



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

DEC 1

UN/EN COLLECTION

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2767
25 November 1987

ENGLISH

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 25 November 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan)

Members: Argentina

Bulgaria

China

Congo

France

Germany, Federal Republic of

Ghana

Italy

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

United Arab Emirates

United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland

United States of America

Venezuela

Zambia

Mr. DELPECH

Mr. TSVETKOV

Mr. YU Mengjia

Mr. ADOUKI

Mr. BLANC

Count YORK von WARTENBURG

Mr. GBEHO

Mr. BUCCI

Mr. BELONOGOV

Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. BIRCH

Mr. WALTERS

Mr. PABON GARCIA

Mr. ZUZE

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

COMPLAINT BY ANGOLA AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 19 NOVEMBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ANGOLA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19278)

LETTER DATED 20 NOVEMBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19286)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Nogueira-Batista (Brazil), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Santos (Cape Verde), Mr. Peñalosa (Colombia), Mr. Nufiez Mosquera (Cuba), Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Mangwazu (Malawi), Mr. Ould Boye (Mauritania), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Ononaiye (Nigeria), Mr. Matos Proença (Portugal), Mr. Branco (Sao Tome and Principe), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia),

Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, Sir, allow me to congratulate you on the excellent way in which you are discharging the functions of President of the Security Council for this month, and to express my conviction that under your leadership the Council will be able worthily to carry out its obligations, particularly in connection with the extremely important item we are now considering.

I wish also, Sir, to express our gratitude to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Italy, Ambassador Maurizio Bucci, for the very skilful and precise way in which he guided the Council's work last month.

We are also very pleased to welcome here the new Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Count York von Wartenburg, and to wish him every success in his responsible post.

Less than a month ago the Security Council was discussing the question of Namibia, and today its attention is once again focused on southern Africa. Once again we are dealing with extremely dangerous events which represent a serious threat to international peace and security - South Africa's acts of aggression against a sovereign African State, the People's Republic of Angola.

This agenda item is not new to the Security Council. It was first brought before the Council in March 1976 - a mere five months after the proclamation of the independence of the People's Republic of Angola - and since then it has been reappearing on the agenda almost annually, and in some cases several times in a single year.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The Security Council has already adopted dozens of resolutions demanding an end to South Africa's aggressive raids. As is known, some draft resolutions were blocked by the representatives of Western countries.

Despite the efforts of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies to put an end to South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States, the South African racists obstinately continue to pursue their policy of encroaching on the sovereignty of Angola and other African countries.

It is particularly alarming that South Africa's war of aggression against Angola is becoming more brazen and more widespread year by year, as is described in detail and with great cogency in the letters from the President of Angola, Mr. Dos Santos, to the Secretary-General, dated 5 November and 18 November 1987, the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Angola dated 20 October 1987 and the statement made in the Security Council last Friday by Angola's Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. da Silva de Moura. Recent reports state that regular army units of the racist régime have penetrated hundreds of kilometres into Angolan territory, where they engaged in large-scale military operations with air support and using heavy ground equipment against the army of the People's Republic of Angola, an army valiantly resisting the aggressor and defending the right of the Angolan people to live in peace and freedom.

At the same time, there is in Namibia, on its border with Angola, a large concentration of South African troops, totalling about 30,000, with more than 400 armoured personnel carriers and artillery pieces. That surely shows that while fierce battles are raging in southern Angola, the aggressor's warlike fist is being poised over that sovereign State, ready to strike a fresh blow.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The brazen conduct and self-confidence of the racist régime of Pretoria are worthy of note; the régime is now openly saying that its troops will carry out military activities in Angolan territory. Furthermore, it has been officially acknowledged that President Botha himself and several of his Ministers, in defiance of world public opinion, entered Angolan territory to boost the morale of the South African troops.

South Africa's armed intervention has been supplemented by subversive acts by a band of Angolan traitors, whose activities are financed and directed by Pretoria for the purpose of forcibly imposing political changes on the People's Republic of Angola and destabilizing its economy. I refer to the terrorist group of bandits called UNITA, which in the past acted in concert with the Portuguese colonialists against MPLA and now serves as the tool of racist South Africa.

The situation in southern Africa is further aggravated by interference in the internal affairs of Angola by the United States, which provides UNITA with military, political and diplomatic assistance and support. It is generally known that over the past two years the United States has been supplying the Savimbi bandits with a considerable quantity of armaments, including Stinger missiles and anti-tank rockets. Thus Washington, together with the racist Pretoria régime, is helping to enlarge the scale of military actions in southern Angola, inter alia by helping UNITA carry out guerilla attacks on economic targets in Angola and destroy the country's infrastructure. This, by the way, has been acknowledged by Savimbi himself, who said: "I would say the U.S. is playing a decisive role in the war."
(The New York Times, 14 September 1987, p. 1)

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

It is a fact - not only a lamentable fact but one which undermines the prestige of the United Nations - that throughout its 12 years of existence, the People's Republic of Angola has not experienced one day of peace. It has been the victim of constant aggression and continuous acts of sabotage committed by racist South Africa. The material damage done is already over \$12 billion.

This long-lasting conflict in southern Africa has caused suffering to the peoples of the region and is a source of tension which aggravates the situation in the world as a whole.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The international community is unanimous in its belief that the reason for this must be sought in the bloody terror and aggressive policy pursued by those who defend the monstrous system of apartheid and thus hinder the resolution of the conflict in the southern part of that continent.

Elementary objectiveness and an unprejudiced view of the realities in that part of the world require a proper assessment of the stabilizing role of the Cuban troops who are in Angola at the request of the Government of that country and who are helping the Republic to defend its independence and sovereignty against a ceaseless and ever-growing threat from outside.

As members are aware, the Government of Angola has never wanted any military confrontation with South Africa. It desires peace on its borders and therefore is steadfastly seeking ways to reduce tension in the subregion and taking practical steps to that end. This is evidenced by its peace initiatives. In July of this year, for example, the People's Republic of Angola proposed the conclusion of a global agreement between the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) under the auspices of the Security Council or its five permanent members, in order to bring about the independence of Namibia on the basis of resolution 435 (1978) and to guarantee peace and stability in Angola.

But the response to those peaceful and constructive efforts of Angola, and also to the recently adopted Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which calls for a cease-fire, has been an expansion of South Africa's armed aggression against that country.

The cynicism and studied brazenness of Pretoria's conduct can be explained only by the fact that it has been allowed to get away with it and by the support

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

afforded the aggressor by its protectors. It is no secret that it is precisely because of the open connivance of certain Western States, which make use of the veto in the Security Council and stubbornly prevent it from applying the relevant provisions of the Charter against the South African racists, that the Council has been essentially unable fully to discharge its functions, as required by the Charter, by taking the necessary effective steps under Chapter VII of the Charter, against the Pretoria régime.

It is noteworthy that in certain other instances the self-same countries are very insistent on having the Security Council apply the relevant provisions of the Charter. What is the reason for this selective approach? Is it not that in this particular case we are dealing with a régime which is seeking to protect not only its own but also someone else's military, strategic and economic interests in southern Africa?

Whatever the truth of that may be, one thing is clear: allowing the racist aggressor to act with impunity only encourages it, and now it does not even take the trouble to camouflage its criminal acts.

So long as the racist South African régime is given support, whether in the name of so-called constructive co-operation or any other kind of co-operation, so long as efforts are made to whitewash South Africa and to free it from its international isolation, the Pretoria régime, as experience has shown, will not cease its criminal policies, will hold on to Namibia, which it occupies illegally, and will perpetrate acts of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States.

The Soviet Union strongly condemns the criminal invasion of the People's Republic of Angola by South African forces and demands an immediate and complete cessation of hostile acts against Angola and other sovereign African States. In

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

the light of the particularly grave danger which the continual acts of aggression perpetrated by the Pretoria régime against Angola pose to international peace and security, we believe that the Security Council must take the most effective steps provided for in the Charter against the aggressor.

Our country, reaffirming its complete solidarity with the selfless and just struggle being waged by the Angolan people, fully supports the appeals contained in the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions calling upon States Members of the United Nations to give all possible assistance to the People's Republic of Angola, in order to help it build up its defence capabilities so that it can protect its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Soviet Union continues to advocate a just settlement of the conflict in southern Africa. It advocates the intensification of collective efforts to find ways and means to bring about such a settlement with the participation of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the front-line States, the Non-Aligned Movement and all forces that favour liberty, justice and peace in that part of the world. For that reason, we shall support the draft resolution which has been submitted by the non-aligned States members of the Security Council, in the hope that its unanimous approval by the Council will be treated with due seriousness by the South African Government and that South Africa will heed the demands contained in it, particularly regarding the cessation of aggression and the withdrawal of the racist régime's armed forces from the territory of Angola.

We also consider it important that the Security Council should continue to keep developments in southern Africa under review and be ready to take the necessary steps under Chapter VII of the Charter if South Africa does not comply with the provisions of the present draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a source of satisfaction to my delegation to see you, Sir, presiding over the meetings of the Security Council this month. The period during which we have served with you in the Council makes us confident that you will preside over its work with expertise, wisdom and traditional Japanese precision. The relations of friendship between our two countries are a further source of such faith.

We would also like to extend our thanks and appreciation to Ambassador Bucci, the Permanent Representative of Italy, for his presidency of the Security Council last month, and to welcome the new Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Security Council.

Today, once again, the Security Council is meeting to consider yet another new chapter in the unending tragedy which has been unfolding in southern Africa since the beginning of the century.

At this late stage in the debate, in the wake of the comprehensive review presented by the Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola and the other detailed statements made in the Council, I do not think there is any need for further details.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The fact that the head of the racist régime found it within his power to enter Angolan territory illegally is a further sign of the contempt in which that régime holds one of the basic principles of international law, namely, the principle of sovereignty. The continued occupation of Angolan soil by the forces of that régime and the expansion of its aggression in Angola's territory are signs of the contempt in which that régime holds this Council's resolutions. In substance, we may not be faced here with an exceptional or strange situation. The racist régime has familiarized us with such practices. It considers the destabilization of the front-line States the corner-stone of the policy of apartheid, as it does the continued occupation of Namibia.

We consider the so-called UNITA a puppet organization which serves external ambitions. We consider its support from whatever source an act of interference in the internal affairs of Angola, in direct contravention of international law and of the Charter.

The incitement of conflict between the States and peoples of the African continent has always been one of the foundations of colonialist-racist policies in the drive to continue the plundering of the resources of that continent and perpetuate colonialist domination. That is why we reject any linkage between the solution of the problems of southern Africa and the international conflicts arising from the competition between the major Powers.

Aggression and occupation are abnormal in the view of all the States of the world. It would seem, however, that it is not so in the case of the two racist régimes of South Africa and Israel. Consequently, those two régimes have acquired an unprecedented record with regard to violations of international law and contempt for the resolutions of the Council. They have blazed a trail for all those that may wish to flout the international will.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Since my delegation is about to conclude its period of office as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, and as a result of our inside experience and what we have heard said concerning the credibility of the Council, we may well ask ourselves whether the meetings of the Security Council have come to be an expression or reflection of an international impotence which precludes any possibility of dealing firmly and decisively with the racist régime in South Africa, notwithstanding the international unanimity on the need to eliminate it.

Some may still believe that it is possible to deal positively with South Africa, that is to say, have the racist régime co-operate actively in some sort of act of self-destruction. It is on this contradictory logic that the South African régime depends in perpetuating and sustaining itself. Racism is not a passing phenomenon. It is an institutionalized philosophy that has historical and ideological roots and international extensions and contacts. It gate-crashed the international arena through its links with foreign interests. Consequently, it is a contradiction in terms to claim that it could be improved or eliminated by doing business with it. That contradicts reason and logic.

This leads us to an important conclusion, namely, that those that subscribe to such a view pretend to concur in the view that this racist régime must be eliminated, while believing the exact opposite. The best proof is the overt support extended to Israel and the covert support given to the South African régime.

The use of historical comparisons and the assertion that the racist régime in South Africa will automatically disappear, as similar régimes did in some Western countries, are irrelevant. Racism in South Africa is practised by an alien régime that came to the continent as an invader, and continues to be an alien régime sustained by external Western support.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The Security Council has been seized of the situation in South Africa since 1960. Yet, nothing has changed. Namibia has not become independent. South Africa has not desisted from its policies of aggression against the front-line States. The black majority in South Africa have not regained their rights.

Thus the meetings of the Security Council have acquired a routine character. Their outcome is known in advance. We know that statements of all kinds will be made in condemnation of the racist régime in South Africa. The speakers will call for the elimination of apartheid. And that is as far as it will go. The Security Council cannot go beyond condemnation and denunciation. When a draft resolution is submitted, one of two things will happen: either the draft resolution will be of a routine nature, in which case it will be adopted and thus added to the preceding resolutions of the same kind; or it will be a draft resolution of substance which aims at tightening the rope round the throat of the racist régime, in which case it will be doomed to failure through the use of the veto.

We do not believe that this was the fate the founders of the United Nations and the drafters of its Charter intended when they entrusted the Security Council with the responsibility for international peace and security.

Security Council resolutions should truthfully reflect the debate which takes place on the subject. We have heard the majority of those who have participated in this debate calling on the Council to take decisive measures against the racist régime and stating that these measures, in accordance with the Council's mandate under the Charter, could be applied through the implementation of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. We look forward to the day when all the members of the Council will be able to respond to these demands to impose the necessary strict measures.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Meanwhile, my delegation is sponsoring the draft resolution submitted to the Council, although we believe that it does not reflect the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. Yet the draft resolution is a further test, not of the intentions of South Africa, which are fully known to us, but of the credibility of those States which continue to co-operate with that system or to act as its apologists.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to me.

The representative of Cuba has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): When on Monday morning, 23 November, the representative of the United States requested to speak and referred to human rights and dignity, we thought he would announce that his Government condemned the South African invasion of Angola and would no longer impose its stubborn veto on the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Council against racist South Africa. However, none of this actually occurred. Instead, the United States representative attempted to orchestrate an illogical, stammering reply to the statement of Cuba's Ambassador perhaps aimed at distracting attention from that statement. He failed to do so. The debate continued at a high level.

But what dignity can the representative of the United States be referring to when the international community knows that the apartheid régime in South Africa is being maintained thanks to the moral and material assistance it receives from the Administration in Washington. What human rights can the representative of the United States be referring to when the entire world knows that the inhuman policy of racial segregation practised by Botha's régime is possible only because of the blessing and the widest support of the United States Government?

It is a secret to no one that the war in Angola is the war of the United States Government. Washington set out from the very beginning to conduct covert activities in order to eliminate the MPLA through counter-revolutionary groups - FLNA and UNITA - with the support of its mercenaries and South Africa.

It is a secret to no one - and some of the statements we heard during the debate have borne this out - that since the spring of 1975 the United States has invested tens of millions of dollars in providing weapons and advisers to the counter-revolutionary and secessionists groups in Angola. There were no Cuban personnel in Angola at that time.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

The first unit of Cuban troops dispatched to Angola, as has also been acknowledged here, left for that country in November, several weeks after the South African racists, with Washington's support - and the members of the CIA should be well aware of this - had invaded Angola and penetrated more than 700 kilometres into the south. It is shameful that a permanent member of the Security Council - which openly supports racist South Africa and co-operates with Pretoria in all spheres, including the nuclear field, enabling that country to acquire a capacity for destruction that represents a constant threat to its neighbours and to international security - to resort permanently to the veto and thus prevent the Council from carrying out the role entrusted to it under the Charter and to resort to lies and false presentations of history in order to support the white South African minority.

It is an undeniable historical fact that apartheid is the cause of South Africa's aggressive policy against its neighbours, that apartheid is the cause of South Africa's invasions of Angola, that apartheid is the cause of the illegal occupation of Namibia. But it is also an irrefutable fact that apartheid is maintained thanks to Washington's support. As evidence of this support we have the monstrous "linkage" and "constructive engagement", which have been condemned by the international community and world public opinion. But notwithstanding United States support and its vetoes in the Security Council, notwithstanding its co-operation with South Africa, including in the nuclear field, notwithstanding its massive violations of the human rights of the African peoples to self-determination and independence, and notwithstanding the lies of the representative of Washington, apartheid is putrefying.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

Neither South African armoured divisions nor United States vetoes in the Security Council will be able to prevent the liquidation of the abhorrent apartheid régime in South Africa, Namibia's independence and the territorial independence of the People's Republic of Angola.

The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Japan.

It is most deplorable that the Security Council must once again consider the question of attacks by South Africa against Angola, a problem which has been brought to the attention of this Council so many times in the past. This time South Africa's military attack against Angola is reportedly larger in scale and greater in intensity than anything we have seen in recent years.

In his letter of 18 November to the Secretary-General, the President of the People's Republic of Angola very well describes the nature of South African involvement. This time, South Africa has in fact admitted that its forces are fighting alongside the rebel forces of UNITA in south-eastern Angola. In an attempt to justify the unjustifiable, South Africa's Permanent Representative has argued that it is simply acting because its security interests are threatened.

Does South Africa really think that the international community is so naive as to believe this patently false excuse?

It was, after all, South Africa, not Angola, that violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of its neighbour. It was South Africa that sent its troops into Angola and launched armed attacks against that country. Angola did not threaten South Africa. The argument that South African troops account for less than 5 per cent of all military forces in the area is as ridiculous as it is irrelevant.

(The President)

The Government of Japan condemns in the strongest terms this latest manifestation of South Africa's destabilization policy and deplores the loss of human life resulting from those actions.

We demand that South Africa cease its hostile actions immediately and withdraw its troops from Angolan territory forthwith. On this occasion, we reiterate our demand that South Africa end its illegal occupation of Namibia, from which it launched its most barbaric attacks on neighbouring countries.

Japan reaffirms its steadfast support for Angola and the other front-line States, which have been victims of the destabilization policy that South Africa is pursuing throughout the region.

If any circumstance dictates that the Security Council speak with one voice, the time is now. South Africa must be made to realize that its military attacks against Angola or any other neighbouring country are totally unacceptable to the international community. Japan hopes therefore that the draft resolution before us will receive the Council's unanimous support.

(The President)

I resume my function as President of the Security Council.

The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I wish to speak in exercise the right of reply of the United States to the intemperate and offensive remarks just made by the representative of Cuba. He seeks again to divert the attention of this body from Cuba's disastrous role in the Angolan civil war by making spurious and unfounded charges against the United States.

The 35,000 Cuban troops in Angola are shedding the blood of Angolans in a civil war. There can be no peace in the region or independence for Namibia until foreign troops, whether Cuban or South African, are withdrawn from Angola.

The representative of Cuba was apparently stung by criticism of Cuba's appalling human rights record. It is no secret, however, that Cuba engages in massive and systematic abuses of human rights. No verbal smoke-screen by the Cuban representative can hide the brutal reality of a system that has driven some 15 per cent of its population into exile; that operates a vast network of prisons, labour camps and firing squads to keep itself in power; that holds some 15,000 political prisoners; and that engages in terrorism. At this very moment Cuban prisoners in the United States are setting fire to their prisons in order not to have to return to Cuba, despite the promises by the current Cuban Government of sweet and gentle treatment on their return. I think that speaks louder than any words can speak, that action of despair.

I would remind members of the Council that the arrival of Cuban forces to take sides in Angola's internal struggle came as a result of one party, the MPLA, breaking the agreement made in 1975 at Alvor, Portugal, with the two other liberation movements, UNITA and the FNLA. Had the MPLA abided by the agreement and

(Mr. Walters, United States)

permitted Angola's transition to independence to be accomplished jointly by the three liberation movements, the strife we have witnessed in Angola since 1975 could have been avoided.

The United States views on cross-border military actions in southern Africa are perfectly clear. We have never condoned cross-border violence or South African military raids into neighbouring countries. We stand by that view in the current instance of the South African incursion into southern Angola. We have always said, and continue to believe, that a military solution is not going to solve Angola's problems or end the bloodshed in that country or region.

This war has gone on for years. Despite Soviet provision of billions of dollars worth of hardware there is no conclusion in sight. In our view this proves the point that an escalation of the military conflict cannot work.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Cuba has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again the hypocrisy of the representatives of the United States has been made clear to the international community. Where is the respect for democracy, where is the respect for the majority opinion, where is the respect for freedom of information and for human rights, of the so-called champions of democracy?

The Non-Aligned Movement, the United Nations and the international community have condemned linkage as an unnatural monster opposed to Namibian independence. Only the United States Government has proved capable of defending that monster. Where is the respect for majority opinion and where is the respect for democracy of the so-called champions of democracy?

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

Mr. Walters referred to respect by Cuba for human rights. The defence of human rights is a banner for the Cuban Government; the way the Cuban people exercise their human rights, their right to life, to freedom, to practise sports, to a secure supply of food and employment is a source of pride for my Government. One does not see homeless people in Cuba. One does not see young people and children begging in the streets. One does not see the number of unemployed that are seen here. Is the Government of Mr. Walters, which sends its aircraft to kill the leaders of foreign Governments, as it did in the case of Muammar Qaddafi, more humane than the Cuban Government, which has reduced infant mortality to a little more than 12 per 1,000 births? Is that Government whose country has 60,000 illiterates, people who cannot read or write and are not even allowed to be freely informed, more humane than the Cuban Government, which has eliminated illiteracy? Is that Government, that system, under which one has to pay tens of thousands of dollars for a simple surgical operation, more humane than the Cuban Government, under which such operations are free, heart transplants are free, without consideration of whether the patient is a counter-revolutionary, a communist, in favour of the revolution or not in favour of it?

The only person who says that human rights are violated in Cuba is Mr. Walters and the band of counter-revolutionary Cubans, paid mercenaries, who from time to time come to international organizations and make such claims.

Arms in Cuba are in the hands of the people, in the factories, in the schools, and in the hands of the territorial militia. What Government that does not respect human rights would arm its people? I invite Mr. Walters to recommend to the United States Government that weapons be given to the young people, the desperadoes, in this country. They talk about Cuban prisoners in gaols. That is another example of the justice of that system: keeping men in prison without trial, who have completed their sentences but have not been released.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I listened to the propagandist speech made against my Government and my country. I think the fact that my country has just amnestied 12 million illegal immigrants speaks for itself. If this country is so bad, if there is no medical treatment and if there are so many illiterates, why are so many people trying to get in? Fifteen per cent of the population of Cuba has fled to my country, and I do not know how many have fled to other countries. I am not really going to get involved in this.

The Cuban representative mentioned that those Cubans are in gaol without trial. That should not surprise him. No one is in gaol without trial in America except when they are in preventive detention until they come up for trial. Anybody in those prisons has been condemned, and the record is open for anyone to read. Trials here are open. Trials here are free. The judges are independent of Government control. But all these things I would not expect him to understand.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution in document S/19291 on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Congo, the United Arab Emirates, Zambia, and, of course, my own delegation.

The numerous acts of aggression against Angola and the front-line States by the racist régime of South Africa, which have formed the basis of this Council's debates since Monday, 23 November, constitute a direct affront to this Council's authority. The character and extent of the present acts of aggression against Angola should be the cause of alarm everywhere. Delegations which have spoken in the debate have all acknowledged that such nakedly aggressive policies on the part of South Africa could, if unchecked, undermine the very foundations of the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Charter. It has also been reaffirmed that this Council has a clear obligation to preserve the principle of civilized behaviour in international relations and therefore should not let the racist régime have any doubts whatsoever about the seriousness with which the Council views its blatant violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The sponsors of draft resolution S/19291, dated 24 November 1987, have endeavoured to reflect those strong sentiments of members of the Council in a clear and unambiguous message to South Africa conveying this Council's outrage over its acts. The preambular part of this draft resolution inter alia recalls previous Security Council resolutions in which it has condemned the racist régime's acts of aggression against Angola. It expresses the Council's grave concern at the implications for international peace and security posed by the repeated attacks against Angola and the Council's unanimous condemnation of the illegal entry into Angola by the State President of South Africa and some of his top officials.

In the same vein, the operative paragraphs inter alia would have the racist régime strongly condemned for its continued and intensified acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Those acts constitute a flagrant violation of Angola's territorial integrity and sovereignty. The same has been said of the use of Namibian territory as a springboard for the South African incursions into Angola. Regarding South Africa's occupation forces, the draft resolution would have this Council call for their immediate withdrawal from Angolan territory, an act which is to be monitored by the Secretary-General on behalf of the Council, and a report would be submitted to the Council by 10 December 1987.

Indeed, the sponsors recognize the absolute necessity of the support of the international community at this critical time for the effective implementation of the Security Council's resolution. To that end, the draft not only enjoins all to refrain from any action that would undermine the territorial integrity of Angola and jeopardize the Secretary-General's mandate, but also calls upon all Member States to lend their maximum support and co-operation to the Secretary-General in the discharge of his mandate.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The need to send a clear and direct message to South Africa at this time cannot be overemphasized. The text before the Council is the result of extensive negotiations conducted over the past three days, and takes into account the sensibilities of all parties. It is therefore the hope of the sponsors of draft resolution S/19291 that it will be adopted by consensus.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is now ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. BUCCI (Italy): Mr. President, I have not had the opportunity thus far to thank you for the kind words you have addressed to my delegation and to me personally on the presidency exercised by Italy last month. I do so now, and I also convey my gratitude to the other delegations which joined you in conveying complimentary remarks.

Allow me now also to express my pleasure in seeing you assume the presidency. If I convey my appreciation to you with some delay, this does not imply that my sentiments are less than warm. All through this month we have been heartened by your experience and your skill as a diplomat, and by the fact that you represent a country rich in outstanding ancient traditions.

Finally, it is a very special pleasure for me to extend our most heartfelt welcome to Count York von Wartenburg, who now leads the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. We wish him all the success he deserves.

This is the first time that my country has been called upon to take a position on a draft resolution presented to the Security Council concerning the situation in Angola. In examining the circumstances of Angola, we have tried, as

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

is necessary in the case of important events which involve human collectivities, to maintain our objectivity. We have done so conscientiously, with a sense of responsibility, seeking the truth in the events which have occurred during past years in southern Africa.

It would be a grave error to think that the events on which the international community has gradually been called upon to give its opinion are the reflection of a situation that is simple or that can be simplified. Rather, those events are the expression of the instability which pervades an entire region, a site of confrontation between ancient and rooted historic traditions, between interests and mentalities which are different and even in opposition. The situation in southern Africa is a very complex one. Political, social and economic elements are closely interrelated.

When, last February, the Security Council held a debate on the draft resolution on apartheid, Italy did not hide the fact that in its opinion the key element in the South African political situation was precisely the policy of apartheid. That is still the case. We considered that element so decisive that we voted against it to the point of supporting recourse to Chapter VII of the Charter.

In South Africa, as in many other countries of the African continent, racial problems are enmeshed with tribal problems. What is even more serious in South Africa is that these problems are aggravated by the coexistence of the black community with sizeable minorities of whites and other races.

The South African Government, itself an expression of the white minority, has thought it possible to respond to this situation by establishing a socio-political order based on discrimination and racial segregation. This system has in essence made apartheid the instrument for perpetuating the domination of the white minority over the other components of South African society. This option cannot be corrected; it can only be abandoned.

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

The option thus taken is not a policy. The negation of equality of rights among men can only be responded to with the total vindication of those rights. And the events of all these years demonstrate that apartheid indeed turns into confrontation while, in a democratic society, a policy requires consensus and participation.

The situation of Namibia and that of Angola both stem from apartheid and the imposition of that principle in South Africa, particularly in the great urban belts where the laws of modern economy have forced whites and people of colour to live together. Once the South African Government had made its choice, it was condemned to defend it within the country and outside it. Thus resolution 435 (1978) has remained unheeded, an example of the old principle whereby man prefers to export his problems rather than resolve them in his own house, where it is difficult or merely costly to do so.

The facts of Angola must be seen in this context. They demonstrate that, if it is not possible to set on a different course the relations between the various communities which constitute the reality of South Africa, the resulting conflicts will spread across its borders, thus threatening the stability of the neighbouring States. This type of threat brings forth other reactions, such as those which justified Angola's recourse to the Security Council.

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

My country is called upon to give its opinion of this situation as a member of the Security Council, that is, of a body which has already in the past given its evaluation of these very things.

Our opinion is that the policy of apartheid rests on the affirmation of a principle which is both legally and morally inadmissible. Segregation cannot have a positive outcome. It is offensive to human dignity; it can only be combated. This must in any case be done here, at the United Nations, where the principle of respect for human rights is the basis of a common campaign by the international community for the promotion of moral progress, and where the process of decolonization - and here I refer to Namibia - has found its major forum. Apartheid is above all an error, but in no case can it find justification here.

If resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia had been implemented, the facts before the Security Council today would not have occurred. No one can really say what the condition of the various ethnic communities which live together in South Africa would be today if the choice made by the South African Government had been different. No one can say which of the ethnic groups would be more prosperous, which tribal group would have more faith in its future and in that of its younger generations. But it is certain that, by taking this path, the path of segregation, the future looks gloomy. It is certain that through this path the future of the surrounding countries is put in jeopardy.

For these reasons Italy will support the draft resolution with its vote. The draft resolution stems from precise facts. The invasion of Angola has already been condemned by the Security Council. It has been condemned, as well, by a specific declaration of the twelve member countries of the European Community. That declaration was issued on the 23rd of this very month. Italy joins in that condemnation and appeals to the South African Government to cease hostilities and withdraw its forces from Angolan territory.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Italy for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): First, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of the office of President of the Council and to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci of Italy, for the skilled way in which he conducted the Council's business last month. We welcome the chance to meet under your wise guidance during the month of November.

It is also a pleasure to welcome our old friend, our good friend, Alexander York as the new Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

My delegation shares the serious concern already expressed by other members of the Security Council at the present situation in southern Angola. My Government deplores and condemns South Africa's indefensible conduct and is deeply concerned at its consequences. Such acts of force are not merely improper and illegitimate: they are short-sighted, counter-productive and self-defeating. Southern Africa has already suffered too much from cross-border fighting, all of which we condemn. What the region needs, as we have said so many times in the past, is a period of sustained dialogue and realistic negotiation. The people of Angola should be left to resolve their internal affairs without external intervention.

A solution to Angola's problems - and those of the region as a whole - would be facilitated by the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Even so, the presence of outside forces in Angola at the invitation of the Government of Angola is not of itself any justification for South Africa to violate Angolan sovereignty. We have already made our views on this clear to the South African authorities, and I ask the Permanent Representative of South Africa to take the same strong message home to his Government today. I also ask him to bear in mind that the consequence of South African actions in Angola may be more foreign involvement, not less.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

It goes without saying that my delegation supports the draft resolution before us today. We hope that it will be adopted unanimously, thus demonstrating the unanimity of the international community in condemning South African conduct in Angola. From what I have said it is clear that we do not interpret anything in the draft as endorsing the intervention of foreign combat troops, which we oppose. Nor should the draft be seen as falling within the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Indeed the Council has already adopted measures under Chapter VII designed partly as a response to South African attacks on other countries. For its part, the British Government will continue strictly to observe the arms embargo against South Africa imposed under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and expects all other Members of the United Nations scrupulously to fulfil the same obligations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

I shall now put draft resolution S/19291 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Bulgaria, China, Congo, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Italy, Japan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zambia

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 602 (1987).

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements after voting.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I wish to express the congratulations of the United States delegation to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your diplomatic skill and experience are an extraordinary asset for the Council. I also wish to express our appreciation and admiration for the skill with which your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci, conducted the work of the Council. I wish also to express our pleasure in seeing and greeting Ambassador Count York as the new Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In adopting this resolution, the Council has expressed its condemnation of South African aggression against Angola. The United States voted for it because it shares with other members of the Council strong objections to the crossing of international borders by foreign forces. The United States finds unacceptable cross-border violence whatever its origin.

The United States, nevertheless, has reservations about some of the language in the resolution. In this connection we wish to note for the record that the United States does not recognize the People's Republic of Angola.

The United States also believes that the resolution does not address many important issues of the region. It does not take account of the fact that in Angola today there is both a civil war and a conflict involving foreign expeditionary forces in addition to those of South Africa. It is the position of the United States that all foreign combat forces in the region must be withdrawn. This means not only the withdrawal from Namibia and Angola of South African forces, but also the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban and other foreign troops as well.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

My Government therefore believes that the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola can be fully secured only if all foreign forces are removed from the southern African region. It also believes that the fates of Namibia and Angola are inextricably linked. The most serious threat to the independence of Angola since 1975 has been the steadily growing presence of an extra-continental expeditionary force and Angola's massive dependence on expensive foreign weaponry. These factors have prevented the peaceful reconciliation of all elements of the Angolan society. In this connection, the United States has been engaged in discussions with Angola in order to help achieve peace and security in the entire region. My Government will continue to pursue actively these negotiations. It seeks to bring about a settlement that removes all foreign forces from the southern African region. This would permit Namibia to attain independence and the people of Angola to resolve their differences through an internal settlement, without outside interference.

There are two internal forces in Angola. One of them, UNITA, has made it clear that the conflict in Angola cannot be resolved militarily. UNITA has declared that it is willing to begin to discuss national reconciliation immediately. This could lead to lasting peace in Angola. My delegation agrees that the key to a secure future for Angola can be found not on the battlefield, but at the negotiating table.

The United States asks all other Member States to support this search for a regional settlement intended to achieve a lasting peace for the people of the region. My Government also asks that other Member States join it in calling upon all parties to the conflicts in the region to end the current cycle of violence. The road to take should lead us not to the battlefield, but to the negotiating table.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution which the Council has just adopted unanimously I wish to express sincere gratitude to all members of the Council for making it possible for the Council to take this significant and historic decision in favour of peace and against war and injustice. The unanimous adoption of the resolution is doubly reassuring. The sponsors are especially obliged, because it is our conviction that the Council has today redeemed its name, in a matter concerning the racist Pretoria régime, as an organ not only responsible for acting decisively to uphold the important principles in the Charter, but also willing to do so.

The condemnation of South Africa for the invasion of Angola, the violation of that country's sovereignty and the use of Namibia as a base for incursions into Angola has resulted not because we have in the past despised the racist Pretoria régime for its apartheid policies, but, more especially, because all the actions of South Africa in this instance are indefensible before the bar of reason and are against international law. It our fervent hope, therefore, that South Africa will co-operate in the implementation of the resolution just adopted, because the reduction of tension in the area and the preservation of the concept of the inviolability of the sovereignty of States, both large and small, in the subregion as a whole are matters of priority for the international community and the Security Council.

Should South Africa fail to co-operate with the Council, as it has been wont to do in the past, the sponsors of the resolution would implore members of the Council to convene urgently to consider appropriate actions under the Charter to ensure compliance with the decisions prescribed.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

I wish to extend our thanks to the Government of Angola for the information furnished to the Council during this debate. We trust that the Council's unanimous decision will contribute to a large extent to bringing the situation in and around Angola to normality.

Once again I thank members of the Council on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution for the invaluable support extended to their humble efforts to uphold the Charter.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Angola has asked to speak. I call on him.

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to make a statement now. At the conclusion of this debate I thank you, on behalf of my delegation, for your most able handling of the Council's proceedings, and for all the courtesies extended to us.

On behalf of my delegation, I also thank all members of the Council, who voted in favour of the draft resolution. At the same time, I request the Council, as the supreme peace-keeping organ of the United Nations, a body whose resolutions are mandatory under the Charter, to ensure that the resolution is speedily and correctly implemented.

For too long inertia has allowed the racists to get away with impunity with not implementing Council resolutions. My delegation believes that, in mandating the Secretary-General to report to the Council by 10 December 1987 on withdrawal of the racist troops, the Council is doing what it is just to do under the Charter - be responsible for peace-keeping operations. If that long-overdue withdrawal has not taken place by that date, it will be for the Council to hold another meeting as a matter of urgency on that same date so that further action can be discussed and mandated.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

I speak, of course, only for my delegation, but I am sure that the majority of those hearing and reading some of the statements made in the Chamber during this debate must have been struck by a number of factors which were common themes in so many of the statements.

It was no mere chance, no mere coincidence, that a number of speakers spontaneously used the analogy of the fascist Hitler when referring to the illegal visit of the racist junta leaders to our sovereign territory. They came like thieves in the night, because that is what the racists are; they have stolen the birthright not only of their own people, but of the people of Namibia. These racist thieves have made many, many attempts to damage, destroy or take away property belonging to sovereign States in southern Africa.

The Hitler-like fascist behaviour of the illegal racist minority régime in Pretoria is not a quirk of history; it can be none other than what it is, both inside and outside South Africa, because there is a symbiotic link between it and the racist foundation on which it is predicated and which it seeks to protect.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

I should like to make a special reference to the statement made by the Ambassador of Zimbabwe on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Ambassador Mudenge has established an awesome reputation as a formidable speaker; and my delegation highly appreciates the grasp of history and current research which his statement displayed. The discussions between the Angolan and United States delegations must not preclude immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

Much as I would like to conclude my remarks on a pleasant note of gratitude and appreciation, I am compelled by circumstances to turn to something most distasteful - the tedious task of referring to the statement made two days ago by the racist representative of the racist régime, who was scurrying around trying desperately to defend what is basically inapplicable and indefensible, in particular the presence of the racist junta members on our territory.

To quote Tyndall, "It is as fatal as it is cowardly to blink facts because they are not to our taste". No amount of data and corroboration will convince the short-sighted racist régime that the policy of apartheid spells doom for itself in the long run and that it simply cannot continue to survive and flourish in southern Africa today.

It is probably useless to try to convince the racist régime that the cause of the problems in southern Africa that threaten peace is apartheid inside South Africa and its military expressions outside South Africa.

It is useless to try to convince the racist régime that our Cuban internationalist comrades were invited by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola to Angola after the first massive invasion of Angola by South African racist troops.

Maybe I should change my words: it is not a matter of trying to convince Pretoria and failing to do so; it is not a matter of the racists failing to see

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

these truths, these facts. Rather, it is its single-minded obsession - paranoia - of maintaining apartheid and minority rule, supported by State terrorism inside and outside South Africa, that makes it imperative for the racist régime to create a series of myths and then defend them to the bitter end. Apartheid, too, rests on a myth. And myths are never supported by history. Myths are destroyed not only by their victims but often by their perpetrators.

Now that the armed forces of Angola, FAPLA, are inflicting heavy losses on whites fighting illegally in my country, even the minority society is waking up. The myths are beginning to crumble in their stronghold.

The racist representative declared that South Africa was not at war with Angola. Are, then, the racist troops having a six-year-old picnic on our territory?

It is pathetic that in his statement the racist representative could not even bring himself to come right out and state exactly where the racist Botha had been recently. He kept referring to "the area of conflict" or just "the area"; that is a euphemism, and the height of delusion. That area happens to be the sovereign territory of the People's Republic of Angola, where the racist commander-in-chief had no business to be, neither he nor his troops.

How much credence does the spurious offer of the racist régime to withdraw from our territory on 9 December 1987 deserve, coming as it does from a régime which accepted Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and then reneged on it and has since refused to implement it?

The route to peace in southern Africa lies through the Sowetos, the ghettos, the townships and the so-called homelands in South Africa, with the dismantling of apartheid and the defeat of its proponents.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The racists and their apartheid ideology bring to mind the following, from Shakespeare:

"For how can tyrants safely govern home, unless abroad they purchase great alliance?".

Hence we must defeat apartheid inside and outside South Africa by destroying its imperialist alliances outside which allow it to survive. But if I may offer a vision for the future - the near future indeed - even this wretched survival will not last much longer. We are many who believe in freedom, justice and democracy, and they are too few. We will triumph and our words will soon turn into reality. And, until then, a luta continua; a vitoria e certa.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.