

Angola Weekly News Summary

January 8, 1976

THE U.S. AND ANGOLA

The following account of the Ford Administration-Congressional-Congressional conflict over US Angola policy is reprinted from Africa Action, the news bulletin of the Washington Office on Africa.

Ford & Congress Clash Over Angola

US intervention in Angola mushroomed into a major political issue in Washington for a few days at the end of Congress' 1975 session, as the Senate overwhelmingly voted to cut off funds for US covert activities in Angola. The 54-22 vote was a clear expression of the Senate's opposition to mounting US covert action in Angola, but it marked only the beginning of a head-on confrontation between Congress and the increasingly arrogant Administration over the wisdom and control of US assistance to FNLA and UNITA forces which are fighting the MPLA.

Senate Victory on Angola

Congressional attention on Angola went into high gear in mid-December when leaks to the press revealed that the CIA was prepared to spend at least \$50 million in Angola. At that time, Congressional liberals discovered that there was money for CIA operations in Angola hidden in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill. When the Senate began its final consideration of the conference report on the bill, Senator Tunney offered an amendment cutting off all funds for CIA activities involving Angola except those intended for intelligence gathering. Senate debate was long and intense. For two days running, the Senate met in extraordinary closed session. When the Democrats tried to move to a vote, Republican Whip Robert Griffin offered a substitute amendment prohibiting US troops and advisors in Angola, but leaving the Executive complete "flexibility" to undertake any and all covert operations. The Griffin amendment was soundly defeated by 72-26 and it was clear that the Tunney amendment would pass. With one day left before the end of the session, the weak Administration forces decided to filibuster. The next day, the Administration switched and agreed to a Senate vote, which resulted in the 54-22 victory.

Of all the political issues involved, the possibility that Angola could become another Vietnam was by far the most significant. Although some Senators probably did not understand the Angolan situation fully, they could

not vote against a measure which could later be used as a Gulf of Tonkin-type license for further US entanglement. In addition, Senators were angry that the Angolan aid was being given covertly, and without the consent or even prior knowledge of all but a few members of Congress. In fact, consideration of the Tunney amendment has already created an atmosphere in which Congressional oversight of CIA activities will probably no longer be left to only a few hand-picked senior members. Passage of the Tunney amendment may create a precedent for early and open Congressional deliberation and decision on future "covert" foreign military operations.

The Administration Fights Back

In a spirit of open confrontation, President Ford censured the Senate immediately following the Tunney amendment vote. In a statement all too reminiscent of Nixon's Indochina hyperboles, Ford said that the Senate vote was a "deep tragedy for all countries whose security depends on the United States." On December 23 Kissinger announced that the Administration was prepared to spend another \$9 million in Angola. A week later, an Administration official quoted in the New York Times said that "we're going to keep up" covert arms supplies to Angola "despite the Senate vote"; "I'm not going to say how much or where it is coming from."

House Still to Act on Tunney Amendment

In this highly-charged atmosphere, the House will vote on the Tunney amendment within a few days of its return on January 19. At the end of December, the momentum in the House was strong in favor of ending CIA Angolan operations; Congressman Bonker and several other freshmen collected over 130 co-sponsors for a House resolution urging non-intervention in Angola in the few hours which the Senate debate was in progress. We must demonstrate to Congress that concern over Angola is not coming solely from the press or being orchestrated in Washington. PLEASE TRY TO VISIT YOUR CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE BEFORE HE OR SHE RETURNS TO WASHINGTON, AND TO MAXIMIZE COMMUNITY SENTIMENT AGAINST US INTERVENTION IN ANGOLA.

What the Tunney Amendment Does and Doesn't Cover

The Tunney amendment cuts funds in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for Angola, except for CIA intelligence gathering (which could be a substantial loophole (which could be a substantial loophole)). The Administration requested \$9 million specifically for Angola and \$28 million in "reprogrammable funds" for Angola (originally requested for other purposes) in the next five months. Expenditure of this \$37 million will be illegal if the House accepts the Tunney amendment. The amendment does not affect the \$27-32 million which has already been spent in the last seven months, or \$6-9 million which is "in the pipeline" - committed but not yet expended.

If the House concurs with the Senate vote - and there is a good chance that it will - it will be a clear statement of Congressional sentiment that the US should stay out of

Angola.

There are several possible loop-hole in the Tunney amendment which will need to be addressed. First, it cuts off only those CIA funds authorized by the Defense Department appropriations bill. More funds could be hidden in other bills.

Second, the Tunney amendment affects only covert assistance; the Administration could still make a public request for aid for Angola. The House International Relations Committee and the Senate foreign aid subcommittee have approved watered-down amendments on Angola if it is openly reported, unless either house disapproves the aid within thirty days (in the Senate version), or unless and until both houses disapprove the aid by concurrent resolution (in the House version).

Third, neither the Tunney language nor the military aid bill amendments deal effectively with US funneling Angola aid through other foreign countries. The New York Times reported on December 19 that the Security Council 40 Committee decided in July to channel US aid through Zaire and Zambia to minimize the evidence of direct involvement. Unauthorized transfers of aid to third parties are prohibited by law, but these violations are very difficult to prove and punish.

- Washington Office on Africa

* * * * *

New Evidence of CIA Involvement in Angola

David Anable, Correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, reported last week that 150 American ex-servicemen were being given refresher military training at Fort Benning, Georgia in preparation for mercenary service in Angola. The Fort Benning contingent was part of a larger group of 300 men who were "ready to go" when the CIA obtained the necessary funds (New York Times, Jan. 2). The group would join 300 Americans hired, trained, paid and equipped by the CIA who are already fighting in Angola with anti-MPLA forces. In a January 5 Monitor article, Anable reported that the CIA abruptly ended the Fort Benning program and shifted its recruitment activities to Western Europe where "African embassies...are quietly recruiting Europeans, using American and other funds."

Presidential Press Secretary Ron Nessen issued an evasive denial of the Monitor reports, leading to increased speculation about the real extent of US military involvement in Angola. Nessen denied US government hiring of mercenaries, but refused to give an unqualified "no" when asked about the recruiting, hiring, and training of mercenaries by private contractors such as the corporations - an often-used mode of CIA operations. Nessen also would not deny that the US is training foreigners to fight in Angola.

Monitor reporter Robert Hey disclosed that a committee in the House of Representatives will soon begin closed-door hearings to try to pry loose from the CIA information on the extent of its Angola operations (Monitor, Jan. 5) Senator John Tunney (D) of

California, who is said to be "very, very concerned" about the Monitor revelations, is planning to introduce a number of anti-CIA measures in the coming Senate session. (see above)

Congressional Black Caucus Statement on US Intervention

The 17-member Congressional Black Caucus will circulate a letter next month to 3500 black elected officials across the country urging opposition to US intervention in Angola. (Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 31) The letter, signed by Caucus leader Rep. Charles Rangel (D) of New York and by Rep. Charles Diggs (D) of Michigan, strongly criticizes Ford Administration actions in Angola. In addition, the Black Caucus has called for the cessation of all US assistance, direct or indirect, to "factions" fighting in Angola, and has urged US diplomatic steps to help bring about a cease-fire in Angola.

Gulf Oil, Boeing Reneg on Angola Contracts

The People's Republic of Angola is already being subjected to economic sabotage on the part of the United States corporations. Gulf Oil, for years the main economic supporter of the former Portuguese colonial regime in Angola, announced suspension of its Cabinda operations, reportedly under State Department pressure. (New York Times, Dec. 30) On December 29, TAG, the commercial airline of Angola protested in Lisbon that export licenses for two Boeing 737-200C aircraft had been revoked by the US Government Department of Commerce. A State Department official explained the cancellation of the licenses "on the basis of national security." (New York Times, Dec. 30) The US Government placed no such obstacles to the sale of Boeing 707's to Portugal at the height of the colonial war in Angola, when the planes were used to transport Portuguese troops to fight the MPLA.

New York Times Editor Critical of US Stance

The following excerpts from a January 6 New York Times Op-Ed article by Tom Wicker entitled "Either Way It Comes Out Quagmire".

"The Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola...is more effective than either of the two factions that have formed an uneasy coalition backed by the United States. The Popular Movement's armed forces are better equipped, trained and motivated and its leadership is better. So far as can be ascertained, it has more popular support among the Angolans - not least because it holds out hope of a more efficient government - and it is not distracted by the tribal and personal animosities that hamper the effectiveness of the coalition forces. It is reported of the latter, moreover, just as was true of the South Vietnamese army, that they are callous and contemptuous of the rights and property of the civilians for whose support they are supposedly contending.

"Why should the Popular Movement therefore, give up its advantage and form a national-unity government with its rivals...? Why should it believe that the United States, having sought to arm its opponents - and having already provided them about \$30 million in arms - is seeking anything now but another way to prevent their defeat? Why should the Popular Movement believe in the integrity of "a government of national unity" proposed by the backers of its opponents, any more than the Vietcong and the

North Vietnamese believed in the integrity of the "free elections" so often touted by the United States?

"The Popular Movement, moreover, has already received diplomatic recognition as the legitimate Government of Angola from more than 40 nations, including the Soviet Union and many (20) African states. It is not at all clear that these governments would extend the same recognition to a coalition government including factions not now recognized by anyone. In any case, the Popular Movement could hardly be expected to give up such a head start toward sole power.

"The major reason for the Popular Movement's widespread international support is not, however, its domestic authority. It is rather that the other side is backed by the racist regime of South Africa, which has unwisely sent troops to aid the same coalition the United States has supported. Having the immense political advantage of not being backed by South Africa is reason enough for the Popular Movement not to enter a coalition with the factions that do have such backing.

"Finally,... the United States has virtually no moral standing in Africa to act as a peacemaker in Angola because of the stubborn American support of the Salazar-Caetano regimes of Portugal. When these regimes were fighting a lengthy colonial war to retain possession of Angola and other African territories, the Soviet Union supported the Popular Movement's liberation struggle - while the United States with an eye to its air base in the Portuguese Azores, backed the white colonialists.

"If the United States is financing the training of mercenary forces to fight the Popular Movement... Washington has learned nothing, either from Vietnam or the last 15 years in Africa."

* * * * *

The following governments have granted recognition to the People's Republic of Angola:

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| *Algeria | *Mauritania |
| *Benin | *Mauritius |
| Brazil | *Mali |
| Bulgaria | Mongolia |
| *Burundi | *Mozambique |
| *Cape Verde | *Nigeria |
| *Chad | North Korea |
| *Congo-Brazzaville | North Vietnam |
| Cuba | Poland |
| Czechoslovakia | Rumania |
| Democratic Republic of Yemen | *Sao Tome and Principe |
| *Equatorial Guinea | *Somalia |
| German Democratic Republic | South Vietnam |
| *Ghana | *Sudan |
| *Guinea-Bissau | Syria |
| *Guinea-Conakry | *Tanzania |
| Guyana | USSR |
| Hungary | Yugoslavia |
| Iraq | |
| Jamaica | |
| *Libya | |
| *Malagasy | *African countries |

ON THE ANGOLAN FRONT

In a New Year's offensive, the Armed Forces of the Peoples Republic of Angola have scored major victories on all fronts against its South African-supported rivals.

In fierce fighting, the MPLA has been gaining ground, taking dozens of prisoners, and large quantities of war materials. The MPLA controls a corridor stretching east from Luanda to the Zambian border and has been fighting a 2-front battle north and south against the combined forces of the National Front (FNLA) and the National Union (UNITA).

Reuters reported a Popular Movement broadcast (NY Times, Jan. 7) that MPLA troops had taken Kungo, 200 miles southeast of Luanda on the central front, and captured 3 more white South Africans in addition to the 4 captured in December, 1975. In the newly liberated areas, political commissars were sent to organize the people and increase food production.

On the northern front, the MPLA blitzed the FNLA headquarters of Uige (formerly Carmona) and the Ngage airbase, a serious military and psychological blow to the FNLA. Uige is the capitol of the coffee-growing province of Uige and is considered by the FNLA as their "spiritual homeland." The Ngage military airfield, built by the Portuguese, was used by FNLA after Independence in November to receive weapons flown in by U.S. C130 and C140 transport planes. The loss of Uige with its important airstrips leaves the FNLA holding no major cities and without an effective means of receiving supplies.

In liberating Uige, the MPLA destroyed 2 American planes and seized hundreds of tons of weapons and ammunition and a number of armored cars and transport vehicles.

SOUTH AFRICA AND ANGOLA

South African Prime Minister Vorster rang out the old year by appealing to the West to become more involved in Angola, saying that "only a bigger Western involvement, not only diplomatically but in all other fields" could keep the People's Republic of Angola, led by the MPLA, from victory.

The U.S. has denied that it is allied with South Africa; rather "there is a convergence on policy. We're both doing the same thing....," claims U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Daniel Moynihan. As of late December, South Africa had committed some 6,000 regular troops in Angola, and announced that it is sending reservist commandos into that country. The reservist units will serve three months at a time instead of the usual three week training period. "This is not a panic measure, but is intended to increase effectiveness," said South Africa's Defense Minister, Piet Botha, in announcing the measures. In Johannesburg, South Africa the country's three major Afrikaans churches called a "day of prayer" Wednesday, January 7, for troops on the Angolan border.

On January 6, the South African government admitted that three more of its soldiers were missing and believed to be captured by the People's Republic of Angola's armed forces. This followed their admission of the deaths in recent weeks of 25 soldiers "in the border region." The Christian Science Monitor (January 2, 1976) reported that, "The field hospital outside the UNITA-FNLA capitol of Huambo contains some 240 white troops, mainly South African regulars plus some mercenaries, many seriously wounded."

On January 7, it was reported that the South African Government stated that it would pull out of Angola if the Soviet Union and Cuba ceased their support for the People's Republic. (UPI, Jan. 7) On the same day, NBC-TV's correspondent Richard Valeriani reported that the

U.S. Government had received word that South Africa would be out of Angola in 48 hours. However, nobody in Washington has been willing to comment on the report, and the following day, Jan. 8, the report was denied by South Africa.

South Africa's claims of withdrawal are seen by the People's Republic of Angola as a ploy to give such countries as Zaire and Zambia a stronger hand in the January OAU meeting on Angola being held in Addis Ababa. Zaire and Zambia are pushing for a "coalition government" between UNITA, FNLA, and MPLA. However UNITA-FNLA's alliance with South Africa has discredited them with most of the member states of the OAU, an organization of all independent, majority-ruled African states. By January 7, 20 of the OAU's 47 member states had already recognized the People's Republic of Angola as the sole legitimate government of Angola.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1976

Text of Ford Letter to Nigeria's Leader on U.S.

Attitude on Angola

LAGOS, Nigeria, Jan. 7 (Reuters) — Following, as made public today by the Nigerian Government, is the text of a letter on the Angolan situation from President Ford to Brig. Murtala Muhammed, the Nigerian chief of state.

Your excellency:

During this critical period in African and world affairs, I believe it would be useful to give you my views on the Angolan situation.

Since your Government has recognized the M.P.L.A. regime as the government of Angola, I believe it is necessary that there be no misunderstanding about our position.

In turn I would welcome any ideas and suggestions which, I am sure, you will offer in the spirit of friendship and cooperation that I present my thoughts to you.

The objective of United States policy in Angola has been to counter efforts by

the Soviet Union to impose one faction as the government of Angola.

Our view has been that only a government composed of all groups can claim to represent that country.

U.S. Global View

We have consequently refrained from recognizing any faction as the government. We have several times called for an end to all foreign intervention and have repeatedly stated our willingness to cooperate with such an endeavor.

As President of a country which has global responsibilities, I want you to know how seriously we regard this

Soviet intervention 8,000 miles from its borders, outside its traditional area of security interest. The Soviet action could have grave future implications elsewhere in the world.

I wish to assure you that we see the M.P.L.A. as one of the three legitimate factions in Angola. We seek neither the destruction nor the defeat of the M.P.L.A.

But we do believe that it should not be allowed to assume total power by force of Soviet and Cuban arms.

National Unity Favored

We hope a government of national unity will emerge, and we stand ready to provide reconstruction assistance when that happens.

On the South African question, I wish to state that the U.S. in no way sought or encouraged the South Africans to become involved in Angola, nor were we consulted. They acted, no doubt, in defense of their national interest as they see it.

We did not initiate any consultation with them and have maintained our military embargo on all arms to South Africa.

We share your concern over their presence and desire it to end just as we do that of the Soviet Union and Cuba.

We will do our utmost to bring about their withdrawal

in the interest of withdrawal of all foreign forces.

Cease-Fire Wanted

The upcoming O.A.U. summit meeting on Angola can clearly be extremely important in promoting an early end to the fighting and a peaceful settlement of the civil war.

It is our hope that the O.A.U. will insist upon a prompt end to all foreign involvement in Angola, arrange a standstill cease-fire between the forces, and bring about negotiations among the Angolan groups.

My Government would support such an initiative and cooperate with it, provided other distant powers do so as well. We would also, in that case, urge South Africa to end its involvement.

We cannot, however, stand idly by if the Soviet and Cuban intervention persists.

I would be pleased to learn your reaction to the foregoing and I hope we can continue to exchange views on this and other matters of mutual concern.

Sincerely,
GERALD R. FORD

NIGERIA ANGRILY REJECTS FORD LETTER

Nigeria responded to Ford's letter with a firm and angry rejection of Washington's suggestion that the upcoming OAU Summit insist on the withdrawal of Soviet and Cuban military advisers from Angola (Reuters Jan.7)

"It should not be that difficult to draw a clear distinction between foreign countries invited by patriotic forces to assist in fighting for national independence and those racist adventures who commit wanton aggression by invading African countries with the sole aim of undermining their independence, exporting their discredited and inhuman social systems...The Federal Military Government rejects completely this fatuous attempt by the Ford Administration to insult the intelligence of African nations."

It was reported that similar letters were sent by Ford to several other African states in a diplomatic offensive by the U.S. to affect the outcome of the OAU meeting on Angola. Nigeria added that it hoped all other African nations would join it in rejecting the American "directive" and continued:

"Gone are the days when Africa will ever bow to the threat of any so-called super power...It is about time that friends of the benighted racist regimes and supporters of the degradation of Africans began to live with the realities of the present thinking in Africa."

The New York Times (Jan.8) reported this as the fiercest attack that the new Nigerian government has mounted on any foreign power since its coming to power last July. The mass-circulation DAILY TIMES of Nigeria carried the headline "Shut Up", and the NIGERIAN HERALD used half its front page for the words "To Hell with America" and wrote in its editorial:

"Africa must stand up squarely to the crude bullying and insulting logic of the US Government. President Ford's double quick march to the right for the purpose of a Presidential election cannot be done at the expense of innocent Angolan people. Nor could Henry Kissinger give substance to his cosmetic diplomacy that failed in Indochina and the Middle East by trampling like a rogue elephant on the independence of Angolans."

INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT AGOSTINHO NETO OF THE PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF ANGOLA

(published in Afrique-Asie, January 11, 1976. Transla-
tion from the French printed here)

On the OAU:

"The OAU is unfortunately not yet an organization which can be characterized by its progressive attitude. Nor is it an organization in which unity is preserved by paying whatever sacrifices are necessary. So this is why we are currently witnessing this lamentable spectacle, in which the majority of the OAU members do not condemn foreign aggression against Angola emanating from both South Africa as well as Zaire. It is even difficult to get them to admit that the struggle of the Angolan people today is one seeking independence and complete liberation, that it is not in the least directed against our compatriots. There is no question here, as is often claimed outside, of a civil war, but rather one of a war of resistance to imperialist aggression in which our country is the victim. Moreover, this aggression has been carefully prepared by the Portuguese colonialists, who have simply stood by and watched the invasion from Zaire, who have entered into agreements with South Africa, and then have stood by and watched as the South Africans invaded. And all of this has taken place before the date of our independence.

"The mounting of this aggression has been in service to the interests of the imperialist circles and of Portuguese fascists today represented by several of the men in power in Portugal. We are convinced that, had Portugal acted differently, our country would not be today a victim of aggression.

"Returning to Africa, I must say we have no illusions as to what will happen at the next OAU summit. It appears quite improbable to me that we will be able to take any decisions there as to the condemnation of South Africa and Zaire. Instead we will witness a dispute of indeterminable consequences, because of the ambiguous position of certain countries within the Organization.

"However, the fact that a great number of African countries do not condemn the invasion will not stop our people from resisting, from continuing our national liberation struggle -- our second liberation struggle -- nor will it stop our people from understanding that we are faced with foreign aggression."

On International Recognition:

"The fact that our young Republic is already recognized on the international level is sufficient to show that we are considered as the true representatives of the Angolan people, as the representatives of an aspiration that is African -- to independence and liberty -- and which is also the aspiration of many peoples the world over. As to the possibility of our conducting a diplomatic campaign to increase the number of countries recognizing us, I think that reality itself will be sufficient to show to all the necessity of such recognition. There is no question, in fact, of making a campaign or of exerting pressure. Rather we will continue to create the political and diplomatic conditions which will lead other countries to recognize us. The fact that certain countries do not recognize us now really doesn't bother us much. Whether they like it or not, we exist, and, sooner or later, diplomatic relations will be established."

On the PRA's Foreign Policy and Relationship to the Soviet Union:

"From the beginning of our movement -- which today directs the People's Republic of Angola -- our international policy has been one of non-alignment, because we want to be ourselves, to be independent, to follow a policy which corresponds effectively to the will of the Angolan people without having to "bow to" this or that other country having this or that policy.

"We are accused today of having appealed to the Soviet Union for the arms which we need. We are accused of dependence on a certain bloc. These are lies. We have received since the beginning of our struggle aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries without being obliged to follow this or that policy. The fundamental nature of our international policy-- which is one of non-alignment-- springs simply and only from the real interests of our people. We are not, therefore, as people say, a satellite of the Soviet Union nor are we against any other powers. Quite simply, we are against imperialism and against all those who represent imperialism. On the other hand, we are for all those who represent progress. We are non-aligned."

On Relations with Portugal and their Effects on the Angolan Economy:

"Our relations with Portugal are and will continue to be difficult, because, as I have already said, Portugal is a power which has not honestly decolonized Angola.

Portugal has always tried to thwart the movement for liberty and independence of the Angolan people. It has come up with several plots attempting to prevent us from being truly independent, from the time of the accords of Sal Island --where Spínola, Mobutu and others decided to partition Angola -- up to and including the Zairean and South African invasion. All this has been done with the full knowledge of the current rulers in Portugal and we won't easily forget it.

"The economic dispute with Portugal will certainly be discussed, although the solution will take time, because the current state of our relations certainly presents difficulties and problems that will not be easily overcome. Moreover, from an economic point of view --even though Portugal has debts to Angola for which we will firmly demand payment -- we must, for the present time, depend above all on our own resources. This is all the more important because Portugal, because of its economic and political situation, will not likely be able to honor these debts in the immediate or near future.

"This said, I must stress that we have always been the friends of the Portuguese people, that we have always supported the progressive circles and the working class in Portugal, that, at this very moment, we are in solidarity with all those who are in prison for having tried to defend democracy in Portugal and that we hope the government in Lisbon will free them as soon as possible so that Portuguese democracy will not betray the hopes it has inspired the world over."

On the Tasks of Economic Reconstruction, Education, Health, etc.:

"Our most urgent task remains the defense of our territory. Before we can attack the questions of economic development, educational expansion and health care, we must defend our country against the enemy invasion. This is our primary problem.

"Still, we are thinking at the same time of all the other problems, of which economic reconstruction is the most important. We are already in the process of planning agricultural development, the basis of our national economy, and industry is to follow. However, for the present,

all our efforts, in the economic as well as the cultural domain, are directed towards providing us with still more energy to drive the enemy from our territory."

ON THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF THE PRA

"Our objective of people's democracy springs from the will of our people to establish what we call people's power throughout the country. It is essential that the workers, the most exploited of the social classes--who have fought for independence and who are the driving force of the revolution we are making--be represented on all decision-making bodies that administer the State. I think that in the not too distant future we will have created the conditions whereby our workers and peasants, who make up the most exploited classes, can participate most effectively in the running of the country. From that moment on, our people's democracy will be a reality, and the people in power."

* * *

Growing Support for the People's Republic of Angola Among American Groups

Demonstrations:

Organizations in many cities are building coalitions and organizing demonstrations for the weekend after February 4, marking the 15th anniversary of the launching of armed struggle by the MPLA. In Philadelphia, a forum is planned for January 22 and a rally for February 7. In New York, a cultural evening of solidarity is planned for February 6 and a demonstration for February 7. Other actions are planned for February 7 in Chicago, Ann Arbor and Toronto.

In Washington D.C. on Monday, January 19, the day Congress reconvenes, a coalition of African support, anti-CIA, trade union and other progressive groups are sponsoring a rally at noon on the steps of the Capitol. A briefing and lobbying session on the legislation to cut funds for CIA actions in Angola is scheduled for that same afternoon. For more information, Contact the Washington Office on Africa (202-546-7961).

A related coalition of organizations, coordinated by the American Committee on Africa, is sponsoring a newspaper advertisement for mid-January opposing US intervention in Angola.

Resources:

- "The CIA's Secret War in Angola": a 12-page report published by the Center for National Security Studies, 122 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington DC 20002. 50¢ ea.
- "Continuing Escalation in Angola": a report by Sean Gervasi, on US-South African Military escalation in Angola. Published by the Africa Fund, 305 E. 46th Street, New York, NY 10017. 15¢ ea.
- "The Facts on Angola" published by the National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity with African Liberation, 530 W. 112th Street, #62, NYC 10025
- The current issue of Nation focusses on Angola, with articles by Sean Gervasi, Basil Davidson, Larry Bowman. Available on newsstands. (333 6th Ave, NYC 10014)