at first light attacking anyone may be you end as a terrorist.

Fifthly, the Security Forces not on fireforce duty walked and drove millions of miles and sometimes were lucky enough to find spoor to follow as the terrorists moved around in their chevron patterned boots issued by the communists. Even horses were used as a means to patrol and the South Africans tried off-road motor bikes without much success.

What does all this tell me? Out of the five methods described above the first three can be seen as actively hunting for terrorists and the last two is by chance only. You simply don't know about the terrorist if he does not attack you for he looks like any of the local population or you happen to recognise him or find weapons on him (or other discriminatory evidence). As long as he keeps to himself you will not know him to be any other than the locals. Of course today you can scan his fingerprint or eye to see what is on file but nothing will be unless you created the database with your police techniques.

Finding spoor is dependable on regular patrols with conventional forces that are not always trackers or ability to speak the local languages. They are dependable on unreliable interpreters who cannot be trusted and probably works for the terrorists also. It is sheer bad luck for the terrorist if his spoor is found and as a method of hunting terrorists it is hit or miss. You may also lose the spoor if it rained (not if you use tracker dogs). Unless you use the *leaping frog method* you will almost never run him in on foot. He is just too fit and may I say scared.

Insofar as atrocities go: The terrorists shot down two civilian airliners with their Strela missiles and killed the survivors in cold blood afterwards! It caused shock and outrage and happened with flight RH 825 on 3 September 1978 and flight RH 827 on 12 February 1979. Both aircraft were Vickers Viscounts and had no chance whatsoever against Strela's with *only* civilians on board. It must be noted that none of the surviving Victims were mistreated or raped before the execution as the rumour had it just afterwards. As you can imagine the anger was intense and the delight of the terrorists great. The West kept quiet and could not care less. This led to the famous "*Green Leader*" bombing attack in Zambia where the Rhodesian Air Force took command of the Zambian airspace with probably the most astonishing radio call ever made in Southern Africa. I repeat it from transcripts and you can find the rest of the transcripts on the Internet under "*Green Leader Raid*" if you wish to read the actual radio transmission during the attack also.

I only took out what I thought was extraordinary for the attack itself is like any other. Note that "*Green Leader*" was the call sign of the Rhodesian Air Force war plane circling the airport and "*Dolphin 3*" acted as a radio link to Rhodesia with senior Rhodesian military men on board. It is a classic example of establishing air superiority to do what you want to do and get out again. They killed about 1500 terrorists (known by counting the bodies via aerial photographs taken afterwards). The liberal press disputes this and still say it was a refugee camp. Whatever! We discussed the liberal press before I think.

"Lusaka tower, this is Green Leader. How do you read? (No answer).

Lusaka tower, this is Green Leader.

Lusaka tower: Station calling tower?

CL: Lusaka tower this is Green Leader. This is a message for the station commander at Mumbwa from the Rhodesian Air Force. We are attacking the terrorist base at Westlands Farm. This attack is against Rhodesian dissidents and not against Zambia. Rhodesia has no quarrel, repeat, no quarrel with Zambia or her security forces. We therefore ask you not to intervene or oppose our attack. However, we are orbiting your airfield now and are under orders to shoot down

any Zambian Air Force aircraft, which does not comply with this request and attempts to take off Did you copy all that?

Lusaka tower: Copied.

CL: Roger, thanks. Cheers.

And a few minutes later the following was said:

Lusaka tower: Rhodesian Air Force, 118.1.

CL: Go ahead.

Tower: Can you confirm we can let our civil aircraft take-off from here? You have no objection?

GL: Roger. We have no objection there, but I advise you for the moment to stand-by on that. I request that you hang on for a short while—half an hour or so.

Tower: I copy. Can you please keep a listening watch on this frequency so we can ask you what we want to ask?

CL: Roger will do.

Tower: What do I call you?

CL: Green Leader!

And then finally as other innocent civilian aircraft wondered what is taking place:

Tower: Green Leader, Lusaka.

GL: Go ahead.

Tower: How much longer is this operation?

CL: Roger. If you'll hang fire, I'll advise you shortly.

Tower: I have one to take off to the north and if you have no objection one to take off to the south. Civilian, you know.

CL: Request you hold them for another ten minutes.

Tower: Roger. Will do.

GL: Lusaka, this is Green Leader. Would you now contact Dolphin 3. He'll be taking over my transmissions.

Tower: Roger. Dolphin 3, Lusaka.

Dolphin 3: Lusaka, this is Dolphin 3, do you read me?

CL (interjecting): Dolphin 3, this is Green Leader. I have advised Lusaka to hold their civilian traffic for another ten minutes. We're going out of range shortly.

Dolphin 3: Roger. Lusaka, this is Dolphin 3. Just a message that you are to keep your air traffic on the ground for another ten minutes. Did you copy, over?

Tower: Copied, thank you. I have a civilian aircraft coming in from the north to land in about one-zero minutes. Any objection to him coming in to land?

Dolphin 3: Roger, there is no problem with that. You can let him come in and land. The main thing is that if there is any air force, repeat air force traffic, they are to remain on the ground. You can let that civilian traffic land—there's no hassle on that."

Quite frankly I am impressed with the professionalism of the Lusaka Air Traffic Controller who made sure the civilian aircraft under his control came to no harm. That was very well done.

The shooting down of a civilian airliner is a nightmare scenario in the War on Terrorism and these weapons are certainly able to bring modern aircraft down. It happened before you know...in 1998 a Boeing 727 was shot down in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire). All on board were killed. At least two missiles were fired at a Boeing 757 during the attacks Mombasa attacks in 2002 without effect. It only became important to the West after 9/11 but as you know I am cynical. I have no doubt it will happen again.

The landmine became a standard weapon for the terrorist who would plant it on the access routes to the scene of his attacks in the hope to kill the security forces. This led to the remarkable landmine proof vehicles which are saving lives up to today. Strangely enough, the landmine threat was *primarily* against the

civilian population who had no access to the specialist vehicles which the Security Forces had. We certainly did not regard the landmines as a threat being quite safe in our Casspirs. You would be really unlucky to die in one. There were no IED's as such though the bombing of civilian targets in towns and cities took place. It is part of terror.

The first successful methods against landmines were to fill the vehicles tyres with water which negated the blast tremendously. Another was to deflect the blast away from the occupants and this led to the revolutionary V shaped hulls with tyres on the outside away from vehicles. The Rhodesians also developed penetrating ground radar scanning for difference in density in the ground to see where landmines were planted. By using old discarded formula1 tyres they reduced the foot pressure of the search vehicle (called *Pookie* or something) they could safe drive over any landmine without setting it off. You can read all about this in Peter Stiff's delightful book "*Taming the Landmine*" if you can find it. It is really good.

Also unique to the Rhodesian War and the later South African one was the use of conventional arms by the terrorists. At one stage the ZAPU intention was to invade Rhodesia with an armoured column from Zambia but that was wishful thinking to be honest. You need air superiority to do so which they never obtained so it was doomed to failure. The invasion never happened and up to the time that the Portuguese withdrew from Mozambique in 1974 the Rhodesians were winning the war with relative ease. The handing over of Mozambique to Marxists however opened up the whole eastern border of about 800 miles. They simply could not stop the flow of terrorists not having enough manpower.

I see very much the same in what happened in Afghanistan. You could not for political reasons close the border with Pakistan which directly led to Bin Laden escaping and many other evils. This is always a weak point in American foreign policy. You are known not to be willing to go all the way as your forefathers did up to 1945. After that your Military was severely constrained and expected to fight with both hands tied and we saw it time and time again from the resignation of General MacArthur during the Korean War and onwards. It is very weird behaviour for us when a strong man acts like a weak bully who runs away

when his nose bleeds. I wonder if that played a part in the 9/11 attacks? Perhaps the terrorists did miscalculate and expected you to run away again.

Hot pursuit operations where a terrorist is chased into another country is allowed in International Law and not seen *as an act of war* to follow and kill the terrorists even if over the border. This happened many times and every time it was denounced as could only be expected. As we said before in those days it did not matter what evidence was produced the world believed what they believed and we should learn a lesson from this.

Whoever controls the liberal media will be the hero in the end. Always! It has nothing to do with the truth or common decency or even perspective for perspective can be written before it happens. Been like that since the press came into being. Look at what baloney they wrote about General Sherman early in the Civil War. They called him mad and it adversely affected him to the extent that he needed to leave the Army for a while during the war. The Union almost lost a top general because of it with consequences we can just speculate on like losing the Civil War. Yes. There is a school of thought that says the Union was rapidly running out of money and the war was about to be lost when he marched to the sea splitting the Confederacy and cutting them off from the sea. Can you imagine what would have happened if the Union gave up? Slavery would have continued and America half of what it is today.

Recently another American General had to resign because of a few relatively harmless comments made between men as if he planned an armed take-over of the US government or something! What does it matter if he joked around a bit about the politicians who are clowns to start with in most reasonable men's opinion? It sort of comes with the job to be joked about. Is absolute unthinking obedience expected of a general officer as it was in World War One or thinking generals who save lives? The man is obviously not entitled to a personal opinion then in the Land of the Free? How weird is that. Makes us non-Americans wonder all sorts of things.

So did another top General (resigned) for a relationship whilst morally wrong which was blown out of all proportion in the media. There is not one American General of World War Two except General Omar Bradley who did not have a less

than platonic relationship on the side with a female companion. None of them was forced to resign! Really, was it that serious to lose good men over? Was it rape? No. Was it sexual harassment? No, as far as I can see two consenting adults having a lack of judgment in their personal lives. Was it a threat against national security? No, as far as we know the other party did not and do not work for a foreign Agency. Nor was the general subjected to black mail. Still he got kicked out but I hope both will be back soon.

Who are we to judge on a personal matter when that personal matter has no security implications? It was General Patton who said: "*If everybody is thinking alike, then somebody isn't thinking.*" Be careful of the media and so called "*public opinion.*" It is usually just another fat politician doing what he does best which is talking nonsense and spending tax payers' money on liberal cr-p. He is so short sighted (another election to lie to you for a vote) that he places his own interests way before that of his country. And they are all the same. Does not matter where you are when you read this.

The Rhodesian forces made many pre-emptive strikes called *raids* into neighbouring countries to disrupt the terrorists before they could get to Rhodesia and though very successful in kills it was too little too late. Whatever weapons they destroyed was replaced by the communists and when South Africa betrayed them by withholding fuel (gas in American) and other assistance the end was near.

It was relatively late in the Rhodesian War before the Malayan village's principles were introduced and it did not work out well. No African likes to be moved from his ancestral land for whatever reason and it was a home goal as it always is. They combined this with the usual curfew and night time ambushes killing everyone who moved outside the villages. I am not sure that this tactic helped a lot for it could not be enforced except in limited reservist type operations and many died who were not terrorists. It is not a clever approach. With regard to the village principle it must be remembered it is very expensive to build tens of thousands small villages with accompanying infrastructure. It must also be protected in some way and all contact between the villagers and the terrorist

broken. It is just not cost effective and I say again will not work in Africa. The access routes are also limited even if landmines were no threat.

They also tried extensive minefields with electronic surveillance which was a waste of resources. It is interesting to wonder if the so called *McNamara Line* in Vietnam played a role in the thinking behind it for it was not normal Rhodesian doctrine. The lesson is it will not work in Africa or anywhere else without massive manpower commitments and the technology to differentiate between animals and humans. If not constantly monitored it means nothing except to be a nice coloured line on a general's map and of as much use in practise too. It will not stop a determined terrorist and many of the landmines were dug out and used against the Security Forces and civilians.

By 1979 the Rhodesians agreed to the Lancaster House Agreement in London and gave up their self-declared independence to become a British Colony again. They realised that South Africa or rather the nationalist politicians wrote them off for the sake of political convenience. During this time the United Nations and others arrived to supervise elections which ZANU won and the rest as they say is history. Every single guarantee given at Lancaster House was subsequently broken by the new tyrant and thousand were killed and tortured to death in the early 1980s to ensure that ZAPU disappeared as a political threat from the scene. Of course the West kept quiet and could not be bothered and we have to ask why? Was it because it was black on black violence as speculated here in Africa? If so it means that black lives are simply not that important in deeds to the West. This has implications on the need for information on terrorists.

I was 12 years old in 1979 when Rhodesia fell and I remember many Rhodesians immigrating to South Africa for we lived in an English speaking part of the country where they felt more at home. All were polite people with very little issues in terms our betrayal of their country. They simply said they give us *ten years* before we fell to black majority rule which in those days came close to treason. It was laughed off for South Africa had vastly more resources than the Rhodesians in both men and equipment and the theory went "*already as far South as you can go in Africa and not going anywhere else.*" For us who lived for generations (300 years plus) in Africa the idea of going back to where our

forefathers came from was and is ridiculous! We simply had nowhere to go but history shows they were right. Ten years later (in 1990) Mr Nelson Mandela was released. The year before that South West Africa (under South African control since 1915) became the independent country of Namibia. We lost our war politically which is the only side which matters.

I would see more of the Rhodesians as the years went on. First as my instructors during SAP COIN training and after that we met in Africa where they still work and travel and smile about the old days when they revolutionised COIN. They were *the* men amongst men and let no-one say different.

South African Border War

South Africa had major advantages over Rhodesia when it came to their own COIN war. Firstly the border area where it took place was much easier to manage being in a single line between Angola and Namibia to the west and the Caprivi (part of Namibia) and Zambia to the east. It had much more economic and military power being then and now the super power of Africa causing its neighbours to live in fear and show much more respect than with the Rhodesians. There was simply nothing in the Southern Hemisphere never mind Southern Africa to challenge it military wise.

** The South African Navy controlled the coastal areas well and we never had a threat of the terrorists landing by sea. This made South Africa very valuable to the West also.*

Ever since its Air Force, Police COIN and Special Forces had many years of experience with the Rhodesians COIN was not new nor in any way unknown to them. They also had the ex-Rhodesians not only in the Armed Forces but also operating on the side with the intelligence Agency called NIS (National Intelligence Service). These men travelled on British passports and could go to places where a South African passport would immediately be flagged. This was well abused.

Furthermore they had a first-rate armaments industry and needed very little outside assistance in this regard and the political will to conduct pre-emptive strikes into neighbouring countries when needed.

So why did they lose so easily?

Politics and the lack of a good cause to start with. As a country they were divided between race groups of which they separated as you would do with farm animals into whites, blacks, Indian (Asiatic) and Colored meaning what Americans would call "*mulatto*." You will never find in my books or real life me defending Apartheid which I believe was evil and a crime against humanity. How smart decent God fearing men could go that far wrong is to be wondered at. They did however and caused untold misery.

I am tempted these days to say the whole COIN war in Namibia was unnecessary. Stopping communist expansion was the excuse but in reality it was about black vote and black rights. Simply they had none. Still, it took place and we can learn much from it. The biggest mistake people make when discussing this particular war is to focus only on the COIN operations in Namibia which is a country just to the north of South Africa on the western side. At that stage it was called South West Africa and came under South African control by right of conquest. During the First World War (in 1915) the then Union of South Africa attacked and conquered the German colony of South West Africa on behalf of the allies. The League of Nations gave it a mandate to rule which was the subject of legal battles during the 1950's onwards. Some which South Africa won and others she lost. As always her Apartheid policies made her the black sheep of the world and created a sort of lager mentality of us against the rest of the world.

Whatever the world said, South Africa spend billions on infrastructure in Namibia and was not about to withdraw just because of world opinion. Accordingly the lines were drawn and the war was on. It must also be said that the tragic and horrible events in Kenya and the Belgian Congo and elsewhere played a major role in this decision. It was seen rightly or wrongly as a war against communist expansion in Africa since all the terrorists were supported by the Soviet Union and openly said they will create a Marxist communist state if given a chance. Such comments would not go down well with the God fearing anti-communist boers.

The actual war was also referred to as the Angolan Bush War being fought by the Army mostly inside Angola which is to the north of Namibia. Inside Namibia in the most northern territory called Owamboland the Police COIN Units killed 90% of all terrorists which was an outstanding effort. The terrorists called it the Namibian war of Independence and most South Africans referred to it simply as the "*border*."

The opposing forces were firstly SWAPO which had a private army called PLAN which we refer to as terrorists as it was at the time and place being local Namibians wanting independence. The Angolan government (called FAPLA) with substantial Cuban assistance defended their own country to the best of their ability. The exiled South Africans formed an armed wing called Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) under the political control of the ANC and assisted wherever they could as they did in Rhodesia as we saw scoring a home goal with the birth of SAP COIN.

South African forces called the SADF or South African Defence Force enlisted the help of UNITA, an Angolan anti-communist liberation movement, which dominated southern Angola against the elected Angolan government. UNITA received some American assistance during the war which took place from 1964 to 1989 and certainly had advanced Stinger anti-aircraft missiles for use against the Angolan / Cuban Air Forces. The missile teams were very well protected and quite secretive. I have no idea how successful they were or what happened to the Stingers afterwards. Certainly the terrorists had SAM6's for their own use.

At the same time, and this is forgotten, a classic counter-terrorism war was going on inside South Africa which we will discuss separately from the COIN operations.

In 1966 the South African Police Security Branch discovered a small terrorist base inside Owamboland at Ongulumbashe and attacked it with members of the Army's elite paratrooper battalion having not the ability to do so themselves at that stage. The bemused paratroopers were sworn in as policemen for the duration of the contact and mounted a classic helicopter assault as it was before the Rhodesians discovered fireforces. You can read about this incident in my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#) (I was not there for it would be

another year before I was even born when that took place). As far as attacks go it was not at all serious as legend had it today with less than two sections of men involved. It directly led to the deployment of policemen in Rhodesia to learn the skills of COIN which our nationalist generals lost somehow for the police always had a military function and in fact fought in the Second World War as an infantry brigade.

** This incident had nothing to do with the creation of the Army Special Forces as some say on the Internet which shows you once again that the Internet is dangerous for serious research. It is very funny to read as I am sure some find my own books quite hilarious.*

Idiotically the Afrikaner nationalists (Apartheid politicians) tried to destroy the "English" traditions of the South African Army when they came into power in 1948. Everyone who could not speak Afrikaans was worked out and the rank structure changed to that of the old Boer Republics until they came to their senses years later. Hence a lieutenant became a *veld cornet* or something and a lieutenant colonel a *kommandant* (that stayed until 1994). The regimental system stayed on but lost some of its traditions with new conscripts arriving all the time. Anyway, it was the last time that the terrorists established a permanent base inside Namibia and it never happened again though they tried desperately to do so in 1989. Undeniably they had many *temporary bases* as they infiltrated south for they had to sleep somewhere. As explained somewhere it is not the same thing as a permanent base to operate from. That never happened.

The South Africans learned well from their Rhodesian experience. No one forgot the problem of terrorist bases inside Rhodesia and the havoc it caused with the elections afterwards being able to dominate the locals to vote freely and fairly for the terrorists home political parties. Nor the locally trained terrorists whose thuggery knew no limits! Thus it was never allowed and they were aggressively hunted down all the time.

Between 1966 and 1974 a few incidents happened but it was insignificant to what came in the 1980s. It was only after Portugal withdrew from Mozambique and Angola (both Portuguese colonies) which thing heated up and the political decision made to place the area under Army control. Up to that stage the South

African Police was dealing with it. However they simply could not be in Rhodesia and Owamboland and in South Africa at the same time because they lacked the manpower and equipment. The SADF was much bigger and better equipped and the logical choice. They gladly took on the job and had a splendid low intensity war as a result in the beginning.

The Army first intervened in Angola to safeguard the large Ruacana-Calueque hydro-electric scheme just across the border when all pretensions of law and order disappeared after Portugal left and Angola degenerated into a civil war. In any case it was built with South African money and a strategic asset. They learned from the Cahora Bassa hydro-electric scheme in Mozambique where they lost a lot of money and no doubt votes. This led to the invasion of Angola proper in 1974 and was one of the best examples of hot-headed behaviour ever. Ostensibly they were promised secret American support in weapons and believed it for reasons only they can explain. As you can imagine, none of the weapons promised ever arrived. France benefitted hugely because of it as South Africa never again bought or allowed American arms dealers close to them and always approached France or Israel. Simply America was forever distrusted afterwards and placed in almost the same category as Britain which is not good for as I am sure I explained before the Afrikaner dislikes the English instinctively.

** South Africa still does not buy American weapons but looked at Sweden, France and Germany for their needs (or manufacture it at home). UK too but only because they owned some of the companies involved in the weapons transaction of the late 1990's and allegations of bribery and corruption because of it is still on-going. Just politics as usual!*

As said, when the Portugese fled Angola in 1974 many African States asked secretly for South Africa (as the only local super power) to stage an invasion to stabilise Angola. The nationalists felt honoured to be trapped into an invasion which brought much negative press in the world. Yes they were played like fools!

The invasion was called Operation Savannah and it did not take long for the Army to reach the outskirts of Luanda which is the capital of Angola. Doing so they made an advance of thousands of miles and their improvasion with outdated French Panhard Armoured cars became legendary. Even more

legendary was the utterly confused and outdated views on media relations. South Africans did not know about the invasion until months later when the whole world already forgot about it. Even then they tried to deny it.

** Freedom of the press was not a priority in Apartheid South Africa and viewed as communist inspired long haired liberal idea to be dealt with in a firm but fatherly way. Whatever you have to say about the so called new South Africa which Mr Mandela created freedom of the media is high on the agenda. It will not be surrendered and the long haired liberals must be admired for that view. They are quite tough and obnoxious people when they want to be. I will miss them very much if they ever decide to agree to my way of thinking.*

At the same time in Northern Angola South African military advisors with a few (26 to be exact) artilleryists assisted Holden Roberto's men (FNLA) invading Angola from Zaire (the North) with a lot of American (via their puppet Zaire) assistance. They got nowhere though and never again were a factor in the war or in Angola after being chased back to Zaire in disgrace. What stopped them were Soviet artillery in the form of Stalin Organs and a serious lack of leadership from Roberto. Unlike his previous campaigns of terror and murder against isolated white Portuguese farmers the new Angolan government was not intimidated by him and actually fought back hard for he threatened their oil production. Roberto was found wanting on all aspects.

It must be noted that Roberto acted against the South African advisors' advice when he was defeated for he foolishly attacked on a single road very much like General Horrocks 30 Corps tried at Arnhem in 1944. It was doomed to failure and history repeated itself. This is also where the mercenary "*Colonel Callan*" got caught and later executed by the Angolan government with I think 6 other white men one of which was an American who took no part in the fighting at all. South African Navy ships rescued the stranded advisors in an operation which justifies a book in suspense and made South African Chief of Staff General Constand Viljoen say "*it was the most difficult night ever in my operational career.*" Leaving men behind was never an option.

The rescue was the usual cloak and dagger stuff of rendezvous on a deserted beach with the ship just behind the horizon. I understand that it was really touch

and go at one stage and I spoke to some of the officers involved decades later. Apparently they had back up plan which fortunately were never tested in practice for it was truly desperate.

Understandably the two old 5.5inch World War Two era cannon they brought with them to assist Roberto were abandoned. This gave rise to the claim that they were forced to abandon their field guns on the field of battle which as you might know is a shameful thing in war and thoroughly exploited by their foes forever after. You still read of it on the Internet. What the articles failed to mention was that it was destroyed before being left and only after it fired every round available and long after the FNLA infantry ran away to Zaire (now the Congo). Thus the newspaper report is told with much mirth and used as an example of long hair liberal reporting by sticking to half-truths only and not reporting the whole story. Two self-destroyed field guns are really not a major defeat.

When the South Africans belatedly realised they had no support from the West or from the African leaders who asked for their assistance they withdrew their forces in an orderly way back into Namibia being quite disgusted with the whole affair. They were most definitely not chased out and they learned many lessons. The chief of which was the lack of good armoured fighting vehicles which gave rise to the excellent mine proofed Ratel Infantry Fighting Vehicles (IFV). These vehicles would routinely shoot out many T55 Soviet supplied tanks with their 90mm (3.5 inch) main guns in the years to come and once with a 20mm rapid firing cannon which must be some kind of a record.

** Some readers asked me how this was possible. Apparently the cannon could switch between armour piercing rounds and high explosive and the gunner simple shot the T55 right beneath the turret where the armour is the weakest and kept on shooting until it blew up. It is well documented.*

The Army likewise created a legendary fighting force consisting of Angolan soldiers called 32 Battalion or the Buffalo Battalion and in Portuguese *Os Terríveis* (The Terrible Ones) which indeed they were to their enemies. It was a political decision for the nationalists could not face their electorate with any losses of soldiers meaning white soldiers. In those days blacks non-South

Africans did not count as losses so it made perfect sense to have a black "mercenary" unit operating inside Angola under white officers. You can read about this outstanding battalion in the many good books which came out after the war of which Colonel Jan Breytenbach, *"The Buffalo Soldiers, the story of South Africa's 32-Battalion, 1975-1993"* is by far the best. They operated with UNITA forces or alone without much support from the rest of the Army and learned to take care of themselves. Per se they caused havoc behind the lines and assisted in full scale conventional attacks where needed later in the war. Besides that they had a reconnaissance function second to none.

** Colonel Jan Breytenbach was a legend being a former Royal Navy Fleet Air Arm navigator and commanding officer of the Paratroopers, Special Forces and the 32 Battalion we discussed above. Truly a remarkable officer and the only South African officer who understood the concept of static line paratrooper operations in Africa!*

When I say Angolan soldiers I mean they were more of a terrorist origin than the Portuguese Angolan army. As far as I know they had no pseudo function as did the Seleous Scouts. They simply fought whoever came their way whether it is Cubans or Angolan Forces or SWAPO or MK. Made no difference! Normal rules did not seem to apply to them for they pulled off victories which no other unit could dream about and were at the forefront of every battle afterwards. Serving with them was seen as Special Forces status. After the war they were disbanded and now live in poverty with their families in a small village close to the Kalahari Desert. It is another example of scandalous betrayal by our nationalist politicians.

Following the Rhodesian principles a fireforce type of unit consisting of members of the elite paratroopers was created called Romeo Mike for the Afrikaans words *Reaksie Mag*. Unlike the Rhodesians the South African Air Force (SAAF) had Super Frelon and Puma helicopters to use as troop carrying platforms so they could insert a lot more troops at the first wave with very rapid reinforcements if needed.

The Alouette 3 K cars with their 20mm cannon last seen in Rhodesia provided the firepower and as with the Rhodesian model command was from the air.

Though equipped with the much larger C160 Transall and C130 Hercules transportation aircraft than Dakota's (DC3) the paratroopers did not jump even a fraction of what the Rhodesian paratroopers did and never did more than a few combat jumps during the entire war of which the Kassinga attack in 1978 was the largest. They made their reputation as crack light infantry once on the ground whether by parachute or helicopter and considered themselves rightly to be an elite force as do all paratroopers. Since they had none of the usual support vehicles which an infantry battalion would have it made sense to use them in the fireforces role and on external operations with 32 Battalion. At that stage they were an all-white unit as was the Rhodesian Light Infantry. Besides Special Forces no black man was parachute trained which I think was a mistake. Certainly the black Rhodesian African Rifles were paratroopers and did many combat jumps as fireforces but you know the feelings in those days on arming black Africans.

When necessary the air superiority Dassault Mirage F1 fighters were available to assist the air to ground Mirage 3's and what they called the Impala Mark 2 and the rest of the world the Aermacchi MB-326. Thus as far as air support go it was as good as any since the pilots had much experience with the Rhodesian Air Force and access to Canberra bombers. Right at the end of the war the Cuban MIG23's outclassed the Mirage F1's and this caused serious concern but air superiority was never lost. Israeli sourced Kfir's arrived called the Cheetah arrived which could and did certainly sort any MIG23 out.

I say this is my other books much to the chagrin of some but sanctions rarely if ever work. It only gives rise to home-grown ingenuity at its best and at its worst a surprise attack as happened at Pearl Harbour when Japan was sanctioned to restricted oil imports and the rest is history. Sanctions are nonsense as far as it is supposed to change anything. It only makes the social elite richer and the poor poorer besides the obvious useless political rhetoric.

The infantry as always in COIN walked and drove patrols and guarded strategic points. In general the moral was very high but as we saw in Rhodesia their actual contribution limited to chance contacts unless on external raids. The problem with this is tracking. In COIN you need to be able to follow spoor which

is not a natural art for most and unlike fireforces where the terrorist is found already here he needs to be found which makes it more difficult. I have serious doubts over the effectiveness of normal infantry in COIN.

Soon however mechanised infantry became the new buzz word. Fast moving infantry in armoured vehicles with their own fire support from the IFV Ratels roamed Southern Angola causing much damage if not havoc.

In 1979 which you will note is just before the Rhodesian war ended the South African Police decided to create a Selous Scout type of unit for pseudo operations in Owamboland. They soon progressed to highly mechanized infantry using their excellent Casspir armoured vehicles and much other appropriated equipment from the Army. The use of turned terrorists in police camouflage uniform raised a lot of eyebrows so it was kept quiet and the unit itself fell under the Special Branch and quite separate from SAP COIN. This unit would become known as *Koevoet* which translates to *Crowbar* in English. The meaning of which was to peel away the layers as to find the terrorists below. Many experts say they were the most effective counter-insurgency unit ever in the history of warfare. On kill rate alone nothing comes close and indeed they killed 90% of all terrorists killed in Owamboland which is a figure totally out of proportion to their numbers. As such they are also the subject of continuous abuse and vilification even to today. You can read about them in the numerous books which came out of which Jim Hoopers "*Koevoet*" is still the best.

The tactics used was simple but very effective and we can learn from it. As with the Selous Scouts they use turned terrorists who were given a Hobson's choice on volunteering or not and expected to use his knowledge on his former mates. The officers and car commanders were mostly white and experienced policemen before they joined the unit. As a rule they were older and more mature than the average national serviceman who was between 18 and 21 years of age. Unlike the COIN operations in Rhodesia nothing prevented the policemen from becoming a permanent member of the unit which is important for it created a wealth of experience. You will remember that the normal combat tour was limited to a few months up to then. The former terrorists stayed on as long as they unit existed and were afterwards abandoned to their uncertain fate.

Many of the founder white members were ex-Special Forces and almost all had Rhodesian experience. As you can imagine they had a decidedly practical approach to the war and did not mind experimenting with ideas. The Police Generals for once were clever enough to let them be but then police discipline is different from the Army and you can read of that in my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#). Different does not mean no or slack discipline. It means operations initiative which is always a force multiplier and much desired in COIN.

Generally they moved around in their Casspirs for two week patrols at a time though it could be extended if needs be. On top of the vehicles they fitted (once only as far as I know) a 20mm cannon they got (don't ask how) from an old air force Vampire jet but the recoil cause the roof to crack and ammunition hard to come by. So they appropriated what they needed from the Air Force and Army which had much more equipment than what was good for them. The norm though was a twin .30 or a .30 with .50 calibre machine gun from the Browning family. It worked better than the 20mm as most contacts took place at close range and had a faster fire rate which was important to keep the terrorists down and unable to accurately fire their RPG7's.

Each policeman had his choice of weapon which may be an AK47 or the Army's copy of the 5.56 NATO Galil called a R5 or whatever he preferred though in later years they standardized to the R5. Besides that they all carried the standard M9 side arm being policemen first and soldiers second. The vehicles operated in groups with between 4 and 6 armoured vehicles (which they called cars) each with a unique call sign based on the leaders initials. A support diesel tanker and supply vehicle completed the group. All were landmine proof and armoured against the AK47 calibre rounds.

A lot of thought went into the design of the Casspirs. For instance they were well equipped with an inboard water tank to sustain the occupants for water was always scarce. It had a relatively long range between re-fuelling and the off road ability simply spectacular though slow being in low range all the time. The Casspirs moved quickly on road and speeds of 70 miles per hour were common.

Landmines were not a threat at all. It was easy to maintain and operated with between 8 - 10 men in each. Of these only one or two would be white. The rest

were black and as said some were ex-terrorists. Discipline was excellent if informal as is the way in elite units. Problems were usually sorted out with a fatherly talk between themselves and outsiders were not trusted nor liked.

Stealing spoor from the Army became something of an art form and they always monitored the Army radio frequencies for just that. I heard of army lads crying in rage and disgust when the Casspirs came roaring past to shoot their terrorists which they followed for days. Moral was never a problem during the war despite some books claiming otherwise today for the sake of political correctness. It was a popular war for most. They also knew the locals well and operated mostly inside Owamboland where they had the same police powers of arrest as in South Africa. They could and did however follow spoor across the border (called the *kaplyn*) into Angola when necessary. Consequently you had a very mobile aggressive force operating beyond the reach of the Army much to their chagrin who complained bitterly after the war about them. At the time though, they were so impressed that they created a copy called 101 Battalion but it was never as successful as the policemen.

All the black policemen and many of the white ones were expert trackers and could follow the spoor on the run or in many cases from the moving vehicles. To delay them the terrorists used landmines and anti-personnel mines called black widows or something. It never delayed the groups long enough and it was not unknown for two or more groups to combine when needed. They could work out just by looking at the spoor how many terrorists there were and what weapons they were carrying. As in Rhodesia the terrorists wore civilian clothing underneath their uniforms to change into when needed. Some had more than one pair of shoes which they could somehow change on the move to confuse trackers. All practised back-tracking to delay the follow-up and they would split in smaller groups (called bomb-shell) to escape. Many terrorists became well-known to the policemen by their tracks only and much respected for escaping.

When a contact (armed clash with the enemy) was imminent they called the K cars to assist and one of them would then control the contact from the air. Since many pilots were ex-Rhodesian a mixture of Afrikaans and English was used with a few words of Owambo in-between. No Army officer ever commanded the Police

Units and I think they would have chucked him out if he tried for they did not take kindly to outsiders to say the least. Obviously that did not sit well with the Army but in general they were highly respected if not feared.

I describe this in my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#) as follows: "During my time a healthy dislike between the Army and Police existed. Why I have no idea but obviously it caused a lot of resentment as the SAP were most definitely not going to be intimidated by the Army, conscripts of otherwise. By law, unless in a state of war or other declared emergency, the SAP would always win such a contest for the Army was under Police command inside South Africa. Unless of course the Army decided to start shooting us for they had all the heavy weapons we could only dream about. They never did and whilst I am sure we caused them much anguish they were always very professional to me at least. I really don't think there was ever a time when the Army considered a coup d'Etat which is the normal way in Africa. It was unthinkable that such a thing could happen and even today is most unlikely.

I made a point to be pleasant to the Army and only stole their equipment when I really needed it and as a matter of honour I never really needed their food so no one suffered too much because of my needs."

Once the contact was initiated all hell broke loose as the armoured cars circled around the terrorists pouring fire into them with the helicopter gunships directing them. If needs be the 11ton car would drive right over the terrorist to kill him. A lot of fire was directed at the terrorists to keep the RPG men from shooting the car for a RPG and rifle grenade could certainly penetrate the armour. No one besides the side gunner in the front ever used the gun ports but stood upright in the car on the seats and shot down the sides the roof being open. During this process many trees were destroyed for the tree which can withstand a Casspir is not planted yet or known to man.

Afterwards the dead terrorists were searched and the bodies either buried where is or left in the field or brought back to base for identification usually tied to the mud guards of the vehicles. Something which caused much criticism from the long haired liberals who simply had no understanding that there was limited space inside the vehicles and that was the only available space for rapidly

decomposing corpses. Owamboland I can tell you was and is very hot most of the time during daylight hours.

It was also standard procedure to turn your camouflaged hat inside out so that the day glow could clearly show the circling K Cars who you are. You would be surprised how far day-glow can be seen from the air. We found out that a RPG7 (many thousands were captured) could be used as a signalling device by shooting it straight into the air and when it self-destructs it left a rather nice brown patch in the air for the K Cars to see. Just remember to warn the pilot first for he may think you are shooting at him and take a distinctly dim view of it. It is one of the few times I heard of a chopper pilot using language which made even us blush. They were usually such polite men and unflappable too.

In regard to the identification of dead terrorists allow me to quote to you from my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#): "There was a rumour, probably true, that Policemen cut the ears off dead terrorists to keep as trophies but I have never seen that myself. I know the Portuguese Security Police paid a bounty on dead terrorists and since a body or a couple of heads are relatively heavy to carry a flourishing trade in (hopefully) terrorists' ears started in Angola during the 1960s.

They, the Portuguese soon learned to ask for both ears before paying or alternatively paying half for one ear. Africans are good traders you know and they figured out that one head provided double the money. The other way was to accept only left ears or right ears in certain months but that would be self-defeating. I wonder, out of professional interest only, why they did not ask for a thumb also. Or even better a trigger finger in case the terrorist somehow survived his blindness. Both could be used to establish a fingerprinting database of (hopefully) dead terrorists. We have a joke in South Africa where a boy is asked by his teacher what would happen if he loses both ears? Great was his surprise when the kid answered he will be blind because his hat will fall over his eyes since his ears are not there to keep it up. Yeah I know it is not that great and very old."

The police approach worked because they knew and understood how the terrorist operated and they stayed permanently. They had good support from

the locals (despite the denials today for obvious reasons) who showed them spoor and mostly when the spoor was found it was followed to the end. There are many allegations of torture of suspects and it may have happened. Certainly a couple of policemen were hung for murder but those incidents took place after hours so to speak. The point is that since the terrorists never had a fixed presence inside Owamboland they could not dominate and terrorise the population as much as happened in Rhodesia. Accordingly it was easier to spot foreigners or strange behaviour like too much food being prepared or children not waving as they used to. Being policemen this was picked up immediately and from my own experience I know that you get a feeling which is not natural and comes with years of hunting terrorists and criminals. You just know. Thus the need for torture of civilians was not great and I am disinclined to believe it.

It is however another matter when a wounded or not terrorist decides to keep silent when courteously asked to clarify where his mates were. Most certainly some unpleasantness was asked for and some (apparently for I did not see it) was tied to the bumper of the armoured vehicles and drove through small thorn trees until they saw the error in their ways. Many other methods were used of which water boarding was not one there being a water shortage in that place. Would probably not be fast enough either.

At all times the follow-up operations needed to be done quickly for even they could not track at night whilst the terrorist could still run in the moonlight. Later on we did manage to steal night vision from the Army but it was not in common use. Hence the need for immediate information overruled any thoughts of the Geneva Convention which was anyway never applicable to the police but only to the army. Nothing prevented the police from using whatever ammunition they wanted for a dead man can tell no lies. You can read about this aspect in my book [*Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police*](#).

The police units certainly never received any training in the Geneva Convention and were more concerned with the terrorist laying a charge of assault against us for it is of course a crime to use unpleasant methods even if he is unreasonably silent when asked politely (once) for more information and to explain his beastly ways to us.

Interestingly towards the west of Owamboland called the Kaokoveldt the mountainous terrain prevented the armoured vehicles from operating so they conducted most of their operations on foot and got to be exceedingly fit and scrawny. All unit members could and did fight as infantry when needed. What makes them different was the lack of operational direction from headquarters. Once they left base they could and did go wherever they wanted as long as they got kills which it must be admitted they did.

Rather uniquely the Police COIN Units made fires at night for a barbeque and the hope that any roaming terrorist would attack them which meant spoor the next day. The terrorists soon learned to ignore the invitation. Where they did attack being it a local village or isolated farm or whatever the first available group would arrive at first light and start tracking. The unwritten rule was whoever arrived first could claim the spoor and be in command of whatever groups arrived later to assist. Stealing spoor from another group was unheard of and totally unacceptable behaviour between civilised men.

They also used the leap frogging method of deploying trackers ahead as the Rhodesians taught them and described above somewhere and generally did whatever experience suggested would work. They were professionals and much feared by the rest of the Security Forces who could not and would not understand their need to appropriate what they wanted and needed. All SAP COIN units were infamous for this type of thing and I was very disappointed when I found out the Army would gladly give us what we wanted and needed if we would only be bothered to ask and sign for it. I felt that was a sort of a betrayal and took all my pleasure in life away. It's not the same.

Many Army sappers sighed and stopped sweeping when they had to dive out of the road whilst searching for landmines and the police Casspirs came roaring past with the members sitting on the roof shouting well-meant insults at their wanker ways. It was this type of individualism which made them so effective.

Lastly, whatever nonsense is said on the Internet, they were never parachutists nor trained to be and thought the Army paratroopers had a death wish and needed much psychological help for jumping out of aeroplanes without reason. Some of the individual members because of their Special Forces (Army or Police)

or prior military service backgrounds would have had parachute training but as a unit they were never part of the airborne community and never operated as one either. Thus any parachute wings you see on the Internet are fakes. It is sad to see good people caught out in such fraudulent practices.

Wearing any rank or insignia on the border was in any case never done for obvious reasons and to create much uncertainty with the Army on whom they were dealing with for they respected anything they did not understand. Further unique was that rank never assured command. Only experience did. Hence it was very possible that a junior member would command a car until the higher ranking member got his own. Without the vote and support of the senior black policemen he would never be allowed to command anything. This is usual for most Special Forces though it must be stressed that the unit was not seen as Special Forces but specialist operators and certainly an elite group.

When the Army withdrew from Angola after operation Savannah it was realised that the terrorists would and did establish quite large bases to train and equip their men who would then infiltrate into Owamboland or cross Africa to the east and bother the Rhodesians. The logistic tail for a terrorist is not as large as for conventional forces but still needed. It is a weak point to be exploited. Logically his equipment must come from somewhere. And he must be able to train somewhere. That somewhere is choke points where you can kill many of them in one go. They cannot hide it forever. Therefore the southern part of Angola was invaded and occupied with UNITA on a semi-permanent base. This meant the terrorist bases destroyed and the poor terrorist reduced to walking hundreds of miles through enemy country before reaching Owamboland where the police waited. It is to me a miracle that they kept on coming back and I greatly respect them for doing that. You know from a conventional war view an insurgent operates very much like your own Special Forces but without air support or medical assistance. It takes a very brave fellow to do that.

The war turned more conventional when the Cubans and Soviet Union became directly involved. Up to 40 000 Cuban soldiers were inside Angola at one stage and many Soviet advisors. Some were captured during the external raids. As combat soldiers we never rated the Cubans highly or as real soldiers. Most tried

to avoid too active service and from the radio intercepts I saw they had a jolly good time with the local girls much to the agro of the proud Angolan men. They did however supply vast amounts of weapons in the form of T55 tanks and other conventional arms and equipment.

Successive pre-emptive strikes involving armoured fighting vehicles and at one stage a squadron of tanks with air support caused much disruption and the biggest disagreement of the war called Cuito Cuanavale in 1987-1988. From talking to the Army officers directly involved it seems that the Angolan government forces with two brigades of tanks and Cuban support launched an offensive against UNITA and at the town of Cuito Cuanavale ran into the South Africans who used air strikes and their mobile G5 (155mm or 6.1 inch) howitzers to destroy the brigades from a distance. The South Africans claimed victory as did the Cubans and today both sides disagree violently on who won. It is all about politics.

My own feeling is that the Cubans & FAPLA were destroyed and failed to take their objectives as is proved by the air reconnaissance pictures. UNITA survived and kept on fighting until 2002. The Cubans also executed by firing squad their own commanding general which says it all but let us see what Chester Crocker, the American Diplomat, said at the time *"In some of the bloodiest battles of the entire civil war, a combined force of some 8000 UNITA fighters and 4000 SADF troops not only destroyed one FAPLA brigade but badly damaged several others out of a total FAPLA force of some 18 000 engaged in the three-pronged offensive. Estimates of FAPLA losses ranged upward of 4000 killed and wounded....Large quantities of Soviet equipment were destroyed or fell into UNITA and SADF hands when FAPLA broke into a disorganized retreat... The 1987 military campaign represented a stunning humiliation for the Soviet Union, its arms and its strategy. ... As of mid-November, the UNITA/SADF force had destroyed the Cuito Cuanavale airfield and pinned down thousands of FAPLA's best remaining units clinging onto the town's defensive perimeters."*

** This is true. Many of the sophisticated arms captured were given to the West to play with. How grateful they were I don't know.*

After so many years it does not matter for the purposes of this book who won. What are important are the tactics used and basically the Special Forces lads directed the air strikes from the ground and fast moving artillery with UNITA and 32 Battalion acting as infantry. The SAAF lost a few planes because they did not alter their initial points and were ambushed. Pilots died. Probably because of the escalation in conventional attacks the belligerents met and signed a peace accord ending the occupation of Southern Angola in 1988. At that stage the Cubans were heavily reinforced with tanks and the latest surface to air missiles and building up forces to attack Namibia directly. Few can fail to see the same tactics which the Egyptians used against Israel in the Yom Kippur War by surrounding their conventional forces with missiles against air attacks and designed by their masters in Moscow. This and the presence of the MIG23's certainly worried the South Africans but the invasion never happened as the peace accords was signed before a pre-emptive strike (the predictable South African response) could be launched. It is one of the great *what ifs* of the war for the South Africans were also calling up thousands of men from its reserves.

Worst case scenarios were taken in account in the planning which included falling back if needs be. However, it must be remembered that South Africa had nuclear weapons as last resort. Though it was never seriously considered it could have been delivered by the Mirages using the standard NATO tactic of "*toss bombing.*" Air superiority was never surrendered and the MIG23's would not have stopped them.

By 1989 a United Nations force called UNTAG arrived in Namibia to supervise free and fair elections. Immediately they begged for landmine proof vehicles which were given to them to paint white which was sacrilege. The Army started to leave with all its heavy equipment in long trains and the once busy bases became empty. Today there are only the ruins of it left. Even the police unit Koevoet lost their machine guns and the Air Force disarmed the gunships for the first time since the 1960's in Rhodesia. We all thought that peace arrived.

However the war had one final twist. The Koevoet patrols picked up an armed invasion of terrorists of about 2000 men just before the elections. As you would recognise the pattern by now I don't really need to explain they planned to have

permanent bases inside the country from which they could dominate the elections. It is the same tactic used in Rhodesia and elsewhere. Terrorists are *always predictable* as long as you study history. They follow the same pattern.

Their presence caused uproar and South Africa demanded the right to chuck them out. Something which the United Nations officials first refused but unfortunately for them Mrs Margaret Thatcher had learned a few lessons from the Rhodesian debacle ten years earlier. She persuaded the United Nations representative to allow the Security Forces to get rid of them which they did. Uniquely to the war it was the first time where the terrorist did not bombshell and ran but stood their ground fighting back in a conventional manner. Many hundreds were killed in what was to become known as the Nine Days War for that is how long it took. There is to this day much bitterness amongst the policemen who took the brunt of the fighting without air support for it was only much later that the Air Force became involved because of political excuses which I for one am not the least interested in hearing. It was a betrayal of trust built over 23 years.

Counter-terrorism during Apartheid

Without going into the political background for the reason for the terrorism which is known to all general terrorism in South Africa was unique because the terrorists had the moral high ground right from the start. It is to be wondered at that the Apartheid State lasted as long as it did and probably due to its powerful security forces. When the end came it was not because of any direct terrorist action but because of a political shift which no-one could foresee and caught even the terrorists by surprise. The Security Forces were not in the least defeated and did not consider themselves defeated then or now or even stretched. That is a moot point but since we can learn from history it is worth our while to see what they did to create this line of thinking.

The first line of defence was the South African Police Security Branch dealing with terrorism and intelligence gathering. Based on the British system called Special Branch they used the normal methods as any other secret police by infiltrating and disrupting the terrorists wherever they could. This meant using informants and whatever else needed. They also had the power of arrest and

detention and considered themselves to be an elite group of highly dedicated policemen. From all available sources they did an excellent job and the terrorists were heavily penetrated at all levels right up to the top. As one said to me they could not really do anything without being betrayed and if they really wanted to reveal their sources afterwards many struggle heroes would have been exposed as informants.

They also got a well-deserved reputation for ruthlessness. Without doubt from what came out later many terrorists (they referred to themselves as cadres or activists) were killed in controlled ambushes. Some of the killing was in the form of assassinations but most certainly not by the hundreds as I read on the Internet recently. That figure is absolute nonsense and it bothers me when facts are distorted for it is important to future generations to read the truth. Anything else is hazardous for they will make the wrong deductions and learn nothing which means history will then repeat itself and all the sacrifice for nothing. Surely that is not what we want for our children?

You have to appreciate that any "*black*" type of operation is usually illegal in some way or the other even if done with good intentions. It was the notorious commander of the Police hit squads or assassination team Colonel Eugene de Kock who in his book "*A Long Nights Damage - Working for the Apartheid State*" who first said what is rather obvious and few realised. Almost none of the operations he commanded whilst a member of the Special Branch was legal and he was later sentenced to 212 years (life in practical terms) for crimes thus committed. That his political leaders who gave the instructions to do so are on a nice fat state pension living ordinary lives is something you can judge for yourself. From my view it is utterly disgraceful and shows their lack of moral fibre and cowardness quite clearly. It alone is enough to show the world what weak and small men the nationalists were behind the bravado of respectability they craved. Turned out when push came to shove they would rather wash feet and let their men rot in jail.

The way the Apartheid politicians acted is insightful and shows us an important warning. The *blame game* from politicians should be well understood when dealing with counter-terrorism. They will not under most circumstances stand by

their *Egg Breakers* or military even when things go wrong. It was President Kennedy who said after the Bay of Pigs incident that "*victory has a thousand fathers, but defeat is an orphan.*" Naturally Mr Kennedy did not shrink responsibility and I am not suggesting he did. As we know he was from a different mould but you know what I mean. We saw it in 1990 and no doubt we will see it again. History does not take kindly to a lack of moral fibre but the politicians have a way of re-writing history to be kind to them.

We need to understand how it became possible that a man like Colonel de Kock became an assassin and worse. He started life quite normally and served honourably with the Police for more than two decades. As with most counter-terrorism experts of his age group he was trained by the Rhodesians as part of SAP COIN but so were thousands of others who did not become assassins. Hence this cannot explain his subsequent behaviour. He was also one of the founder members of Koevoet where he participated in more than 400 contacts (shootouts with the terrorists). By all accounts he had an excellent record as a COIN operator.

Being recruited into the Security Branch was sort of logical for many ex-Koevoet members became formal members of the Security Branch when they returned to South Africa. At Koevoet they worked very closely with Security Branch and probably demonstrated their hate of terrorism during action which made them vulnerable for recruitment. As you may imagine Special Branch only took in those they wanted and undoubtedly thought of themselves as an elite unit.

Along the way he became an explosives expert (only Special Forces and the Security Branch had these skills) and took command of a unit known as "*Vlakplaas*" in folklore. Vlakplaas itself refers to a farm which was used as a safe house for his unit which used turned terrorists in a counter-terrorism way instead of the usual counter-insurgency as we saw with Koevoet and the Seleous Scouts. The turned terrorist was known as an "*askari*" or "*vultures*" by the less impressed long haired liberals. They would operate in civilian clothes with unmarked vehicles as quasi policemen / intelligence gatherers and assassins though of course they did not see it as assassination.

Vlakplaas, known as C1 in Police terminology, existed only to hunt terrorists down and to kill them when found. They were not limited to South Africa for its operations and went where needed. It is known that they attacked on more than one occasion MK safe houses outside the borders in neighbouring countries and as with all such actions civilians died in the crossfire. They also tried to kill activists in such a way that the death would be blamed on other factions which was quite easy to do since they sometimes investigated their own murders. Not all attacks were done in the Israeli style of shooting the terrorist from close range. At one stage they tried mailing package bombs which maimed and killed innocents when opened. From a purely professional viewpoint that is wrong and a home goal for it created sympathy to the victim. It would be better to shoot or otherwise kill the target directly.

The fact that de Kock was promoted (and highly decorated) to senior rank shows he enjoyed and received the support of the Apartheid politicians. I suspect he must have been part of a secretive Afrikaner organisation called the Broederbond for in those days no-one who was not part of it could and would be promoted to senior rank. Many religious ministers and school principals were part of this evil and made sure that the white folk kept believing in their cr-p for you will never find me defending Apartheid. As far as I am concerned this was corruption for it made the selection process uneven. They still exist even if in a dilapidated form and may they never again obtain any of their previous powers. Exactly what they are up to today I have no idea.

Logically this meant that we now had state sponsored terrorism which happens all over the world. It was not unique to Apartheid South Africa. The Army also had a similar unit called the CCB or Civil Co-operation Buro responsible for intelligence but somehow went over to more active operations killing a number of activists and terrorists. They also used their Special Forces to take out leadership cadres in safe houses in neighbouring countries. You can read about this in Peter Stiffs excellent book "*The Silent War*."

Legally long hair liberals will argue that all *Egg Breakers* are the same as a terrorist and it is state sponsored terrorism. They kill terrorists or kidnap them or otherwise sort them out all without regard to the law. Indeed, they have a

point though it is a philosophical question which I am in no way qualified to explain to you except to say in my own time we argued as follows. Allow me to quote again from my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#): "Many times we swore we will kill the criminal next time because the courts did not deal with them in the way we thought it should. I believe this is a normal view of any frustrated Policeman. This went one step further when the Security Police approached me to join a unit which specialised in the "terminating of terrorists" through a commissioned officer I trusted. I seriously considered it for I liked the idea of killing terrorists and could morally also justify it by saying "well, let us say we have an asset in place and if we arrest the terrorist he will be blown. But if we kill the terrorist everyone is happy and the asset safe to prevent more attacks." Made sense to me anyway!

I can tell you such thoughts are very dangerous. Luckily a family member persuaded me not to volunteer by telling me the war is about over and Mr Mandela will be released soon. I am grateful to him today even if I thought then he must be mad and a long haired liberal saying such things. But he was right.

I had a long argument with my dad about this when I said "*Dad, why not just kill them and save the court, society and prisons a lot of distress.*" Unlike the Chaplains he did not only shook his head in disbelief but gave me a long lecture on natural justice and that it would be morally wrong. "*Besides such action is murder in real life. Did I join an honourable organisation to commit cold blooded murder? Who decide on who live and die? Arrest them and bring them to the court to deal with and be grateful you don't judge them for they have good reasons for acting the way they do.*" As a lawyer these days I understand his long haired viewpoint and agree with it. Then it took some convincing and I thank God that he took me seriously for I said it in a joking way but was indeed very serious. I would have taken them out given half a chance."

Does it matter who has the moral high ground in such actions or what your intentions are? Not practically for the results are the same. But to protect you I say the *Egg Breakers* must stick to intelligence gathering as far as possible and only be more active when Special Forces cannot do so for whatever reason. As explained before it does not matter practically who pulls the trigger but it feels

somehow better if the terrorist is killed by the uniformed members of the Armed Forces. Why I would not know.

It is also better for publicity and publicity is the one thing which Apartheid South Africa and Rhodesia failed in completely. They did not control the media and in fact ran a few operations to place less bad articles in well-known newspapers overseas. Obviously some journalists would have been paid very well for such services. All men have a price but it may not be money in some cases. From what came out later and always suspected the accredited diplomats did nothing to protect their country's reputation for they felt as long haired liberals that they could not defend Apartheid. That I understand and agree with but I have to wonder why then be part of the system? Why not then do what most long haired liberals don't do and vote with your feet? By not doing so they acted immorally in the eyes of history for as we know you need to stand by your convictions to be taken seriously.

Out of this came a new form of corruption called "*detente*" which was an utter failure borne out of desperation by weak men. Detente simply means to ease tension and was used to describe the way nationalists reached out to Africa during the 1970's. As we know it seriously damaged Rhodesia in the process. To promote detente the Department of Information under Dr Eschel Rhoodie came into being. They soon had the diplomats crying foul for Dr Rhoodie was a man on a mission. Young, handsome and dedicated he opened doors and arranged an assault for the lack of a better word on the liberal media and the world in general to improve South Africa's image. They created pseudo academic and sporting groups to explain the wicked Apartheid ways as only a true spin-doctor could. Along the way they tried to gain control of a South African English language newspaper called the "*The Citizen*" via the classic espionage methods of using front companies. It was in effect a second attempt for the first takeover bid for the "*Rand Daily Mail*" failed.

So what you ask? Well, the media is supposed to be neutral and fair so for a government to take control of a newspaper without anyone knowing it harks back to Dr Goebbels and the many Nazi newspapers. It is dangerous for it subjects the readers to black propaganda bringing government views over in a

wrong way. Why they felt the need to do this within South Africa is interesting to me for it shows they detected enough criticism of their policies to be worried. Why then an English one and not a black language one is something which does not make sense. The English speaking white South Africans were never supporters of Apartheid and also never constituted a threat for even a pooled English vote would not have stopped the Afrikaners at the polls. So I have to deduct that as a counter-terrorism plan it failed right from the beginning for it targeted the wrong people. Once again we can learn from this failure. Target the correct fish.

When the exposure came Dr Rhodie was (after a brief flight) arrested and found guilty of fraud. It must be noticed though that on appeal he was found innocent and he emigrated in disgust and died in America a free man. You can read about this and other clandestine operations in his excellent book "*The Real Information Scandal*." No doubt also that it was all about domestic politics for the battle for succession to replace Premier John Vorster. To make a long and boring story short the moderate candidate was replaced by the hawk known as PW Botha who would dominate the scene for the next decade causing unspeakable damage. One of the ways to gain election was to show that the moderate's candidates' Department of Information "*misappropriated state funds*" to run their black operations. Politics is the dirtiest game in town.

There is nothing per se wrong with black operations and understandably it plays a major role in the war on terrorism but history tells us that oversight is the key. Once a black type of operation is launched and money is paid to agents of influence etc it is very hard to explain legally what you did and why you did it for reasons which the judge will believe. For example you cannot ask legal permission to bribe someone for if what you do is illegal no-one can sanction it from a position of authority. What you did cannot be defended in law and thus once it get to the stage where the police gets involved the *Egg Breakers* are thrown to the wolves. Historically we saw this many times in the past and a need to protect both sides must be found. Any of my readers will understand this concept.

There is also no such thing in law as a presidential pardon or amnesty in advance or for any action not specifically asked for. That means that a blanket amnesty is always unlawful. During the last days of Apartheid a blanket amnesty was given to all members of the Security Branch but it did not stand legally in court for these very reasons. It is also well-known that all outgoing US Presidents sign the pardons the morning before the new guy gets sworn in. For example President Ford pardoned Richard Nixon. More recently President Bush (43) became very unpopular amongst his own staff for refusing to sign a certain pardon for one of his own staff which shows a lot more decency in the man than what is usually ascribed to him by the media.

** Africans loves President Bush (43) by the way. He doubled the aid money for them to waste.*

South Africa overcame the pardoning with its Truth & Reconciliation (TRC) hearings where anyone could admit to his crimes and be pardoned under certain rules like full exposure. Something which the lawyers attacked *ad nauseam* as is their way when feeble in law. Though much criticized I cannot see how else it could have been done. Without it no-one would have come forward and it presented the forum to explain your actions and you had no legal need to apologise for your actions and thus many did not. It did bring closure to some and lasting resentment in others. You either move on or you stay behind according to your choice. It seems that TRC type of hearing is beginning to gain momentum in other post conflict countries.

Ironically there is nothing new to the principle of confessing and to be forgiven. I remember reading in Miles Copeland books twenty years before the TRC hearings that they introduced a letter box in which you could "confess" any lack of security on your part. The reason was if you left your safe unlocked or misplace a file it may have consequences and to keep quiet will be worse than to be able to deal with it. Hence you could admit it and it would not count against you. It was and still is standard procedure in many Agencies. For myself I always want to know if such things happen on my shift. I feel rightly or wrongly I can deal with what I know if I knew.

Another way the Apartheid State fought terrorism was draconian laws which almost guaranteed the death penalty for terrorism and or treason. Mr Mandela was very lucky not to be sentenced to death to be honest. Many were surprised when he got life which usually meant 18 to 20 years. As is known he stayed longer than that behind bars. The even created something called the "Sobukwe clause" to keep a liberation leader in jail which is plain silly and an abuse of law.

Indirectly the law believed the police when they testified in shootings and often found "no one to blame" which is the same as declaring the murderer innocent. Thus many an activist died in police detention with signs of torture on his body. This cannot be denied. As described before we had our own version of waterboarding long before it became news. Other methods such as electric shocks, beatings and pro-longed sleep deprivation were also used. The law allowed us to detain any prisoner almost indefinitely without the need of habeas corpus so we had time to work with them and gain whatever information was needed. You can read about it in my book [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#) if you wish. It also explains the lack of a human rights culture and how the courts were abused into Apartheid legally for the Judges were not necessarily supporters. Such laws are a home goal for the Security Forces because it created genuine martyrs. We think of the free Mandela campaigns and many others including the recent ones on Gautama Bay. There will always be a long haired liberal who demand answers and will not stop unless killed and you cannot kill them all. Where do you draw the line once you go down that route?

It stands to reason that when all the "*political*" prisoners are grouped together in one prison apart from the normal criminals they obviously have time to learn from each other and you from them. This may work for you or against you. It is not new of course for very little under the sun is. It is well-known that during and after World War Two many of the senior German Generals were kept together at Trent Park and other places as prisoners of war. Treated correctly according to the Geneva Convention they unwittingly gave interesting political intelligence to the listeners who planted the microphones before their arrival. Hence it came out that they knew of the murders of the Jews in Russia. This meant that the Allied leaders must also have known.

So it may be possible to deduct a lot by running such an operation against prisoners. Whether this happened with the South African political prisoners I would not know and never heard of it happening for our ways were a bit more direct. I read in the newspapers that during the recent far right treason trial the authorities apparently breached lawyers' confidentiality by bugging interview rooms. That was exceedingly silly if it happened for it will lead to an immediate mistrial. Even in Apartheid South Africa this type of behaviour was not allowed.

Another adoption of this tactic is the old "*stool pigeon*" which sometimes work well depending on how far the detainee is drugged and abused. One thing which the Al Qaeda operatives do is to be trained against these techniques but as you know it is one thing to be aware of it and another when your enemy have you to play with. Very few men or women are able to withstand continued interrogation. Most will at some stage give up and talk.

Another way was pure intimidation. For example the Police Riot Units was issued video cameras to record the rioters for evidential purposes. The idea was to be able to defend themselves in court with unalterable evidence and at the time made sure who the ringleaders were. That is where the intimidation factor came in and it worked well enough though the cameras were sometimes abused to make erotic movies with.

Every terrorist attack, whether murder (of which there were thousands) or bomb attack was treated like a crime scene inside South Africa and in the cities. This stopped after a while on the border area which was a mistake in my eyes. All attacks must be treated like a crime for that is how you build up enough intelligence to understand the modus operandi of a particular terrorist. There is always a pattern to identify them with and it makes the next one preventable.

The second line of defense was SAP COIN who roamed on the South African borders preventing infiltration. There was never genuine insurgency type terrorism in South Africa except for a few landmines next to Zimbabwe in 1985 which killed innocent civilians. The COIN units still made sure to follow up on all suspicious tracks and held roadblocks all over the border areas to make it as difficult as possible. There was no insurgency as such because ANC learned from their defeats in Rhodesia and Angola that it would be suicide to establish bases

in the rural area. Hence they always tried to infiltrate into the *townships* (black parts of cities, not always slums). There they established safe house and training bases. They tried and succeeded to create much internal unrest which was suppressed by the SAP COIN Riot Units. They called it "mass mobilisation" and made sure the liberal media always reported the police brutalities.

Thirdly, all units of the SAP or Army who bumped into a terrorist killed him. Shootouts did happen but it was mostly chance encounters like at a road block or when found planting bombs etc. The planting of bombs were not the IED type aimed at military convoys but simply high explosives inside a restaurant or other civilian targets of opportunity. As with all such things the value of it was very much a home goal for it brings much negative publicity to the cause. We can learn from this and make sure that the atrocities of the terrorist are always well documented. This is another reason for police type investigations.

Divide and rule is often used as a counter-terrorism method and we saw how the Rhodesians created RENAMO in Mozambique which was later taken over by South Africa. There is no doubt in my mind that South Africa did the same with an organisation called the "*Wit Doeke*" which refers to a state sponsored group who attacked the rioters for being "*criminals*" and chased them away from their town. As you can imagine it caused a lot of bloodshed. From my own experiences I can tell you that we in the Police were quite sympathetic towards our enemy's enemy so to speak. Of course at our level we did not know about the skulduggery behind our backs.

Soviet intelligence was especially good at this type of thing and we think of Operation Trust where they ran a pseudo white Russian group in France called the "*Monarchist Union of Central Russia*." By doing so they were always one step ahead of what their enemies were planning. The bad news is that they would be more than willing to sacrifice their own people to look good. It is the only way and I am sure we can learn from such operations. Counter-terrorism is never in isolation but always a multi-level approach.

Arms cache's when found was sometimes booby trapped to explode prematurely when disturbed. The idea was to create doubt on the reliability of their weapons in the terrorists mind. The other way would be to blow it up or confiscate it for

own use or to watch it (surveillance) and see who comes close. All SAP COIN and many Military Units were trained to use communist weapons in an emergency.

The third line of defense was the activities of the Apartheid intelligence Agency called NIS (National Intelligence Service) and not much is known about them being very small and secretive. They acted as far as is known with the usual methods of spying and intelligence gathering all over the world combining both counter espionage and espionage in one Agency. The forerunner of this Agency was under control of a police general and called BOSS. Thereafter it had civilian control. Their successes were seen in the arrest of a Navy Commodore as a Soviet GRU spy in 1983 but that only happened because of a defection of a Soviet officer to the West. He was sentenced to life imprisonment and released restored to his rank under the TRC amnesty deals. Probably got back pay too for all I know. Ever since he was married to a foreigner who acted as his courier it seems that the vetting process must have been thoroughly pathetic to start with. His value as a spy is debatable and I don't think he rates with a Philby or the one known as Suvorov who turned out to be an excellent historian. His books are well worth reading and the "*Inside the Aquarium*" is the best book on Soviet Military Intelligence (GRU) ever written.

As an Agency the NIS had no powers of arrest and had to rely on the SAP to arrest spies for them if they could find them. No doubt they were also heavily involved in sanction busting and obtained equipment for South Africa including tanks and electronics. I know for a fact they had quite a few agents of influence around the world who was well paid. They never had a sabotage capability as far as we know. There is a constant rumour that they assassinated Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme in 1986 because he supported the ANC against Apartheid South Africa an about to make a speech about it. Unless better evidence comes to light I really cannot see how they could have done it being intelligence gathers only by nature. Besides that every prime minister of every country in the world supported the ANC so it was in itself nothing special and Sweden not an important trade ally. I already described the food which ABBA apparently donated to the terrorists before so we knew about the Swedish sympathy for the ANC.

Because of it Volvo removed their dealerships from South Africa and only returned decades later. Therefore it was no big deal whatever Olof Palme had to say or not and certainly not a good enough reason for assassination. It would have been counterproductive with all the negative press. The allegations were never proven and from what I read the evidence is nothing but speculative. It will never stand up in court. Furthermore no-one admitted to that at the TRC hearings where they admitted to everything and whatever. Perhaps the rumours came from the ones who could benefit from it and did benefit.

One episode that NIS was involved in was the failed coup de e'tat attempt to take over the island of Seychelles by using many former Rhodesian soldiers in 1981. If you read the accounts by mercenary Colonel Mike Hoare and others I spoke with NIS acted extremely amateurish. The idea behind the Seychelles attack was to gain landing rights for South Africa for most countries banned the national air service from flights across their airspace. You can read Colonel Hoare's excellent book called "*The Seychelles Affair*" for details. Without doubt it made the neighbouring island of Mauritius the new South African holiday destination. The Seychelles government being a bit upset with South Africa for a while did not welcome any of its citizens for years. It cost their economy dearly.

What did we learn?

From the Rhodesian experience we learned the absurdity of political pardoning for crimes committed during terrorism. The current Zimbabwean president was released on parole which he broke and became even a worse enemy to society. It will be plain madness to let any terrorist out on parole for his word means nothing and the means to an end principle will be applicable as an excuse. Thus as a political settlement this will never work.

The Malayan principles demanded a single strong military leader which they got under General Templar. He was able to take command and appoint younger more active officers to get something positive done. Even the police commissioner was immediately fired during this process. Thus your command and control lines must be very clearly sorted out. Without it you are doomed to failure for COIN is 95% political & intelligence based and 5% military. As soon as this ratio is changed you will fail in counter-terrorism for a terrorist needs some

sort of grievance serious enough to commit and act of terrorism. If not it does not matter what he does he will not succeed. In this regard look at Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City bombing. Did that cause a general rise of right wing insurgency in America? Of course not! It was an utter failure and soon forgotten.

I read the other day the US Army manual on COIN which says "*Counter insurgency is not just thinking man's warfare—it is the graduate level of war.*" That is true as we saw in our three case studies above. *Counter-terrorism* is far above that for it is much more complex and never in isolation. COIN is but one small part of your counter-terrorism efforts. The basics will always work but each war is unique. Time and time again the Malayan principles did not work in other conflicts. Thus we need to be smarter than what we are now.

Chapter 7

Understanding the terrorist mentality

I claim no knowledge of psychology but you can bet your last penny that many who do try for decades to understand why a terrorist becomes a terrorist and if there is any logical way to spot him from a distance (called profiling today). Most who give up for a terrorist is not much different from anyone else in most aspects. It is this very nature of terrorism which makes it so difficult to combat. However, as I always say, it is not rocket science. History gave us valuable trends and I believe there are patterns and the patterns once identified can be found. It is the same as with any other criminal investigation and certain predictions (and deductions) can be made.

Grouping of terrorists

We identify five groups of terrorists each with its own mind-sets which is generally based on one of the following:

- 1) Nationalist-separatist as we saw in our examples above as well as the IRA in Northern Ireland as a non-African example.
- 2) The religious fundamentalist as we have on the war on terrorism that is not bound to any one country and have the West as a common enemy!
- 3) What is known as new religious by whom we mean cults like the Aum Shinrikyo in Japan.
- 4) The social revolutionaries as we saw in West Germany with the Baader Meinhoff gang angry about the past and guilty about the present.
- 5) Right-wing terrorism as with the attack in Oklahoma. They may be found anywhere and are the easiest to defeat.

There is a group of experts who believe that the "*green activists*" should be classified as the sixth group since many of their activities is terrorism or borderline-terrorism. Certainly much of their actions are indeed unlawful but I feel they don't have the intention of violently overthrowing the State. That is rather important.

As you can see the above covers very much all parts of society and they have nothing besides terrorism in common. To classify them into sub sections will lead to academic debates which is useless to us. Broadly speaking they have a single aim which is to use terror to gain their objectives.

Home goal myths

During the cold war most security experts believed no terrorist group will use weapons of mass destruction as it would be counter-productive to their cause and provoke a response which will destroy them. They pointed out that any normal bomb exploding in a civilian target like a restaurant or bar usually brought much condemnation from the media. Indeed we saw that in South Africa too when the Magoo Bar bomb planters were not treated as struggle heroes after the war. They also believed that for the same reason the Pope or a Royal Family will not be attacked and events proved them wrong.

None of the usual ideas are applicable on religious fundamentalists. For them it is about destruction only and not about attracting media interest to their cause. They also have no particular desire to live in the place where the mass destruction took place so they simply don't care if it is destroyed in the process since they would want to live there anyway. Likewise they have no home base at the target like the Mau Mau did or the IRA in Northern Island. This alone makes them more than willing to use the bomb for it suits their needs admirably being relatively small in size with abnormally large destructive powers.

I say again that weapons of mass destruction in terrorist's hands are a very serious threat. We seem to forget because of the Iraq fiasco when it could not be found or never existed to start with that the threat did not diminish one iota though the ability to attack reduced as we explained before. It is not a figment of an unpopular Presidents' imagination. Twice in modern times weapons of mass destruction were used in an attack. The first in 1995; when the doomsday cult Aum Shinrikyo released sarin gas in the Tokyo subway system! Luckily only 13 died for the sarin gas was not pure enough. It could have been much worse although we feel for the dead. Next in 2004 radicals in Iraq tried to do so again by exploding an artillery shell but it is unknown if they understood that it contained the binary precursors of sarin. They may have thought it was a normal

artillery shell which they use for IED. The design of the shell meant it needed flight to mix the ingredients to become effective sarin gas. Two soldiers needed treatment for the infection and I don't know what happened to the bombers.

As a weapon Sarin gas will kill you within one minute if you are lucky. It is 500 times more deadly than cyanide which is frightening to say the least. The first symptom is a runny nose and tightness of the chest. Then come nausea, drooling and difficulty in breathing. You will start to vomit, defecate and lose control of your bodily functions and go into a coma. In the end you will die of asphyxia. It is not a nice way to die.

Sarin gas is not new and been in military armouries since the 1950's. All countries have it for it is relatively simple to manufacture. We know of only one instant where it was used by Security Forces and that was when Saddam bombed the Kurds in the 1980s with it. He ordered a lot more than just one bombing attack and over six years and about 5000 Kurds died. Women and children for the gas attack whoever is close by.

Since the 1950's the military developed anti-dotes which works well if treated quickly enough. But you know the problem is that the terrorist attack is always directed at civilians who are very vulnerable to it. From the end of World War One all gas related attacks are banned by international conventions because of the carnage caused. During the Second World War Germany had a massive fright when they intercepted that huge amounts of "*gas*" was required for the American Armies until they realised it meant gasoline. No side used gas during the war against each other's troops for fear of retaliation.

I think it would very foolish to believe that if the terrorists find or manufacture a weapon of mass destruction that he will not use it. The mere fact that he wants it is to indicate he plans to use it against you. Plainly it is very irresponsible to believe differently or dismiss it as a President Bush (43) invention. It is most definitely not. The old rules do not apply since 9/11 anymore.

Dirty Bombs

Part of the weapons of mass destruction is what is known as a dirty bomb or RDD (radiological dispersal device). This is an area denial weapon for it

commonly refers to radioactive leaks which will contaminate a large area. It is not a nuclear explosion and once again not new. Many historians believed that Germany would have bombed New York in 1946 with dirty bombs if the war did not end in 1945. Their ballistic rockets would have made defense impossible. The effects of such a weapon are in some ways comparable to the Chernobyl disaster though in general the experts are dismissive of its effectiveness which they say is not deadly. With fast and decisive reaction by the government it may be contained and if radioactive washed off. Consequently they don't see it as a weapon of mass destruction but of mass disruption.

Honestly I think they are wrong and busy with academic cr-p by saying such things. The intent of the terrorist is to cause mass destruction and it will cause enough havoc to be seen as an excellent weapon of choice with the ingredients being readily available in all developed countries. I am concerned when people who should know better try to be dismissive of reality. The terrorist knows its value and you can classify it as you wish but the effects will be bad enough for those exposed. It will also cause serious economic disruption and should be taken seriously.

In the good old days in the 1970's the terrorist's skills were limited to what he learned at training camp. Thus he knew about weapons and explosives but in no way could he be seen as an engineer able to create sophisticated dirty weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. But now it is known that terrorist groups are increasingly recruiting specialists in engineering, medicine, chemistry, physics, computer programming and you have to ask yourself why for the skills they are trying to recruit is betraying their intentions. We already know that countless cyber-attacks are made on America and the West. I wonder if we realise the danger of such attacks. It is quite possible to crash an economy with it. Everything today is online or networked in some way or another. It is your most vulnerable spot and the terrorist does not even need to leave his living room. Mark my words; it is going to escalate a lot.

We also know that Al Qaeda is trying something known in the trade as "*sleepers agents*" where they actively advise the newly recruited members to stay in their countries and become active later on. Meaning they are building a network of

terrorists in your midst with no authentic contact except via the Internet. This takes away the travelling to parts of the world which will raise eyebrows at the Agencies. Hence there are no red flags on their passports and they are below the radar so to speak. Nothing prevents these men to study chemical engineering or whatever is needed and then abuse that knowledge to create a dirty bomb. It is known to have happened with the Japanese incident. This is the worst scenario possible for it was long believed that terrorists never acted alone. It was criminologist Franco Ferracuti who noted that there is "*no such thing as an isolated terrorist; that's a mental case.*"

I don't think that is true anymore. As the young and impressionable Muslims hear and see what happened in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib prison they research the Internet for answers and find enough websites to explain the basics of terrorism survival to them. That is why the so called "*Al Qaeda Manual*" exists. This is a big problem and very difficult to counter though there is ways which I am not discussing here for reasons which I am sure you will understand.

Terrorists are not mental cases

I wish the public would understand that a successful terrorist is not a mental case or mad and well able to work in groups which is important for all psychologists agree that a schizophrenic cannot. This eliminates the crazies almost immediately. Certainly we know of some mentally ill ones but they are rare and being unpredictable not welcomed either. Besides it may not be good to the public image of the terrorist group to have genuinely mentally ill people in their ranks. They are untrustworthy. Psychopaths and other mentally ill people are simply too unreliable for terrorism for you need to be able to control a terrorist to prevent destruction of the group. He further should not draw attention to himself and understand what the word "discreet" means in real life. Otherwise he would never be able to blend into the crowds before or after his terrorism deed.

Terrorist attacks needs careful planning and attention to detail which is not characteristic of mentally ill people but shows much normality and certainly intellect from the leaders. The terrorist groups are dominated by a single leader which makes them very much the same as a cult with absolute obedience. As

such it is very unlikely that decisions are made on a democratic base and it is good thing too to have a strong leader who knows what he wants done. It creates confidence. On the other hand if the Security Forces can kill him it creates panic in the terrorist's ranks and they lose direction. It is a major weakness and in long run bound to cause them considerable trouble. Let me explain. All good leaders have lieutenants who are able to take over at any time. They tend to strive in competitive orientated environments. A weak leader has "yes men "around him and actively discourages anyone who may be able to replace him. This creates a lack of leadership element at the highest level in terrorist groups.

The democratic systems of government are designed to encourage competition known as elections every now and then. Therefore there is always adequate leadership and the laws very clear on succession. Historically we saw that when the US Presidents were assassinated. The American nation knows what will happen next and who is next in line and they will for a short while support him until it becomes business as usual between the two main parties. A catch 22 is rarely able to work in real life and the mere fact that the succession is prearranged makes Presidential assassination unfeasible to the terrorist. It has no real value for simply put life will go on and the dead President replaced within minutes of his unfortunate death. Normal society is not a cult or terrorist gang where the death of a leader is much more serious and leave them fluttering around.

From a counter-terrorism perspective the assassination of the President is not a big deal at all. Yes I know I am cynical and obviously I do not wish ill on him. It will be better for the terrorist to kill the head of the counter-terrorism Agencies than the President. He is simply not that important.

Interesting is that most terrorist leaders order the strategic objective and then leaves the operational details (tactical) to his lieutenants to work out. They will always then activate it to the cell that as we know is isolated from the rest for security reasons. However, the leader usually makes the final decision.

How educated are terrorists?

It all depends on which era we look at. As a general rule the Western social group were highly educated with college degrees and some were studying for post graduate degrees when they became terrorists. The more educated the more idealistic they are and we see the same trend in Al Qaeda. Ominously Islamic fundamentalist terrorists come from middle-class families which makes me wonder what they were taught at school. Most certainly in our examples the black schools and teachers were thoroughly indoctrinated to be sympathetic to the terrorist cause. The same in reverse with us and as you know government normally controls what is taught at school. It is a big deal.

Most terrorist leaders are highly educated. In our examples in the previous chapter all the leaders in Rhodesia and South Africa except one were qualified lawyers holding LLB degrees which are the same as JD in American. It is not the easiest of degrees to obtain and is highly rated. This is thought-provoking for it is a known fact that lawyers makes very good intelligence officers. During the Second World War both 6 and 5 went out of their way to recruit (wartime only) practising lawyers or barristers as they are called in the UK. The FBI as we know has more than its fair share and so does other Agencies. Lawyers tend to remember everything and forget nothing and are quite ruthless. No wonder they are involved.

At the same time the lower ranks of the terrorists groups are mostly uneducated and jobless youths who are seduced by the desire of adventure and serving a cause they believe in. It may start with a relatively harmless protest or sympathy. Many times the new recruits are from support groups and it is known that active recruitment is taking place in Mosques. It takes time to become a fully-fledged member of a terrorist group for it a highly selective process which can take up to a year or more. They are sensibly paranoid about penetration which is a weak point to be exploited.

In the recruit it often means a gradual change which is seen in the way he dresses and acts. Many Western ones stop using alcohol and dress more traditionally. They also grow beards and are seen discussing their new faith and beliefs in public. Clearly all these things are just indications and may also mean

that the young man has found his way in life. Not all who take religion seriously are automatically terrorists in the making. You know how cynical I am.

Since many terrorists are undoubtedly idealists they also feel frustrated with normal life and the traditional road is never for them. As a group they are easily influenced by role models and if that role model is a terrorist they may well become one.

Female terrorists

As a general statement it is correct to say that by far the most terrorists are male though there are many advantages to a terrorist group to have female recruits. They are simply better terrorists for they all have demonstrated abilities to be cool and calm under stress. More so than men and though we often joke in my books about my deplorable lack as a male to do more than one thing at the same time females are well-known to multi-task well. They have that ability to get the job done and are great organisers.

Being female they are less likely to be searched and to be dealt with the same suspicion as males. This makes them excellent couriers as indeed happened during SOE operations in France during the Second World War. They are able to move around in places where no man would be able to.

Psychologically females are in general much more grown-up and dedicated than the same age group males which make them pretty good at terrorism. They will not be side-tracked once they decide on a cause. That story of a woman being unable to keep secrets is nonsense in real life. They can keep secrets better than most men and have an inbuilt lie-detector since birth. Sort of comes naturally to all women which make them paradoxically very good interrogators.

Experience showed they are tougher to crack than males under interrogation and able to withstand any kind of torture including rape for much longer. They will not give information for a reduced sentence as most males will do. I have no idea why not but it is what case studies shows.

What is also beyond doubt is that rationalism that her actions were wrong in some way has the best results. It is utter nonsense and chauvinistic to say

women is irrational or illogical. If that does not work the average female terrorist will only talk if made to talk which is not easy for she is naturally more able to withstand pain than males. Abuse in any shape or form only makes her more stubborn if I may use such an ugly word.

Desensitising

Since killing people is an unnatural act we find that in almost all cases of terrorism the Victims are dehumanised as "infidels" or "pigs" or whatever. Many terrorists show no regret for their actions because of it for they don't consider the act to be murder. I suppose it is very understandable and no doubt we do the same. A dead terrorist sound so much better than a dead father or mother or son. It is part of the game and during the cold war we used the word "communist" to indicate evil. Of course from the other side "capitalist" had the same meaning. Especially in the military a number of words such as "*wasted*" etc are used to dehumanise the subject. It is all about surviving the great game.

Fanatics

All terrorists are fanatic in some way and quite prepared to die for their cause. They don't prescribe to General Patton's quote that "the object of war is not to die for your country but to make the other guy die for his." That is a military thing. Terrorism has other rules. Remember for a terrorist it is an honour to take as many of the infidels with them as possible and if that means a suicide bomb for the cause then it is quite acceptable. Suicide to escape everyday problems though is prohibited by the Holy Koran and frowned upon as is with most religions.

You may not know this but for many centuries suicide was seen as a crime in Christian laws also and the deceased's property be forfeited to the King. Nor could such a person be buried in a Christian cemetery. Yes this was the law in England until 1961 and in many other countries it still is. Of course we are not now talking about assisted suicide or euthanasia.

There are only two groups who tend to go for suicide missions. The Islamic radicals and North Korean saboteurs and it seem that revenge plays a role. Many of the videos left behind by the bombers state that they die for something which

happened in the past. This confirms that a silly act by the Security Forces can indeed create a new terrorist. Part of their fanaticism can be seen in how they re-act against members who want to drop out even if not intending to betray them. Like the Mau Mau a new member is expected to commit an act of terror to bind him to them and show loyalty I suppose. It is the same method used by the Selous Scouts in reverse. The new recruit must betray his comrades to the Security Forces to gain trust. No doubt that it is a dirty game on both sides.

Accordingly if he wants to drop out he may be killed and sometimes have to if he knows too much and constitute a threat. Executing a drop-out is a home goal for it forces the drop-out to make a deal with the Agencies to gain protection and a new life somewhere else. Likewise the one who is doing the killing may not be too happy about it.

There is always pressure inside the group to commit violence and for the action-orientated member it is torture to sit around. Highly motivated he wants to do something and that something is always to attack the infidel. Sometimes they link their manhood and honour to their acts of terrorism. This means to me they will not be good *Egg Breakers* for they don't have the patience for intelligence gathering. It also makes them vulnerable against false flag operations. The longer they live underground the more they move away from reality for few can do the things normal people do for relaxation. No doubt it affects their thinking and general behaviour. As a group they tend to think subjective about the world and not objectively. A very definite them versus us mentality exists which can be exploited.

There is no warning

Historically it happened that a terrorist would call before the bomb explodes to warn about it but that was limited to nationalist groups worried about their own fish. It is very unusual to have such warnings with radicals. Typically there is no warning whatsoever. With assassination especially there is none. Interestingly I read a report stating that none of the US Secret Service profiles of the loner or threatening person ever murdered a President before which made it totally wrong. Out of the many dozens of people who actually tried to kill a celebrity or

public official not a single one made a threat to do so beforehand. They just acted for they knew that threats would make the murder more difficult.

This makes *motive and behavioural pattern* the key words now. As an example in counter-terrorism you may concentrate on the logistics of bomb making. We all know which ingredients if bought or stolen in large scale will be used to make a decent size bomb. So that is what you are looking for. Not a silly warning in the mail though of course all the threats must be investigated. At the same time you are able to track those who researches bomb making techniques on the Internet. It is an early warning. Why would any normal person want to have such knowledge?

What age are terrorists

It depends on what period we look at. During the cold war the average European left wing terrorist was in his middle twenties. They usually came from middle-class families and exposed to Marxism somewhere in the past.

In Islamic states terrorists are much younger. Boys from the age group 11 to 16 are popular to recruit because they don't question orders and are easily manipulated. In general it is said that a child growing up in violent areas is more likely to develop into a terrorist as an adult than is a child growing up in peaceful part of the world. In this regard we need to understand also the child need to have access to a terrorist group which is not usually found in a peaceful part of the world. For me this means that unless your aid money is actually reducing poverty the recruiting grounds for new terrorists are growing rapidly. It brings us back to the use of available resources to your own good and not for the sake of the social elite who are despised.

All terrorist leaders are much older than their operatives and from their late 30's and upward. Many are married whilst the rank and file is not though serious relationships between members may be seen as a marriage and respected. There are very few women terrorist leaders for it is a male dominated society.

Al Qaeda membership is primarily for fit young males from Egypt, Jordan, Yemen, Iraq, Algeria, Syria or Sudan with average age of 22. If not on those passports they will be Arabs on British passports or as we know South African.

That makes the new wave of white or Caucasian recruits dangerous for they fall outside the norm.

Dress code

Terrorists tend to dress according to what they want to infiltrate and look like everyone else. Logically they must be unremarkable and "normal." Particular social skills are important not to look out of place. Counter-terrorism experts can deduct a lot from the clothes found in a terrorist's wardrobe. For instance the Lockerbie bomber was traced by clothing items.

Insurgents will almost always wear a uniform for several reasons. Firstly he may be seen quite far in the veldt if not for he needs to blend into his surroundings. Furthermore he needs to dominate and terrorise the locals which is easier done in uniform and lastly he dislikes blue on blue fire fights as much as you do. He may also be proud of his uniform.

State terrorism and private terrorism

We have a paradox in modern times which we saw from the 1990's when radicals first became a serious threat to the West. In the cold war it was relatively easy to gain training, support and weapons if you wanted to be a terrorist. You simply approached either Moscow or Washington with the correct rhetoric and they would fall over themselves to support you. I call that state terrorists which is not the same as state sponsored terrorism where the organs of state commit the terrorism. But when the cold war ended the game changed dramatically for suddenly your rhetoric became rather unimportant to Washington and Moscow ceased to exist as a supplier. Consequently you found the poor terrorist selling counterfeit goods to get enough money to pay for his weapons and training for it became a mercenary business. Yes you still had a few countries that on religious reasons alone would be willing to take over where Moscow let off. Countries such as Libya come to mind as one. After 9/11 that stopped for America essentially said they will attack any country which harbours terrorists and promptly did so with Iraq and Afghanistan. Even Libya suddenly stopped supplying the needs of terrorists and today there are not many countries willing to take the chance.

What this tells me is that terrorists can be found by their bank accounts. They have to be able to live somewhere and since they do not work and are not state funded they have to be either already rich (Bin Laden) or be paid in some other way. How else can they survive? I know the profile of the 9/11 attackers showed regular money transfers from which they withdrew all in cash at one go thus minimising the time spend at a bank. It also stands to reason that they will have no need for a cash flush bank account after the deed. This brings me back to police techniques in counter-terrorism. Following money trails is standard procedure and nothing new when dealing with syndicates. The money trails says it all and gives a lot of new leads for no terrorist lives in complete isolation. He likes to live with his cell.

The experts say to be effective each counter-terrorism action must be adapted to suit the particular group which is logical. Others say that *the Al Qaeda problem is international* because you find their operatives in many different countries. This was obviously believed for at the last count the Western Agencies are busy in 60 countries with counter-terrorism. I believe the theory is wrong. Terrorism is always *local even if in many countries* for it has to happen somewhere and that somewhere is local for the locals. Let me explain. It may be in a foreign country to you or me like the attacks in Kenya on the American Embassies in 1998 but for the Kenyans it is local. They know and understand their own ways and culture and are well able to take care of counter-terrorism in their own country. They don't need nor want an invasion from you. So all comes down to the locals which must sort out the terrorism where it occurs. You have to follow him to where he is and use the locals for information. They are much better equipped to operate in amongst their own than what you will ever be for obvious reasons. Yes you may assist with you *Egg Breakers* and should do so but never with conventional forces for we saw how that turned out.

Al Qaeda is not an international problem but every country individually. Even if you operate in 60 countries it stays a local problem. It may even be deducted that you need the locals more than what they need you. It is not they who are under attack but you.

Chapter 8

The future

I think that the most important message in this book is that counter-insurgency is not the beginning and end of counter-terrorism. It is but a small part and though important it is only fought in exceptional circumstances. It will not be automatically part of any future counter-terrorism operations in Sub Saharan Africa and it should never be self-created as was the insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan by overstaying your welcome. Hence this message to stay out of Africa with your military unless it is for a very short time as in a pre-emptive strike. Anything else will escalate beyond what you expected and you don't have the political will to stay on and will not only lose valuable soldiers and equipment but much prestige. We know that you will leave after the next election at home.

Being the world's policeman does not mean you have a positive duty to save everyone and whatever you do is for your own benefit or should be. It is always better to raise your defences at home and make it as difficult as possible to be attacked by foreign terrorists where he is a radical or whatever. In this aspect you are doing very well and you are winning the counter-terrorism war. The barriers are very much higher than what they used to be.

You don't have any insurgency problems at home and there is no indication that you ever will. Thus the domestic terrorism should be dealt with by the Agencies created to do so. Leave the Military out of it for they are not needed for such operations on home soil or anywhere else for that matter. As we saw time and time again in history it is not possible to win a war on behalf of a weak nation unless you have a conventional enemy as you did in Korea and the Second World War. If a nation is not willing to help itself with decent non-corrupt government there is nothing you can do to save it from itself. I suppose it is their democratic right to go down in flames. Some call it life. I also think the domino theory of the 1960's is proven wrong in history so there is no need to re-activate it again.

Your approach in Africa is wrong. It does not help your cause in any way to support the social elite who are playing you for fools. Because of this you are

unable to catch your target fish and are seen as weak, corrupt and part of the problem. You also underestimate Africa and are less professional than usual when here. Be warned it will bite you at some stage.

We know from history that the much revered Malayan Principles did not work in Africa. We also saw the concepts which worked extremely well. Firstly that would be the pseudo operations and the fireforces as described as well as the visual reconnaissance from the Rhodesian Air Force. We saw that it was a police unit acting as highly mobile mechanised infantry who had the most success later in South Africa's war and not the military. We saw that air-superiority is needed in COIN also as in all war. In every one of the COIN operations we noted that conventional troops had almost no function and stumbled across the terrorist almost by accident. From this we can deduct that they are not to be used for COIN or anything which is not conventional with clearly defined objectives. They are simply wasted resources at best and fairly nice targets at worst.

Counter-terrorism is a police technique war done by the *Egg Breakers* and Special Forces with as much air support as needed. Everything is based on intelligence or information gathering or you will enter the war blind and be humiliated. It is never in isolation and the desired fish must be caught amongst the other fish which is not easy but history shows us it can be done. All you need is information or intelligence and the rest is easy for you have the military capability to do with the identified fish whatever you please when you please. So it is a matter of fishing.

It stands to reason that with the pressure being applied on the terrorist in the rest of the world the more he would be inclined to operate and hide in Sub Saharan Africa. We know that the region is seen as corrupt but still have excellent communication and other facilities. As a hiding place for radicals it is tailor made. History tells us it already happened that the terrorists used South African passports and there is other evidence such as alarming increases in Mosques in many of the Sub Saharan countries. This is indicative of more trouble to come. Regretfully this is an environment in which you are not specialists but there are many experts who are. They are not historically your enemy though they are neutral now for reasons explained.

The wise fisherman will have his nets already in place before the fish arrives for how else will he know they are there unless he caught one? Throwing your nets afterwards is not only desperation but probably too late. This book attempted to show that your net is small and full of holes and worse targets the wrong fish. I hope the warning is understood for I could not make it plainer to you. Neutrality amongst the general population is not to your advantage. It is to your detriment. If you continue to do business as usual you will be left vulnerable without knowing from where the next attack will come and then you have lost the operational initiative.

Your first line of defense is the *Egg Breakers* who are the only people able to show where to strike and when to strike. They can only operate in Africa with local assistance. Without good local intelligence you are doomed to suffer unnecessary casualties. Al Qaeda is a localised problem. Not international.

I wish you much successful fishing for the future.

End of book

About the author:

K is a legal & risk management professional with more than 20 years' legal & management experience in South & West African jurisdictions. He obtained his B Juris & LLB in 1997 from the University of the Orange Free State (Bloemfontein, South Africa) and was an admitted attorney in the High Court of South Africa between 1998 and 2006 after which he worked as legal advisor & risk manager for various companies in South Africa and Nigeria. Before that he was a member of the South African Police for six years and was awarded the SA Police Medal for Combating Terrorism twice.

K is the founder of JKLS Africa, an exclusive legal consultancy specialising in legal risk reduction in African jurisdictions based in South Africa and a frequent speaker on legal forensics on Voice of America. His favourite pastime is Military History and particularly the American Civil War which he finds much less boring than law.

Connect with the Author online

Contact K at: meanstreets45@gmail.com

JKLS Africa: <http://www.jklsafrica.com/index.php>

Extract from K's eBook [Mean Streets - Life in the Apartheid Police](#)

On Religion

The SAP had no sense of humour with regard to religion, and was in fact held it in very high repute. Religion is not the same thing as faith in my eyes. Faith is personal. Religion is the outward worship of a god and therefore of no value to anyone without faith. The Chaplains were all commissioned officers (and thus not to be trusted and to be avoided at all costs), and there were many jokes about them.

Every time we went on border duty we were presented with a pocket Bible with the Police Star on its cover, and a nice message from someone important on the inside. They were stored in a box next to the Chaplain. I collected six of them through the years though almost all are lost. They came in differing colours and languages and included the New Testament and Psalms only.

There was a rumour that one of these pocket Bibles actually stopped a bullet during a contact (shootout/fire fight) in Rhodesia. I doubt that because I tested the rumour by firing clean through one with an AK47...much to my disgust. We never had bullet proof vests by the way—those came after my time. Still, I diligently carried my issued Bible with me. Just in case you understand! Survival is a terrible concept.

Once, being obnoxious according to the perplexed Chaplain, I asked why the issued Bible repeated itself in the first four books of the New Testament and would it not be better just to choose one gospel and get done with? It was not as if you needed more than one statement on the same subject because the Apostles were fairly reliable witnesses and would not any of the gospels do? And then add something practical, like Proverbs perhaps? He had no answer, and just

shook his head and muttered to himself under his breath about the obnoxiousness of Flying Squad members. Obviously I was ahead of my time because it made a lot of sense to me. It still does.

I remember a friend being ordered into the Chaplains' office because he was concerned about his heavy drinking. He asked: "*Son, I understand that you have a drinking problem?*" My friend answered in all righteousness. "*Yes Chaplain, I do not earn enough money to support it.*" Yeah, he was sent to the wine school immediately and we only saw him a few months later, sober, upset, and divorced, since his wife thought that he'd become too boring now that he was sober, (true). He had died the next year while on border duty, and she had promptly married another policeman. When he died in a car accident while chasing criminals, no one would even look at her after that. For obvious reasons she was now regarded as the angel of death, to be avoided even though she was wealthy from all of the insurance money. At least the kids were left well off.

A coloured policeman, while enduring a heavy mortar stonking on the border was overheard praying: "God come down and help me before I am compelled by the f terrorists to come up and meet Jesus before my f time! And come down Yourself and f help me. Please do not f send Your Child for what we have here is a man-sized problem in case He hasn't noticed." I heard that same prayer rumour being attributed to the Army's Cape Coloured Regiment, so it might have happened elsewhere.

There was no such thing in the Police regulations regarding an atheist. Every cadet had to belong to some recognised church denomination, or he would be made to choose one on the spot. One really had no choice in the matter! Believe or don't, but you *will* attend church and look like you are enjoying it too. Every day began with a prayer at the parade ground regardless of where you were stationed or what you believed in. As a sergeant on the border I would always read from Proverbs something like "*Enjoy the life which God has given you with the woman you love,*" etc. I knew of course there were no white women on the border except for a few very old ladies of the *Southern Cross*, and a few military types who we steered clear of since not only did they have fearsome reputations, but as commissioned officers they outranked us. We also knew or

suspected they would not want to be appropriated by SAP COIN. Black women were not regarded as women in those days. Any white Policeman caught having ideas or notions with regard to that would be in immediate trouble. Thus the impossibility that any of my men could ever follow that proverb was the very reason why I read it. No one got my joke though, which is perhaps for the best. As luck would have it I have the type of personality which finds great amusement in my own jokes...for days on end. That cheered me up for weeks. It still does.

** The Southern Cross was a charity who supplied much needed comforts from home to the troops and policemen on the Borders during the war. It ranged from soccer balls to swimming pools. It was greatly appreciated and the old ladies always treated with considerable respect.*

I respectfully asked a SAP COIN instructor during a scramble up and down some mountain (Boleo probably) whether he believed in the Bible, particularly Proverbs 28:1, which reads: "Only the wicked shall flee *without* being chased." Are we, the SAP then as wicked as the commies we were supposed to chase now and then? That really showed his lack of humour and I had to appear before the Chaplain to confess my sins. He told me to read the next part of the verse which showed me he missed the point but they were serious people at the best of times. Also told me to leave my f long haired liberal notions at home and stop bother God with cr-p.

Made me a much fitter policeman that comment did! The instructor took great delight in me running in front of his vehicle for what seemed like hours so that I could feel chased so to speak! I suppose I must have felt wicked for the entire six months during basics for we ran everywhere. A cadet walking around better be already close to death and be certified on light duty or he will be soon after being spotted by the instructors loafing around and they had eyes like a hawk. Uncanny sometimes how they knew everything and saw everything too! It only occurred to me as I type here that they probably had a few impimpi's (informers) inside our ranks. Man, we would have kicked them fatherly to the hospital if we knew of their existence. I was still green in those days so the thought never came up for serious discussion.

Every Sunday morning we went to church. That was compulsory. We had no choice in the matter. I believe that cost the church many men afterwards. Religion is like love in my opinion. It cannot be forced, but what do I know? We would assemble on the main parade ground, have roll call and then march a couple of miles to the church which was a magnificent building. There we would be left in peace for the duration of the service only. It was always amazing to me how it was possible that we were ill-treated all the way to and from church. How could one not see the double standard in that kind of behaviour?

While I hardly ever go to church these days, I always carefully gaze around before stepping out of any church just in case the vampires are back in business. I just can't help myself and it does not matter on what continent or country I am. Something which amuses my American Patriot to no end!

Our Sergeant would take careful note of any cadet snoozing during the service (we were tired and the services were boring in the extreme) and sort them out afterwards. If unlucky, it all depended on the Sergeants mood, the rest of the platoon would be punished for "being f disgraceful and inviting the f wrath of God not only on himself, but also on his beloved sergeant f unfairly too since he is f known far and wide to be a God f fearing man. All of which he, sergeant van der Merwe by the grace of General Johan Coetzee blah blah blah, will correct and we can thank him later for his fatherly interest in our souls." Whether we thanked him I will leave for your imagination. Survival is a serious matter, but in an indirect way we had the culprit to thank.

Group punishment is standard in any military and I do not whine about it. It is supposed to create a sense of team spirit, but I can tell you it did not always work out that way. The only sense of belonging felt by some of the sinners was the longing for their mothers afterwards as we made sure that they understood their wickedness in making their fellow innocent cadets suffer on Sunday afternoons since God had ordained the seventh day as a day of rest, a command which had now been broken with their communist tendencies of sleeping in church. More importantly we did our laundry on Sunday afternoons so the culprit's snoozing interfered with our laundry, which is not an acceptable behaviour between civilised men! Perhaps that had been the idea after all. To be

sure, they never slept again in church. They should be grateful for the life lesson.

Then one day a Chaplain proved to me that they actually had a sense of humour when he explained that "Adam was originally a black man who got such a fright when God caught him stealing apples from God's garden that he turned white from shock and fear. After all, when you get a fright you don't turn black in the face...but white! It is a well-known medical fact." I chuckled respectfully, but took bets in my mind on how long he would last saying such things, which the Nationalists would surely regard as sacrilege. He may have been correct according to the latest genetic research for all I know. Perhaps he was also ahead of his time.

On a more thoughtful note, I once had a major fallout with the Chaplains. Some years later I got fed-up with the Chaplains meddling with my operations while I was on border duty. Right at the time when I had wanted to follow some spoor, they wanted to talk to my platoon. From their point of view, it had been a great opportunity to fly in a nice Police helicopter to talk to us. For me it was like: "I have a job to do here which has no Biblical application, so please p off! I have terrorists to f kill if you don't mind!" Because they were representatives of God Almighty, I could of course not speak my mind, and they had flatly (very brave I say) ignored my evil eyes to p off too. So I'd had to interrupt them by asking: "What is the reward for faith Chaplain?" Their answer was "To go to heaven sergeant, and eternal life." I replied, quite reasonably I thought, "Chaplain, what should I do in heaven? By the time I arrive, God would have sentenced all of the criminals and terrorists to life in hell. He therefore would have no need for my skills! Who should I arrest or kill there? There can be no job or satisfaction for me in heaven, Chaplain. Do you wish for me to endure a thousand years year of extreme boredom while I wait for the convicted criminals and terrorists to escape from hell so that we can kill them again once and for all at Armageddon? Why not just kill them now properly and get done? I think the system in heaven is ineffective and the known intelligence is poorly utilized. This is not SAP COIN's way of doing business!"

They looked at me as if I was mad as I continued: "While you contemplate an answer let me share a couple poems with you since I love poetry, and I need an explanation from educated men such as yourselves. The first one is by a Roman citizen named Horace, but made famous by an Englishman named Wilfred Owen in 1917 and goes like this:

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori

mors et fugacem persequitur virum

nec parcit inbellis iuventae

poplitibus timidove tergo.

And while you are still contemplating, let me recite poem number two by Leo Marks, a SOE officer (Special Operations Executive) during the Second World War written as one-time code for SOE Agent Violet Szasbo, who would later die in a Nazi concentration camp. But note, Chaplain, the poem was not originally written for her, but for his fiancée, who also died before her time:

The life that I have

The life that I have

Is all that I have

And the life that I have

Is yours.

The love that I have

Of the life that I have

Is yours and yours and yours.

A sleep I shall have

A rest I shall have

Yet death will be but a pause.

For the peace of my years

In the long green grass

Will be yours and yours and yours.

"I see that you have not replied yet Chaplain, so let me recite the last poem written only a few years ago in 1979 by Rhodesian Army Medic, Staff Sergeant Chas Lotter."

Appeal

Don't mind my hands

Padre

They shake like this

When I am in the base

I dream of death

Padre

Scream in the dark

To chase the nightmares away

I drink

Padre

To keep my memories

At bay

I am nineteen Padre

Why do I feel

So old and worn?

Why can't it be

Like the books?

Padre

For God's sake answer me"

Needless to say I had no answer that day nor since, and now I don't give a you-know-what if you saw the movie. The Chaplains left me in an undignified silent manner, muttering to themselves and shaking their wise heads while looking at me as if I were the unbalanced one. They were still climbing into the chopper when we started our Casspirs and set out to hunt for terrorists to kill. They had delayed me for more than an hour with their uncalled for visit and the spoor went cold because of it. I still blame them for robbing us of our kills. This was really not the SAP COIN way!

My comments must have caused a stir amongst them. My commanding officer looked at me rather strangely a few days later and asked if I wanted some to take some leave as the Chaplains recommended strongly recommended it, and said that they were praying for my lost soul. They also send me a book of poems by a well-known Afrikaner poet I disliked intensely. I threw it away the next day, (the only book I have ever thrown away in my life). You would have noted perhaps that none of the poets above were Afrikaners, though there are excellent ones. I declined the home leave. It was too late for me since there was nothing for me at home except loneliness and nightmares. I was already middle-

aged at 22, and had turned into something that would make satan happy. The end justifies the means, and we will fight fire with fire. What is another life? Kill them all, and let God sort them out. I did not make the laws and only long haired liberals think too much!

In the College we had a designated prayer time, and we would all dutifully sit at our desks reading the Bible before going to bed, or we were supposed to anyway. The Rooinekke and I played chess, which they usually won by cheating well within the rules. I would have also had I first thought of having two extra queens in the set—it took me a while to figure that one out, but as you know I am not too bright at the best of times. Quite often my exes tell me as much, and now with all of the criticism of my books so do foreigners. That's fine. I have known for a long time that I am not that smart, which makes me smarter than most others who unfortunately still have that lesson to learn.

Seriously though, the Chaplains did marvellous work and tried their best under difficult circumstances, since both sides apparently believed in the same God. Their problem was (my opinion), and I might be wrong since I do not dispute their good intentions, is that they acted first and foremost as commissioned officers of the Apartheid State, and secondly as the representatives of God.

*A senior officer told me after reading the Afrikaans version of this book that they reminded him of the Russian Commissars we despised as a method of indoctrination back then. One must decide for oneself – I have no comment and hold no resentment against them either.

We always searched the personal paraphernalia of dead terrorists for intelligence and would almost always find a Bible amongst their few earthly goods. That made me wonder how God could know which side was righteous, since both were requesting His support and promising good behaviour for eternal life. It troubled me greatly, but when a man decides to take up an AK47 and attack the country of his birth he should not be surprised when the police come after him. And the Police were not going to invite him to church or a nice debate, but would first have a fatherly talk with him at the end of a barrel. They would have found a Bible on my body too you know.

The Chaplains once explained to me: "Commies and terrorists were undoubtedly using the Bible as a one-time code and as they could not read nor write." Yeah, sure Chaplain! We found letters in neat handwriting too. Life should not be so serious Chaplain. God also said that we should enjoy our lives even if they come to nothing. We are all His children, just below the Angels in the food chain, black and white. We are made in his likeness even if some of us are more sunburned than others!

Before we leave this subject I want to say that I don't dislike Chaplains and I apologise if some of the above has offended you. I am a Believer, and I thank God for everything in life for I am not very strong. Man should be grateful for his experiences—both good and bad. That is how you are tested in your faith! When earthly things push you beyond the ordinary and you begin to question, the answer, my friend, is always in your past where you have failed God's tests. Seek forgiveness and fix what you can, and be glad you are still worthy of being tested.

Extract from K's free eBook [*Your Worst Enemy*](#)

Tactics like above (all legal and just business as usual) more often than not leads to the original shareholder being bought out at a very fair price really quickly to get rid of him and his new biker mate. This happens where the shareholders contract does not provide the right of first buying of shares to the original shareholders. Something which is standard in our contracts as it should be in all shareholder contracts. As with your relationship with your worst enemy you always consider the divorce proceedings first.

It must be said that this happens more often in private companies and not with your worst enemy as such. Their lawyers are not exactly inexperienced and know these tricks. Still, as a shareholder you can ask awkward questions even if only to be obnoxious. You may even be escorted out of the meeting by security if they are really irresponsible for it will make a wonderful story in the local newspapers and start a rumour they have indeed something to hide. You may now have a claim against your worst enemy for your injuries and loss of dignity

etc. No bank likes bad publicity for obvious reasons. It is the worst thing ever to them and they act with great decisiveness through their lawyers and spin doctors when it happens. Remind me again who acts like that when people say things they don't like? Spoiled brats perchance?

The thing is that legally, as long as what you publish is the truth and in public interest or already public knowledge their chances of winning a libel case against you (or me for this book) are less than zero and the publicity you gain for your cause is tremendous. It is a home goal in all senses of the word. I for one am more than willing and able to defend all my views in all my books in court.

Another good clause which is standard with our contracts is to make the share value for the first year on a new venture rated zero. Why? Simply because I got bitten when I was younger when my clients' business partner (fellow shareholder) decided to leave after a few months and offered his shares at a ridiculous price to him! He either had to buy it or end up with a shareholder he disliked even more. He also (worse) lost his former business partners skills which was essential to the business. Accordingly we took the third option and liquidated the company and started again with someone else tied in and understanding loyalty. That was not the best legal option but the only practical one.

Stocks and shares are the same animal in simple terms. Just different wording depending where in the world you are! I can tell you from experience that listing your company is the easiest and safest way to borrow big money. The dreadful thing is the original owner (entrepreneur) can lose control and in fact does for he is now subjected to other laws and rules than what he was used to. That is not good for his business and sometimes the original owner buys all the shares back and de-lists the company at enormous expense to him. I believe that the Sir Richard Branson of the Virgin Group did that a few years ago.

As you can imagine it is vastly expensive to list a company and lawyers make good money from it. Deservedly so I say. It is a lot of work. Many times shares are offered instead of full fees which may or may not be a good investment. I refused once and walked away reasonably untouched when it folded. Money in your pocket is always better is my motto. Other times I lost out. That is life.

Not all listed companies are successful for you (the investor) are buying into an idea and nothing else. The listing company is usually nothing but a myth in recoverable financial terms. I guarantee you that legally very few listed companies owns anything physical of value. The assets you see like aircraft or ships are all leased thus transferring the risk from the operating company to the asset owners. Listed company's tend to be the owners of nothing except their name and shares which may or may not be bulls-t when (not if) the fan hits (you know what). That fancy high rise tower with their name so proudly on it is registered in an offshore tax haven company. Same with the shopping malls and other assets they point out so proudly as being the owner. Their subsidiary companies may be the owner but they are not in law. Half the time the subsidiary also owes so much money on the assets that it is useless to sell.

Your worst enemy however must have by law a certain percentage of cash as security against losses. It is never enough and Mr Average Joe always takes a loss and you see it on television every now and then. The reason being that your money is not really kept in a safe somewhere and given back to you on your request called a withdrawal or transfer of funds in real life! In simple terms it is mixed with the rest of the tens of thousands deposits and loaned out to whoever or invested wherever. No Bank in the world will survive if everyone withdraws their money at the same time even if they complied with all the rules and regulations on liquidity. Your money is not safe with your worst enemy when (not if) it crashes and you would be lucky to get 25% of it back. Often it is even less.

Yes I know the Government (in some countries - not all) guarantees deposits but it is usually limited to 30g or whatever. It is not an open guarantee without any limits on. People are wiped out like that. Some commit suicide for after the crash the liquidators tries to sell assets to recover you money but as you know they then discover that the assets are in other companies. Even if you are able to legally lift the corporate veil (which is rather difficult in law) you routinely lose out very heavily. Only the liquidators make money in a sequestration or insolvency. Liquidators of course are mostly specialist lawyers.

Lifting the corporate veil

Lifting the corporate veil is explained by understanding that the company is a legal entity entitled to act on its own and thus be sued on its own without the shareholders being held responsible for what the company does or does not do. In simple terms the debts of the company are the company's debts and not the shareholders. The same with assets if any! You know what happens. The assets are put in a separate company and we will discuss it in greater detail later on where we look at your structures to safeguard you against your worst enemy. Simply we use their own structure model against them in your own portfolio.

Lifting the corporate veil is to get to the shareholders and sell their possessions for the debts of the company. As said the courts will not easily agree to this unless recklessness and criminal intent was involved. But how do you prove the difference between a rash business decision and a reckless one? What generally happens is the Government hammer them with tax evasion and other laws but that does not assist you to get your money back. The only advice is to spread your risk as my clients do.

My richer clients invest in physical things rather than bank balances though theirs are substantial for cash stays king despite the cr-p your worst enemy tell you. They also say they enjoy the finer things in life which is the logical extension of our first rule to pay you first. They contend (correctly) that driving luxury cars will protect them in a crash or high jacking attempt since some are armoured. They are that important to themselves and only rightly so.

They spread the risk around the biggest and most well-known your worst enemy with the very highest credit ratings and will not even look at regional banks whatever the incentives to do so. For such operators they are at heart actually very conservative (hope they don't disagree too much with this assessment) simply because all of them graduated from the school of hard knocks. Most was sequestered at some time.

Most of my clients have (so they say) stacks of gold bars somewhere except the Chinese who is buying silver for some reason. When asked why they just grin so obviously they know something we don't know. I do know it is rumoured on the Internet and in Africa for years now that silver will replace the gold standard in the future. I also know that very polite Chinese gentlemen are buying all the

silver and copper mines in Africa. They are not interested in gold mines which say something to me and I cannot afford gold anyway.

The point is your exposure should always be minimised. Remember that saying of not keeping your eggs in one basket? It is good advice in any language. In law or rather banking terms it is called *your portfolio*. It should be balanced and I am not the one to explain to you how. There are many good men doing this for a living. Keep in mind though that any asset which is used as security or collateral is in danger to be sold (given is a better word) to your worst enemy. Never ever sign surety and always ring-fence assets.

I read a wonderful book the other day. The *Memoirs of General William T Sherman* to be specific. Yes the famous Union General and it is probably not well-known that he left the Army before the Civil War and became a banker (note not a *bankster*) in California I believe. Now I say this often to my American Patriot and in my other books that I have yet to read more honourable accounts of warfare and men in my life. Keep in mind I am not an American with any uncalled for patriotic notions on Union Generals. Besides this my American Patriot is a Southern lady by birth!

I read many hundreds of military history books in my life (my library holds about 2000 last time we counted) and never did I find that much honour as in those Civil War Generals of both sides. They were young men too in case your history teacher failed to inform you. Generals Sherman and Grant were in their early forties when they became famous. Generals Schofield and (Stonewall) Jackson in their thirties which makes their actions so much more remarkable in my view! They were men amongst men.

The reason for my digression to the Civil War is simple. At one stage the Banker William T Sherman had to pay his deposits out because another Bank failed and a general rush of withdrawals took place. (Obviously our forefathers also knew who their worst enemy was and forgot to tell us or your worst enemy suppressed the news somehow.) Fact is he paid every single withdrawal. Not one person could point fingers and roar for a wash basin full of water to wash the future Generals' hands. Can there be more honour in that kind of behaviour?

I am astonished by American History in general and if you want to know why read Presidents Lincolns Gettysburg speech.

Why do we then not see this type of standards today? What went wrong?

Historically speaking no-one trusted your worst enemy which is proved by the many laws enabled through the years to keep them under control. They are the most regulated business in the world and you should think they would keep inside the rules but as we know from what we see on the news it does not always work that way in real life.

What does this tell us? Simply that a bank is a myth, a piece of paper with a number on it in the company registration office. It is the people inside who are the bank and they are the ones using the legal entity call bank x for whatever purpose they have in mind. Mostly legal it must be said. Most banks are not run by crooks and other wankers and this is not what this book is about. We are saying to banksters stop your inhuman behaviour in treating defaulters as something akin to satan. We are not saying you are evil and should not be in business for we saw that your worst enemy can be useful. Still, they hide behind the corporate veil to say it is your worst enemy doing this or that and not themselves. Or bank policy or whatever nonsense they come up with and sell to the public. If you accept a bank is run by people and not really a super computer then it blows away their silly defense of "*computer errors and red tape.*" There is no such thing. It is *Mr I am the big bankster* who makes the decisions as with everything else in life.

So what you ask. We knew that before we started with our book. Sometimes it is the Pretty One with the fake smile. You know that already. Why mention it then? Merely because it means legally *Mr I am the big bankster* can be sued for his wrongful deeds and feel the heat for a change. He has nothing to hide behind except a legal fiction for which he acts. It may sound terrible but we always advise our clients to go after the man also and turn the heat on him personally based on precarious liability where possible. Destroy his life as he tried to destroy yours and even if you lose in court he sweated for a while. Naturally it is just business and not personal.

Your worst enemy always sue you and whoever stood surety for you. Always! Thus you sue your worst enemy for it has the money to pay you should you win and the men who caused the delict and let him explain the "*computer error*" or "*bank policy*" to the court. I am sure they will be vastly amused and so will you.

We spoke about the Pretty One who signs the contract with you before and presumably she signs on behalf of your worst enemy. I explained how they could not understand the legal difference between an attorneys trust account and the account of a trust. Now let me take that deplorable lack of knowledge further to our advantage. According to the legalities of the Consumer Protection Act they need to explain to you what the contract means in a language which you understand. As you know I also said that no-one including me really understand the terms and conditions and Latin phrases which makes it sound so good. I do foresee then that it will be very possible to call that Pretty One to court and ask her to explain the finer details on the contract and that she will fail miserably.

What does that mean to you? A lot actually for now you proved to the court that she is incapable of explaining the finer contract details and thus you probably (on a balance of probabilities) could not and did not understand what you signed. Your version of events now starts to make sense. This may destroy their claim against you and yes it is tough on the Pretty One but then it is just business as usual you know. She does not mind when you are called to court to explain whatever questions they have. Get a helmet Pretty One. It is just business as usual. Blame the one who called me in the beginning of this book.

Your worst enemy may then try the legal defense of *ultra vires* which is where they say that the Pretty One exceeded her powers by signing the agreement and throw her to the wolves. It is mostly obsolete now and they will have a terrible time in proving that to the court. These days the general idea is that if someone signs on behalf of a company he was fully authorised to do so. Thus the company is bound to whatever stands in that contract and the contract was not properly explained as required by law. How pathetic to play the blame game to begin with I say!

I can tell you though that the state is most definitely bound by ultra vires. Anything they do which is beyond their specific powers will be challenged but that is an entirely different book which I will not be bothered to write.

Your worst enemy will probably say you had the right to consult your attorneys before signing which is true but does not take away their deplorable lack of knowledge which they claim to be experts on. The court will not take kindly to this which is in your favour.

One thing I fail to understand is that all of your worst enemies have essentially the same percentage rates. How is that possible? Surely that shows a lack of competition between them and any kind of monopoly is prohibited by law for that very reason. In American this would be called *anti-trust laws* whilst we know it as *competition law*. I believe that they are investigated now and then and as said in law they are vulnerable for they need to act with cleaner hands than most businesses.

The counter argument they love to use is over regulation makes good old fashioned competition (to your advantage as the consumer) virtually impossible and the law gives them almost no leeway to change interest's rates. I say be creative for why then charge the maximum allowed all the time? Experience tells me there is quite a bit they can do but it is not for me to give them free advice. As you know my legal consultancy refuses out of principle to act for or with your worst enemy so I will keep my ideas secret. What do I know anyway?

The other peculiar thing about your worst enemy is calling themselves *financial institutions* which I am tempted to believe is solely to regain some credibility with the ordinary folk. Even the Swiss banks took serious knocks the last few years. First it was alleged (I have no idea if it is true or not) that they have millions of executed (Holocaust) Jews money which they are refusing to pay out to the children and then they suffered enormous losses with rogue traders in London. Some of the biggest banks (other than Swiss) even laundered terrorist money if the news is to be believed.

How is this possible? I ask again what went wrong.

As an forensic law expert I can tell you that legally any bank caught with money laundering will face severe (hundreds of millions) in fines and (we hope) a few banksters in jail. As nice as that sounds it is a home goal for they will only use your money to pay for the fine and as we saw recently it just means another golden handshake with your money to the offenders.

What made them so arrogant when it comes to defaulters?

I believe it is the power of money. Ironically it is not even their own money for it is your money (deposits) which they play with. We saw how the system works and it is not nice reading. They make their money by enslaving you in loans. They act without any sense of known human decency and hide behind spin doctors and lawyers. Let us not forget the red tape and computer error myths in this regard which is the second reason why they act the way they do. They feel they will be able to hit out through their lawyers and hounds from hell with impunity. It is as a psychologist friend explained to me the same when road rage happens. You feel immune in your car and removed from reality and thus much more obnoxious than what is good for you.

Ironic to me is that your worst enemy fire their staff every now and then for whatever reason and obviously it is sad when that happens. As said before it is good for the share price if nothing else. Consequently the loyal henchmen are not even safe from the same fate which overtakes their victims. They have no more rights under labour law than you or me and being salary drawers their job security is non-existent and they are also enslaved in company loans etc. The only real job security is to have your fate in your own hands meaning to create your own income. As long as you work for someone you are exposed! Look what the American sequesters did to thousands of workers!

I don't really care what the reason is why your worst enemy behave as they do but it must stop. A poor man is still a man with legal rights. He is not something akin to satan to be hounded and humiliated at will. You will receive the treatment you dish out in life. It says so in the good Book.

Extract from K's free eBook [The Circle of Life](#)

It is rather nice to ask your better half for her hand in marriage and is known as being engaged or betrothal if she agrees. Should she refuse it is known collectively as the great escape or the day you embarrassed yourself (joke). Seriously, you cannot claim any compensation because a woman refused to marry you. And whilst you may plan the big question to the last detail the law is not as bothered with it as much as you may expect. In law it is simply an understanding between two people to get married in the future and live as man and wife in the fullest sense of the word together under one roof facing life as one.

You don't need her parents' permission unless she is a minor and if I may say so you better not ask me unless you want see if you can outrun my shotgun pellets. Wait until she is of age and able to make her own decisions. If you then ask the parents you do so out of respect only and not because the law tells you to do so. Discuss this with your fiancée to be for I find many modern women do not take kindly to the idea of being given away as an item.

There is nothing to say you need to be on your knees or have a ring ready. That is just a custom but it may be cheaper to buy the ring yourself rather than let her choose it (joking). Nothing in law says you as the man must buy the ring anyway. She can also if you happen to be broke.

The engagement does not need to be in writing though it sometimes is and known as an engagement letter. Not very original that is. Some have an engagement agreement which is a full contract but note an engagement contract is not the same as an antenuptial agreement which we will deal with later. It only states that the parties wish to marry in the future and deal with property issues. It cannot be enforced which is why it is seldom used and you cannot have penalty clauses in this type of contract like for instance stating if you don't marry me by next week Wednesday you pay me 100 dollars a day penalty.

That would be against the morals of the public at large. All in all such a contract is rather useless.

Keep in mind that when I say man I also mean woman and these days same sex marriages are allowed in many parts of the world including South Africa but not

under the Marriage Act. That is done under the Civil Union Act as the Marriage Act does not recognise a marriage as anything else between man and woman.

Consequently with the Civil Union Act gays and lesbians can also be legally married. Not all consider homosexuals to be animals as one African dictator put it so inelegantly recently. For myself I believe in marriage between man and woman only but I do not discriminate or judge. Their problems in life should be between them and God and I suspect my opinion is of no relevance. Whatever their sexual orientation they stay humans and quite nice people also. Don't mix religion with law. It is wrong to treat some different than others without good reason.

I read that during colonial times in North America betrothal was seen as a trial marriage which would or could if you wish only go forward to marriage if a child is conceived. Honestly I am not sure about the reason for this attitude and not at all what I expected from a country as puritanical as America. It is not my idea of American public morals which I learned by reading Westerns up to the age of nine and then switched to history proper. I think that even in today's enlighten society, this would be frowned upon.

I suspect in some countries deflowering a virgin in a trial marriage may be a crime if not a delict. Most certainly, in recent years, we had a case where a fellow married a virgin whilst knowing he is still married to another woman and he was hammered in both the civil and criminal courts. The law does not take kindly to such behaviour as it is presumed in law that a woman's virginity is a serious matter (as it is and should be) for once broken it stays broken even if physically repaired.

It is also well-known in law that a woman with children is a lesser "catch" than one who is a virgin but I expect that this will be challenged under the equality laws. The amounts given as compensation differ drastically between the two when it comes to seduction awards.

Not sure it should be on the law books anymore.

The legal consequences of being engaged

The effect of being engaged is to marry at some stage in the future with the person you are engaged to. Besides that there is not any other legal effect which binds you to celibacy or anything in that nature. In law all woman not married is presumed to live a celibate life anyway. Since this comes from the Romans with their well published orgies I find it ironic. Note please that being engaged does not take away a woman's right of refusal to have sex. You have no automatic right to act like a beast.

Nor do you share your estate yet and you have no special rights to his. If he dies without you in his will you will inherit nothing. Thus I always recommend changing your will and policies the moment that you become engaged.

The problems arise when you break that promise to marriage without good reason. At least you cannot be forced in law to marry anyway which was the way it was up to 1838 in England. As you can imagine that led to a lot of abuse!

The legal formalities to become engaged

It is important to note that you must be sane to become engaged. Many points out that this is indeed a contradiction of terms but let us not be nasty. I believe in marriage and love and so should you. Being with your soul mate is the ultimate high and best of all, free and forever and two weeks.

Obviously someone who is drunk or in a coma cannot enter into a legal contract. Nor can someone who is feeble-minded for obvious and fair reasons. Also persons within the prohibited degrees of relationship may not marry each other which are blood family in simple terms like brother and sister or father and daughter. As a general rule we prohibit the direct line of ascendants to marry each other and thus they cannot be engaged either.

Being of the right age is dealt with more under marriage where it differs from country to country but most are fixed at about 15 years of age for the female. In South Africa, if you are less than 15 years old and female or 18 years and male you will need the consent of the Minister of Home Affairs to marry AND your parents. In fact, under 18 (the maturity age) means your parents must always agree and if they refuse you may approach the High Court who acts as the father of all minors for permission.

I assure you though that our courts are conservative and unless you can prove that it is in your best interests or your parents unreasonable (read very unreasonable) this will not be given willy nilly. In case you carry on regardless the marriage may be dissolved afterwards but we will speak about that under divorce later on.

So what happens when a minor promises to marry when she is of age to do so and when she comes of age she refuses? In law all promises to marry made by minors are voidable at the option of the minor meaning she can decide if she wants to go forward with the marriage or not. Weirdly enough a minor may sue on such a promise but may not be sued. She may even make a new promise to someone else and that is the way it will be.

Being pregnant is no reason in law or otherwise to get married but it was not always like this and in some cultures that would be enough reason for a marriage. It was a practical problem for under Roman law an illegitimate child could not inherit nor be entitled to his father's name. This meant wars in the old days as the kings' illegitimate offspring decided to take fight for their inheritance as happened often in history causing civil wars and worse. These people were called "bastards" and at one stage were seen as that even if the parents married afterwards. Under equality of the law I am glad to say this is something of the past in most countries. Unfortunately the child and his mom may still be treated like something akin to satan by the community.

We tend to throw stones quite quickly and it is very wrong.

You simply cannot in law be engaged to more than one woman at the same time or whilst you are already married. This will be in all countries which do not support bigamous relationships. In effect the second marriage or engagement is void under law but then the universal law of partnership comes in and we will look at that in some detail. It is the same as where you live together. It has far reaching effects on your estate and is known as the common law wife principle.

Why it is so important to understand what is meant with an engagement to be married?

Let me explain that getting engaged to marry is a contract in law but oddly enough it cannot be enforced if one party wants to walk away from it. Being forced to marry against your will would be against the good morals of the nation. It can never be. Thus some law professors refer to it as "semi-binding." To marry legally both parties must be willing and able. There is nothing wrong with such a system and an example how neutral the law is.

As said there is no prescribed way in law in how to ask a woman to marry you but for long haired liberals it may involve two weeks of nonstop begging. Candle light dinners and being on your knees also help I suppose and through the ages many traditions arose around betrothal which are not in the law books as such meaning it is not required in law to fulfil before the legal effects of an engagement comes into being.

Let me explain.

A ring may be given to the woman (usually is) who wears it on her left hand fourth finger which is seen as the reserve for a wedding ring. It does not matter if it is gold or silver or even rope but the intention does. In law, if a woman accepts a ring and wear it in public on her left hand fourth finger it is very strong evidence that she agreed to be married in the future to the person who gave her the ring. If she then refuses the fiancé may claim damages from her and usually she must return the ring and that is called breach of promise or just breach. Nor does the law care if the ring has diamonds or emeralds in it. As you can see it has only evidential value on what the parties decided on.

Fascinatingly, that specific ring finger is used because our Roman forefathers believed it contained the "vein of love" which goes straight to a womans heart. Before them the ancient Egyptian physicians believed that the same finger has a nerve to her heart. And apparently our Western way of exchanging rings started in again in 1477 when Maximilian the First gave Mary of Burgundy a diamond ring symbolising their relationship. She died at the age of 25 when she fell of her horse or the horse on her. It is tragic but I understand he married again quite soon after that.

The left hand ring finger is not the tradition in continental Europe where the right hand is seen as the place for the ring. I suppose all arteries go to the heart anyway if you want to be unromantic. I could not find anything on what happens when the woman does not have a ring finger because of accident or defect.

In other countries (Argentine apparently) a serious relationship is celebrated with a silver ring, then a gold one at the engagement and finally a diamond ring at the actual wedding.

In Nordic countries I understand that both men and women wear an engagement ring and in Brazil they switch from right hand to left hand at the wedding. Some have a separate engagement ring and wedding ring later but really it is all symbolic. None of this is of interest for the law. It is only interested in what the intention of the parties was.

That is the question and bottom-line is that you don't even need a ring to be engaged to marry. When you ask and she agrees and the two of you are legally able to marry then you are engaged. It does not give you any real rights though as with marital rights which we will look at later. For instance a medical man would be quite within his rights to refuse to discuss any medical condition relating to your fiancé to you. If I may be brutally frank, you are not family yet.

I could not find anything in law stating that a woman is not allowed to ask a man to marry her and it can happen anytime. Not only on 29 February as is tradition in our part of the world. My research also tells me that refusal from the man meant he had to buy her twelve pairs of gloves to hide her empty (of a ring) finger or a new dress. She may choose.

She cannot sue you for refusing to marry her but we did have a thought-provoking case in Apartheid South Africa where a black man proposed to a white woman. The law in those days was not neutral and it was a crime for different race groups to have intercourse or to marry. In truth it was impossible under law to do such things. He was arrested for *crimen injuria* I think (criminal defamation) but I believe he was found innocent.

You must understand the Apartheid laws were not based on anything but farming principles and the Bible. You can read about it in my book [*Mean Streets*](#)

- *Life in the Apartheid Police*. The argument was that the animals on a farm don't mix with each other so why should humans? There is no way in this world that that system can be defended. It was a crime against humanity and an example of what happens when an artificial imbalance is created.

If you lose your ring it does not mean you stop being engaged. You can only legally stop being engaged if you break the engagement or with death of one or both of the partners at the same time which is called commorientes in law. We always presume the man, being bigger and stronger, took longer to die than the wife. With death the engagement stops automatically. You cannot marry a dead person because of the lack of consensus for one. Nor can you marry anything which is not human.

It is not possible to stop an engagement by doing nothing even though in our customary law the husband may refuse to eat his wife's food and that may be seen as divorce. The point is the law being neutral wants to make logical deductions on your behaviour. There must be no room for doubts on your intentions. You have to show what you mean in a practical way.

The same is true in reverse. If a woman takes her ring off and throws it at her fiancé it is very strong evidence that she does not wish to carry on with the engagement and the subsequent marriage. Clearly she may also just give it back or send it to him by mail or messenger. No need for unpleasantness.

Returning gifts is also strong evidence that the marriage is off. Not making any arrangements for the wedding may be indicative but note that there is no time limit on engagements before tying the knot so to speak. It may be a few hours or decades. The law simply does not prescribe a time but the dirty looks from your future mother in law may indicate that the time is near.

This was not always the case because under Roman law a widow could not legally be married within one year of her husband's death (did not need to be actually dead - if captured as a prisoner of war he was considered dead). This was to ensure that any children to be born be borne within that year so that no arguments could follow afterwards on whose children it were. This is not the case today. A widow can marry when she pleases though of course the

community may frown on a hasty marriage the law does not prevent that at all. Clearly a widower could also marry whenever he could find a new wife.

As always with law no coercion is allowed. I remember a case in the 19th century where a woman was rescued by a sailor after being shipwrecked. Before he would allow her into his boat she had to agree to marry him which she did. This was not seen (correctly) as binding on her and he failed in his bid for damages when she told him afterwards to take a hike. He probably went to Australia and it caused quite a scandal.

Legal effects of breach of promise

When an engagement is broken off without good reason the lawyers refers to it as breach of promise and the "guilty" party may be sued for damages by the "innocent" party under delict. It used to be women suing men but these days you just don't know and it does not matter anyway. If the party is aggrieved she has rights and justice must be seen.

A good reason in law to break off an engagement would be insanity, intoxication, force, intimidation, mistake, fraud and misrepresentation and the discovery of impotence, sterility, alcoholism or serious criminality on the part of the other side. This is not a closed list but what courts accepted previously as a good reason or defense meaning if the sued party can show that the above was the reason why she broke the engagement she would almost always be the victor in court. All of the above is excellent defenses against breach.

The reverse is also true. Where a party commits breach of promise for any reason besides the above (and what the court thinks is good enough) he will pay dearly for his actions. Marriage is a serious thing in law and not to be taken lightly.

We briefly spoke of deflowering a virgin and where one party seduced the other (usually the female but not always) under promise of marriage, she can claim damages for seduction as well as for breach of promise. Obviously this will only be where a pattern emerges or the defendant (usually the man) bragged to his friends about his "victory" and never was serious about marriage and only used the engagement as a way to get her into bed. Bragging may cost you enough to

learn how to act like a gentleman next time. Certain matters should stay private unless you are a little boy needing attention. They usually get spanked in public by their moms and really are nothing to be proud off.

It can even happen where a woman is married and her husband sues the new guy but obviously that is something else called adultery. It really should not be a crime or on the law books but it is and the sentences for it harsh in Muslim countries where flogging in public (100 lashes) and or stoning to death is the norm. Again this is what happens when religion and the law is mixed.

It must be understood also that you cannot be forced into a marriage just because you had a sexual relationship with someone. In law it is presumed that a married woman cannot be a virgin but note that there is absolutely no rule in law in this country to say that a marriage must be consummated before it becomes legal or that the wife must be a virgin when it is.

I know it is different in other countries and especially it was a big deal in Germanic Law. Reminds me of a joke we had many years ago that one particular wild girl was almost still a virgin as she only had the army and police on her. Yeah well, is not really funny. I admit. It sounds better in Afrikaans.

As with any private law case the action must be taken within three years or the claim will prescribe. Once prescribed there is nothing in law which can resurrect it. It is the end of the road.

So what happens with the gifts between the parties?

Well, it can become quite complex but it is usually dealt with in three different categories.

The first is the so called tokens of earnestness from the giver. This will include the engagement ring and must be returned to him. If not he may sue successfully in most cases for the value of the ring. The reason is simple and found in the Roman law dictum of *cessante ratione legis cessat ipsa lex* which means when the reason for the law ceases, the law itself ceases. There is no more marriage thus no more ring. The best case to illustrate this point was

where a child died and the mom still demanded the maintenance money for him even though he is now deceased. The court refused.

Obviously the parties may decide to keep the ring and it is always a good idea to settle this without the need of the court getting involved. As I always say in my books you have a 50/50 chance of winning in court despite the cr-p your lawyer may be telling you. Once in court you either win or you lose and those odds are way too bad for me to take a bet on. I just don't know what will happen in court. The witness may have an off day or even your advocate. It is almost never a good idea not to settle. There are no guarantees in court but a lot in settlement because you control it.

Extract from K's free eBook [Tricks of Trade - Memories of a Rogue Lawyer](#)

What is so special about law that no one can afford it?

I keep on saying no-one can afford a lawyer and that is an injustice in itself for it means unequal treatment. Why are lawyers so expensive? There is no real reason besides an imperfect system in my eyes if not greed in certain cases. I understand the principle of professional men and charging fees. I understand the many years of study to become a legal expert but still something is wrong.

Let me explain in a general way how lawyers (by which I include all professionals) work and I can hear them howling in outrage in the background for it is not all of them. Let me rather say the unscrupulous ones and it happens a lot despite the frequent denials from the law society which no-one believes anymore. It also very hard to verify so you have to take my word for it as no-one will admit to such behaviour for obvious reasons.

Padding

Any Law Office has different grades from partners (directors) to associates to professional assistants to secretaries. All must and want to be paid at the end of the month which is normal commercial business and not to be wondered at.

Someone has to pay for the fancy offices and original portraits and genuine coffee. It is presumably not for free and that someone is you, the client.

The bigger the law office the more money is needed to survive. That is logical. All the lawyers regulate themselves with nice high sounding phrases to limit the fees allowed to charge but there is (always) a loop hole. In South Africa you have three different fee scales agreed to by all attorneys. The first two is limited to which court is applicable, that is the Higher Courts and Lower Courts and is limited to a specific rate which can be charged to your client. And then the loop hole to make more money. The so called "attorney and own client" scale which means charge whatever you will get away with in normal non-legal English despite the different explanations from the law society in this regard.

Let me explain what happens in practise. A legal letter which could be written on one page swiftly becomes ten or twenty pages. Why? Because the lawyer gets paid per page written or per word and they count it which is easy with modern computers. Thus you find the most wonderful phrases and words flowing in an elegant way quoting legal sections and other parts of previous letters to create as much pages as possible. It really looks impressive to the untrained eye but is utter rubbish in the sense that it is totally unnecessary information.

Further the letter will be signed by the partner but in fact he was not the one writing it but he would have (I hope) read and agreed with it. It was drafted by a much junior professional assistant who booked his time against it. And so does the next one and the next one and the next one. Everyone cashes in on that one letter for everyone looked at it and made a small adjustment or not. Does not matter for it is time spend and time is money and thus charged to you, the client.

This technique is called "padding" and you will find my letters to be extremely short and to the point so that this cannot happen. I simply don't believe in long boring explanations for it is not in my nature and never padded anything in my life. I think to pad a letter (or any legal document) for more fees is unfair to you, the client.

Paper wars

Some will even start a flood of letters to create more fees. This is called a "paper war" and very difficult to prove for it looks like diligent work and caring as well. And yes I am sarcastic when I say just look at the effort made by him for his client. He must be a very hardworking fellow to take such care! Yes I am sarcastic. His work is to chase money which is not the same as chasing Justice though it may be the end result.

The problem here is twofold. One it only takes one idiotic lawyer to start it. And two, everything in law must be answered or denied or it will stand as the truth. So you have no choice but to answer the silly letters and answering creates another letter in return etc. Each letter answered cost you the client money. It is a nice merry go round which will only stop once sense returns and no-one will convince me that fees don't play a role or that some just happen to like writing boring letters with no real substance to them.

Only once in my life, as an article clerk, did I hear a senior partner call another senior partner and tell him to "stop his nonsense and his paper war." Thus the fees generate a life of its own which is unfair to you.

Rubber stamps instead of personal attention

We find that a secretary rubber stamps the attorneys signature on letters and even summonses. What right does he then have to charge for the work he did not do I ask? Or they have one standard letter which is copied by the hundred and sent to the debtors on behalf of the creditor (client).

Why do I mention this? Because you will note some of these letters are not even signed for even the signature is copied. Only the date and named is changed. Still, they want and demand full fees for such work from you, the client who does not know any better and defend themselves by pointing out the original letter was signed and time spend drafting it and it is just about efficiency etc.

I saw this even on court summonses also which should make them defective if you know enough to take a stand on it. Most don't so they get away with it. This type of behaviour and business practises is to me rubbish. You the client pays for personal attention and worse, you think you actually get personal attention from a qualified man who you don't mind paying because of his experience. Do

you really want to pay the same money to an unqualified legal secretary? I think not.

How many times did you sit in the consulting room and it is rather obvious that the lawyer did not prepare for your case and sit there reading your file in front of you? That is the ultimate disrespect but it happens all the time.

Now multiply the above and see why they can afford the nice buildings. Of course it will be denied and said, "Yes there may be a few horrible ones who do this type of thing but we have systems in place where you can complain about your legal bills and we don't condone it either." How many complain and how many are punished for this I wonder. Why do I need to write this in a book? Why do my clients complain about this all the time when we first meet? Why is the system / red tape of such a nature that no-one wants to complain?

* We talk about the shenanigans of banksters and debt collectors in great detail in my free eBook [Your Worst Enemy](#). A book which I am proud to say is downloading by the tens of thousands. It will show you your legal rights when your worst enemy (your bank) comes after you as they will if you miss one payment. The legal relationship is one of "*sincere mutual distrust*" never mind what they say. It is all in the book!

Overreaching

In Africa the legal system works in US Dollars (for foreigners) and thus you need to establish the fees in writing before giving the instruction. As far as we are concerned a foreigner has the money to spend lavishly! After all we are professional men and used to charging good money for services rendered. That is not the scam for no one denies the right to charge reasonable fees. Even the good Book says the worker is entitled to his wages as he earned it. However, since the US dollar is worth many times the local currency the worker in this case makes millions and the client don't even realise it. He thinks, "Well it is expensive but it is the same as my New York lawyers and besides this is in a different country etc." Sir, let me explain to you. They should not charge you more than what a local is charged for the same work. To do otherwise is to take advantage of your good nature and called "over reaching." There is enough

money for everyone without doing this. It is not a fair wage to charge you in any other currency but the local one.

This is a scam in my eyes and not fair to you either. The law and the efforts are the same. Why should the currency then be different and in fact the price 10 times (to the ZAR) more? No way has this made sense to me even if you are a rich man. The answer is to get the fees in writing and do a bit of research.

Contingency fees or to work on risk

Let us talk about risk or working on contingency fees. This is allowed in Africa but you will not easily find a lawyer in Africa (including South Africa) willing to take any real risk for his client for unlike America and elsewhere if you lose a civil court case you will pay the victors legal fees which may be millions and often destroy the losing client financially.

If I say you I mean you the client. Not the lawyer though he may in extremely rare cases be ordered to pay the wasted costs. I heard of such cases but never saw it in real life. Even if you win you still need to pay your lawyer. This may be reduced if the other side actually pay but many times it turns out to be a man of straw. So you, the client, just cannot win. Rather settle it and limit your risk but we will get to that too.

I never work on risk by the way. My view is that I am running a business same as you. Why should I take the risk and I must warn you against anyone who is willing to do so. It is not the norm and sometimes may be born out of desperation which is always a bad way to start.

The system failed to prevent summonses

As said it is a risky business to sue without excellent cause in Africa for it reduces the amount of summonses being issued in theory. It is not working though. The amounts of summonses are climbing every year and now it is not uncommon to wait five years before you get a court verdict.

Justice delayed is Justice denied or so say the long hair liberals. There is of course a big element of truth in this statement and it is indeed abused

sometimes. We hear of men awaiting trial spending years in jail for they cannot afford bail. That is not Justice and never will be.

There is no such thing as bail bonds in the American sense of the word here. You pay for yourself or get a mate to help if you can't. Otherwise you stay in jail and it is an unfair system but what else can the law do? There are case law stating that bail should not be artificially refused by making the bail amount too high but our people are poor and what may be easy money to some is life and death to most.

Delay and postpone

That is another tactic lawyer's use. Delay and postpone as much as possible in the hope that your opponent run out of money or that you give up. Thus we find appeals to higher courts for no other reason than time wasting and of course creating excellent fees. Whenever a lawyer takes a technical defense you can bet your last penny that he has no case on merits. Meaning he is looking for a way out since his client is guilty. That by the way is allowed and part of the game.

It must be said that in our legal system you sometimes need permission from the Judge to lodge an appeal. Refusal will lead to another court case wasting even more time. We try to overcome this by ensuring an Arbitration exit in your contracts and to enforce them. That is the new way and it works very well. No contract should be without it and it must be binding on the parties. In the alternative settle the matter before wasting time and money on the courts. As said somewhere we try to minimise court time to zero.

I firmly believe that law is way too expensive in Africa (including South Africa) and unfair towards the client. I really have no idea how it can be turned around. Insurance and big corporates will make it more expensive and out of reach of the common man. It can also be correctly said to be a business and a business needs money to survive. Surely no-one denies a fair wage for a fair days work. Just make sure you know what you get into.

Article clerks do not need to be treated like humans

I have no doubts that the article system is abused by some lawyers to gain cheap labour which they otherwise would not have had. This view I am willing to defend in any court of their choice if they want to run the risk of exposure and public humiliation. I am sure that I will receive many thousands of affidavits from former article clerks to back me up. Once again I must say this is not everywhere and not all lawyers treat their slaves inhumanely. There are apparently good ones too for I heard of them.

It is a system we inherited from the British Colonial times and comes down to a legal graduate working for an existing law office to "learn" the trade. I think in America it is called Internship but I am not sure. Perhaps someone can tell me for I would like to know.

Whilst it started off as a good idea it became nothing but a form of institutionalised slavery in my eyes. My experience (and I am not alone saying this even if no-one else is willing to write it down) is that you learn nothing and are abused as cheap labour. Conservatism & tradition is very much counterproductive if slavishly followed and the articles system is indeed abusive.

Where else have you seen graduates work for less than the minimum wage (it is not regulated and the pay vary in the extreme) because they are forced by law to do so? Advocates doing their version of articles called pupil ship is not paid even one cent but they are expected to entertain and pay membership fees towards the bar council for the privilege to be treated like a slave. At least their misery is only six months and ours one year or two years or even more depending on qualifications.

In the legal community there exists an unwritten rule that the more senior of the two lawyers will pay for the drinks or dinner. Obviously the senior because he should have more money to do so but you may be sure that you, the client, will in some way make up for our expenses. That is also an unwritten rule. Advocates needs the attorneys to send them work so they end up paying almost as a matter of course. This system at least works well in practise.

Worse than the lack of a decent salary the article clerks are made to feel inferior. Unlike the advocates they have no fancy title to impress the secretaries

with. I saw a very bright female candidate forced to clean the kitchen because she is female. She is still angry about it and asked me to spit in the mugs she being ladylike and me not (enjoyed it too). Or the male clerks forced to clean carpets after hours because they are cheap labour. Or refused entry to the lifts and take the stairs because the lifts are for clients only and not lowly article clerks. Or walk around for one year being a glorified mail man delivering and serving pleadings. And let me not even start on that wonderful skill which every article clerk obtained and that is making photocopies by the million. If it was not so pathetic and inherently wrong it would be funny.

The main excuse used by the perpetrators called senior partners is that articles are what you make of it! That is so obvious nonsense that it defies reason. Articles are what the law office makes it via the senior partners. The article clerk has neither say nor any rights in it. Some are lucky and some not. That is life. But all has to follow the stupid rules and stick it out.

Then why put up with such cr-p? Simply because you have no choice! If you don't or rock the boat by complaining you will not qualify as an attorney or advocate and the system will work you out. I saw it happen. No doubt, even after all these years I am still angry about it. I have not forgotten nor forgiven the insults which indeed were uncalled for between civilised men. It is of course only a coward who insults someone unable to return the insult.

I ask you. Is this the way to treat legal graduates or any other employee for that matter? I think not. One of the tests at my consultancy is to note what a new associate does when a woman enters the room. He better stand up and be polite or he is out. We Africans are respectful people and the traditions must be kept in this regard. I often tell my overseas clients it is rude not to ask about the weather before getting down to business. We are from an agriculture society and always ask about the rain before commencing on less serious things like business.

This treatment of article clerks leads to a lot of frustration if not outright hatred as you may gather and is one of the ways how the system is abused. I assure you my old article law firm did not receive a single instruction from me after I left. Nor will they ever receive an instruction from me but their opposition across

the street did well from my instructions. During the years I cost them hundreds of thousands of lost income by supporting the law office next door. So it is not even clever business to be nasty to your article clerks and shows the supreme arrogance which came with such behaviour.

I am very suspicious of anyone who says he enjoyed his articles and avoids him also for being of an unsound mind if not a (you know) what creeper. The publishers made me take the anatomy part out but you know what I mean. It is always a good skill to be able to read between the lines even if not a legal man.

The sooner we get rid of this article system the better off this country will be for it is also impossible for many law graduates to find legal articles in the first place. It is inherently an unfair system which does not belong in modern society and with the law schools in place it is unnecessary and outlived its usefulness.

Of course it will never happen. After all it took a Civil War to get rid of slaves in America. I studied that war and its causes being a history boffin. Let me tell you I have never read more honourable men in my life. Just look at President Lincoln's Gettysburg speech which is almost of no length and summarise everything you need to know about democracy. That is what life is about. The search for Justice and the Americans it must be said obtained it. For some reason my American clients find this paragraph hilarious but they miss the point! For us who look towards the Land of the Free the view is much different. We still endure what you got rid of in 1774 and 1865.

We will not as long as we cling to colonial times and traditions. We did not even had the guts to tell our colonial powers cheerio as America did and created real democracy two hundred years before the rest of Africa. That will always be amazing to me and a sense of wonder is as great as the first time in a university library and you feel the incredible knowledge around you.

** There is a new Act coming out (soon I hope) which will abolish the legal slave trade in article clerks in South Africa. It will open the doors to many and is only a good thing. Wherever a closed club is you will find abuse or so I believe.*

End of extracts



This free edition was downloaded from
www.obooko.com

Although you do not have to pay for this e-book, the author's intellectual property rights remain fully protected by international Copyright law. You are licensed to use this digital copy strictly for your personal enjoyment only: it must not be redistributed commercially or offered for sale in any form. If you paid for this free edition, or to gain access to it, we suggest you demand an immediate refund and report the transaction to the author.