

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2300th MEETING: 31 AUGUST 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2300) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| Complaint by Angola against South Africa: Letter dated 26 August 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary- General (S/14647) | 1 |

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2300th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 31 August 1981, at 5.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2300)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 26 August 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/14647)

The meeting was called to order at 7.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 26 August 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/14647)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2296th to 2299th meetings, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table and the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Cuba, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, South Africa, 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. Bueno (Brazil), Mr. Morden (Canada), Mr. Roa Kourl (Cuba), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Burvin (Libya Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Eksteen (South Africa), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam), Mr. Lazarević (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mashingaidze (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Mozambique in which he asks to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lobo (Mozambique) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Members of the Security Council have received the text of the revised draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Mexico, Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda, distributed in document S/14664/Rev.2.

4. I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Council to a new document related to this item: a letter dated 28 August 1981 from the representative of China addressed to the President of the Council, distributed in document S/14665.

5. The first speaker is the representative of Mozambique. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): It is an honour and a privilege for my delegation to participate in these deliberations which are presided over by a man who has a thorough knowledge of the issue in question and who has himself been for many years a participant in the complex struggle for liberation. Mozambique respects and admires the objective zeal of your leadership, Mr. President, and your understanding of the dilemma involved in trying to coexist with an aggressive and unscrupulous neighbour.

7. The racist régime of South Africa is today the focal issue whenever war and peace are considered anywhere on the African continent, and most particularly in southern Africa. Its racial policies, its colonial character and its repressive and aggressive methods are the causes of that concern and are the issue the Council is discussing today, namely, the military invasion of Angola by South Africa.

8. In southern Africa, the emergence of the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of Mozambique and, lately, the Republic of Zimbabwe has sharpened the change in the balance of forces in favour of the oppressed peoples of Namibia and of South Africa itself. That tip in the balance of forces is so dramatic, so drastic, that the racist régime of Pretoria has resorted to open military aggression against the neighbouring countries. Racist South Africa wants to destroy Angola. It wants to destroy its independence. It wants to destroy its economy. Furthermore, South Africa wants to provoke a full-scale war from which its friends can profit.

9. It was within that context that we witnessed the South African invasion of Angola on 24 and 25 August 1981. It was within the same context that South Africa carried out its cowardly attack on the homes of South African refugees in the southern Mozambican town of Matola in the early morning hours of 30 January [S/14358].

10. The invasion of Angola and the attack on Matola were both meant to destabilize the situation in our countries and sabotage our national reconstruction efforts. Those attacks were meant to make it more difficult for us to express our political and material solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC).

11. Mozambique is extremely concerned by the South African military invasion of Angola as well as by the violation of Angola's territorial integrity, not only because of the barbaric manner of the invasion but also because of the increasing self-confidence South Africa has exhibited lately in conducting these operations in the region.

12. Of course, we are well aware that the aggressiveness and self-confidence of South Africa are a result of the connivance of certain Western Powers and permanent members of the Security Council. Because of the obvious benefits it derives from the intensive plunder of the natural and human resources of Namibia and South Africa, the United States of America has repeatedly failed to condemn *apartheid* in South Africa and in Namibia and the aggression against Angola. The Pretoria régime has found encouragement to proceed with its illegal occupation of Namibia and its military aggression and menace against the other neighbouring countries.

13. The refusal of the representative of the United States on 28 August [2296th meeting] to condemn the South African invasion of Angola clearly indicates the extent to which the United States is committed to protecting Pretoria's policy of destabilization of the front-line States.

14. Sometimes we wonder whether the supporters of South Africa know exactly what it is they are

upholding. Reading from excerpts of the policy statement on southern Africa delivered in Honolulu by Mr. Chester Crocker, we noticed indications of misinformation, naïvety and some tone of identification with everything that the South African racist régime stands for. In case it is a matter of misinformation about the nature of the South African régime, any one of the neighbouring countries is in a position to provide correct and accurate information on the nature of that régime.

15. During the statement he made on 6 October 1980 to the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Joaquim Alberto Chissano, stated:

"In the so-called free world, few know about the nature of *apartheid* and of those who practice it."

He also said:

"*Apartheid* and nazism are based on the same political and ideological principle—the superiority of one race over the other races. They use the same instruments to suppress and massacre the peoples.

"The direct victims of nazism in Europe were whites while those of *apartheid* are blacks."

16. As a matter of fact, two months after Mr. Chissano's statement, in the very early morning hours of 30 January 1981, the commandos of the South African minority régime carried out a cowardly attack on the homes of South African refugees, just because they were located in Mozambique and not somewhere else, in Europe or America.

17. On the afternoon of the same day, members of the diplomatic corps in Mozambique visited the site of the attack, where they found the body of a South African commando still wearing a helmet with a variety of Nazi symbols, such as swastikas and the words "*Sieg Heil*". Furthermore, evidence of the racist acts of savagery, such as cutting off the ears of the dead refugees, could be seen everywhere. This, therefore, confirms what Mr. Chissano had warned the international community about two months earlier.

18. Sometimes we wonder if it is possible that a nation which fought nazism in Europe can consciously find peace of mind supporting it in Africa. Does it mean that if Hitler were alive in 1981 he would have fewer nations to oppose him? Does it mean that some nations are beginning to have second thoughts about the swastika and to forget what it stands for? It is impossible not to entertain these questions, especially when the representative of the South African Government can find the courage to inform the Council that "Pigs and goats ran through the streets ahead of us" [2298th meeting, para. 38] to show that peace and tranquillity exist in southern Angola—as though a pig running has anything to do with the massacre of 240 to

270 members of the population they have admitted having killed, as if goats running are an indication that everything is normal. Yes, for a racist mentality, a pig running has more meaning than a kid playing in a school playground. In like manner, a Nazi will treat a Jew in the same way he will treat a guinea pig, as he did during nazism's nefarious experiments in concentration camps. Are these the people some permanent members of this august body refuse to condemn?

19. We leave this simple moral question in the hands of the Council. For our part, we shall continue to struggle shoulder to shoulder with the African people until justice is respected in the continent in general and in Angola in particular. The People's Republic of Mozambique strongly condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its premeditated and unprovoked armed aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

20. *A luta continua.*

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of PANAMA.

22. The complaint put forward by the President of the People's Republic of Angola, Mr. José Eduardo dos Santos, the communiqué from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country, Mr. Venancio de Moura (*see S/14646*), and the dramatic statement made by Mr. Elisio de Figueiredo [*2296th meeting*] have presented to the Council the terrible dimensions of the new series of acts of aggression which have been committed by the Pretoria racist régime with manifest cruelty, in open violation of the sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

23. The Government and the people of Panama condemn this infamous act of aggression while expressing solidarity with the Government and the people of Angola at this painful crossroads in their history. The Panamanian delegation deeply regrets the loss of lives and the untold cruelties and merciless crimes committed by the *apartheid* régime against the civilian population of Angola. We share the just indignation of the international community over these reprehensible acts and convey our most sincere condolences to the families of the victims and to the Government and the people of Angola.

24. In the view of the Panamanian Government, the recent military operations conducted by the South African army have reached unprecedented intensity. We are facing aggression against the People's Republic of Angola which also involves a serious threat to the front-line States, as well as the other nations in the area, with the resulting danger to peace and security in the region and the world at large.

25. In the face of the South African aggression, we can rightly ask what the Council should do to fulfil the

primary responsibility given it by the Charter of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security.

26. The system of security conceived at San Francisco by the founders of the Organization is based, firstly, as noted in Article 4, paragraph 1 of the Charter, on the acceptance and fulfilment by Member States of the obligations enshrined in the Charter, secondly, as stated in Article 25, on the binding force of the resolutions of the Security Council and, thirdly, as stipulated in Article 103, on the primacy, in case of conflicts, of the obligations imposed by the Charter over obligations contracted by Member States by virtue of any other international agreement.

27. It is clear that the concept of neutrality as far as the application of resolutions of the Security Council is concerned, particularly as regards conflicts in southern Africa, cannot be upheld in light of the above-mentioned provisions.

28. Even those States that are traditionally neutral, States that are not Members of the United Nations but are parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and States that, although not parties to that Statute, have access to the Court are subject to the obligations deriving from Articles 25 and 103 of the Charter which apply to all States Members of the United Nations.

29. Therefore, there can be no justification of South Africa's non-compliance with Council resolution 475 (1980), which was adopted on a previous occasion when this topic was considered, nor room for any other pretext from South African or non-South African sources that might be invoked that would allow the illegal acts of the Pretoria régime to be passed over without any international sanction.

30. Universal condemnation of the Pretoria régime is eloquently expressed in the media in Africa, Latin America, Asia, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, North America and Oceania. It could not be otherwise. The town of Xangongo, as has been confirmed by European diplomats, has been totally destroyed. More than 600 human lives have been taken. In spite of the statements about withdrawal made in Cape Town by the Commander of the invading force, General Constand Viljoen, several hundred South African soldiers still remain in the area of hostilities, according to reports circulated by international press agencies.

31. Condemnation of South Africa in Latin America has been unanimous. Its representatives in the Council have expressed their views unequivocally. The positions put forward in this chamber by Brazil, Cuba, Mexico and Panama are a clear gauge of the intensity of the feelings of repudiation of the South African aggression prevailing in the region among those of different political and ideological persuasions.

32. South Africa is an isolated country within the United Nations because of its violation of the Charter and its delinquent conduct. From the point of view of the health of the Organization, South Africa represents a body that is socially, politically and morally sick. It is a State that suffers from such a highly infectious disease that it must be isolated. Therefore we could not accept any suggestion that this debate might be aimed at isolating any country other than South Africa. It is clear that those who try to absolve the Pretoria régime of sin and cleanse its body of infectious germs without submitting it to the sole treatment that can produce a cure, namely, the fulfilment of the resolutions of the United Nations, will have to face the consequences of contamination and contagion.

33. African problems must be subject to African solutions. The eradication of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and the exercise of the right of self-determination by the African peoples cannot be made subordinate to the economic, political or strategic interests of the super-Powers. To claim that those interests can prevail over the rights of peoples to freedom and independence is to go against the course of history.

34. We also uphold the fact that Latin American problems must have Latin American solutions. Asian problems must have Asian solutions. European problems must have European solutions. The very fact that today we talk about the crisis of the capitalist and the socialist systems, as well as growing tension among the super-Powers, creates a dislocation in world relations that is reflected in pathological human behaviour. There is a growing recourse to violence, an increase in delinquency, a tendency towards a breakdown of the family and a relaxation of the ethical values of modern societies, all of which is directly related to the climate of international tension. We might say that to the extent that the United Nations loses its institutional effectiveness, the feelings of despair predominant in most of the social strata of mankind will also be heightened. The United Nations is a forum for the prevention of confrontation and the promotion of communication and constructive dialogue. The dangers of nuclear conflagration are always present in our times. Today more than ever, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries must insist, as it did in the New Delhi appeal adopted on 11 February 1981 at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981 and as we ourselves insist now, that the United States of America and the Soviet Union call a halt to their evident rivalry in Africa, the Middle East, Central America and the Caribbean. That would be the first step by which the statesmen of the two super-Powers, in honouring their responsibilities, could promote a meeting of the minds among the leaders of their and other regions so as to create conditions of security, harmony and peace in the world.

35. Concerning the subject under discussion, my delegation is in favour of the adoption of the draft resolution jointly proposed by Mexico, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda [S/14664/Rev.2], which strongly condemns South Africa, demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all its troops from Angolan territory, recognizes the right of the People's Republic of Angola to full and sufficient compensation, calls upon all States to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa [Council resolution 418 (1977)], provides for the immediate establishment of a commission of investigation of the Council to undertake an on-the-spot evaluation and urges all Member States, as a matter of urgency, to extend material assistance to the People's Republic of Angola.

36. It is our duty as States Members of the United Nations seriously to insist that the Council should fulfil its obligations under the Charter and that it should adopt the necessary coercive measures so that the Government of South Africa will put an end to its persistent acts of aggression. The Pretoria régime must withdraw from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia whose people, with SWAPO as their sole legitimate representative, have the right to see their national unity and territorial integrity respected and to be granted independence promptly, through a process which should be brought to fruition under the control and supervision of the United Nations. It is truly ironic that the South African Government, in a gesture which I shall not venture to describe, should be claiming to invite the Security Council to Namibia when it refuses to accept the presence in that Territory of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the sole legitimate authority that should function there until the Territory attains independence.

37. The States Members of the United Nations cannot remain neutral and indifferent in the face of the constant institutional erosion that the stubborn and delinquent attitude of South Africa produces in the Organization. How can we remain neutral in the face of an attitude of this type which is an absolute violation of the Charter? Neutrality in this case would mean our complicity with the maintenance of the *status quo*, in other words, our acceptance of the present state of affairs in South Africa and Namibia. It would mean the maintenance, with our consent, of the odious system of *apartheid*, the recognition of the validity of racism and racial discrimination and our acquiescence in the continuation, for the sake of alleged economic, strategic and security interests, of a system of colonial exploitation which is a disgrace to mankind.

38. The seriousness of the unjust and unprovoked act of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa against Angola requires the Council and, above all, those States on which the Charter has conferred a special responsibility for the maintenance of peace, to

adopt forceful coercive measures against the Pretoria régime so that it will put an end to its reprehensible acts of aggression and cease to be a threat to world peace.

39. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT. It is my understanding that the members of the Council are now prepared to vote on the revised draft resolution they have before them. If there is no objection, I shall now put the draft resolution contained in document S/14664/Rev.2 to the vote. I now call upon the representative of the United Kingdom who has asked to speak before the vote.

40. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): My Government in London and my delegation here have already made abundantly clear our view of the South African attack on Angola. The United Kingdom wholly deplores the South African action which transgressed the norms of international behaviour and was unacceptable to the international community. We hoped that the Council would address to Pretoria without delay a clear, unanimous and unambiguous demand for the immediate withdrawal of South African forces from the sovereign territory of Angola.

41. There is much in the draft resolution on which we are about to vote which my delegation can support. I am thinking particularly of the language of operative paragraph 4: the demand for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola.

42. We are also grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution for the serious efforts they have made to meet the objections to the original draft which were put to them over the week-end. Nevertheless, the draft still contains elements which my delegation finds difficult to support.

43. In a statement that I made some weeks ago on another subject in the Council, I made clear my view that offensive characterizations and highly coloured rhetoric directed against States Members of the Organization do not contribute to the possibility of a peaceful solution of problems. If you wish to convince someone by argument, you do not abuse him; nor, may I say on the other side, do you launch military attacks against him. Oral abuse on one side and military action on the other are the vocabulary and the equipment of despair. Furthermore, there is still language both in the preambular and the operative parts of the draft resolution to which my delegation cannot subscribe. I should add that if this draft resolution is adopted, I state unequivocally and on the specific instructions of my Government that it is the British Government's view that operative paragraph 3 will not constitute a determination under Article 39 of Chapter VII of the Charter. My delegation will therefore abstain when the draft resolution is put to the vote.

44. I have one last point to make. My delegation firmly believes that the only hope of progress towards a peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia—that is to say, the achievement for Namibia of internationally accepted independence—lies in the continued efforts of the contact group of five to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In our judgement, there is no alternative course which is in keeping with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. The contact group of five has not been inactive in recent months and, as the Council is probably aware, the five Ministers for Foreign Affairs will be meeting in New York very shortly. My delegation is resolved to take no step which could hinder this process.

45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution sponsored by Mexico, Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uganda, distributed in document S/14664/Rev.2.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The result of the vote was 13 in favour, one against, with one abstention.

The draft resolution was not adopted because of the negative vote of one permanent member of the Council.

46. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak following the vote.

47. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): My Government has long opposed violent solutions to the problems of the southern African region. Such violence only creates an atmosphere that undermines serious negotiations. We deplore the recent South African action into Angola, just as we deplore any other escalation of violence from any quarter, and indeed have been prepared from the beginning of these proceedings to vote for a draft resolution so based.

48. There is little doubt that South Africa's resistance to granting the people of Namibia the right to self-determination—as the Council has called on it to do—is a basis for the tension and instability which exist in the region. At the same time, it is clear that the presence of foreign combat forces in Angola—particularly the large Cuban force—the provision of

Soviet-originated arms to SWAPO and the presence of Soviet military advisers fuel the explosive atmosphere of confrontation and violence which daily plagues the people of Angola, Namibia and, indeed, the entire region. As a result, the United States had to vote against the draft resolution under consideration today, a draft resolution wherein the blame is placed solely on South Africa for the escalation of violence.

49. How, then, can we bring about a solution to the conflict in the region? My Government's approach is not one which provides or promises quick or easy answers to this complex situation. It is one, however, which is shared by those who stand for co-operation over confrontation and by those who will seriously consider the settling of differences through negotiations, difficult as that process might be. Those negotiations must, of course, be on the basis of Council resolution 435 (1978). With our contact group partners, we aim to bring these negotiations to fruition. The result must command international acceptance, take into account the interests of all parties involved and impart to them confidence to proceed with implementation. Such a result will alleviate tension in the area to the advantage of all southern Africans.

50. Without addressing in a balanced way the underlying sources of conflict in the area, on the other hand, it is unlikely that any well-intentioned effort can bring about an end to the resort to violence.

51. The United States will continue to work with the contact group to advance proposals which are consistent with the resolutions of the Council and which promote the settlement in Namibia that we all seek. We will continue to act as an honest broker. We will deny ourselves the indulgence of taking sides in the public war of words which accompanies this most crucial issue. Our focus will remain at the bargaining table where we can most effectively pursue the struggle for a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

52. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution of the African and other non-aligned countries against the act of aggression committed by racist South Africa because that draft resolution reflects the demand of the victim, Angola, and because it reflects the position and interests of independent Africa.

53. What has taken place today—a blocking of the draft by one delegation alone—is no mere repetition of events that have taken place in the past. The vote of the United States was cast against the draft resolution in a particularly defiant context. We are talking here about the "new regional strategy" of the United States, which was officially stated only a few days ago, on 29 August—the so-called new regional strategy on southern Africa. It is against that background that the United States delegation cast its vote.

54. The consequences of that new strategy may be truly ominous. The "new strategy", in fact, is a demand to disregard the will of the international community, to invalidate the basic resolutions of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly in respect of South Africa. It is the call of one Power, the United States, which, having joined the South African racists as a self-declared "regional partner", is trying to reverse the history of decolonization in that region by forcing on independent Africa its régime on the African continent.

55. It has been officially stated that "the Reagan Administration does not intend to destabilize South Africa to please others". That warning is frankly addressed to independent African countries. The United States does not want to please them but Pretoria. Similar recently-declared sympathies for the racists of South Africa slipped in even before that, in the corridors, particularly in February of this year, when members of the Council prepared an appeal [2264th meeting, para. 2] to save the lives of three fighters against apartheid who had been condemned by Pretoria. As a price for that appeal, the delegation of the United States tried to force other members of the Council to grant recognition to the horrendous legal system of apartheid. For the last two weeks, members of the Council have done their utmost to prepare a new appeal of that kind, for the apartheid régime has sentenced to death three other members of the ANC. If we have not made such an appeal today it is because the United States has again blocked it in the corridors. That is the new strategy of, in fact, pandering to the apartheid régime.

56. Now, for the other side of the coin. The United States is stating that it does not intend to destabilize South Africa. But it does intend to destabilize the internal system of Angola. That is the only way we can interpret what is said in the statement of the new strategy of the United States vis-à-vis South Africa, namely, that Angolan traitors and the mercenaries of South Africa from UNITA [*União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola*] are seen as a lawful element in Angola.

57. And what is the following fact worth, for example? In the same statement in which so much understanding and so much sympathy were expressed for the punitive actions by South Africa against SWAPO and the armed incursions by the racists against neighbouring African States, there was not even a semblance of criticism of the aggressive actions committed by South Africa against African countries.

58. Further, as regards Namibia, again there was not a word of dissatisfaction about the South African racists having wrecked the political settlement of the Namibian problem. On the contrary, the United States underscored the need to take account of a condition which Pretoria is trying to impose in this respect. But that condition is well known: it is agreement that Namibia recognize the South African puppets.

59. When that notorious new strategy of the United States in southern Africa was proclaimed, it was stated that the United States wanted to be objective, that it would not choose between blacks and whites. But, in actual fact, a decisive choice has already been made by the new strategy and that choice is against the anti-*apartheid* fighters in South Africa; it is a choice in favour of maintenance of the *apartheid* system, a choice against a truly independent Namibia, a choice in favour of Namibia as a puppet of South Africa—in other words, a choice against the security, stability and independence of African countries, a choice in favour of continued armed aggression against them by South Africa. The negative vote of the United States delegation on the draft resolution of the African and other non-aligned countries is eloquent proof of all that.

60. One last thing. In today's statement, the representative of the United States said that everything must be seen within the context of a global struggle. We are not even mentioning the fact that that approach is disparaging for Africa in that it treats it as though it did not exist. What is worse is the fact that it reminds one of the behaviour of a bull who in his rage sees red all around him and nothing but red—not because that colour is really present everywhere but simply because the bull himself has eyes that are reddened by madness.

61. Mr. OTUNNU (Uganda): As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution that has just been voted on, my delegation is most disappointed at the outcome of the vote. Our disappointment in this respect is all the greater since it was the single vote of a permanent member of the Council that blocked the adoption of this draft.

62. Nevertheless, we deem it important that certain features of the complaint we have just been considering be underlined, in the spirit of appreciation of the full context of the question before the Council.

63. The first feature is the fact that there has indeed been a massive act of aggression committed against Angola by South Africa and that that act of aggression falls squarely within the context of Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, it not only constituted a grave threat to international peace and security, but also resulted in an unnatural breach of the peace. That is the first feature.

64. The second feature of the case before the Council that we must appreciate is the fact that this is not the first time that Angola has come before the Council with a complaint against South Africa arising out of an act of aggression. In the space of only three years, this is the fifth time.

65. The third feature that we must appreciate is the fact that twice before today the Council has formally postponed the invocation of Chapter VII of the

Charter against South Africa. In resolution 439 (1978) and again in resolution 475 (1980), the Council decided that, in the event of another attack against Angola, the Council would invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. In spite of the moving plea made by the representative of Angola last Friday, 28 August, in which he said: "Let me not take back to my people another paper resolution" [2296th meeting, para. 23], the Council today is delivering to the representative of Angola what is not even a paper resolution; it is nothing at all. The representative of Angola is going back to his people empty-handed.

66. It will also have been noticed that the draft which has just been voted on is a very mild text. This is not the text with which the sponsors began this exercise. The text just voted on does not contain any reference to Chapter VII of the Charter. In spite of the existence of an act of aggression, the massiveness of that aggression and the repeated nature of that aggression, there is no reference to Chapter VII. Furthermore, there is no reference even to the fact of aggression, even though we are meeting to consider an act of aggression. Why has this been the case? Clearly, we, the sponsors, have been anxious from the beginning to retain the unity and solidarity of the Council. We have been anxious from the very beginning to retain the collective nature of the responsibility of the Council. We have been open-minded. We have invited all members of the Council to engage in discussions with us in a give-and-take manner and to take into account all positive contributions. In spite of these efforts on our part, the draft resolution—weak, mild and watered-down as it is—is a fallen piece of paper.

67. What then is the meaning of the veto we have just seen? My delegation had occasion to warn the Council on 30 April that the triple veto that was then cast by three of its permanent members would not serve the purpose of peace and security in the world; that, on the contrary, it could only strengthen the forces of *apartheid* and oppression. Well, the aggression which we have just been discussing is clearly a result of the signal that was sent by the Council—especially by three permanent members—on 30 April [see 2277th meeting]. Those who cast the triple veto then must therefore today bear a big share of the responsibility for yet another act of aggression against Angola. Today's veto will have the same impact as the triple veto of 30 April 1981. It will strengthen and protect the aggressor and expose the victim, making the latter ever more vulnerable. It will give comfort and encouragement to the Pretoria régime. It constitutes yet another mighty blow against the people of Namibia in their search for genuine self-determination. It is a rebuff to those who seek to abide by the Charter and, when injured, seek remedy under the Charter through the instrumentality of the Security Council.

68. The essence of the veto power is a notion of power with responsibility. But what we witnessed on

30 April and again today is the manifestation of power without the corresponding exercise of responsibility, power that has been used to frustrate the forces of freedom and dignity and to provide cover to the forces of oppression and tyranny.

69. Still, I say that all is not lost. We believe in the principle of progress. On 30 April, we witnessed a triple veto; today we have witnessed a single veto. There has been some progress. It remains our hope that even the permanent member who decided on this occasion to abstain will soon join in a positive vote and, indeed, we refuse to give up even on that one single mountain, the one permanent member who cast a negative vote today, because we believe that history is a dynamic process and, because it is a dynamic process, it is never too late to join in the global consensus in favour of the forces of freedom and dignity.

70. So once again, I extend an invitation to that one permanent member, the one with the heaviest hand of all, to come and join in the global consensus in favour of freedom and dignity. It is never too late.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Angola.

72. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, I have always admired your natural brilliance and I hope that in that context you will accept the appreciation of my Government and my delegation for the able manner in which you have presided over the meetings of the Security Council in connection with the South African acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and for the assistance we have received from you personally and from the mission of Panama.

73. Although the Council is shortly to end the present series of meetings, I should like to point out once again that the invasion by the South African racist forces continues and that areas in the southern part of Angola are still under military occupation. Contrary to South Africa's announcements, the racist troops are still deep inside Angolan territory. According to the latest reports, they have now occupied Ondjiva, the capital of the province of Cunene, and the town of Xangongo has been mostly destroyed. Over 600 people have been massacred during this invasion alone and we have not yet even begun to assess the damage caused. It was to see for itself the death and destruction of this particular invasion that the Council was requested to send an investigative team to Angola.

74. The nation of Angola, which daily suffers acts of racist aggression of one kind or another, takes strong exception to those views expressed here by the representative of the United States of America that sought to give an erroneous impression of the military invasion and occupation of southern Angola by the

racist armed forces of South Africa. There is an intimate connection among oppression, racism and colonialism. But there is only one response: resistance, a war of liberation by any and all means, and support for such a war. In this, Angola is doing no more and no less than what is enjoined on us by resolutions of the United Nations, of our own regional organization, of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

75. The simple facts are these: the People's Republic of Angola is a sovereign independent State in southern Africa, a Member of the United Nations, a member of the OAU and a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Angola has no borders with South Africa. The racist régime is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia. Since 1975, its military forces have repeatedly invaded Angola from Namibia. That has been the issue before the Security Council: the attacks perpetrated by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. As for those who may wish to discuss other issues, my delegation's view is, yes, let us do so, let us discuss them, but in the proper context and in accordance with the proper procedure. If they wish to discuss the independence of Namibia, let us by all means do so. In fact, that is why the General Assembly is holding an emergency special session in a very few days. If they wish to discuss the question of foreign troops all over the world, let us have a Council meeting on that subject. But any attempt to bring up a matter which is the sole concern of a sovereign, independent State, an issue limited to the nationals of a sovereign State, is strictly outside the jurisdiction of any entity, organization or organ and is the prerogative of the legitimate Government and the people of that sovereign State. Revolutions never go backwards and attempts to link unconnected issues are morally wrong, politically unacceptable and historically unjustifiable.

76. For every man who lives without freedom, the rest of us must bear the guilt. The veto that was cast here today was a veto cast against the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations, against the principles of international law, against the human rights of the people of southern Africa and against the most basic human right of all, the right to live in freedom and security. With that veto, the racism and brutality of the Pretoria régime have indeed been strengthened and allowed another temporary victim. The veto was an insult to the cherished concepts and practices of independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty. It was a callous requiem for those who have been martyred by the racist troops.

77. The racist régime's *apartheid* system and military expansionism, as well as its regional terrorism, have been made possible by the massive assistance given to Pretoria by the United States. That political, economic and military support has enabled the racists to perpetuate and extend their system far beyond their

borders into Namibia, Angola and other parts of southern Africa, South Africa's nuclear capability now threatens much of Africa.

78. That veto can be seen by Africa and by the third world as nothing short of support for South Africa's racism, its flouting of United Nations resolutions and its disregard for human dignity and life. With that veto, the Council's potential for action in southern Africa has again received a blow.

79. At this point, I must warn the international community that I am empowered by my President and by my Government to state categorically that, in the face of continued inaction and increasing destabilization of the situation in our region, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola may have no option but to invoke, however unwillingly, Article 51 of the Charter to which President José Eduardo dos Santos made reference in his letter of 25 August 1981 addressed to the Secretary-General [S/14643].

80. In every instance, we have brought our case to the Security Council. Any efforts undertaken under Article 51 will fall within the bounds of the Charter itself and we shall surely have the support of the international community.

81. The representative of the terrorist racist régime sought to give the impression that the situation was normal in southern Angola, that there were 200 "spectators" at a football game [2298th meeting, para. 38]. The Angolan people are being slaughtered, their territory is under military occupation, women and children are being brutalized and raped—that is belittled and ignored. Perhaps the Cassinga massacre in May 1978, in which over 1,000 persons were killed, was also a football match? By its own admission, the racist Pretoria régime has killed more than 450 persons in the last few days and it continues to kill women and children and other civilians. A war is being waged against Angola today. Will the United Nations be

unable to do anything about it? Peace in southern Africa can be lasting only if it is peace between equals; if it cannot be maintained with honour, it is no longer peace. Inaction will lead to all-out war in that part of the world where, with South Africa's racism, *apartheid* and military adventurism, conditions are just ripe. If I may quote:

"The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant and so devastating that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored because it cannot survive their being repeated."

82. In conclusion, I should like to thank all those who spoke in our defence and in support of those principles by which many of us have chosen to live and which are enshrined in the Charter: freedom, justice, sovereignty, independence and peace. For those who drive nails into the coffin of liberty, there are others who smash the coffin. To those who defended tyranny, racism, imperialism and colonialism, I have nothing to say except that those who deny freedom to others will some day perish.

83. *A luta continua.*

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of this agenda item.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 25th meeting, para. 84.

² *Ibid.*, paras. 79 and 80.

³ A/36/116, annex III.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу : Организация Объединенных Наций. Секция по продаже изданий. Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a : Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
