

2 ANGOLA REGIMES REPORTED SEEKING TO JOIN THE O.A.U.

JAN 12 1976
Rival Administrations Said
to Submit Applications to
African Organization

CLOSED MEETING HELD

Leaders of 46-Nation Group
Continue Debate on Steps
to Resolve Conflict

NYTimes

By MICHAEL T. KAUFMAN

Special to The New York Times

ADDIS ABABA, Ethiopia, Monday, Jan. 12—The heads of state of the Organization of African Unity met in closed session yesterday on the question of Angola amid reports that the two rival governments of the war-torn country had made formal applications for membership in the organization.

Little word of what was happening emerged from the closed session as the leaders of the 46 member nations debated various courses of action in the conflict between the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, which has received Soviet support, and the rival coalition of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, which has received support from Western powers.

Call for Seating

There were reports, however, that 22 African countries that have recognized the government of the Popular Movement, which is based in Luanda, the colonial capital, were preparing a resolution calling on the O.A.U. to seat an Angolan.

Twenty-two other countries that have recognized no faction were said to be drafting a resolution urging the formation of a government of national unity in Angola.

Some countries were suggesting that the O.A.U. limit its action to condemning foreign intervention and two versions of such a position were reported being prepared. The first, a mild one, would list as aggressors in Angola only South Africa and certain unnamed powers. The other reportedly specifies Cuba, the Soviet Union and the United States in addition to South

Continued on Page 6, Column 3

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

Africa and calls for withdrawal of all such support.

Meanwhile, the leaders of the government in opposition to the Popular Movement pledged today to continue the armed struggle until the Luana government agreed to a political coalition. The leaders, whose administration is based in Huambo, in central Angola, also characterized recent action by the United States Senate to halt aid to them as an abdication of great-power responsibilities.

Americans' 'Wisdom' Hailed

The Popular Movement, through its spokesmen, said, however, that it could never join with the two other factions and praised the Senate vote and the "wisdom of the American people" for curbing Kissinger's war.

The Popular Movement's representatives spent yesterday in consultation with their allies on strategy to press their case for sole representation. Their leader, Dr. Agostinho Neto, has not come to the meeting here and his representatives say he will not come until he is recognized as a head of state rather than one of three equal leaders of factions.

In a memorandum that the Popular Movement submitted to the Organization of African Unity with its application for membership as the People's Democratic Republic of Angola, the movement's rivals were described as "a gnost-like nomadic republic" that did not exist either in fact or in law. "These puppets," the memorandum continued, "declared a republic in which nobody knows what its constitutional principles are, its national anthem nor its flag." The government, with Prime Ministers serving alternately from each of the component factions, was described as "juridical abomination." The position paper emphasized throughout that the Huambo group's claim to legitimacy was totally nullified by its "collusion with South Africa, the enemy of all Africa."

In advancing its own case the Popular Movement asserted that it was "the only African government whose army had killed and captured South African soldiers." The memorandum concluded by insisting that "the People's Democratic Republic of Angola must be admitted as an O.A.U. member and F.N.L.A. and Unita must be condemned because they have betrayed Africa." F.N.L.A. is the National Front and Unita is the name popularly used for the National Union.

The rancor that divides the two sides in Angola is becoming evident also in the relations

of their respective partisans among the delegations at the meeting here. There was a report that in yesterday's session a delegate from Guinea, a strong backer of the Popular Movement, called President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire a "reactionary." Such a direct attack of a head of state constitutes a severe breach of O.A.U. protocol.

With the lines drawn hard and fast, debate continued through the night and officials of the organization thought that it might go on past dawn, with no one making any bets on the outcome.

Given the secrecy that surrounded the deliberations of the African leaders, much attention here was focused on a new conference by Representative Charles C. Diggs, a leader of the black caucus in the United States Congress.

U.S. Accused of 'Blunder'

Mr. Diggs, a Detroit Democrat, sharply criticized United States policies in Angola. "The American intrusion in the Angolan conflict is the biggest blunder in the history" of the United States' relations with Africa, he said, "and may be the most serious foreign policy miscalculation it has ever made."

Mr. Diggs is on an official visit for the House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, whose subcommittee on food and energy he heads, and he has been granted observer status by the African organization.

He deplored what he termed the United States "misadventure" in Angola, and while he did not come out in support of the Popular Movement, he de-

scribed Washington's assistance to the movement's rivals as "folly."

"The error of allowing United States policy to converge with that of white-supremacist South Africa was compounded by the covert nature of the operation," Mr. Diggs said. "Did the United States intervene to hold back the expansion of influence of progressive African majority-ruled states southward toward the cape under the guise of meeting a Soviet challenge?" he asked.

In his statement, which was printed for him by the United States Information Service here, Mr. Diggs called on the State Department to issue a clear call for the immediate withdrawal of South African forces in the same terms that it has demanded Soviet withdrawal. And he challenged the view that Soviet influence in Angola, even if it should be established—and he said he himself doubted it—posed a threat to United States interests.

"As an American," said Mr. Diggs, "I regret that the United States has allowed the Soviet Union to become identified as the principal supporter of African liberation." Mr. Diggs has for many years been a vocal critic of earlier United States policies of alliance with Portugal during the Colonial wars in Africa.

Just before Mr. Diggs issued his condemnation, Jonas Savimbi, the leader of the National Union, held a news conference in which he said that the United States as a great power had its own responsibilities in Angola "because it was the other great power that caused the situation." He asserted that the curbing of as-

sistance by the American Senate represented an abdication. Later Holden Roberto, the leader of the National Front, with whom Mr. Savimbi is allied in the Huambo-based government of the Democratic Republic of Angola, said American assistance to his forces was "too small, too late and consisting of old weapons."

Mr. Savimbi was asked about a rumored compromise under

which a coalition government would be established under Dr. Neto of the Popular Movement but without the participation of either himself or Mr. Roberto.

"If the plan is to exclude all three of us in the interests of unity, I am ready to be excluded," he replied. But he insisted that he could not defer to Dr. Neto since he and Mr. Roberto had the backing of most Angolans. "Ultimately the

issue will have to be resolved by free elections," he declared.

If no government of national unity is formed, Mr. Roberto said, "there will be war." "A civil war is bad, a long war is bad, he went on. "But it is also a school for political education for the masses. Our people will participate. They will not be merely observers and have a government imposed on them."