

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

**1903**<sup>rd</sup> MEETING: 30 MARCH 1976

UN LIBRARY

NEW YORK

OCT 10 1984

---

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1903) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola: Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007) .....	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.

## 1903rd MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 30 March 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Thomas S. BOYA (Benin).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1903)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola:  
Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007).

*The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola:**

**Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions adopted earlier [1900th to 1902nd meetings], I shall invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table and the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Luvualu (Angola) took a place at the Security Council table and Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt),*

*Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussen (Somalia), Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Kamana (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision adopted at the 1902nd meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the members of his delegation to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that they will be invited to take places at the Council table when it is the turn of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamana (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the members of his delegation took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Furthermore, I should like to inform the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Mali, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uganda in which they ask to be invited, under Article 31 of the Charter, to participate without the right to vote in the Council's debate. If I hear no objections, I propose, in accordance with the Council's practice and with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite these representatives to participate without the right to vote in the debate.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kanté (Mali), Mr. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Mwangaguhunga (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is Mr. Kamana, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. I invite him and the members of his delegation to take places at the Council table and I now give him the floor.

5. Mr. KAMANA (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia): The delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia is grateful for this op-

portunity to address the Security Council. Conscious of our special responsibility for Namibia and realizing the crucial importance and relevance of the issue before this Council to Namibia and its people, we could not remain silent.

6. The Security Council is today rightly considering the aggression committed against Angola by the racist régime of South Africa. Needless to say, its aggression was launched from Namibia, a Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The illegal character of the presence of South Africa in Namibia has been stated by the International Court of Justice and repeatedly reaffirmed by this very Council and the General Assembly. Therefore, in carrying out its aggression against Angola from Namibia, South Africa compounded its defiance of the consensus of the international community against its illegal occupation of the Territory and its abhorrent policies and practices therein. In fact it committed a double offence in international law.

7. For some time now the Council for Namibia has been gravely concerned at the militarization of Namibia by South Africa and the intensified acts of brutality, oppression and repression of the Namibian people. Indeed, Namibians along the border with Angola have experienced immense suffering, humiliation and deprivation. They have been uprooted from their homes in order to give way to the aggression against Angola and a savage so-called "hot pursuit" against the gallant freedom fight of Namibia led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Fear of SWAPO, because of its ever-growing support among the Namibian people and its effectiveness in military terms, was in fact the main reason for the South African aggression against Angola. It was a desperate and shameless attempt to stifle the efforts of SWAPO and to suppress Namibian nationalism through savage brutality.

8. South Africa is now reported to have withdrawn from Angola, but the withdrawal is into Namibia. Surely this is totally unacceptable, since Namibia is not part of South Africa. The profound problem posed by South African racist military adventurism must be faced squarely. The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, must not tolerate such withdrawal into Namibia. The senseless military buildup in Namibia must not be allowed to continue.

9. The General Assembly has continually reasserted its stand on Namibia and has, furthermore, called upon all Member States to assist in promoting the withdrawal of South African forces and administration from Namibia. The Security Council has on several occasions reiterated its decision expressed in resolution 264 (1969) condemning the refusal of South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and considering the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and detrimental to the interests of the

population of the Territory and those of the international community.

10. The situation that confronts the Security Council has a quality which is rare in political conflicts: there is no ambiguity about the issue. South Africa must be branded as an aggressor State which used its illegal presence in Namibia to launch an armed invasion of a neighbouring country. The withdrawal of its troops from Angola is not sufficient to reduce the threat to international peace and security in southern Africa. The Council must condemn South African withdrawal into Namibia as an attempt to mislead world opinion. The militarization of Namibia is yet another dimension to the escalating contempt that South Africa reveals for the common decency of mankind.

11. The existence of the Portuguese colonial empire served many purposes for the South African racist colonial régime. It provided not only an additional barrier to protect its own brand of ruthless exploitation and colonialism but also was the condition for the expansion of its policies of plunder in connivance with Portuguese colonial authorities. The exploitation of Angolan resources through such colonial contracts must be defined as void of any legally binding commitments with respect to the Government of independent Angola.

12. It is in this light that the issue of the Cunene hydroelectric project must be considered by the Council. The South African presence in Namibia is illegal. Thus, it has no authority to negotiate new contracts regarding the utilization of the Cunene river project. The legal authority with respect to the Territory of Namibia rests with the United Nations Council for Namibia.

13. If it were possible for the reckless and blind South African racists and exploiters to show wisdom, they would heed the warning signals of outraged humanity and cease their military adventurism and recognize the right to self-determination of the Namibian people. If it were possible for such reckless, blind racist exploiters to show wisdom, they would renounce their uncontrolled greed and proceed to dismantle the brutal apparatus of exploitation by *apartheid*. Indeed, if it were possible for such reckless, blind racist exploiters to show wisdom, they would have the foresight to perceive that pursuing the present course will inexorably bring untold misery and suffering to the same people they assume to be protecting by imposing inhuman conditions on the African population of South Africa and Namibia.

14. The bells of history are ringing. The hour of total African liberation is at hand. No strategic, tactical or personal opportunism will hold down the rising banner of the African peoples' national dignity. No challenge is too great for the realization of their national identity.

15. The crucial character of these issues must not escape the attention of the Security Council. Clearly, only decisive action by this body will convey to South Africa the hopelessness of its stand.

16. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Sierra Leone. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

17. Mr. BLYDEN (Sierra Leone): First, let me congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March, soon to end, and to say how proud and pleased my delegation is over the distinguished manner in which you have so far steered the affairs of the Council—without fuss, without megalomania, without fanfare. My delegation wishes you well for the next day or so as you continue to wield the gavel with the same *éclat* and distinction which has already characterised your performance as you presided over the debate on two of the thorniest issues with which the Council has been concerned from its very beginning.

18. May I also seize this opportunity to extend to the representative of the People's Republic of Angola a warm and enthusiastic welcome as he takes his seat among us, thus presaging the occasion when we shall have the opportunity of extending an official hand of welcome to the Government and people of Angola as a full Member of the Organization. In his presence here we are able to witness once again positive evidence of the determined efforts of all Members of the Organization to fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the founding fathers of the United Nations to make the Organization what it was originally intended to become, an organization fully representative of all the peoples of the world.

19. But when I have said that, I cannot resist the temptation of reflecting upon what I judge to be the unsound judgement and unfounded optimism of the founding fathers of the United Nations in including among their ranks as a charter Member of the Organization the Union of South Africa, a supposedly "Christian" and "civilized" State and hence deemed capable of measuring up to the lofty standards and high ideals espoused by all founder Members of the Organization. The irony of South Africa's charter membership lies in the fact that, although known to the rest of the international community of the day as an avowedly racist Government, it was not only to become one of the original 51 signatories of the Charter at San Francisco in 1945, but, what was worse, it had been invited earlier to become one of the original 26 signers of the Declaration by United Nations proclaimed on 1 January 1942, three and a half years before the United Nations was to come into being, a declaration in which those States which were still in the throes of a global war had felt compelled, looking to the future, to express their resolve "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

20. Yet, on a note of generosity to those founding fathers, one cannot altogether rule out the possibility that those 25 other decent and responsible members of the international community that signed that Declaration by United Nations may well have been moved to include, rather than exclude, South Africa from their ranks in the pious but naïve hope that through such association and through full participation in the work of the Organization, South Africa would be motivated by the lofty ideals and aspirations proclaimed both in the Declaration and in the Charter, and would inevitably veer away from its bizarre and inhumane policy of *apartheid* as an instrument of government in the twentieth century. How wrong they were; how wrong they were. Time has shown again and again and again how outrageously wrong those founding fathers, with all their good intentions, must have been over South Africa.

21. The ink had scarcely dried on the parchment at San Francisco than South Africa began to demonstrate its recalcitrance as a Member of the Organization. For although South Africa was not only a charter Member but also one of the first seven Vice-Presidents of the first session of the General Assembly, it remained the only one of the then Mandatory Powers under the League of Nations Covenant which flagrantly challenged the authority of the Organization it had helped to create by its wilful refusal to transfer its Mandatory power to the Trusteeship Council as called for by the General Assembly, a point which the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia so ably made a few moments ago. Indeed, it is the view of my delegation that we are meeting here 30 years too late to brand South Africa an aggressor. By the forced imposition of its political régime on Namibia—formerly the Mandated Territory of South West Africa—South Africa was and still is committing an act of aggression which we did not take time to notice because we were more concerned with observing its practice of *apartheid*. For 30 long years South Africa has been an aggressor against Namibia and is now an aggressor against a second African territory, the People's Republic of Angola.

22. The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its twenty-sixth ordinary session held at Addis Ababa in February 1976 gave the African Group at the United Nations a mandate to call for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. In order that members of the Council may be properly advised and directed as to the expectations of the OAU on this matter, and in order that there may be no further doubt as to where the OAU and the African peoples as a whole stand vis-à-vis the *apartheid* Government of South Africa at this juncture of the history of their countries, I consider it necessary and useful to recite appropriate passages of the OAU resolution, of which paragraph 5 is only a single item:

“The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in its twenty-sixth ordinary session in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 23 to 29 February 1976,

“... ”

“Considering that the People’s Republic of Angola, member State of the Organization of African Unity, is at present a victim of an intolerable aggression by the troops of the racist and fascist Government of South Africa who are occupying part of its national territory,

“Convinced that the aggression against Angola is directed at all OAU member States,

“... ”

“Recalling the numerous resolutions of the OAU, the United Nations and the non-aligned countries condemning South Africa for its policy of *apartheid* and its illegal occupation of Namibia,

“Conscious of the major role that the People’s Republic of Angola should play in the intensification of the liberation struggle in southern Africa,

“1. Strongly condemns South Africa for its unspeakable aggression against the People’s Republic of Angola...;

“2. Demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African forces of aggression;

“3. Urges all member States of the region to cooperate fully with the Government of the People’s Republic of Angola in order to defend its independence...;”

Then there is paragraph 5, under which we are meeting here.

23. I have taken the trouble to read out some of the passages that are appropriate and related to the item which brought us to convene this series of Council meetings because I wish this Council and the world at large to be aware of the underlying spirit behind the call for these meetings to discuss South Africa’s aggression against Angola. It is not unrelated, as members of the Council will see from some of the passages I have read out, to the inspiration which has guided the continent and its peoples throughout the last half century or longer to seek total liberation not only for their individual territories but for all territories in Africa, since, as the passage says, aggression against Angola is aggression against all the States members of the OAU and against all African peoples.

24. The Charter of the United Nations provides, as we know, that States “shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against

the territorial integrity or political independence of any State...”. The General Assembly, in developing this principle, has proclaimed over and over again and at various times that a war of aggression constitutes a crime against peace—peace, that ultimate goal of the United Nations.

25. Under the Definition of Aggression, contained in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which was approved and adopted after consideration of the report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression, South Africa stands condemned in the eyes of the world of aggression against the sovereign State of Angola. There can be little doubt about it. Article 1 of the Definition defines aggression as

“the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition”,

while article 3 spells out in more specific terms those “acts” which, “regardless of a declaration of war, shall... qualify as an act of aggression”.

26. In the view of my delegation this is the first real occasion on which the Security Council may be said to have met to implement the report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression since its adoption by the General Assembly—a task which took the United Nations 29 of its 30 years to accomplish. Forgive me, therefore, if, for the benefit of the world community which as yet is not too familiar with the provisions of that document, I engage in a cursory recital of a few of its relevant provisions so as to enable the Council and its supporters to address themselves to the task for which this body is currently assembled, to wit, to consider “the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People’s Republic of Angola”.

27. I have already referred to article 1 of the Definition of Aggression. Article 3 lists the following as constituting acts of aggression:

“(a) The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof;

“(b) Bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State or the use of any weapons by a State against the territory of another State;

“(c) The blockade of the ports or coasts of a State by the armed forces of another State;

...

“(g) The sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries, which carry out acts of armed force against another State of such gravity as to amount to the acts listed above, or its substantial involvement therein.”

Article 4 states:

“The acts enumerated above are not exhaustive and the Security Council may determine that other acts constitute aggression under the provisions of the Charter.”

28. The participation of my delegation in this debate is based not on considerations of political or ideological sentimentality nor of geographical proximity, linguistic or cultural affinity, nor even of the similarity or identity of political and ideological persuasions. The interest of the delegation of Sierra Leone in the Angolan question, both before and since that country's accession to independence, is deeply rooted in ties of affinity and consanguinity forced upon our two countries and peoples by the circumstances of history.

29. It is scarcely known and, where known, seldom remembered that my country, Sierra Leone—originally called Serra Leoa, a Portuguese name meaning Lion Mountains—although at no time a Portuguese colony or dependency in the conventional usage of those terms, can nevertheless be regarded as the “mother” of Portuguese-inspired enclaves on the African continent dating back over 500 years—to 1462, to be precise—to a period in history which antedates that later and ugly period of adventurism on the continent by Portugal as a colonial Power, which we were fortunate to escape.

30. As if marked by the hand of providence or destiny to participate in the grand design of nation-building long before the contemplation of such a policy was forced upon the European colonial Powers during the past two decades, my country was as far back as some 75 years ago already engaged in the positive task of rendering technical assistance to a European colonial Power—the great Government of Portugal of the day—as it sought trained and skilled manpower to help it in administering a colony, a task for which it was inadequately equipped. Sierra Leone provided all the skilled and trained professional manpower for the technical, administrative and telecommunications services of all the Portuguese colonies without exception—Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe. Hence our desire to participate in the debate is rooted in considerations far greater than just the sentimental one of being African.

31. Happily for us and our brothers and sisters of Angola, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Guinea-Bissau and so on, the opportunity provided for my fellow-countrymen of earlier generations to live, to work and even to fertilize our blood with that of our compatriots in those countries, especially

Angola, has led to this momentous occasion when my delegation, along with other delegations not only of sister African States but also of other liberal and well-disposed States from other parts of the world, can proudly proclaim our solidarity with the sister State of Angola as it here and now presents its case as well as its cause before this Council in search of justice and fair play in the conduct of relations between States.

32. My delegation is neither amazed nor amused by the call for moderation, tolerance and a spirit of reconciliation which has been emanating from certain quarters of the advanced and industrialized community in recent weeks, regrettably, from some of those States which had long ignored pleas and appeals from colonial peoples during the last quarter of century to aid and abet the forces of moderation in Africa during the nascent period of our nationalist struggle and campaigns for independence.

33. Today, when our compatriots in Angola find themselves reluctantly compelled to seek the aid and assistance of other and more positively well-meaning States within the comity of nations, the cry goes up in loud and stentorian tones from certain bastions of inaction and reaction that the African peoples and their leaders should listen to the voice of “reason”, “moderation”, and “accommodation” rather than indulge in confrontation and violence. Indeed, it is no laughing matter that this call for moderation, restraint, negotiation and conciliation to get us out of the Angolan impasse comes out louder than ever on an issue that involves not one, not two, but three well-populated African countries which by accident happen to share a common border with, or are within the immediate environs of, certain enclaves in which protected, vested interests of friends of South Africa happen to be lodged. This has not escaped our notice.

34. My delegation has, throughout the 15-year history of its membership in the Organization, never once ceased to raise its voice against all those forces of repression, suppression and oppression without regard to the quarters from which such ungainly and inhuman acts of public policy may emanate. It is for this reason that, as the record of the Organization will show, not only in the General Assembly and in the Security Council but in all the specialized agencies, my delegation's stance has invariably been on the side of liberty with restraint, justice for all peoples without discrimination or oppression. Yet, painfully, very painfully, with all my country's known commitment throughout the years to the cause of peaceful negotiation and persuasion as the only means for the solution of difficult and impossible conflicts, we have been compelled to the unhappy and inescapable conclusion reached by an African poet more than a century ago that those who would be free must, themselves, strike the blow.

35. My delegation is at one with all the other delegations that have preceded me here or that will follow

me which have called for a clear and unequivocal denunciation of the aggressor State of South Africa for its daring, if misguided, attempt to encroach upon the sovereign territory of the People's Republic of Angola and to deprive that country and its people of their lives and fortunes.

36. My delegation remains resolute in its stand that aggression of whatever shape or form is a crime against humanity and against the conscience of mankind. Let us therefore during this meeting not only denounce this despicable phenomenon in the world community but act with firmness to put an end to it once and for all and put to shame and lay down a denial of the language and words of one of the world's greatest statesmen of this century, that great American citizen Adlai Stevenson, who himself once sat in this chamber. Adlai Stevenson, writing about what he called "our broken mainspring" in the West in his book, *Putting First Things First*, published some 15 years ago, states—and, indeed, I hope that in citing this we can prove him wrong by the action which we take in the Council:

"I come back to the painful fact that the Communists show a world-wide concern which is largely lacking among the men of the West. The whole human race is their horizon. Their 'brotherhood' is materialist, collectivist, atheist, and we dislike it, but it embraces everybody, and it is the framework of policies which take the missionaries of their new order to the end of the earth. I say with all the emphasis that I can command that we have no corresponding commitment to our fellow man."<sup>1</sup>

37. I want to say publicly that I do not believe, I do not agree with Mr. Stevenson, for I was brought up in the Christian tradition handed down by the majority of States Members of the Organization—that we are our brother's keeper. The Security Council stands at the crossroads of its own destiny to prove Mr. Stevenson right or wrong.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

39. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): Mr. President, allow me to thank you and the members of the Security Council for inviting me to participate in the discussion of the question of South Africa's aggression in Angola.

40. Before I proceed, I should like to congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency of this Council. You come from a sister African country which has excellent relations with Nigeria.

41. I should also like to welcome among us Ambassador Scranton of the United States. I am quite certain that he will be able to contribute usefully to the work of the Council and of the United Nations as a whole,

especially to those aspects bearing on the freedom and dignity of our part of the world, for we all know and have read about the liberal ethics that have dominated the political activities of Ambassador Scranton in this country.

42. Although my country is not a member of the Security Council, permit me also to say how much, during the debate on the question of Angola, my delegation misses the presence of Ambassador Malik, who, I am told, is still ill in hospital.

43. Allow me to congratulate the Council for having opened this forum, in spite of the limited reservations stated, to Ambassador Luvualu, the representative of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola. There is no doubt that Angola has the right to be heard in the Security Council, in accordance with Article 32 of the Charter. Its presence in the Council is a signal light indicating that other oppressed Africans in the rest of southern Africa will one day win their freedom, although human dignity continues to sink to an abysmal level that was not even contemplated by David Livingstone when he implied that Africans should continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, and although they are driven to fight with their backs to the wall.

44. The interest shown by the quantitative and qualitative range of participation in this debate reflects the consciousness of the international community in general. It underlines the significance of the problem of Angola, which is only a landmark and the beginning of greater struggles by the black man in Africa to extricate himself from the remaining shackles of white domination, which continues to be characterized by acts of human degradation by the white community in southern Africa. The people of Angola have also demonstrated to freedom fighters in southern Africa that what is built by blood can only be brought down by bloody struggle. It is left for the racist South Africans to see the writing in blood on the wall and to prevent the situation from reaching these undesirable levels.

45. The Nigerian delegation understands perfectly why we are here. It is to condemn in no uncertain terms the intolerable aggression by racist South Africa against sovereign Angolan territory.

46. There are two aspects which I wish to underline. First, it has been claimed that Angola was not independent on 28 October when South African forces joined hands with local puppet elements to penetrate about a thousand miles into the heartland of Angola in so-called hot pursuit. The legality of this action was said to lie in the acquiescence of the Portuguese colonial Government. Luckily, Portugal has clearly and publicly stated that at no time did it have any agreement with South Africa to assist in protecting the Calueque hydroelectric complex, as claimed by the South African Government according to its usual habit of distorting the facts.



47. The second aspect is that after independence was achieved on 11 November 1975—I repeat: after independence was achieved—the forces of the racist South African Government continued their aggression and made efforts to pull out only over the past week-end, after five months of an occupation characterized by destruction, murder, pillage—and I need not go into details, because that was undoubtedly done earlier by the representative of Angola. In addition, under armed coercion and intimidation, thousands of Angolans have been herded into Namibian territory. It is probable that the objective of this exercise is to hold them hostages to provoke a dialogue between the racist régime and an African Government. In their retreat the South Africans blew up over 100 bridges, large and small. In spite of these provocations, the Angolan Government forces have avoided military confrontation along their borders, all their borders, on which they should be congratulated.

48. We cannot help but cast our minds back briefly to five centuries of slavery, brutal extractive colonialism, racism and fascist Governments until the advent of the wind of change that has been blowing over Africa during the last decade. Africa and all other lovers of freedom are aware that this wind inscribes a message of hope clearly on the wall of decolonization. It is in the interest of all of us that this wind should not be allowed to become one of despair, manifesting itself in a hurricane sustained by centuries of bitterness over oppression and darkness.

49. The Angolans have had no opportunity to articulate options in their domestic, and even less in their external, policies. We all recall that the colonialist Government scuttled Angola, in the dawn of its independence, with the threat of usurpation by the minority racist régime in South Africa. The Portuguese had for five centuries sat snug in their ivory tower, as the white racists continue to do, oblivious of the impending change. They refused to develop their territories towards independence. They refused to accept the inevitable. When it came, they pulled out unceremoniously.

50. As the Portuguese pulled out, the South African régime promptly attempted to fill what they thought would be a vacuum by exploiting the weaknesses of some of the leaders of Angola in regard to achieving their objectives. These local leaders thus lost their credibility, for they joined forces with the declared enemies of Africa to wage war against their own brothers in Luanda through military collaboration with South Africa, thereby betraying Africa.

51. This is the first time that we have discussed Angola directly in the United Nations. I crave the Council's indulgence, therefore, for having made such a long preamble and also for taking this opportunity to underline that those who spoke and wrote with glee about the division in the ranks in the Organization of African Unity on Angola, especially

at the January Addis Ababa summit, must now understand that the OAU has been and will continue to be firmly united against racism, fascism and inhumanity to the black man in Africa and against the usurping powers of white minority régimes in southern Africa. At the OAU summit it was clear that nobody supported the cause of those who collaborated with South Africa. Those who failed then to support the recognition of MPLA [*Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola*], which was a crucial aspect of the Addis Ababa meeting, took that position not because they supported either FNLA [*National Front for the Liberation of Angola*] or UNITA [*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*] but because they thought that the options for reconciliation of the three parties had not been fully explored. However, those of us who gave support to MPLA did so from farsighted judgement and after weighing the options, not in the interest of our own countries but in the interest of the Angolans in particular and Africa in general. We have been proved right. Permit me to salute those in the Western world who promptly appreciated this and have since joined with the OAU in its attempt to work towards the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Angola. I select the Western world not because we do not appreciate the great contributions of the rest of the third world and the socialist world but because we are always assured of their support.

52. I believe that the Secretary-General, within the constraints of his terms of reference, is also already doing his best to help salvage something from the disaster created by the wanton acts of destruction and pillage by the South African army. I believe that there is a general rethinking in the United States, at least in some circles, towards the solution of the Angolan tragedy in all its aspects. I would venture to suggest that the right objectives to pursue in Angola would be those that promote progress, peace and unity and access by the international community to Angola's immense natural resources and markets, and not red herrings about military aid sent out by the Soviet Union and Cuba.

53. I hope that nobody here will attempt to pull wool over the eyes of the Council. Aggression grows beyond the presence of troops in Angola, and I am very happy that my colleague from Sierra Leone went into the entire legal framework that backs our political request now before the Council. Whether we reason, in addition, from the moral or the political point of view, the legal issues being clear, the international community should be just in its decisions. In that regard let us support the request for compensation and urge South Africa to make reparation and restitution, as demanded by Angola and as supported by the sponsors of an important paper to be submitted to the Council on the foregoing lines. That is the only way that Angola could obtain a measure of justice in this matter. The Angolans have suffered for too long.

54. Other aspects bearing on this issue that worry my delegation are a number of assumptions that con-

tinue to impose constraints on the policy options available to certain Western countries, leading to their inability to tackle the problem of Angola in the interest of world peace. The first is that the situation in Angola is a super-Power contest of strength and influence and is a test of détente. Secondly, the direct interests of the United States in the crisis hinge on the misconception that the super-Powers have priority influence over and above the interests of the people of Angola. The relevant ideological slogans have therefore been manipulated to becloud the issues—pro-communist, communist-backed, and so forth. As I said before, I feel certain that we are all aware here that the Angolans have not been given the opportunity to assess the options in their domestic and external policies. And let me warn that the longer they are frustrated, the more the external Powers will themselves circumscribe the spectrum of options available to them.

55. Another misconception is that the MPLA represents only a fraction of the Angolan people. The irony of this argument is too obvious to warrant discussion here. The dignity of the Angolan leaders, their demonstrated humanism, their good political judgement and sense and all their other traits are self-evident in their statements during the current meetings of the Council and in other international bodies. No group, after such bitter experience as theirs, could have spoken with more stoical mildness. It is on record that so far there has been no victimization of followers of known traitors who, on the basis of tribalism, misled certain people of Angola into supporting them. Angolans have not been acrimonious, and the Angolan leaders, who in fact represent the intellectual and leadership cadres of Angola, have been very magnanimous. We in the OAU have often been surprised at this magnanimity. The international community encourages them to remain magnanimous.

56. Another misconception is that Cuba has carried out a policy of intervention and communist expansion in Africa. This, as everyone knows, is not true. Cuba has only acted in prompt response to the sovereign action of the legitimate Government of Angola in defence of its territorial integrity, which had been violated by South Africa. If *apartheid* and racism had succeeded in their northward thrust into Angola, we would have been debating a different kind of problem here today.

57. We in Africa have no quarrels with the Cubans. There are filial links between Cuba and Africa in general, apart from the basic Afro-Latin cultural and blood relations between Cuba and Angola. This is the basis on which Angola turned to Cuba. In the spectrum of those who have recognized Angola we also noted the great and quick response of Brazil in recognizing Angola on similar grounds.

58. Pan-American conflicts should not be extended to policies in Africa by Western Powers, and par-

ticularly the United States. We are capable of determining our own policies. And may I add here that it is dangerous to threaten Cuba and to mislead the world by allowing an impression to be created that these Cuban forces are poised to invade certain territories in southern Africa. Even then, as long as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola can promote the siege mentality fast escalating in the ranks of the racist Government in Rhodesia and can weaken the effect of its treasonable unilateral declaration of independence, why urge their exit when they are helping to further the objectives of the Security Council and the United Nations?

59. On a less serious note, we have read in the press of how an American spotted Cubans fighting on the Golan Heights. I do not know whether he used Telstar, or whether from U-2 planes one can distinguish between Portuguese, Angolans and Arabs; but, Nigeria not being so technologically advanced, I might not have an answer to that. We hope, however, that these threats against Cuba for helping African liberation are as serious as the reports of the phantom Cubans fighting on the Golan Heights. The extension of pan-American ideological squabbles to becoming a determinant in United States policy in Africa is certainly a matter that clearly requires urgent review.

60. Another aspect which I wish to examine is the contention that the presence of Cuban troops and Soviet advisers is a threat to white minority régimes in southern Africa. This apprehension on the part of certain Western countries reflects the greater concern which they have for the white minority régimes than for the very democratic values, basic freedoms and great ideals of Western democracy which are the *raison d'être* for their Western policy against Cuba and which have been trampled underfoot by these racist Governments in southern Africa. It is remarkable that in spite of protestations, which are only recent, at no time have these southern African régimes been encouraged, much less coerced, blustered at or threatened, to change their policies, as the Angolans, the Soviets and the Cubans are today being subjected to pressure, by the United States in particular.

61. It is the hope of my delegation that the definition of aggression will be a universal one, that reparation will be made in accordance with the practice of civilized society and that the Security Council will urge South Africa to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and, in accordance with the principles inspiring declarations of the Council and the General Assembly, not to use the Territory of Namibia for aggression against African States.

62. Finally, my delegation hopes that the generosity with which guns were rushed to the war in Angola will be reflected in the generosity with which assistance is given to Angola for its rehabilitation and reconstruction.

63. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

64. Mr. PETRIĆ (Yugoslavia): May I first of all extend my most cordial welcome to the representative of Angola, Ambassador Pascal Luvualu. His presence at the United Nations symbolizes the success of the liberation struggle of his country and, at the same time, heralds its early participation in the work of the Organization in the capacity of a full Member.

65. My delegation believes that the question which the Council is presently considering at the request of the African Group, namely, South Africa's act of aggression committed against the independent People's Republic of Angola, is a very important one for the maintenance of peace and security in Africa and elsewhere. The United Nations and the Security Council should lend full assistance to the independent People's Republic of Angola, victim of aggression by the racists of South Africa. My delegation is taking part in the work of the Security Council in order to express, on this occasion also, the full support of non-aligned Yugoslavia for the Government and people of the People's Republic of Angola and for every resolute action undertaken by the Council to combat the aggression committed by South Africa against Angola.

66. My country, after lending full support and assistance to the long and heroic national liberation struggle of the people of Angola, recognized the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, headed by Agostinho Neto, immediately after the proclamation of its independence last November. We note with satisfaction that 94 countries have already recognized the Government of Angola, a fact which represents world-wide recognition of the struggle and victory of the Angolan people.

67. As we all know, the People's Republic of Angola has incorporated its adherence to the policy and posture of non-alignment in its Constitution as one of its fundamental principles. That is a great contribution to world peace and security that Angola is making, together with all the newly liberated countries which, as a rule, opt for the non-aligned movement.

68. At their first summit meeting, at Belgrade in 1961, the non-aligned countries proclaimed that the further extension of the non-aligned area of the world constituted the only possible and indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs and the intensification of cold-war policies. At that summit it was also prophetically stated that the emergence of newly liberated countries would further assist in narrowing down the area of bloc antagonisms and thus encourage all tendencies towards strengthening peace and promoting peaceful co-operation among independent and equal nations. At the most recent non-aligned summit meeting, at Algiers in 1973,

12 years later, it was underlined that more than half the member States of the international community, representing the majority of the world's population, took part in that conference, and it was stated that non-alignment was continuing to grow in scope and acquiring ever wider acceptance by expressing at the international level the aspirations of an increasing number of States, of the national liberation movements and of all the forces for emancipation and progress throughout the world.

69. The success of the people of Angola in winning and defending its independence, together with the previous victories of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe and with the major advances in the struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, represents in addition to everything else a most telling answer and rebuff to all those who view with pessimism the activities of the United Nations.

70. Of course, the victories that I have just mentioned are, first and foremost, the result of the terrible sacrifices in lives and blood that the peoples of those countries were ready to make in their liberation struggle. At the same time, every effort to support them that we have made here, every resolution, every measure and every concrete step that we have been pursuing year in, year out have been of real help and by their accumulation and growth over the years have also constituted a major contribution. Everything that we have ever done in and through the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Committee of 24<sup>2</sup> or the United Nations Council for Namibia, the work of the Secretariat, various funds, missions and all the myriad ways of helping liberation movements—from recognizing their fight as being in accordance with the Charter to all kinds of direct aid—all have borne results in the end.

71. The United Nations and the international community have been coping with the aggressive policy of the South African racist régime and its system of *apartheid* and racial discrimination for more than three decades. For a decade the United Nations has been endeavouring to free Namibia from the illegal occupation imposed on that African Territory by South Africa, although international responsibility for the administration of Namibia has been vested in the United Nations. For more than a decade the United Nations has been making efforts to get rid of Ian Smith's illegal minority régime by imposing economic and other sanctions against it.

72. In spite of all the efforts and decisions of the United Nations, South Africa has intensified its racist policy against the 18 million Africans of South Africa. It has strengthened its illegal military and other presence in Namibia, stepped up its terror against the people of Namibia and used Namibian territory for aggression against Angola. It has given full support to Ian Smith and has repeatedly threatened the security

of neighbouring African countries. Because of all that, the South African régime was universally condemned and at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly was even deprived of the right to take part in the work of that body. However, the *apartheid* régime has ignored the United Nations and the international community by resorting ruthlessly to aggression by its regular military forces in Angola.

73. The aggression in Angola constitutes a desperate attempt to stop the liquidation of racist positions and interests in southern Africa. Thus it has been confirmed once again that it presents an open threat to independent Africa and to peace and security on that continent and beyond. Therefore, the responsibility of the Security Council, and of every one of its permanent members in particular, is all the greater. The need for the Council and all countries to condemn South Africa's premeditated aggression in Angola is ever more acute and of ever greater significance for the process of the final liquidation of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. My delegation believes that by its attitude towards racism there and, concretely, towards South Africa's aggression in Angola, every country actually determines its position with regard to Africa and its struggle for the final liquidation of colonialism.

74. We have no faith in any statement made by the racist South African régime, nor in its intentions. The danger of South African aggression against Angola is still very much present, even if the withdrawal of its troops has really taken place, because the South African army is still in Namibia. Consequently, the Security Council should call upon South Africa to commit itself to respecting the independence of Angola and its territorial integrity. In this regard, the only genuine guarantee is the withdrawal of South Africa from and the cessation of its illegal occupation of Namibia. The Council should condemn that occupation as aggression against the people of Namibia and as forcible prevention of the United Nations, which is directly responsible for the administration of this Territory, from taking over its administration on the very soil of Namibia. In accordance with its obligations and powers, the Council should compel South Africa to return all the property plundered by its troops in Angola and to pay compensation to Angola for all the damage inflicted by the aggression of South African armed forces against its territory.

75. We support the appeal addressed by the People's Republic of Angola to the United Nations and to all the specialized agencies requesting them to lend full material and other assistance to that young and independent African country so as to enable it, in the first days of its independence, to consolidate its economic and social life, which has been so seriously affected by age-long Portuguese colonialism and the aggression of South Africa.

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the German

Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

77. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to thank the members of the Council for giving the delegation of the German Democratic Republic the opportunity to take part in the debate.

78. Mr. President, permit me, on behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, to congratulate you whole-heartedly on your assumption of the extremely important post of President of the Security Council. Between the German Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Benin there exist cordial and friendly relations within the context of which the citizens of my country have had the pleasure of welcoming you personally in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin. The fact that the discussion of the aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola is taking place now under the presidency of a representative of Africa is in itself of special significance. I would therefore express my delegation's hope that under your leadership the Council will conclude the discussion with an appropriate document.

79. Permit me also whole-heartedly to welcome, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the delegation of the youngest member of the Organization of African Unity, the independent People's Republic of Angola. I should also like to express my conviction that very soon we shall be able to welcome the People's Republic of Angola as a full Member of the United Nations.

80. On 4 February, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the beginning of armed struggle by the people of Angola under the leadership of the MPLA, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Erich Honecker, and the Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, Willi Stoph, assured the President of the MPLA and the President of the People's Republic of Angola, Comrade Agostinho Neto, that:

"The German Democratic Republic, side by side with the Soviet Union and the other socialist States and all anti-imperialist forces, will continue in the future to offer solidarity and support to the people of Angola in its heroic struggle."

81. In accordance with the proposal of the African Group, based on the relevant decision of the Council of Ministers of the OAU, the Security Council is dealing with a question of aggression by the South African *apartheid* régime against the independent sovereign State of the People's Republic of Angola. This problem on our agenda is, in the view of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, a matter of principle and one of the utmost importance to ensure peace and security in southern Africa. This is a problem which

without any doubt is very closely connected with the implementation of the resolution adopted more than 15 years ago on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the well-known resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

82. Permit me to remind the Council that from the very beginning of the aggressive actions of Pretoria against Angola the German Democratic Republic, together with other States, has, in the United Nations and elsewhere, exposed the criminal actions of the South African régime and has indicated the need to resist aggression and to provide assistance to the Angolan people. Today, the occurrence of the aggression is virtually common knowledge, and this creates even more favourable circumstances for preventing a continuation of the aggression of the fascist régime of South Africa.

83. The armed aggression of the *apartheid* régime against the People's Republic of Angola is part and parcel the futile efforts to deprive the peoples of southern Africa of their right to self-determination and of fundamental human rights and to continue oppressing and exploiting them by the methods of racism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

84. As a European I should like to make the following point. More than 30 years ago in Europe, thanks to the heroic and selfless struggle of the peoples, primarily those of the Soviet Union, Hitlerite fascism—an inveterately racist régime—was defeated. Its offshoots in other continents will also be thrown on to the scrap-heap of history. The balance of forces in the world is changing increasingly in favour of the forces of peace and progress. The map of Africa has changed radically, and it is becoming ever clearer that the days of the last bastions of racism and colonialism in the southern part of Africa are numbered.

85. The peoples of the world will not resign themselves to seeing such international law-breakers as the illegal *apartheid* régime threaten peace and security. The People's Republic of Angola had to wage an arduous struggle against these forces, which attempted to prevent the African peoples themselves from determining their own fate and the course of their own development and becoming masters of their own natural resources. A whole array of opponents organized a plot against the lawful rights of the people of Angola. The South African racist régime once again, quite clearly, has displayed its hatred of mankind. The troops of the illegal Vorster régime, equipped with the latest weapons from the arsenals of a number of members of NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*], have spilled over to the north. As we know, a propaganda campaign was launched in favour of open violation of the integrity of the territory of young African States and armed intervention in Africa as far as the Equator, and there were shameless attempts to find a legal basis for that. In Namibia, illegally occupied by South Africa, streets

and squares are named after such well-known fascists and war criminals as Goebbels and Goering. These facts speak for themselves.

86. In spite of all the facts which demonstrate the clear aggression of Pretoria against Angola and the criminality of such actions, one permanent member of the Security Council at the beginning of this debate virtually undertook to defend the policy of aggression of the illegal *apartheid* régime and to divert the attention of the Council from the question of the criminal character of that régime, thus demonstrating once again that its policy is entirely in keeping with the darkest forces of reaction. It is quite natural that the senseless distortions of history should have been challenged by Africa. In this connexion I believe any further comment on my part would be gratuitous. There is an old African proverb which runs as follows: "He may say he loves you, but wait and see what he will do for you." When a policy is based solely on ferocious anti-Sovietism which at the same time is anti-Communism and which the German humanist, Thomas Mann, once called the supreme folly of our times, then facts are distorted and a point is reached where racist intervention on the part of the Vorster régime in Angola can be justified. That is detrimental to the interests not only of the Angolan people but of others.

87. It is time that those States which, in spite of the clear decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, have been providing the Pretoria régime with political, economic and military assistance were energetically forced to face up to their responsibilities. On 21 March this year the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic, Horst Sindermann, said on the subject of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic believes that it is indispensable for the Security Council to take a decision with regard to effective measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter for the final elimination of the policies and practices of the racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia which are inhumane in their character and which flout all the principles of international law, and also to call a halt to the illegal occupation of Namibia. Those members of NATO which, in disregard of decisions of the United Nations, co-operate with the racist régimes in the political, economic, military and nuclear fields and do everything they can to support them are promoting the further pursuit of the policy of racial discrimination and are becoming accomplices in the policies of those régimes, which represent a threat to peace."<sup>3</sup>

88. The German Democratic Republic wholeheartedly supports the lawful demands for the immediate, unconditional and total cessation of aggres-

sive actions against the People's Republic of Angola which have been made here by the representative of the People's Republic of Angola in agreement with the Group of African States. We cannot permit the Vorster régime to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent and sovereign African States. Any people, any State, has the right to strengthen its independence and the right to make a free choice of the path of its development in accordance with the principles of the Charter of United Nations. We must force the *apartheid* régime to answer for the damage done to the People's Republic of Angola and fully compensate that damage. The *apartheid* régime must leave Namibia, which it is illegally occupying, so that the people of Namibia itself finally can determine its own fate and begin to build a happy life without oppression or fetters and so that peace can reign in southern Africa.

89. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic hopes the Council will take due account of the lawful demands of the People's Republic of Angola and adopt an appropriate resolution.

90. The peoples of the world are increasingly mobilizing their efforts in the struggle against the illegal régimes in the southern part of Africa. The glorious struggle of the people of Angola against the racist neo-colonialist aggression has given further stimulus to that cause in the United Nations. History shows that the peoples of Africa, in close alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist States, have been able to foil the criminal plot against the People's Republic of Angola. The greater our solidarity the better it will be for the cause of safeguarding our common interests.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> *Putting First Things First: A Democratic View*, New York, Random House, 1960, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

<sup>3</sup> A/AC.115/L.430, p. 15.

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

---

### 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 الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。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.

---