

what point do they enjoy the relatively greatest war-winning advantage by launching total war?

Apart from certain flash-points at which a total-war threat posture is highly probable (if not certain), the pattern of which I warned during my Nov. 1, 1976 nationwide address is the fundamental consideration to be watched. It is not a process of isolation of the Soviet Union which itself leads toward war, but a process of aggressive efforts to isolate the USSR conducted by a USA administration visibly committed to 1962 Missile Crisis-echoing postures of strategic confrontation.

The Carter administration's operations in Libya are deadly, but even more deadly is the pattern of hints being insinuated into leading Western European circles by NATO Brussels. These hints have been interpreted by some very sophisticated recipients as indicating that a Soviet intervention into the Libyan affair might probably result in a selective strategic launch against East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and so forth. That pattern of hints, which cannot fail to gush into reports hastened to Moscow, will shape Soviet thinking in the most dan-

gerous way. Faced with reflections of such thinking in NATO-Brussels, the Soviets' inclination will be a qualitatively-increased disposition for launching total war.

One of the most dangerous elements in the current situation is the Carter administration's hysterical effort to consolidate its political position with aid of a hard-line "anti-Communist" posture, thus attempting to neutralize its trade-union and conservative critics in the USA and elsewhere. That thrust will convince the Soviets that the Carter administration's strategic confrontation thrust is not offset by internal controls within NATO. The trade-unionists and conservatives who allow themselves to be manipulated by this gimmick ought to be accompanied by the act of kissing cherished parts of their anatomy a fond, final goodbye. Their gullibility in falling for that trick means that one not-so-fine early morning, the United States will probably cease to exist.

The way key Congressmen and others react to Carter's current insane escapade will inform us all whether these Congressmen and others have sufficient combined brains and guts to enable our nation to survive.

A Soviet Lesson

In April of this year the Soviet Union made a dramatic show of strength in the Atlantic Ocean which left NATO shocked. A *Reuter* release citing NATO intelligence sources has made known that the Soviets deployed 89 submarines, a fleet of surface warships — including the new aircraft carrier Kiev — and long-range aircraft in the unannounced maneuvers. The sources admitted that the show of strength was more than NATO tracking procedures could handle.

In May, the USSR moved 120,888 troops into Eastern Europe by air in the space of one week.

Alert readers will recall that around this time, Secretary of State Vance returned from his mission to Moscow, and the full brunt of Soviet anger at the Carter Administration's provocative SALT package was first felt. Foreign Minister Gromyko, in a Moscow press conference, and *Pravda*, in a 5000 word editorial, charged that the package was designed to be unacceptable. With the deployment of Admiral Gorshkov's fleet, Moscow flexed the muscles behind its verbal warnings that Carter was heading for war.

The *Reuter* wire did not conceal the import of the Soviet move: "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization views the deployment of the Soviet submarine fleet to sea as one of its most important warning signs that a conflict is about to begin. Intelligence experts expect the submarines to begin moving out to operational areas between seven and 14 days before the start of war."

The news story sheds light on reports emerging in the intervening period to the effect that NATO's monitoring ability at the Iceland entrance to the North Atlantic waters, through which the Soviet fleet passes on the way from its base at Murmansk, should be revamped.

Also in April, it will be recalled, the conflict in Zaire with the involvement of NATO-directed French forces was escalating. The massive transport of foreign troops to aid Zairean President Mobutu was audibly con-

templated. During and after the Zairean war, the Soviet press portrayed it as a Wall Street-run operation that could lead to global conflict.

In light of events to date, readers might also return with interest to an April 24 article in the Soviet Military daily *Red Star*, which reported tension mounting at that time between Egypt and Libya. "The possibility of an attack by Egypt on Libya," commented the newspaper, "is linked with the recent visit of President Sadat to Washington, where he received positive statements of American support for such an action. Such support results from Egypt's pro-American policy in Africa and the Middle East, as demonstrated in Egypt's interference in the Zairean crisis."

Just last weekend, in the feature excerpted here, *Red Star* situated the several African "hot spots" as focal points in a single U.S. "local war" strategy which will cause global war.

Experienced observers in the United States greeted the *Reuter* report with a query: if the Soviets did *that* in April, what did they do last week?

General Haig Plays The Hypocrite

This article by Major Yu. Gavrillov and V. Vinogradov appeared in the Soviet military daily Red Star, July 24.

A few days ago Supreme Commander of the Allied Armed Forces of NATO in Europe General A. Haig gave an interview to the paper *France Soir* in which he said that he fears the beginning of a war in "the Third World." This war, in the opinion of A. Haig, "could break out as the result of an evolution of the situation in the Third World, without even any encouragement from the so-called superpowers.

This is patent hypocrisy. Everyone knows that it is precisely as a result of gross interference and "prompting" by the United States and other NATO countries that armed conflicts sporadically flare up in the "Third World." Africa is a good example.

In the south of the continent, with the active assistance of the major imperialist powers (there are still) dangerous hotspots of military tensions. With the military help of the USA, the racist regimes in Pretoria and Salisbury are attempting to suppress the liberation movement in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia with the help of an armored fist. They are aided by mercenaries recruited in NATO countries. The racists are committing one armed provocation after another against member countries of the OAU (Organization of African Unity). Mozambique, Angola, Zambia and Botswana have been recent victims of such pirate assaults.

Imperialism is sowing the seeds of conflict in relations between independent countries of Africa, provoking confrontations over problems inherited from colonial times. There are now alarming reports from the Horn of Africa. Imperialist circles are furiously attacking Ethiopia and its course for social reconstruction of society, supporting the intrigues of internal reaction, kindling separatism, instigating the Sudan to armed conflict with Ethiopia, and trying to involve other countries in it.

All this is done to weaken the independent countries of Africa, for the destruction of anti-imperialist struggle and the unity of the peoples of the continent.

The Beirut paper *An-Nida* writes that the Western countries — especially the USA — are "more than ever resorting to encouraging local wars and, so to speak, local military interference to inflict blows on the liberation movement in Africa and the entire world." As their tools they use regimes who follow reactionary internal and pro-Western foreign policies. The goal, according to the newspaper, is the following: to remain in the shadows while merely "sending transport, arms and

ammunition" to these regimes.

Secret operations and subversive actions against the young states formed from the shards of Portugal's former colonial empire also serve to ignite military conflicts. Recently, the name "Cobra-77" has appeared on the pages of the press. The President of the People's Republic of Angola, Agostino Neto, wrote in the journal *Afrique-Asie* that with this operation the imperialist forces are planning to liquidate the Angolan people in an armed incursion. The plan is as follows: seizure of a number of regions of the country by splinter group forces consisting of traitors to the Angolan people, establishment on these territories of "puppet states" obedient to imperialism, and suffocation of the People's Republic. In this connection, attention falls on reports of the CIA's participation in these plans. As the Nigerian paper *West African Pilot* wrote at the beginning of this year, the subversive activities of the Angolan schismatics in the FNLA and UNITA are coordinated by a special military-political committee which is headed by CIA cadre officer General Moore.

The risk of African countries' involvement in armed clashes is aggravated by plans for the creation of a so-called South Atlantic treaty bloc including several Latin American countries and racist South Africa. The planned military pact is aimed against the liberation struggle of peoples. The main inspiration for this block which "is necessary to preserve the strategic and economic interests of the West" in southern and central Africa, writes the Senegalese journal *Africa*, is the Pentagon — although for tactical reasons the American generals prefer to still remain behind the scenes.

Facts are stubborn things. In this case, they leave no doubt that responsibility for the already existing tension stops in Africa, for the danger of drawing new countries into the maelstrom of military confrontation, belongs to the imperialist circles of the Western powers. Such a course goes against the efforts of peoples to strengthen peace and international security.