

005 645-1  
UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL

## OFFICIAL RECORDS UN LIBRARY

OCT 16 1984

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

1906<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 31 MARCH 1976

NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1906) .....  | 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:<br>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.

## 1906th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 31 March 1976, at 3.30 p.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/1906)

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 4.25 p.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 1905th meetings], I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table and the representatives of Bulgaria, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. In accordance with the decision taken at the 1902nd meeting, I also invite the President of the United

Nations Council for Namibia and the members of his delegation 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. Ghelev (Bulgaria), Mr. Mondjo (Congo), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Neugebauer (German Democratic Republic), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Fernandes (Guinea-Bissau), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Kanté (Mali), Mr. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Galvão Teles (Portugal), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussen (Somalia), Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Mwangaguhunga (Uganda), Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Kamana (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, together with the members of his delegation, took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In addition I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Mozambique in which he requests to be invited under Article 31 of the Charter to take part, without the right to vote, in the debate of the Council. If I hear no objection, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite him to take part, without the right to vote, in the debate.

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

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

5. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction for the delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo that this important discussion has been placed under your guidance. Since you assumed, Sir, the responsible function of President of the Security Council, you have brought to bear on it the full

weight of your competence and objectivity. I need hardly recall here the profound sentiments of brotherly friendship and militant solidarity that exist between Benin and the Congo, two African countries which are firmly committed to the constant struggle against colonialism and imperialism, a struggle to achieve the dignity and the genuine independence of peoples.

6. Nor can I be silent about the fact that we have with us the delegation of the People's Republic of Angola, headed by Comrade Pascal Luvualu, a very well-known and respected figure in the Organization of African Unity. The participation in this debate of the delegation of the People's Republic of Angola is an embodiment of the victory of a heroic people which consented, under the leadership of the MPLA [*Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola*], to make tremendous sacrifices in order to liberate its country. This gives my delegation an opportunity to pay a very well-deserved tribute to the heroes, the worthy sons and daughters of Angola, who fell for their people and who, in sacrificing their lives, have written the finest page in the history of African liberation of which they symbolize the highest virtues.

7. Once again the Security Council is considering a complaint against the racist and fascist régime of Pretoria. This is not the first time that the Council has been called upon to pass judgement on the blatant acts of criminal aggression perpetrated by the South African racists against an independent African country. The odious aggression of the Government in Pretoria against the People's Republic of Angola provides, if, indeed, it were necessary, a striking illustration of the deadly role which world reaction, with its various manifestations of imperialism and old and new colonialism, has assigned to the hysterical and bloodthirsty hordes of Vorster in Africa.

8. Those who dreamt of this debate being swiftly reduced to confusion will have been proved wrong and will have to pay for their miscalculations. The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, by requesting the Security Council to consider the act of aggression perpetrated by the South African Government against the People's Republic of Angola, the youngest of its members, sought to express its unequivocal desire to see the consideration of this serious problem pursued to its proper conclusion in the Security Council without its getting lost in a maze of digressions that could only serve the machiavellian designs of imperialism. We must therefore be chary of false arguments which, quite obviously, by planting erroneous ideas in open minds, are intended only to disorientate us and to mitigate the burdensome responsibility of the South African racists for their aggression against the Angolan people.

9. The bourgeois press which speaks with one voice when besmirching Africa may be trying hard to play on the emotions of world public opinion by talking about foreign troops in Angola. This is a very clumsy

way of exploiting the weakness of those not privy to imperialist manoeuvres. The generous aid which friendly socialist countries have, at its request and without any hesitation, made available to the People's Republic of Angola—an independent and sovereign country—in order effectively to stem the avalanche of aggression perpetrated by the racist imperialists with the support of puppets who are traitors to the national cause needs no justification to those who criticize unjustly. A calm analysis of the nature and type of this aid, which is based upon a proper evaluation by the socialist countries of their internationalist duty, would, on the contrary, lead us to express aloud and unequivocally our whole-hearted gratitude to those friendly countries which have constantly given their most loyal support to the struggle of the peoples of Africa for freedom and independence.

10. Therefore, this debate must be structured around a single *leitmotiv*: the criminal aggression by the racist South African Government against the People's Republic of Angola. We have stated on previous occasions that the aggression of the racist South African régime against the independent countries of Africa is not a new problem just now knocking on the Council's door. The Pretoria régime, under the label of the Republic of South Africa, is nothing more than the bridgehead of imperialism in Africa; it is the headquarters from which the exploitation of the peoples of southern Africa is perpetuated, these peoples against whom imperialism is showing its ever more greedy talons. To be convinced of that it is not really necessary to rehearse once again here the long catalogue of the crimes and acts of psychological piracy committed by the followers of *apartheid*. In the case before us I would refer to the masterly statement made by the representative of the People's Republic of Angola [*1900th meeting*], who gave us a sharp awareness of the shameful and criminal activities of the fascist South African army. The violent destruction of property belonging to the Angolan people, the massacre of women and children—in other words, the civilian population—of that country, the brazen pillaging of the areas that they had invaded show quite clearly the nature of these monsters who are blindly supported by the NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] Powers, despite the most vehement universal condemnation of the *apartheid* régime.

11. The statement made by the representative of Guinea, Comrade Jeanne Martin Cissé, Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*1901st meeting*], contained a wealth of irrefutable facts. Because of that and because of Comrade Cissé's revolutionary commitment, with which we are all familiar, that statement was very useful in helping us to understand the unsavoury conduct of the Pretoria régime, an evil tool of imperialism against African independence and unity.

12. Of course, there has been no shortage of arguments in the mouths of the allies and accomplices of



the Vorster régime, who coyly close their eyes to the atrocities that that régime is perpetrating against the African peoples, while flaunting a spurious legality and so-called irrefutable proof. We have always spoken out against the logistic and military support which the Western Powers generously provide to the South African régime, since we are deeply convinced that these weapons not only serve to massacre the black peoples of Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe but also are destined to be used, by dint of the deadly logic of *apartheid*, to threaten seriously the independent states of the sub-region.

13. Is there, then, any reason to be astonished that South Africa can with impunity extend the frontiers of its hideous régime to the north of its territory by illegally occupying Namibia? Some undoubtedly thought that we were acting like prophets when we fought to have the voice of Africa heard both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, to reveal the serious risks which the policy of *apartheid* involves not only for our continent but also for international peace and security. Today we are all tragically seeing cogent proof of the criminal behaviour of the Pretoria régime and its diabolical future plans.

14. The convening of the Security Council at the request of the African Group, as a result of the South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, has, unfortunately, now proved the correctness of our analysis. In May 1975, under the fraudulent pretext of defending its interests, South Africa launched its troops in a vast attempt to recolonize Angola at the very moment when the Angolan people, at the end of 15 long and bitter years of heroic struggle for liberation, had finally glimpsed the dawn of independence, the chance of recovering their dignity after having severed once and for all the servile bonds that had attached their country to Portuguese colonialism. The arguments which Vorster's envoy developed, in a letter circulated to the Member States in an attempt to justify South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, do not warrant any time being spent on them, so threadbare are those arguments. Referring to the so-called moral obligations of his country, the emissary of the South African racist régime speaks of the anachronistic desire of his Government to give protection "to the workers at Calueque in order to ensure the vital water supply to Ovambo" [S/12024]. That is an extremely serious claim, which could lead to all sorts of adventures, at any point of the planet. As for the so-called assurances that Pretoria states it has received from the revolutionary Government of Angola, they should be treated with scorn. Indeed, the point of view of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola on that matter has been made abundantly clear by Ambassador Luvualu.

15. My delegation challenges any contention that the South African régime has anything whatever to do with a dam over which the People's Republic of

\*Angola exercises full sovereignty. The South African letter refers to respect for international frontiers. That is a serious insult to the intelligence and competence of the members of this Council. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind: South Africa has never shared a frontier with Angola. Furthermore, this arrogant attitude on the part of the representative of South Africa has been encouraged by the conniving indifference of the international community. South Africa has no sovereignty over Namibia, whose territory it is illegally occupying.

16. For several days now, efforts have been made, stealthy manoeuvres have been set in motion, to ensure that the unilateral withdrawal of the South African troops on 27 March would be considered by the Council as a sufficient argument for diverting attention from the underlying reasons for its convening, that is—I would once again recall—the aggression by South African troops against the People's Republic of Angola, an independent and sovereign country, a member of the Organization of African Unity and soon, we have no doubt, a Member of the United Nations. The withdrawal of Pretoria's troops from Angolan territory has expunged nothing from the fact of the aggression.

17. I shall not dwell on the serious damage and harm suffered by the fraternal Angolan people as a result of this indescribable aggression. The lofty sense of justice and equity of Council members will properly advise them what energetic measures should be taken to redress the grave harm caused to the martyred Angolan people. For its part, the People's Republic of the Congo would like to join those friendly delegations that have already demanded that South Africa be condemned to redress the gratuitous acts of barbarism committed by its troops in invading Angola. The Council must take energetic steps to discourage any inclination on the part of the South African racists to repeat their foolhardy venture in Angola.

18. It is intolerable that South Africa should feel so assured of impunity that it can at any time commit aggression against an independent, sovereign African country, cause it serious damage and, merely by withdrawing, consider its action as a simple accident of history without any consequences. South Africa must undertake scrupulously to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the young People's Republic of Angola.

19. We have been told that South African troops, in withdrawing from Angolan territory, have fallen back into Namibia, thus leaving the door open for other acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. This is why, when considering this important matter, the Council must demand that South Africa refrain from using the international Territory of Namibia to perpetrate its acts of provocation or aggression against neighbouring African States.

20. While the South African racists persist in their stubbornness, for us the fundamental point at issue is

the struggle of peoples against oppression and exploitation. The peoples of southern Africa, like other peoples in that continent, are entitled to freedom and independence. To turn one's back on this truth is to damn oneself irrevocably. That is why, in conclusion, I should like to quote this passage from the letter recently addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Comrade Théophile Obenga, speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labour Party, Comrade President Marien Ngouabi, said:

"Because, finally, the time has come when the true friends of the African peoples must no longer rest content with writing love poems to our continent with one hand while with the other they engage in the most impious acts in association with the enemies who, openly in the face of the world, avail themselves of the most contemptible principles and methods on which their world is built. Each should henceforth align himself on the side of victory."<sup>1</sup>

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

22. Mr. KANTÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased to see you presiding over these meetings of the Security Council called for by the African Group to consider this painful question of the armed aggression perpetrated by the followers of *apartheid* against the People's Republic of Angola. Indeed, we have no doubt that you, as the worthy representative of a country and a people that have contributed with steadfast militancy to the liberation of our continent, will conduct this important debate with the firmness and honesty which are typical of the dynamic revolution of Benin.

23. In response to your appeal, my delegation will willingly and strictly keep to the item on the agenda. However, we reserve our right to speak again should the course of the debate require it.

24. My delegation, which assures you of its fraternal co-operation, is certain that the conclusion of these meetings of the Council will fulfil the expectations not only of the martyred people of the People's Republic of Angola but also of Africa.

25. Allow me, before taking up the problem which is before us, to extend a welcome to the delegation of the fighting people of Angola, headed by my eminent colleague Ambassador Pascal Luvualu. This is an historic moment for us, and we cannot fail to welcome the event. We are certain we voice the profound feeling of all those throughout the world who are struggling for freedom, peace and progress.

26. Mali had no doubts about the victory of the MPLA. Following the tide of history, its Government from the very start supported that national liberation movement, and our head of State, Colonel Moussa Traoré, in the early hours after the proclamation of the People's Republic of Angola on 11 November 1975, sent a cordial message to his brother and friend Mr. Agostinho Neto to hail the event and extend his congratulations. Subsequent events today confirm the correctness of that position.

27. We bow humbly before the memory of all the patriots who gave their lives that Angola might regain its independence. The sacrifice of those heroes was not in vain because the People's Republic of Angola has been established, under the dynamic leadership of its prestigious party, the MPLA. Although independent Africa hails that victory, it is not a cause for frivolous celebration; we accept it with a sense of profound responsibility. That is why the People's Republic of Angola and independent Africa dedicate that victory to all those who have given their lives throughout the ages and the centuries for the cause of liberty and justice. Those heroes belong to all continents and all races. The People's Republic of Angola and independent Africa dedicate that victory also to the United Nations, which was created for the protection of peace, freedom and justice in the world. And finally, they dedicate it generously to all of you, regardless of your basic positions, Africa has no rancour, because for us what matters in the final analysis is not men, who come and go, but peoples, who make history. As I stated in the General Assembly debate on the Cambodian situation in 1973, each one of our countries has had its Glaouis, its Ben Arafats, its Ngô Dinh Diems, its Thieus, its Kys, its Syngman Rhees, its Pak Cheng His, its Savimbis and its Roberto Holdens. And although the views of men like ourselves around this table may differ on crucial problems, I have no doubt that the fundamental interests of the various countries which we represent, and the fate of our peoples, must converge.

28. History has just provided us once again with proof that the last word belongs to the just, that is, to the peoples. Today those who laid their wagers—for reasons that we shall willingly refrain from describing here—on puppets and Trojan horses must overcome their bitterness and recriminations and assess the situation objectively; because what is actually in danger is international peace and security, our *raison d'être*.

29. We cannot fail to recognize that the aggression perpetrated by the proponents of *apartheid* against the valiant people of Angola was premeditated, cowardly and barbarous. Premeditated, because it was meticulously prepared over a long time; cowardly, because it came about without a preliminary declaration of war; and barbarous, because it decimated innocent populations and sowed desolation and death in the south of the country. Nothing could have led us to foresee this odious crime, because Angola has no common border

with the closed world of *apartheid* and also because no tension existed between the two countries. We would certainly have to go back to Hitlerian fascism to find a similar offence.

30. While the Angolan people were preparing to celebrate the independence they had won after an arduous struggle, Vorster's clique was actively organizing an armed expedition against it from the international Territory of Namibia. A plan of attack had been worked out and the armed forces of Pretoria were waiting for D-Day in order to carry it out. On 9 August 1975 the signal was given and Angola was treacherously invaded by a heavily equipped expeditionary army which destroyed everything in its path. Emboldened by the silence of its allies, the Pretoria régime decreed a partial mobilization and placed the reservists on a state of alert in order to "bar the route to communism", to "save Christian and Western civilization", and who knows what else. Innocent civilian populations were massacred, bridges and roads were ruined, the economic infrastructure was destroyed and livestock was killed. It was a war with no holds barred. What mattered for those freebooters of the twentieth century was to sow terror and reduce the brave Angolan people to the slavery of hideous *apartheid* in order to preserve the safety zone which, with the complicity of the fascist régimes of Salazar and Caetano, they had cleverly created north of the Limpopo. The cruelty of it could be matched only by the ignominy.

31. The world could not remain indifferent to such a crime. Everywhere voices were raised to condemn that criminal aggression. Shaken by everyone's censure and harried by the popular armed forces for the liberation of Angola, Vorster's hordes beat a retreat, mined the lost terrain and pillaged the country, carrying out a scorched-earth policy and dragging off the able-bodied inhabitants to a forced exile. They installed themselves in the extreme southern part of the country, which they occupied until 27 March. And in order to legalize this aggression in their own way, the white Power, on 28 December 1975, presented to its pseudo-parliament a cynical and iniquitous bill which would authorize it to undertake military operations beyond the borders of South Africa.

32. That was how the abject *apartheid* régime conducted itself in the Angolan crisis, in contravention of international order represented by members of the Council. The fallacious arguments it advanced to justify its crimes were rejected by the international community. Portugal, which had assumed joint responsibility with the national transitional Government for the administration of Angola, strongly condemned the aggression and thus proved that its country had concluded no agreement with Pretoria concerning the protection and security of the Cunene dam. Even if such an agreement existed it could not justify under international law an aggression against Angola, because the works in question had been erected on

the territory of that country and are part of its national heritage. Their security is the exclusive responsibility of its people, that is, the Government which it freely elected on 11 November 1975. No one can and no one must take its place to protect that national heritage.

33. The Portuguese Government, as the administering Power had to protest against South African aggression three times, but in vain: the first time was 12 August, the second, 18 August, and the third, 3 September 1975. Things are very clear, the proof is evident and the accusations are overwhelming. The eloquent testimony we had this morning from the representative of Portugal [*1905th meeting*] leaves no doubt about Pretoria's culpability.

34. Under the Definition of Aggression annexed to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, the proponents of *apartheid* are guilty of three acts of aggression, three crimes against the peace: first, the invasion by force of the territory of Angola—article 3, paragraph (a); secondly, the utilization of the international Territory of Namibia to invade Angola—article 3, paragraph (e); and, thirdly, military occupation of the south of Angola—article 3, paragraph (a). It should be recalled here that article 5 of that text, which is a fundamental law of the Organization, states:

"No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression."

and

"A war of aggression is a crime against international peace. Aggression gives rise to international responsibility."

35. The Council has before it a well-known repeated offender, a rebel—in a word, one beyond redemption. The Council's responsibility is all the greater because it is now facing the first act of premeditated aggression since the adoption of the historic resolution 3314 (XXIX), which gives the definition arrived at after more than 10 years of difficult negotiations. The future of peace in the world depends upon the Council's decision, because the judgement it renders will create a precedent.

36. My delegation had occasion during a previous series of Council meetings [*1885th meeting*] to make clear the Government of Mali's feelings on the invaluable and effective aid that the Soviet Union, the revolutionary Government of Cuba and all progressive forces gave the MPLA in its national liberation struggle. I shall not, therefore, revert to that. I mention it simply to point out that it is not possible with honesty to place this internationalist duty, which is moral in every respect, on a part with the criminal aggression perpetrated against Angola by the racist régime of Pretoria. Nor is it possible to condemn

the crimes committed in Europe in the years 1939 to 1945 by Hitlerite fascism and its collaborators yet endorse those committed in 1976 in Africa by the adherents of *apartheid*, because in both instances it is the same evil born of the same motives. Our European friends will surely be careful not to fall into that contradiction.

37. The crime, wherever it may have been committed and whatever may be the colour of the victim, must be acknowledged as such, and its perpetrator punished accordingly. In the case we are considering, the guilt of Vorster's régime is evident, and its representative has confessed, as well. Moreover, the file presented by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola offers more than enough proof. The racist authorities of Pretoria must therefore be strongly condemned for: first, its armed aggression against Angola without a prior declaration of war; secondly, the military occupation of that country; and, thirdly, the utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a base for aggression against Angola. In addition, that racist régime must be condemned to pay damages and interest to the People's Republic of Angola for all material and moral damage it has caused to it. All the Angolans it has forced into exile must be repatriated, including the 100 workers from the construction site of the Cunene dam whom it dragged along with it when it withdrew from the Namibian border. Any other decision would weaken the authority of the Organization. At the same time it would destroy the fragile structure of peace which it has for 30 years worked so hard to establish for the survival of mankind.

38. The racist régime of Pretoria has not relinquished its expansionist designs. Has it not just incited the so-called Constitutional Council of Namibia, another of its artificial creations, entrust to it by a "resolution" the defence of the borders of that Territory under international trusteeship? The Council's verdict must serve as an example to nip in the bud any leanings towards hegemony and to discourage all potential aggressors.

39. The withdrawal of the South African army from the People's Republic of Angola on 27 March could not be invoked as an extenuating factor in favour of the racist Vorster régime, nor could it erase the crimes that régime committed in Angola.

40. As I stated in the Council on 30 January [*ibid.*], the threat of a racial confrontation weighs over southern Africa because of the expansionist whims of the minority régimes which have usurped power in Rhodesia, in Namibia and in South Africa. Thus the stakes are very great.

41. My delegation has no doubt that the decision the Council will take at the end of its debate will respond to the expectations of the international community and will deter all the warmongers who are preparing to endanger peace. Therefore we trust in the

wisdom of the Council's members, in their keen awareness of their international responsibilities and, above all, of their duty towards succeeding generations which their countries and Governments have solemnly undertaken through the Charter the Organization, "to save... from the scourge of war".

42. I could not conclude without thanking, on behalf of my delegation, the Secretary-General for the untiring efforts he has not ceased to make within the limits of his delicate functions to constrain Vorster's forces of aggression to withdraw unconditionally from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola.

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

44. Mr. FERNANDES (Guinea-Bissau): It is an honour for me, Sir, to address the Council while you are still its President. You have discharged your responsibilities in a very able manner in the month now coming to a close. You have shown skill and leadership on issues which have been very complex indeed, and I take this opportunity to congratulate you and to express my appreciation.

45. If you would allow me, I should like to welcome to the Council and to the United Nations in general the newly appointed representative of a permanent member of the Council, the representative of the United States. I wish him a good tenure, and I hope that the daily contact with the rest of the world, particularly with the third world, will bring a better understanding and promote a better climate between the majority of the Members of the United Nations and his country.

46. Permit me also to welcome here an old friend indeed, an old fighter for Angola, Mr. Pascal Luvualu, who is now Ambassador at Large of the Government of Angola, a country which we are quite sure will be the pride of the Africa of tomorrow, a nation enriched by the blood shed by many of its best sons, a country which will live up to the ideals of those who have given their lives for the dignity of our continent.

47. We asked to be allowed to participate in this debate because Angola is very dear to us and we therefore felt compelled to state our views on this issue for the record. Our association with Angola, and specifically with the MPLA, did not start just recently. Instead, it can be traced back to more than 20 years ago, and even before the founding of the MPLA itself. In fact, our late leader Amílcar Cabral was himself one of the founders of the MPLA. Our party, our Government would have neglected the teachings of Cabral if we had not made the cause of Angola our own cause. Whatever the consequences, whatever the price we have to pay, our Government will

stand firm, side by side with the Angolan people. For us, the problem of Angola goes beyond the borders of that country, because for us Angola is the cause of Africa itself.

48. Mr. President, since you and the Chairman of the African Group have appealed to speakers to confine themselves to the item on the agenda, I will heed your appeal, since I understand perfectly well the reasons behind such an appeal. Nevertheless, if you will allow me, I will make a few comments of a general nature which will be brief and to the point.

49. First of all, we have always recognized and will always recognize MPLA as the only movement and the only party genuinely representing the interests of the Angolan people as a whole. From the very beginning for us it was never a question of supporting FNLA [*National Front for the Liberation of Angola*], whose dealings with foreign intelligence services were evident to us; nor of recognizing UNITA [*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*], whose very leader, Savimbi, was implanted in Angola by the Portuguese secret police, the famous PIDE, with the sole purpose of destroying MPLA and slowing down and even inhibiting the full realization of the aspirations of the Angolan people. The collusion of UNITA with the Caetano régime was so close that when Savimbi became sick he was taken to a Portuguese field hospital for treatment and then sent back to the countryside to continue relentlessly his attempts to destroy MPLA. These facts can be confirmed by any senior Portuguese officer today, and the only reason I am not mentioning names is that it is irrelevant to the current discussion; otherwise I could have supplied the Council with the names of very high-ranking men in the Portuguese leadership who could easily confirm them.

50. Another point which I should like to emphasize and forcefully state in this Council is that my Government does not regard the Cuban troops in Angola as mercenaries; nor do we categorize Soviet material help with arms as "adventurism". To do so would be to negate the long history of support and involvement on the part of the socialist countries in the struggle for the liberation of Africa. The Organization of African Unity itself has over many years passed a number of resolutions praising this international solidarity. My Government is convinced that, as it has stated on many occasions, without the support of our friends in the socialist countries our own liberation would have taken many years indeed. In fact our only regret concerning this question of support in assisting the Angolan people in their just struggle for independence is that Guinea-Bissau is too small and too poor; otherwise I can assure you that, if we had had a larger population and greater resources, for every Cuban soldier in Angola there would have been two from Guinea-Bissau.

51. Last October, less than a month before Angola was scheduled to become an independent country

after having been subjected to five centuries of subjection, the Government of South Africa, which exploits its own people under the vicious and inhuman system of *apartheid*, invaded Angola in a hostile, yet futile, effort to prevent the Angolan people from achieving their national independence. This act of aggression on the part of the Boer Government shows clearly the contempt, the disrespect and the disregard of the Government of Pretoria for Africans, for, believing in the superiority of the white man, they thought that a few thousand white soldiers, backed by some 150 tanks, in collusion with African traitors and a handful of mercenaries, would be enough to subjugate the entire people of Angola. For the sake of peace and racial harmony in that part of the world we hope that the South Africans have learnt a lesson in Angola.

52. Last week the Government of Pretoria informed the Secretary-General that the South African forces were pulling out of Angola. It is the view of my Government that the whole question cannot be simply reduced to a withdrawal from the area of the Cunene. During the brief period of South Africa's penetration into Angola, its forces caused extensive damage to the transportation system of Angola, destroying bridges, roads and railway lines and even confiscating small aircraft and fishing boats. The Council should address itself to the question of compensation to the Angolan people for the material losses which they have suffered as a result of the invasion of their sovereign country.

53. The South African Government has asked for guarantees from the Government of Angola that the Cunene River hydroelectric scheme in Angola will be protected and that the power derived from this complex will not be diverted from its original purpose of providing irrigation and energy for Namibia. The question then arises: after invading Angola, causing the death of countless Angolans and removing property belonging to the people of Angola, after refusing to comply with countless resolutions of this body asking the South Africans to leave Namibia, after extending their abhorrent system of *apartheid* to an illegally occupied Territory and after defying international public opinion, what kind of guarantees does South Africa want? What kind of guarantees should be given to a country which invades another one from a Territory over which it has no jurisdiction?

54. South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia in violation of a Mandate. The United Nations is the legal administrator of the Territory of Namibia and, until such time as Namibia becomes a free and independent sovereign State, negotiations or the provision of guarantees concerning the use of water or power from the Cunene River dam, should they become necessary, should take place between the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Government of Angola. South Africa has no legal or moral voice in this matter; it has even forfeited its economic rights with this naked invasion.

55. My Government holds the view that this Council should pass a strong resolution which should include the following four essential elements. First, South Africa should be condemned for entering a sovereign territory and carrying on acts of aggression; secondly, South Africa should be condemned for using the international Territory of Namibia to perpetrate such aggression; thirdly, the Council should demand that South Africa pay compensation for the damages resulting from its acts of war and aggression in Angola; and, finally, all the property illegally removed from Angola should immediately be returned to Angola.

56. In conclusion, let me state once more that we sincerely hope that Angola was an example for South Africa. If South Africa was not able to trample under foot the aspirations and wishes of the people of Angola, it will not be able to do it in Zimbabwe or in Namibia and certainly much less in South Africa itself.

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

58. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): I should like first of all, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your excellent performance and great achievements during the term you have presided over the Council. It has been quite a historic term indeed, and my delegation has every reason to believe that the international Organization will record it in the book of its best memories, while Africa will recall it with much pride for many years to come, in view of the important nature of the problems with which the Council has had to deal this month under your guidance.

59. Two weeks ago [*1890th meeting*] the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Comrade Joaquim Alberto Chissano, had the opportunity to express in this same chamber, in the name of my people and Government, the esteem and high consideration that we Mozambicans have for the people of Benin, your country, Mr. President, for its Government and for the progressive stand that your people have taken throughout the long and difficult years of national struggle for Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde and Sao Tomé and Príncipe. Today I can only remind you of our sincere gratitude. I should also like to extend the same gratitude to all those members of the Council who, in one way or another, have contributed to the freedom and well-being of my people.

60. I should like to congratulate our brothers from the People's Republic of Angola, who have for the first time been invited to participate in a Council debate. The delegation of the People's Republic of Mozambique salutes, through Ambassador Luvualu, the heroic people of Angola, which conquered its independence under the leadership of Comrade Agostinho Neto, President of the MPLA and President of the

People's Republic of Angola. The people of Mozambique hails the victorious people of Angola, to whom we are related by virtue of long years of resistance and the difficult years of the common struggle against Portuguese colonialism and fascism.

61. For a long time the South African racist régime has been misbehaving in many irresponsible ways in southern Africa and in the entire international community. The systematic and stubborn way in which South Africa has been defying the resolutions of the United Nations is something known to every Member of the Organization. South Africa is the leading country in the world in which racism is not only advocated but encouraged and openly practised under the repulsive and inhuman policy of *apartheid*. South Africa is the country which insists on the illegal occupation of Namibian territory in complete disregard of world opinion and total disrespect for all resolutions adopted by international organizations and bodies such as the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations.

62. In Africa the Republic of South Africa on various occasions has acted as a real policeman for international imperialism. The aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola reflects this role of the racist régime of Pretoria. This time South Africa committed naked aggression against the People's Republic of Angola on the pretext of protecting the hydroelectric complex of the Cunene and the Ruacaná and Calueque pumping stations. Moreover, not long ago the same forces of the Pretoria régime, attracted by another dam at Cabora Bassa, also occupied part of the north-western province of Tete in Mozambique. The South African régime sent some of its élite troops to Chioco and several companies to Chicó, Magoé and Zumbo, which are located along the Zambezi River. That attitude alone shows how dangerous the racist régime of Pretoria is becoming for the nations of that part of the world.

63. For a long time South Africa has been a threat even to the countries having no frontier with it, as is the case of Angola. Those countries sharing common borders with South Africa live in an atmosphere of constant terror of the racist régime. Finally, the people living under South African control in Namibia or Azania have become the victims of oppression and discrimination. It is quite clear that the racist régime of South Africa is a dangerous threat to all the neighbouring countries. Through its own attitude, South Africa has demonstrated that it cannot conceive of the idea of good neighbourliness, except within the framework of master-slave, exploiter-exploited and superior-inferior relationship.

64. Despite all this, my delegation would like to repeat the support the People's Republic of Mozambique for the brotherly people of Angola by using the same words as those used by Comrade Samora Moisés

Machel, President of FRELIMO [*Front for the Liberation of Mozambique*] and of the People's Republic of Mozambique, during his closing address at the recent extraordinary meeting of the Organization of African Unity on Angola held at Addis Ababa. He said:

"We are Africans, Africans under attack, Africans who refuse to let themselves be intimidated in the defence of the dignity of Africa. ... Therefore, we are with the people of Angola. We are with the Angolan people who in blood continue to affirm their right to independence, to territorial integrity, to choose without any interference their alliances and the political, economic and social system that corresponds to their interests.

"We are with the Angolan people who, arms in hand, affirm their right to support the struggle of Namibia and the liberation struggle of southern Africa. In all circumstances we are the same. We earned this right with our blood.

"We are absolutely with the Angolan people, with the People's Republic of Angola, which defends its right not to become a new bantustan."

65. That is still the position of the People's Republic of Mozambique with respect to the question of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola, and that will continue to be our position as long as the South African racist régime refuses to change its attitude and arrogance in regard to international public opinion and as long as it insists on maintaining its policy of aggression, occupation, repression and discrimination.

66. We hope the Council will issue a vigorous condemnation of South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, one which will make South Africa respect in future the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and of all other African countries.

67. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan): Allow me, first of all, Mr. President, to extend my delegation's hearty welcome to the representative of the People's Republic of Angola, Mr. Pascal Luvualu, on his participation in the consideration of the question before us.

68. The recent developments in Angola, in particular the armed strife since the withdrawal of the Portuguese authorities, had greatly concerned my delegation. We had wanted to see the prompt establishment of a national Government of Angola based on unity and national harmony and representing all the liberation movements, in full compliance with the Alvor agreements. Indeed, the peaceful transfer of power from Portugal to the people of Angola and an orderly accession to independence, such as took place in other former Portuguese territories in Africa, was the hope of all the people of Angola and the rest of the world.

69. To our regret, however, immediately before its independence and for months thereafter, Angola became the scene of large-scale fighting, which cost the lives of many innocent Angolans. After months of tragic fraternal fighting, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, under the leadership of President Agostinho Neto, has established effective control over virtually the entire country and has won the recognition of most of the international community as the sole legitimate Government of Angola. Under these circumstances, all States are obliged to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of this new State. We are confident that the people of Angola will soon restore complete unity and national harmony throughout the country and consolidate its independence and sovereignty, free from outside interference, thus making possible the reconstruction and development of this war-devastated but potentially rich country.

70. The delegation of Japan considers that no intervention of South African forces in Angola, in violation of the independence and sovereignty of Angola, can be justified. Hence we were opposed to the intervention of South Africans in Angola, whatever the reasons given by the Government of South Africa, and we consider that they should have been withdrawn immediately and unconditionally.

71. In this connexion, we have taken note of the assurances given by the representative of Angola in his statement to the Council that his Government has no intention of depriving the people of Namibia of the electricity and water they need and is prepared in due course to discuss with the people of Namibia the use of electricity and water from the Cunene project.

72. My delegation has noted also that the representative of South Africa, in a letter to the Secretary-General dated 25 March [S/12024], stated that South Africa had decided to withdraw its forces from Angola by 27 March, after having obtained the necessary clarification from the People's Republic of Angola through the Secretary-General. Subsequently, South Africa announced that it had completed the withdrawal of its forces from Angola by 27 March, as confirmed in the letter dated 28 March from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General [S/12026].

73. We are relieved by this action. But at the same time we wish to reiterate our view that the withdrawal of South African forces should have been without any conditions. We urge South Africa to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and not violate them in the future.

74. As regards the request by the Angolan representative for the return of property removed from Angola by the South African forces and for full



compensation for the injury to the people and the economy of Angola, we sympathize with the People's Republic in its claim. We hope that this problem will be settled in a manner satisfactory to the parties concerned in accordance with international law.

75. Now that South African forces have been withdrawn from Angola, the main objectives for which the Council is meeting have been achieved. Therefore, we urge the Council to follow a realistic and constructive course which will win wide support here.

76. As the Council has been called into session to take up the complaint of the People's Republic of Angola concerning "the act of aggression" by South Africa against Angola, I have deliberately confined myself to this question and not commented on other aspects raised during the debate. I wish merely to say that we consider it desirable for all African States to safeguard their independence and sovereignty, to solve their internal affairs and to establish an African continent with peace, freedom and progress without outside interference.

77. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana): Within the last two weeks the representative of the racist régime in Pretoria has circulated as official documents of this Council no less than four letters concerning the presence of South African troops in the independent State of Angola. The most recent, contained in document S/12026, purports "to confirm that the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola was completed by 27 March 1976". Thus, on the basis of the evidence which South Africa itself has given the Council in these documents, its troops were in Angola from 9 August 1975 to 27 March 1976. This is a simple statement of fact. A closer examination of the documents which the racists in South Africa have circulated here would, however, reveal the contempt in which they hold the international community and the deliberate deception they practise in seeking to delude it.

78. In a statement made on 21 March [S/12019, annex I], Vorster, as if asserting an inalienable right, proclaimed that South African troops occupied the Calueque dam site in Angola allegedly on the grounds of "the complete breakdown of law and order" and with the sole purpose of "protecting the lives of the workers and of safeguarding the installations". That, he said, occurred on 9 August 1975. He went on to assert that it was "not for any ulterior motive that we are still there". That statement was made in an interview with the British newspaper, *The Sunday Telegraph*, on 14 March. Was this the only violation of the territorial integrity of Angola by South Africa? Did the troops of that fascist régime remain within the vicinity of the Calueque dam site between 9 August 1975 and 27 March 1976? On this question Vorster is strangely silent—silent to the international community and silent to his own racist electorate. Yesterday, however, Vorster's representative here sought, in a manner as twisted in logic as it was incorrect in substance, to fill the missing gaps.

79. It is true that some sections of the international press are not always reliable for analyses of events in some countries. Indeed, recently my own country has been the victim of some of the most deliberately malicious and despicable reportage. I venture to suggest, however, that the South African régime, which mounts one of the biggest propaganda campaigns in the world to misrepresent reality, is, for reasons which should not detain us here, not without friends in that section of the international press. It is to that press that I will now turn.

80. Two points of significance emerge from a perusal of press reports on South Africa's intervention in Angola. The first is that, starting with a force of about 30 men in August 1975, South Africa increased that force to about 1,500 in November, at the time of Angola's independence, and rising to approximately 5,000 by mid-December. The second point is that, despite the impression Vorster tries to give, the unchallengeable fact is that his troops, some of whom were captured, moved deep into Angolan territory with modern sophisticated weapons and with their sights set on Luanda. Confirmation of these reports was given repeatedly by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola in its own press releases. It is apposite to observe that, judging from press reports, statements by spokesmen of the racist minority régime concerning the operational activities of South African forces in Angola changed over time. In September 1975 Botha, the so-called Minister of Defence, asserted that South African troops had gone into Namibia to protect the pumping station on the Cunene River. One month later, in October, troop incursions—it was said—were made to attack SWAPO [South West Africa People's Organization] bases in keeping with a policy of "hot pursuit". By November the racists began to talk of the "border operational area". By December the war-zone was euphemistically described either as the "number one military area" or as the "operational area". Before the close of 1975, sensing impending defeat, Botha, the Minister so-called, reassured his racist colleagues that South Africa would not fight "to the last man".

81. As regards the habitual practice of deliberate deception by the Pretoria régime, I need only draw attention to Vorster's assertion on 21 March that in August 1975 the Portuguese Government requested South Africa to continue its so-called "protective measures", an assertion which the Portuguese Government has categorically refuted.

82. From the outset of the racist misadventure in August last year, Portugal—then the administering Power in Angola—vigorously protested the territorial violation of Angola by South African forces. And when the people of Angola, under the dynamic leadership of the MPLA, proclaimed their independence in November 1975, they expressed their condemnation of the military intervention by South Africa. On 12 December 1975 the Co-ordinating Committee of



Non-aligned Countries, in accordance with the non-aligned's well-known position on South Africa's aggressive designs, issued a declaration condemning most emphatically the flagrant acts of aggression of the South African racist régime against Angola. In February 1976 the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity strongly condemned South Africa for its naked aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and its occupation of part of its national territory. To these voices of condemnation must be added those of all the other progressive forces, including the militant anti-apartheid and pan-Africanist movements and peoples the world over who cherish freedom and oppose aggression, racism and apartheid—all so characteristic of the fascist régime in Pretoria.

83. That South Africa has committed acts of naked aggression against Angola is crystal-clear. South Africa's aggression is a matter of pre-eminent concern to the brotherly States and fraternal peoples of Africa, who have expressed their determination not to be deflected by considerations external to that central reality. It is a matter on which many people—numbering not least among them those influenced by ancestry and history—feel the anguish and share the pains of the people of Africa. It is a matter on which the progressive forces stand four-square behind the oppressed people of Africa who valiantly soldier on to those inevitable fruits of victory—freedom and independence.

84. But the aggression of South Africa against Angola is only the most recent manifestation of the strategy of survival through aggression and domination which is the essential hub around which white racism based on apartheid is structured. It is the hub around which white economic prosperity in South Africa is built, premised, as such prosperity is, on the theory of forced and cheap labour.

85. We all know, as my brother Ambassador Salim, the representative of Tanzania, reminded us on 12 March [1900th meeting], that the racist régime of South Africa daily commits aggression against the black population of that unfortunate territory. Ambassador Salim reminded us as well that the racist régime had in the past committed aggression against Zambia, that the forces of that régime had worked hand-in-hand with their erstwhile colleagues from Portugal in suppressing the people of Mozambique, and that with its racist cousins in Salisbury the Pretoria régime collaborated in treading underfoot the legitimate aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe.

86. My delegation is in no doubt about the aggressive intent of the South African régime. The apex of its strategy of survival lay in the once-held hope of an impenetrable *cordon sanitaire* based on the Lisbon-Salisbury-Pretoria axis. Now that that axis is shattered, the second stage of that strategy has been reached. It is a defence perimeter of deep political and economic significance for South Africa, having as one of its outer

limits the Calueque dam. The final battle begins when that perimeter is smashed, for there is no gainsaying the fact that the racist régime in Pretoria is the *bête blanche* of the African continent.

87. If one were to focus intently on the recent South African aggression against Angola, there is an aspect which could have implications of an extraordinary nature even beyond the boundaries of the African continent. I refer to the asseverations of Vorster attempting to explain the presence of his forces in Angola—the safeguarding of installations and the alleged breakdown of law and order in someone else's country. Can we, as a responsible organ of the United Nations, give any semblance of legitimacy to such outmoded and outdated concepts? Guyana, for its part, categorically and emphatically rejects the South African contention. No State, whether neighbouring or not, has any such right, and the Council should leave the racists in South Africa in no doubt of its stand on this issue.

88. There are many other aspects of the South African aggression against Angola which merit comment. My delegation will, however, confine itself to two. The first concerns the utilization by South Africa of the international Territory of Namibia, which South Africa occupies illegally. The second relates to the assurances which the Pretoria régime was presumptuous enough to seek as a condition precedent to the withdrawal of its forces occupying part of the territory of Angola.

89. We will have occasion in the months ahead to review the activities in Namibia of the illegal South African racist régime. Suffice it to say two things at this stage about the blatant and callous manner in which a territory, legally the responsibility of the United Nations, has been abused by South Africa in mounting a massive invasion of the neighbouring country of Angola. Such action should be forthrightly condemned by the Council, and when we meet to consider Namibia specifically, this recent unpardonable action by South Africa—the utilization of the Territory of Namibia for aggressive purposes—will be part of the matrix informing my delegation's position.

90. The matter of assurances is not in essence separate from the question of Namibia. It is really paradoxical, if not ludicrous, that the racist régime in South Africa, which acknowledges rights only for its white population, a régime which violates the decisions of the Organization in defiance of world public opinion and of the views of the overwhelming majority of the people of Namibia, should contemplate, let alone require, assurances concerning property in which it professedly has no self-interest and regarding people whom it despises. Is that not beyond the bounds of credibility?

91. This debate began on a sober note last Friday, when the representative of the People's Republic of

Angola, Mr. Luvualu, described in a measured way the effects on the patriotic people of Angola of South Africa's brutal and premeditated aggression as the Angolan people approached the dawn of the recovery of their liberty. He spoke graphically of the havoc and destruction wreaked on Angola by the invading forces of those racists. Guyana salutes the victorious struggle of the Angolan people and remains committed to them as they seek to consolidate and secure the results of that struggle.

92. The ties which bind our two peoples are rooted in history. For many of us in Guyana, indeed in the Americas, Angola was the starting point of a long and painful journey. Strong links of empathy and understanding between our peoples have been forged, not only by a shared history of suffering through slavery, indenture and colonial depredation. The continuing struggle for the full development of our peoples has strengthened those bonds.

93. We look forward to intensifying our co-operative efforts when Angola takes its rightful place in the Organization.

94. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the delegation of Panama I have the honour to extend a cordial welcome to Ambassador Pascal Luvualu, representative of the People's Republic of Angola, who is honouring us with his presence. I hope that Panama will soon join those countries of Latin America—Brazil, Cuba, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico and Peru—which have already recognized the People's Republic of Angola as a free, independent and sovereign country. We hope too that we shall soon see the People's Republic of Angola occupying the seat reserved for it as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations, thereby crowning the historic episode which will open up new horizons of progress and well-being for that great people of Africa.

95. During the meetings held by the Security Council in Africa in January and February 1972, I had the honour to say the following:

"... my delegation wishes to state that it will vote in favour of [the draft resolution in document S/10607/Rev.1] since the text is designed to lend support to the independence movements of the Portuguese colonies in Africa. Panama states decisively and unequivocally that it sympathizes with the peoples that are fighting for their independence from colonial domination in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Portugal's policy concerning the colonial Territories that it controls is not shared by my Government, which on various occasions has expressed itself in favour of self-determination and freedom for these peoples." [1639th meeting, para. 150.]

96. I shall now refer to the item on our agenda, the question of the aggression committed by South Africa

against the People's Republic of Angola, and to the support given by Panama to the wishes expressed by the members of the Organization of African Unity that we should formulate a constructive draft resolution that could be unanimously adopted. Panama, in association with the non-aligned countries and other members of the Security Council, has had circulated the draft resolution contained in document S/12030, the operative part of which would unequivocally: first, condemn South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola; secondly, demand that South Africa respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola; thirdly, demand that South Africa desist from the utilization of the Territory of Namibia to mount any kind of new aggression against Angola; and, fourthly, call upon South Africa to pay compensation for the damage inflicted on Angola through the aggression that was committed.

97. It is no accident that the Council has met twice during the month of March to examine acts of aggression committed against Mozambique and Angola, independent African States that have been attacked by the racist and minority régimes of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa which desire at any cost to maintain the *status quo* in that part of the world. South Africa intervened in Angola with the deliberate purpose of extending the pernicious policy of *apartheid* to a region of southern Africa where it could not succeed, owing to the great nationalist forces opposing it. The Salisbury and Pretoria régimes have in recent days been given very clear lessons that the time is drawing near when the policy of racial discrimination to which they are clinging will disappear once and for all.

98. Despite the announcement that South Africa has withdrawn its forces from Angola, we wish to place on record our view that the pretext that it was there to protect the Calueque dam on the Cunene River gives no justification for the act of aggression. In my delegation's view, the problem of the benefits that may be derived from that dam is a question which, in the final analysis, will have to be negotiated between Angola and Namibia, once the latter has been freed from the South African yoke. That is why it is extremely important for the Council expressly to demand that South Africa withdraw not only from Angola but also from Namibia, so that Namibia may exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

99. The defeat suffered by the colonialists in southern Africa with the independence of Angola and Mozambique serves as encouragement to the oppressed peoples still struggling to ensure respect for their territorial integrity.

100. Even though our friends from Africa have asked us not to depart from the specific item under discussion—that is, the question of South Africa's aggression against Angola—we have seen that China, Cuba, the

Soviet Union, Nigeria and other delegations have given their views on the general situation in Angola. Hence, the delegation of Panama, without going into a thorough historical review, wishes to express some opinions that it considers to be of interest to its country and Latin America.

101. As 11 November 1975—the date decided upon by Portugal for Angolan independence—drew near, the Angolan liberation war turned into a conflict of international proportions. The United States accused the Soviet Union and Cuba of intervening, and, in a simplistic manner, Western propaganda informed us that the struggle was really between communism and anti-communist forces. Nevertheless the United States, since December 1975, has had diplomatic relations with Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, the two other former Portuguese colonies, whose liberation movements follow a socialist policy analogous to that of the MPLA. The truth is that for more than 10 years the liberation movements of those peoples in the Portuguese colonies received assistance from the socialist countries, for the most part, with little or no help from the United States.

102. On 6 November 1975, in the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, the fact emerged that through the CIA [*Central Intelligence Agency*] that country had given \$25 million in weapons to Angola and that it intended to contribute \$25 million more to other factions vying for power with the MPLA. By that time South African forces were already well within Angolan territory, where they were operating in conjunction with those anti-MPLA factions. It is a fact well known to all that, although to a lesser extent, there were also Chinese instructors, British mercenaries and volunteers of African and other nationalities operating in Angola at that time. In the United States, public opinion and Congress were opposed to the United States embarking on an anti-communist crusade in Angola that could have turned out to be more costly than that in Viet-Nam.

103. The MPLA has triumphed, thanks to the sacrifice of its martyrs and the efforts of its many followers, as well as the timely assistance given to it by the Soviet Union and the internationalist fighters from Cuba.

104. Angola has been accepted as a member of the Organization of African Unity, and apparently the quarrels aroused by the war of independence among African countries have now been forgotten. The Unity of the African continent against racism, colonialism and *apartheid* is sound and is greater than any differences of political ideology or problems of economic development.

105. All wars and revolutions that take place in our day have repercussions throughout the world. The Angolan liberation struggle, according to the Soviets, is not inconsistent with *détente* in the world. For his

part, President Ford has been so displeased that he has asked his followers not to use the word "*détente*" any more in the context of the foreign policy pursued by his country vis-à-vis the other super-Power.

106. Since the Soviet-Cuban intervention in Angola, the United States has feared that those forces may intervene in Rhodesia and Namibia. The Executive Secretary of SWAPO has stated to *The Times* of London that, since "the Cubans are ready to assist us in our struggle to liberate Namibia", the Executive Committee of SWAPO will decide in due course whether or not it will invite the Cuban forces in Angola to join them in the armed struggle in Namibia. He went on to say that "The Cubans are already co-operating, with assistance, training and other types of aid".

107. In recent days, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has unleashed a campaign to warn Cuba and the Soviet Union that the United States will not accept future military interventions by those communist countries in Africa. Even though spokesmen from the United States Congress have shown themselves reluctant to allow their country to move towards a confrontation with Cuba over possible Cuban intervention in Rhodesia, Mr. Kissinger has insisted, with rather belligerent threats.

108. The truth is that because of the forthcoming presidential elections in the United States, to be held in November of this year, the matter of the famous *détente* has now become one of the most important items in the political debate, and the officials of the present administration have been making every type of rhetorical effort to show that the agreements recently concluded in Moscow and Helsinki to alleviate tensions and improve relations between the two countries in no way mean that the United States is willing to capitulate to the Soviet Union.

109. It may be that after the resounding triumph in Angola the Cuban fighters feel like the leaders of the troops which the non-aligned countries might send to any part of the third world where injustices exist and where their assistance is requested. But it would be well to clarify that in our case, the process of national liberation in Panama follows a course different from the African one. As was said by General Torrijos, "We have our own brand of aspirin for our pains".

110. The vast majority of the countries of Latin America respect the principle of non-interference, as enshrined in article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,<sup>2</sup> amended by the Protocol of Buenos Aires in 1967,<sup>3</sup> which reads as follows:

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality

of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements."

111. We believe that the President of Venezuela, Carlos Andrés Pérez, in his address to the Congress of the Republic of Venezuela on the second anniversary of his Government, faithfully interpreted the feeling of the majority in this continent when he said:

"I must affirm once again our absolute and categorical opposition to intervention on the part of any country of this hemisphere, not only in internal problems of the area but in extracontinental disputes as well. Every country in Africa, as well as in Asia, America, Europe or any other part of the world has the right to make its own internal decisions in a clear, autonomous manner, without any kind of interference."

112. The Government of Panama has taken due note of all that has been said by the mass media which speculate on the idea that, after Angola, Cuba might intervene in Panamanian affairs.

113. Last Sunday, Senator Dick Clark—Democrat from the state of Iowa and member of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee—speculating, during an interview, on future Soviet-Cuban interventions and the extent to which the United States would tolerate such interventions, replied:

"I think that you can draw the line at another level beyond which we could not be successful; and I think that in the case of Namibia or Rhodesia, which is now before us, we could not be successful."

"I would say, for instance, that if Cuban troops are taken in Soviet aircraft some place in this hemisphere, then certainly, in my view, we should take some action against that, assuming that in our view of the situation some injustice is being perpetrated."

114. Last week the United States Chiefs of Staff participated in a meeting of the National Security Council to review "possible actions to be taken concerning Cuba". *The New York Times*, in an editorial, remarked, and accurately so, I believe, that if the United States were willing to impose a blockade of the island it would not find support for doing so in many Latin American countries. That editorial concluded by stating:

"If Fidel Castro has started once again to export his revolution in the hemisphere—as Administration spokesmen have recently hinted—it is a matter of concern to all the American States; it is even covered by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro.<sup>4</sup> There are obvious targets of opportunity for the Cuban régime to exploit in the restless and poverty-stricken Caribbean countries—though a more active policy of United States assistance in that area might diminish Mr. Castro's prospects."

Some publicity media in the United States have stated that the clear precedent established by Soviet-Cuban intervention in Angola paved the way to similar ventures in the Caribbean, from Puerto Rico to Panama and Venezuela.

115. I declare that Panama, in its international relations, will always refrain from resorting to the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State and that, consequently, it will never accept intervention by the United States, Cuba or any other State in those matters which fall within the internal jurisdiction of the Panamanians.

116. In the United Nations, in addition to the countries which comprise the Latin American Group, the countries of the third world and others support the Panamanian cause, which demands recognition by the United States of the effective sovereignty of my country over its territory, including the so-called Panama Canal Zone.

117. The truth about what has happened and is happening in Africa is that the colonialist Powers have, in a selfish manner, for such a long time denied the basic rights of the majorities that the oppressed peoples, in their despair or impotence, have been compelled to accept any type of assistance—coming from Heaven or from other countries—for the purpose of attaining their goal, which is freedom, independence, sovereignty and the right to be masters of their own destinies.

118. Panama has been negotiating with the United States for more than 11 years a treaty to put an end to that colonial enclave known as the Panama Canal Zone, which divides our territory in two and which constitutes a colonial situation that is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. At present, the most difficult question which remains to be resolved is the time period during which North American troops can continue to occupy my country's soil. Panama would be willing to accept a reasonable period of time, not to extend beyond the year 2000. With regard to this particular question, the Congress, the Pentagon and the present United States Administration have not been able to come forward with a proposal acceptable to my country.

119. The solution to the Panama Canal problem is today the most serious and inflammatory point of conflict that the United States has in Latin America. The wise thing would be to find an early solution to it and not to speculate here about what could happen in my country if that arrangement was not achieved in a satisfactory manner. It is to be hoped that the United States will not forget the lesson which it has had in Angola, which, despite all the colonialist forces opposed to it, has achieved its complete liberation.

120. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): It is, obviously, difficult to speak at this stage, when

so many of my colleagues, both members and non-members of the Council, have preceded me with such forceful and eloquent statements in support of the legitimate struggle of our brothers in Angola against South African aggression. It is even more difficult to do so since a number of my brother African colleagues have already effectively stressed Africa's position on this matter. For it is important to emphasize that what we are discussing here is Africa's complaint. It is free Africa as a whole which wishes the Council to face up to its responsibilities squarely in the face of a blatant and perpetual threat to Africa's freedom and Africa's dignity perpetrated by the South African racists.

121. The aggression against Angola must be seen in its proper perspective. It is not simply an isolated act on the part of the South African *apartheid* régime. South Africa's actions in Angola follow the systematic pattern and scheme of that régime's policies of oppression and suppression from within and expansionism abroad. Thus, in bringing this complaint to the Council, the African States are not simply acting out of solidarity with Angola. Nor are we simply doing so because the Charter of the Organization of African Unity obliges us to defend the sovereignty, the territorial integrity and the independence of African States; nor, for that matter, simply because the charter also commits member States to fighting for the eradication of all forms of colonialism in Africa. These three factors are all important in themselves, and all are involved in Angola's struggle against the adventurers of Pretoria, but they are not exclusive factors. Of no less importance for an understanding of Africa's preoccupation with South Africa's blatant violation of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Angola is a collective awareness, reinforced by practical experience, of the fact that the South African régime is determined by its action not only to stem the tide of freedom in our continent but also to undermine and possibly eliminate the freedom already achieved by many of the currently independent African States.

122. We do not, therefore, consider lightly South Africa's aggression against Angola. Our call for the condemnation of that aggression is not a mere academic exercise. We are not here to seek debating points; we view the situation seriously. We consider South Africa's actions ominous and dangerous, and we believe that it is the clear responsibility of the Council to take concrete actions to put an end to the dangerous and extremely hazardous policies of expansionism, harassment, provocation and aggression which now seem to be part of the grand arsenal of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

123. Never before has the Council been confronted with a clearer and less ambiguous case of aggression, and never before has an aggressor so publicly and pompously prided itself on its actions. I do not believe that there is anyone in the Council who would entertain any doubt as to whether the South African régime

has committed an aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The nature of this aggression was as cowardly as it was unprovoked. It was deliberate, calculated and premeditated. Indeed, the representative of South Africa has not even taken the trouble to provide a semblance of legitimacy for his country's actions. Rather, he has sought constantly to justify the incursions into Angola as if it were a matter of right. Such justifications have been self-righteous and arrogant. A classic example occurred yesterday in the presentation made before the Council [1904th meeting] by the South African representative, Mr. Botha. I shall have more to say on Mr. Botha's absurd and ridiculous assertions later.

124. The representative of Angola, my brother and comrade of long standing Pascal Luvualu, has eloquently explained the nature of his people's struggle and has exposed the motives of South African aggression. I shall therefore refrain from going into the details. I shall venture to make only a few observations.

125. The struggle of the Angolan people against South Africa is an extension of their long and heroic struggle against Portuguese colonialism. The South African racists, through their intervention in Angola, attempted to rob the gallant people of Angola of the victories they had won after centuries of brutal colonization by Portugal and after 15 years of unceasing armed struggle ably and dynamically led by the MPLA. In the long struggle against Portuguese colonialism, the Angolan people made untold sacrifices, both human and material, to regain their lost freedom and dignity. The struggle in Angola has always been a struggle for freedom, a struggle for human dignity and a struggle against colonial domination. The South African racists, who cannot be expected to coexist with freedom, know this very well. They also know perfectly well that the struggle there has nothing to do with being for or against communism. It is because South Africa felt threatened by every additional African country that regains its freedom that it took the desperate step of attempting to prevent the final triumph of the liberation forces in Angola.

126. Put succinctly, South Africa's invasion of Angola was an attempt to perpetuate, perhaps in different forms and styles, the enslavement the Angolan people had suffered during the hundreds of years of Portuguese colonialism. All the talk, whether by South Africa or by those who think like South Africa or those who have sympathies with the South African position concerning the bogey of communism, is utter nonsense. South Africa's main objective in invading Angola was a desperate last-minute attempt to rob the people of Angola of the victories they had won after their heroic armed struggle led by the MPLA.

127. I realize we are not here to discuss Angola's foreign policy or, for that matter, to discuss its internal political situation. That is a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the Government of the People's

Republic of Angola. But if I have alluded to the convenient labels that are given to the Angolan people's struggle, it is to dismiss once and for all such deliberate distortions. Often in the past, African representatives in the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international forums, have painstakingly emphasized the importance of properly understanding the nature of the struggle in southern Africa.

128. We have sought to solicit the sympathy, if not the support, of those members of the international community who, for reasons best known to themselves, have chosen to adopt policies detrimental to the liberation struggle. Regrettably, such appeals have yet to be heeded by some. This is neither the time nor the place to start a retrospective, though justifiable, accusation against those countries which had pursued policies in support of Portuguese colonialism in Africa and other minority régimes there. While we do not see the need to repeat those criticisms at this point, we certainly have a sight to demand that they not distort the essence of the African people's struggle for freedom and dignity. Indeed, we have every right to take the strongest exception when further attempts are made to distort the perspective and the sacrifices of those countries which have successfully fought for their liberation. The sacrifices of the Angolan people, as well as their victories, deserve no less. Those who still refuse to understand and appreciate the real nature of the Angolan struggle and its victories under the leadership of the MPLA and its esteemed leader, President Agostinho Neto, would be well advised to take into account the very pertinent remarks made by an esteemed and outstanding Western statesman. The Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme, a Western leader with a clear sensitivity to Africa's legitimate struggle for freedom and a clear perception of the nature of Africa's struggle, recently made the following observation in a Swedish newspaper:

"I see in the press the MPLA practically always is depicted as 'Marxist', pro-Soviet or even communist. This is propagandistic simplification..."

"There is, of course, a reason for these labels; it is more legitimate to attack 'communists' and 'terrorists' and to support their opponents."

The only additional comment I should like to make in respect to the candid remarks made by the Swedish leader is to point out the obvious, namely, that there is nothing new in these attempts to confuse on the part of those who detract from African freedom. The history of the decolonization struggle fully testifies to the campaigns launched against the liberation movements by the opponents of freedom. Thus, the systematic campaigns against the MPLA Government are only part of the general campaign against African freedom fighters in general.

129. I have already stated that South Africa's aggression against Angola was designed to stifle the tide of

freedom. In brief, it is clear that the South Africans, in the hope of realising that objective, had aimed at the liquidation of those forces in Angola which were genuinely fighting for freedom. South African aggression was geared to the creation of a clientele régime in Luanda which would be subservient to the *apartheid* régime's ambitions of continued subjugation and degradation of the African people. At the same time, the South Africans were attempting to liquidate the fighters of SWAPO. It is not difficult to understand South Africa's objective in committing aggression against Angola, because, as I said, the actions against Angola are only part and parcel of the systematic, aggressive ambitions of the *apartheid* régime against free Africa. Nor is it difficult to understand why such aggressive measures were resisted fiercely and eventually overcome by the Angolan people under the leadership of MPLA and supported by the traditional allies and supporters of the African liberation, for Angola's resistance to South African aggression is an extension of its history of resistance to colonial domination. At the same time, the support given to the Government of the People's Republic of Angola to resist South African aggression is an extension of the support that MPLA had traditionally received in its struggle against Portuguese colonialism.

130. What is difficult to understand, however, is the reluctance on the part of those who continue to ignore Angola's legitimate struggle and hesitate to condemn South Africa's aggression. Is any member of the Council, or for that matter any Member of the United Nations, going to allow itself to be so naïve as to accept South Africa's pompous, ridiculous proposition articulated here yesterday by Mr. Botha that the *apartheid* régime's sole interest in Angola was philanthropic? Can any Council member now fail to see the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa's systematic aggression against African States and the utilization of the international Territory of Namibia to mount that aggression? Is any Council member ready to accept the proposition that the incursion of South Africa's regular armed forces hundreds of kilometres into Angolan territory was calculated solely to protect the Cunene dam and that such aggression was motivated, to quote Mr. Botha's words, purely by "humanitarian considerations"?

131. The South African representative yesterday told the Council that his country's intervention in Angola had been limited. Besides the fact that international law and this Organization have never sanctified the theory or practice of limited intervention, the very assertion of the South African régime is nonsense, as it does not conform to realities. How could South Africa's spokesman come to the Council and subject us to such ridicule? What sort of limited intervention is that, involving as it did a massive deployment of South African regular forces with sophisticated equipment of all kinds, hundreds of kilometres into the heartland of Angola? How can the South Africans

be so bold as to ask the Council to disregard the havoc, damage and destruction, both human and material, that their invading forces have caused in the People's Republic of Angola?

132. Mr. Botha believes that he can create jokes out of serious situations. Confronted with the overwhelming condemnation of South Africa's plunder and pillage of Angolan resources in the course of its aggression, and confronted with the demand for restitution of the equipment and materials that the South African forces have looted from Angola, Mr. Botha tries to be cynical, and perhaps in his own way humorous, by asserting that they have been accused of removing hotels. What arrogance, what crude falsification of facts. What a callous disregard for the solemnity of the Council's deliberations. I say to Mr. Botha that Angola and Africa demand that South Africa should not be allowed to get away with the looting it has committed. Angola and Africa demand that it should not be allowed to act with impunity as an international outlaw. Angola and Africa demand that, as a Member of the Organization, it should observe the rules and regulations of the United Nations as enshrined in the Charter. These are some of our charges and these are our demands, and the Council will not have failed to take note that on all of them Mr. Botha has demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt his country's guilt and has done so in the most arrogant manner.

133. The South African régime has also continued to subject the Council to lies. Thus the South Africans, who have now admitted that they invaded Angola long before that country's independence, again through their representative yesterday sought to justify that that act had been sanctioned by the then administering power of Angola. Perhaps Mr. Botha believes that Council members do not even take the trouble to read Council documents. Unless he so believed, it is difficult to comprehend how Mr. Vorster's régime can repeat the nonsensical claims in the light of the clear rebuttal made by the Portuguese Government as recently as the letter from the Portuguese representative of 23 March, which clearly asserts that

"the affirmation that the Portuguese Government had asked South Africa to remain in the Calueque area and to continue to assume the safety work in progress at the dam, is completely without foundation" [S/12023].

134. We are now told that the South African forces have withdrawn from Angola, yet the reported withdrawal of South African forces has not been to South African territory. Rather—and the South Africans themselves openly confirm this—those troops have been withdrawn into the international territory of Namibia. Thus what the South Africans have done is to move from one illegal situation to another illegal situation. The South African forces have now been massively deployed in Namibia to consolidate the

*apartheid* régime's illegal occupation in defiance of the international community. Quite clearly, besides the serious implications for the Namibian struggle that the withdrawal of South African armed forces into Namibia will entail, we must in the strongest terms express our serious concern at these developments, for as we know from experience, Namibia has been used by South Africa as a springboard for aggression against independent African States. The utilization of that international Territory to commit aggression against Angola is not the only example; it is just the most recent one. The People's Republic of Angola has every reason to feel threatened by the presence of South African forces in Namibia. Moreover, I believe, in respect to this question, the 20 March statement of the Political Bureau of the MPLA succinctly sums up the problem as follows:

"South Africa, with which Angola has no common borders is illegally occupying Namibia in violation of United Nations and Organization of African Unity resolutions and is imposing on its people a racist minority régime in contradiction with the interests and legitimate aspirations of Africa."

135. In his intervention yesterday, the representative of South Africa also sought to convince the Council that South Africa is a peaceful country, that it desires nothing but peace and security in southern Africa, that it has never committed any aggression and that it harbours no aggressive intents against its neighbours, that in respect to Angola all that it was interested in besides the so-called protection of the dam was to see that the Angolan people had the Government of their choice. But Council members are aware of the emptiness of those propositions. South African actions in the last several years have been repeatedly condemned by the Organization and the Council. Those condemnations have not just been confined to the abominable system of *apartheid* but also relate to the series of actions committed by South Africa against the freedom and independence of Africa.

136. Need I remind the Council that it is South Africa which has sent its forces into Zimbabwe to bolster the forces of the minority régime and to defy not only the will of Her Majesty's Government, but indeed the will of the international community? Need I remind the Council that it is South Africa which committed aggression against the Republic of Zambia? Need I remind the Council of its condemnation in its resolution 326 (1973) of the acts of provocation and harassment against the Republic of Zambia by the alliance of the Smith régime and the racist régime of South Africa? Need I remind the Council of its own resolution of 30 January [385 (1976)], in which it expressed its grave concern at South Africa's aggressive military build-up in southern Africa? And what of South Africa's persistent and systematic violation of the resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly? Yet, Mr. Botha has the audacity to come to the Council and project an image of his country as being peace-loving. Deeds speak louder than words.



137. Africa is indeed preoccupied with the aggressive ambitions of the régime in Pretoria. Our preoccupation is not lessened by the monstrous legislation of which Mr. Botha tried yesterday to paint a rosy picture in the Council, authorizing South African defence forces to operate with impunity in Africa, in defence of South Africa's supposed interest and security. Clearly also, the fact that the initial legislation tended to define South Africa's borders for military purposes as "Africa south of the equator"—a definition which would include a number of independent African States, including my own—serves to illustrate the aggressive ambitions of the authorities in Pretoria.

138. As to Mr. Botha's preoccupation with the rights of the Angolans, one can only say that such cynicism must be treated with the contempt it deserves. They say, "charity begins at home". How can the representative of South Africa in this year and age come to the Council and claim to be preoccupied with the rights of the people of Angola to choose a government of its choice, while as the world knows the whole essence of the problem of *apartheid* is the continued denial by the minority régime of South Africa to 20 million Africans of their fundamental rights, including the right to have a government of their own. Mr. Botha seems to have forgotten that the fundamental reason behind the General Assembly's decision to reject the credentials of South Africa in 1974 was that that régime did not represent the people of South Africa. And yet the representative of the *apartheid* régime wants us to believe that South Africa has now been converted to accepting the rights of the people to have the government of their choice. If the South African régime is really interested in having peace and security in southern Africa, there would be no better way to demonstrate that intention than to practise what Mr. Botha desperately tried to profess in the Council: let the South African Government create conditions permitting the African people in South Africa to have the same rights—not more rights, but the same rights—and the same privileges possessed by the white minority and thus allow the majority of the African people in South Africa to have the government of their choice.

139. One other observation in respect to Mr. Botha's statement. He tried to question the justification under the Charter of the Security Council deliberations concerning his country's aggression against Angola. Obviously, it is not difficult to understand that type of mentality. For as we know, Mr. Botha's régime and the Charter are strange bedfellows indeed. It would be too much to expect the representative of South Africa even to bother to go through the Charter provisions. For if he did, he is obviously not blind and he would see that Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter clearly stipulates that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any

state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Thus for Mr. Botha to be wondering why the Security Council is meeting serves only to underscore the degree of contempt they have for the Organization. It also shows that the authorities in Pretoria have their own moral values, their own laws and their own standards which are totally alien to those held by the rest of the international community.

140. One final observation concerning Mr. Botha's statement yesterday. As he did in January, he again tried very eloquently, very desperately, to convince us that he is an African, that he represents an African State and so on. Perhaps the only new thing yesterday was his excessive references to the Organization of African Unity.

141. We want to make clear that we have never questioned and that we do not now question whether the whites in South Africa are Africans. What we have questioned, what we do question, what we shall continue to question is that they are superior beings, and until such time as the South African white minority régime comes to its senses and understands that they cannot be Africans and superior beings too, they will be wasting the time of the Council and the Organization by repeating nonsensical assertions which no one really wants to hear. Secondly, we have never said that South Africa is not an African State. In fact the whole purpose of our struggle is to ensure that that African State legitimately chooses its rightful leaders and its rightful Government.

142. We are faced with a very serious problem. The African position has been articulated by many of my colleagues. In the course of the last few days we have been involved in intensive consultations with a number of colleagues in the hope of arriving at a draft resolution which would command, if not the unanimous support of the Council, at least its overwhelming support. In the process we have tried to take into consideration certain aspects, certain proposals which have been made to us. We believe that this draft resolution—which I am about to introduce on behalf of Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Panama, Romania and my own delegation—succinctly meets the problem before the Council.

*[The speaker read out the draft resolution, contained in document S/12030.]*

143. In commending this draft resolution to the Council, I should only like to stress that it is clear-cut and unambiguous and that it addresses itself to the specific problem of South African aggression against Angola.

144. The Council may not have been able to take the necessary measures to prevent South African aggression against Angola; it might have hesitated to



take prompt action to support the Government of the People's Republic of Angola against South African aggression. But let it not be said that South African aggression was in any way condoned by the Council, for I submit in all solemnity that if the Council were to reach the stage where an aggressor could get away with his aggression, not only would the purposes of the Organization have been eroded but members of the international community—particularly the people of the world—would have every justification to question the Organization's moral authority, strength and capacity to meet threats to international peace and security.

145. In commending this draft resolution the African members and the non-aligned members, together with our colleague from Romania, are only requesting that justice be done to the victims of aggression and that the Council send a message to the world that aggression does not pay, strengthen the forces of freedom and reason in Africa and by its action demonstrate its clear determination in favour of justice, freedom, reason and the Charter of the United Nations. To do less, I submit, would be doing injustice not only to Angola and Africa but also injustice and damage to the Organization.

146. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I do not propose at this stage of our debate to comment in detail on the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Tanzania. I will only say that for reasons which I have explained to him and his colleagues at length in the course of the last day or two, it is a draft resolution which is unacceptable to Her Majesty's Government. I would propose to explain the reasons for my vote on this draft at the appropriate time.

147. This is now the third debate in the Security Council on a southern African question in the last three months. It is hardly accidental that we have devoted so much time to the problems of southern Africa. If I may adopt a phrase from a previous British Prime Minister: The wind of change is now blowing faster than ever in that region of the world. The collapse of the old régime in Portugal has brought five new independent African nations into being. I have already had occasion earlier this month to greet the Foreign Minister of Mozambique, Mr. Chissano. I should now like to greet warmly the representative of Angola, Mr. Luvualu. Both Angola and Mozambique are destined to play an important part in the situation which is developing in southern Africa.

148. My own Government recognized the People's Republic of Angola on 18 February, and we wish President Neto and his Government well. There can be very few newly independent countries which have faced, and still have to face, such enormous problems. There is a legacy of past wrongs which cannot be transformed overnight. The recent fighting in Angola has ravaged the country and gravely affected its

economy and communications. We wish the Government of Angola all possible success in the task which now lies before it of rebuilding the country. There is a clear case, in our view, for generous assistance by the international community to the Government of Angola and to the region as a whole, and we for our part stand ready to do what we can.

149. My Government's position on the recent tragic events in Angola has been clear and consistent throughout. We have refused to intervene in any way in the internal affairs of Angola. The British Government provided no assistance to any of the rival political groups. My Government condemned the use of mercenaries on any side, and we for our part did what we could to discourage it. But in my country, at any rate, as is not the case in some whose representatives are sitting around this table or among some of their closest allies whose representatives we have had the opportunity of listening to in the last few days, a person who has not committed a criminal offence is entitled to leave the United Kingdom if he so wishes. It is one of the penalties of being a free society.

150. We have also consistently held the view that the question of Angola is an African question, and we warmly supported all efforts made by the Organization of African Unity to bring the fighting to an end and to allow Angolans to live in peace, free from all outside interference. We have maintained, and still maintain, that the future of Angola is for the people of Angola alone to decide. We intend to conduct our future relations with the People's Republic of Angola on the basis of mutual respect, sovereign equality and non-interference.

151. The immediate question before the Council is that of South African aggression against Angola. Here, again, my Government's position has been clear-cut all along. We have consistently stated that South African troops have no right whatsoever, morally or legally, to intervene in the affairs of Angola. We therefore associate ourselves with those speakers who have condemned South Africa's role in Angola, which, to put it mildly, has not enhanced the prospects for peaceful change in southern Africa as a whole. Both bilaterally and in conjunction with our partners in the European Community, we urged the South Africans to withdraw their forces from Angola immediately. In this connexion, may I note that on 16 March the nine countries of the European Community made a formal *démarche* to the South African Government on this matter. My colleague from Italy has already referred [*1905th meeting*] to the statement made by the Foreign Ministers of the Community on 23 February. Since it is now common knowledge, may I also add that my Government, in company with others, was able to be of some assistance in acting as a channel of communication during the last few weeks. I do not wish to go into details of those exchanges, but members of the Council will be aware that South African troops finally left Angola on

27 March. It is essential, in our view, that members of the Council should bear that important fact in mind.

152. I do not think it would be helpful if the Council were to get involved in debate about who in Angola was entitled to call for foreign assistance before 11 November 1975 and who was not. The People's Republic of Angola is now a sovereign and independent State which many countries in the world, including my own, have recognized. No one questions the right of a sovereign State to receive aid from its friends so long as this does not carry implications for the security of other countries.

153. I must, however, voice a wider and more general concern about what is happening. In this connexion may I say that I agree with what the representative of the Soviet Union said yesterday, that "the question raised by the Group of African States before the Security Council goes far beyond the framework of a local question concerning South Africa" [*1904th meeting, para. 38*]. As the Minister of State in the Foreign Office, Mr. Ennals, said recently:

"We must be frank and direct in our criticism of all those"—all of them—"who have sent foreign troops on to Angolan territory. We have insisted from the beginning that it would have been better if no foreign troops had been present in Angola... Let me stress again that it is our hope, now that the People's Republic of Angola has been recognized in Africa, Europe and elsewhere, that all foreign troops will be rapidly withdrawn."

154. The Cuban Government has stated that the introduction of its troops was the result of armed intervention by the South Africans. We know that the South Africans have now left Angola. What of the others? We believe that the continued presence of foreign troops anywhere in southern Africa can only make it more difficult to achieve an African solution to an African problem and can only make the white minority régimes of Rhodesia and Namibia still more stubborn in their resistance to international opinion. I do not want there to be any misunderstanding. The responsibility for what is happening must rest with those in southern Africa who have consistently denied to Africans their basic human rights, but it remains our view that African questions are best settled by Africans and in an African context. My own Government has learnt this lesson in the past. No doubt others will have to learn it in the future. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, Western imperialism is dead, and a good thing too. It would be a tragic irony if new imperialisms were now to arise in its place.

155. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): The United States delegation has listened with deep interest to the statements made in the Council on the agenda item that is before us. Our delegation welcomes the withdrawal of the South African troops from

Angola. The exchanges which resulted in this announcement are encouraging, both because they suggest that the situation on the frontier can be dealt with by peaceful means and because they mark the withdrawal of a foreign military force from an area where it does not belong.

156. The withdrawal of South Africa from Angola can only serve to highlight for the international community the tragic fact that there remain other, even larger, foreign interventions in southern Africa. I fully understand, Mr. President, the appeal you have made and the appeal that has been supported by the representative of Tanzania and others, that the Council remember the subject of our agenda and focus attention thereon. We do not, of course, interpret this appeal to mean that the debate should proceed as if the end of one case of wrongful international behaviour in southern Africa should somehow blind us to others. A number of speakers have already referred, quite rightly, to another case of such wrongful behaviour: the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The United States, for its part, continues strongly to support the Council's resolution on this subject [385 (1976)], unanimously adopted on 30 January. The United States holds firmly to its policy of support for majority rule in southern Africa.

157. But there is still another case of unacceptable international behaviour which must be brought to an end. I refer of course to the presence in the African continent of a large Cuban expeditionary force now numbering over 13,000 men, an adventure which could never have been begun and could not be continued now without the support of the Soviet Union, a permanent member of the Council. It is an adventure which is based on the assumption that Cuba can introduce itself as an arbiter of intra-African affairs, using the most modern weapons and a trained expeditionary force to that very end. This is a peculiarly and particularly dangerous precedent, not only for Africa but for the entire world.

158. The attempt by the Cuban representative to distort the tragic history of foreign intervention in Angola's civil war is a self-serving misstatement of the facts, which are themselves by now well known to many of the members and observers at the Council. Cuban armed intervention in Angola began long before the date cited by the Cuban representative, that is, 5 November 1975. Regardless of how one judges the Cuban intervention one cannot ignore the public statement of the Cuban Deputy Premier, Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, that Cuba dispatched 250 military advisory personnel to Angola in the "late spring" of 1975. This move coincided with the arrival of massive amounts of weapons supplied by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the available evidence indicates that Cuba decided no later than mid-August 1975 to commit sufficient numbers of combat troops to Angola to impose the movement they supported as the only Government of Angola. I state this with confidence,

since we know that during September 1975 five Cuban vessels transported about 1,500 combat troops from Cuba to Angola and that by late October at least 2,000 Cuban combat troops were deployed inside Angola. This intervention into an indigenous African struggle was occurring at the same time that the Conciliation Commission on Angola of the Organization of African Unity was calling for all States to refrain from intervention in Angola, a call that my Government supported.

159. From the beginning of the struggle in Angola the United States Government sought three principal goals: an end to bloodshed, the opportunity for all competing factions through their own efforts to be represented in the Government of an independent Angola, and the cessation of all foreign military involvement. And just as the end to South Africa's wrongful intervention is very welcome, so the continuing Cuban and Soviet intervention is wrong: wrong because it deprives the Angolan people of the ability to exercise self-determination freely, uncoerced by foreign military intervention; wrong because of its massive size—Soviet aid to Angola in 1975 and early 1976 far exceeded the entire amount of military aid to sub-Saharan Africa from all sources in 1974—wrong because it can no longer be related to any of the alleged purposes it pretended to serve; and wrong because of its implications for the future in Africa and elsewhere in the world.

160. What are the implications of the presence of such combat forces in Africa, supplied and equipped by a great Power?

161. First, the central development in the entire history of modern Africa has been the emergence of African nations from colonial status to independence. In area after area, in country after country of Africa the end of foreign domination has resulted in the removal of foreign troops. Proudly—and rightly proudly—independent Governments have arisen in their place. This has been a powerful trend in modern African history, a trend which all friends of Africa welcome and support. Thus in Angola the Cuban military presence in large numbers has been and continues to be inconsistent with this history, with the great traditions of modern Africa and with the firmly stated convictions of Africa's leaders.

162. Secondly, the radical departure from modern African tradition represented by the massive Cuban movement in Angola must be terminated. The continued presence of Cuban combat forces in Africa risks establishing a pattern of action and competition for foreign sponsorship which can fundamentally undermine what has been achieved in Africa over these past 20 years. The involvement of Cuban troops in Angola, if not terminated, can only serve to turn back the clock of history to an earlier epoch.

163. I say this because the United States supports African independence. We support the principles of

non-intervention, territorial integrity and the non-use of force in Africa. President Ford has made clear that rapid change is required in southern Africa and that the opportunity for negotiated solutions must be seized and moved forward. The United States supports majority rule in southern Africa. Our dedication to these objectives and our friendship for Africa impel us to point to this continuing anomaly of the Cuban presence.

164. We believe the African nations are aware of the threat to their independence and sovereignty posed by the presence of those who profess to be their disinterested friends. We believe they recognize that Cuban and Soviet actions are designed to serve Cuban—and Soviet—global objectives which have nothing to do with peace and progress in Africa. We believe the African nations and all members of the Council know what is required: the immediate and total withdrawal of all foreign military forces from Angola.

165. The United States strongly supports the motivation for African independence inherent in the draft resolution before the Council [S/12030] but will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because of its failure to apply to other continuing foreign interventions. The draft resolution purports to reflect a conclusion by the Council on the situation in Angola and asks for responsive action by South Africa. It says nothing whatsoever about the irresponsibility of those who employed by far the most destructive weaponry there. Furthermore, the operative part of the draft resolution unaccountably fails to set forth what should be a key requirement: that all States refrain from intervening in the affairs of Angola.

166. Thus, to the extent that the draft resolution reflects the Council's efforts to deal with the problem of foreign involvement in Angola, in our judgement it falls badly short of that mark. It cites South Africa's unwarranted violation of Angola's territorial integrity, yet it is totally silent on the continuing presence of the Cuban expeditionary force in Angola. Such a blatant disregard of facts, such a double standard, such hypocrisy cannot further, in our judgement, the Council's discharge of its own responsibilities. Accordingly, the United States will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, strongly as we feel about the independence of African States.

167. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation wants to welcome amongst us Ambassador Luvualu, the special envoy of the Angolan Government. We have already had the privilege of hearing his two statements. We want to confirm right now that France will be pleased to maintain the best of relations with the People's Republic of Angola, a new important State on the African continent, whose history binds it in many ways to Europe and which has just emerged from a great national trial. We noted with great interest the statement by which Ambassador Luvualu informed the

Council that his country was determined to respect the Charter of the United Nations and to have relations of friendship and co-operation with all States and to observe the fundamental principles of non-alignment.

168. Through its President, the representative of Kenya, the African Group has submitted to the Council a complaint against South Africa. My delegation feels that that complaint is legitimate, and we deplore the behaviour of the Government of South Africa towards Angola. France, which is very attached to the principles of independence, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of States, can find no excuse for those who, under the pretext of a civil war and the weakening of sovereignty resulting therefrom, have violated the territory of a country. It is undeniable that South Africa has intervened in a region where it had no business at all and where apparently no one had requested its intervention. By prolonging its occupation beyond the time when the Government of the People's Republic of Angola controlled the majority of the country, South Africa aggravated its case in a regrettable way.

169. Extremely concerned and even alarmed by the extension of such a state of affairs, France and its eight partners in the European Community, on 16 March, as my colleagues from Italy and the United Kingdom have already pointed out, urged the South African authorities to withdraw troops immediately and unconditionally. That approach was not without effect, yet it was necessary to wait until 27 March to obtain a promise of withdrawal. If I can believe a recent press release, yesterday or the day before the secretary of the Political Bureau of the MPLA, Mr. Lucio Lara, announced in Luanda that South African troops had left their last positions in the province of Cunene. Certainly we must take note of that.

170. Although South Africa's intervention in Angola is now a thing of the past, the Council has decided to inscribe the African complaint on its agenda. This was inspired by many motives, in particular the seeming trend of South Africa to consider itself as a sort of gendarme in the region. Three years ago in the Council we condemned the sending of South African troops to Rhodesia. Every year we pass a severe judgement on South Africa's continuing domination of Namibia, a Territory which does not belong to it and which should have been allowed to accede to independence long ago. It is undeniable—and this is one of the greatest concerns of the United Nations—that the political behaviour of South Africa correspond neither to the historical requirements of decolonization, as France understands and practices them, nor to the indispensable restraint of a State that wishes to live in good neighbourliness with other countries of the region.

171. During the long and interesting debate which began last Friday at this very table, many speakers

transcended the subject of the invasion of South Africa and mentioned the Angolan civil war. We have heard many eloquent words concerning what has been happening in Angola in the Cunene area and elsewhere, in descriptions more detailed even than that of the representative of Angola.

172. I should like to make few brief comments in this connexion. First of all, I would stress that it is, naturally, up to the authorities of the People's Republic of Angola to define for themselves the policies of Angola. It is true that the international community is very concerned about seeing a matter which is the business of Angolans, Africans and the administering Power to resolve becoming, or running the risk of becoming, a source of a larger conflict. In a statement dated 23 February, the nine countries of the European Community expressed their concern about all foreign military interventions in Angola as well as all attempts to establish a zone of influence in any part of Africa whatsoever. France, which has strictly abstained from any interference in the affairs of ex-Portuguese colonies in general and Angola in particular, feels that the responsibility for resolving African conflicts is first and foremost incumbent upon the Africans themselves.

173. At this time I should like to welcome the courageous efforts made by the Organization of African Unity in the difficulties which arose in Angola as a result of a process which the administering Power could no longer control. In speaking on behalf of a country that has also experienced many invasions and has struggled against many attempts at influence and division, I should like to state my Government's support for any policy that allows the peoples of any continent to be masters of their own destiny. Obviously, it is up to them to define that destiny without any interference in the exercise of their sovereignty. I repeat that Africa belongs to Africans.

174. There was a civil war in Angola; that is a fact. But that is no excuse for the Pretoria authorities or for others. The future belongs to the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, which has stated here through its representative that it intends to respect all the principles of international law—that is, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and reciprocity of benefits.

175. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since no other member of the Council has asked to be allowed to speak at this stage, I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of BENIN.

176. As soon as the invasion of Angola by the South African troops in September 1975 was announced, the people of Benin mobilized to defend Angola and Africa. Later, responding to the appeal of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Party of the People's

Republic of Benin, the militants of Benin volunteered *en masse* to go and fight in Angola side by side with the patriots of the Angolan people's liberation front. That is to say that had the political situation not been favourable to the worthy son of Angola and Africa, President Neto, and had it not been for his insistence that the troops of Benin wait and remain on alert ready to intervene in case of need, they would certainly have found themselves in Angola. And had this been the case, my delegation would have been curious to know whether its country would have been considered an invader or not.

177. Having said this, I am sure that members of the Council will understand that in my capacity as representative of the Military Revolutionary Government of the People's Republic of Benin I can now intervene and outline the point of view of my delegation on the question under discussion.

178. In my delegation's view, the question now before the Council has very definite outlines and consequently is clear. It can be summarized in the following way. Can a disgusting, racist and backward régime that has been set down in the southern part of Africa and, furthermore, has been outlawed by our community for its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia, use that Territory as a base to commit aggression against a five-month-old State and, through that insane act, threaten the independence and territorial integrity of that State? If the answer is "No", one must ask what punishment that régime deserves when its case is brought to the Council.

179. The delegation of Benin has been astonished by this orchestrated campaign of poison carried out here and elsewhere for the unavowed purpose of torpedoing the present series of meetings. It is true that that campaign has been undertaken and maintained by the Vorster régime, which has constantly increased the number of its press communiqués and statements announcing the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola on 27 March. The result of all that has been that some delegations—certainly with the best of intentions—began to harass the African delegations with the question whether meetings of the Council were really necessary since South Africa had decided to withdraw its troops from Angola.

180. To put such a question amounts to saying, if not that the Africans carrying out instructions from the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity acted too hastily, at least that their request now had no purpose. In the light of all that, my delegation can only feel pleased that we have had present at the debates Comrade Luvualu, a member of the Central Committee of the MPLA and Angola's roving Ambassador. By coming here to present his country's case personally, he has given striking proof that the request of the African Group was justified and that there could be no doubt whatever that it was necessary for the Council to meet.

181. In bringing the South African case before the Council, the African Group has given definite proof that it can assume its responsibilities. It knew that, despite the clear and specific outlines and the concrete aspect of the question before the Council, some delegations would not fail to take the opportunity to air their hatreds and resume the cold war. None the less, it decided to go forward because it was convinced that—and no one can contradict this—the fact that South Africa had announced a withdrawal, or even that it had indeed withdrawn its troops, took nothing away from the very nature of the aggression. For, after all, what could be the fate of the small and weak countries if the case of South Africa were permitted to constitute a precedent? Would that not open the door for future abuses of all kinds, since it would appear to be sufficient, after having committed aggression and pillaging a country, to announce a withdrawal upon the convening of the Security Council, in order for the act of aggression to be wiped out and given a facade of legality?

182. It is sad to note that in the face of a self-evident fact—South Africa has, after all, admitted that its troops entered Angola and occupied a part of that State—international hypocrisy tries to place on a footing of equality the heinous crime committed by the disgusting *apartheid* régime and the presence in Angola of troops invited by the lawful Government of Angola at Luanda to come to its assistance. In any case, one is greatly tempted to ask those who uphold that thesis whether the presence of American troops in one or another part of Europe during the Second World War could be regarded as aggression, when we know very well that, faced with the danger of Hitlerism, certain nationalist Governments of the time had felt it necessary to appeal for those troops? That question should be sufficient to ask those who hold this thesis to reflect and make an objective judgement, and not to bring grist to the mill of South Africa. Although, taking advantage of a Council debate on the international Territory of Namibia, Botha had the audacity to come here to justify the presence of South African troops in Angola by that disgusting régime's desire to protect Africa from the danger of communism and who knows what else, I do not think that there is a single delegation in the Council prepared to believe the South African thesis.

183. It is also sad to note that in an attempt to justify what cannot be justified, the racist Vorster gang does not even take the pains to remember things correctly. Otherwise, how can one explain the fact that after the grotesque scene which the Council witnessed in January, the representative of the Pretoria racists dared to communicate to the Secretary-General the statement by Vorster from which I quote the following passage:

"Immediately thereafter, the South African Government informed the Portuguese Government of the steps taken and urged them to take over this

task. The Portuguese Government could not do so at the time and requested South Africa to continue its protective measures and to remain *in situ* until such time as they could assume this responsibility.” [S/12019, annex I.]

184. Having done that, South Africa maintained that it had received the prior authorization of the Portuguese Government. Now, if we refer to the 23 March letter from the representative of Portugal to the Secretary-General [S/12023] and to the refutation made this morning by that same representative [1905th meeting], we can only note the wholly imaginary nature of the statement by Vorster, who clearly has no inhibitions at all any longer about taking serious liberties with the truth and the facts.

185. In my delegation's opinion, all this hotchpotch proves only one thing: the South African act of aggression against Angola was committed deliberately. That is not difficult to understand. After the failure of the Caetano régime, swept out on 25 April 1974 by the young elements of the Portuguese army, and confronted by the forthcoming collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire and the successive proclamations of the independence of the territories formerly under Portuguese domination, whose courageous liberation movements had been struggling for many years, the disgusting *apartheid* régime nourished the hope of being able to replace Portugal with impunity, convinced that its military force was invincible. Thus, having seized the international Territory of Namibia, South Africa wanted to use Angola as a bridgehead to carry out its expansionist and provocative aims in Africa. That design was encouraged, indeed even conceived, by international imperialism, which could not resign itself to seeing that country follow a normal development towards independence—because, of course, of the great wealth in its soil and subsoil. But imperialism and its lackeys had not counted on the vigilance and determination of a people in arms. The progressive Angolan forces inflicted crushing defeats on the South African military forces. They obliged those forces to withdraw rapidly and to take up a defence position around the area of the Calueque dam, whose interests they claimed they were protecting. It is not necessary to recall that at one time the General Assembly was very concerned about the consequences that the construction of that dam could entail and condemned the plan and its execution. That means that for the Council the dam could not in any case serve as a pretext to justify the South African aggression, because the dam was planned and built despite the objections of the international community; nor can the alleged South African humanitarian feelings serve as a pretext.

186. An even more aggravating circumstance is the fact that South Africa has no common frontier with Angola, and in order to accomplish its crime it had to use the international Territory of Namibia, which it continues to occupy illegally. That is why the aggression

itself must be condemned. Moreover, the Council must now seriously warn South Africa and require it to respect scrupulously the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and to desist from using Namibia to stage provocative and aggressive actions against Angola or other neighbouring States. Finally, South Africa must be invited immediately to return everything that was looted before its withdrawal, or to pay compensation to the People's Republic of Angola for the damages and losses inflicted.

187. That is the minimum which Africa, united around Angola, can demand. However, nothing leads us to believe that the racist South African régime will accede, especially if one refers to the statement by Mr. Botha reproduced in *The New York Times* of Sunday, 28 March, which reads, in part, as follows:

“We want peace, but until peace exists properly we shall be on the alert and shall remain on our side of the border to protect the interests for which we are responsible.”\*

One may well wonder what kind of peace Botha means, and whether the much talked about withdrawal is actually anything more than a deceptive manoeuvre.

188. As you will see clearly, my Head of State, Comrade Mathieu Kérékou, was right when, addressing the workers on 29 January following a march in support of the Angolan people, he declared:

“The Angolan question is nothing other than the question of the genuine independence and unity of Africa. That is why the African peoples must today understand that after the stinging setbacks to imperialism in Asia and elsewhere, the future of our beautiful and rich continent is at the heart of the preoccupations of the imperialist Powers.”

189. This is a question of vital interest to Africa, which must close ranks in order to block any paternalistic or imperialist initiatives. The time has passed when one could dictate to the African what he must do, what friends to choose and which ones to avoid. It is time we recognized the obvious fact that Africa is now an adult and cannot concede to anyone, no matter how powerful, the right to dictate its conduct.

190. The people of Benin, which is engaged in the same revolutionary struggle as the Angolan people, faithful to the policy outlined by its Head of State in his programme statement of 30 November 1972, will lend its active and militant support to the peoples struggling for their liberation. We know that struggle pays off when the cause is just and noble. That is why, as we hail the heroic struggle of the people of Angola under the direction of the MPLA, Benin energetically denounces all of the crimes and atrocities

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.



committed against the people of Azania by the racists of the shameful *apartheid* régime of Vorster. As I have already stated, Benin's support of Angola is total. It is not dictated by circumstances or by any immediate interests. It is based on the policy of its revolutionary Government resolutely to defend its principles and to combat imperialism in all its forms and manifestations.

191. I could not conclude without recalling what my delegation has repeatedly had occasion to declare here: it is high time that those who support the régime which has been rejected by the international community realized that profound political changes are taking place in southern Africa and that the Africa of "Papa" and of the well-behaved child of "the good old days" is gone forever. In these conditions, what could be more normal and more rational than to give up the anachronistic policy of supplying arms to the Vorster gang to perpetuate that régime? What could be more logical than not to keep trying blindly to stop the wheel of history, which is turning implacably and inexorably? And what could be more normal than to utilize the means at our disposal to make South Africa listen to reason? Today, more than ever, it is clear that if we really want to we can break the backbone of that racist *apartheid* régime. Under these circumstances, why then wait any longer?

192. Finally, I should like to invite certain friendly countries which have never refused their material, military and other support to the African liberation movements to ponder this anecdote told in Benin: a couple sitting in a house was suddenly surprised by a snake. While the man hurried to find a weapon in the bedroom the woman took up a stick that was lying nearby and killed the snake before her husband had a chance to return. The husband's pride was a bit wounded, but he nevertheless drew the following wise conclusion: "What did we really want anyway? To kill the snake. It doesn't really matter whether the credit goes to my wife or to me." Let everybody understand us well: as far as Benin is concerned, the shameful *apartheid* régime in South Africa is a snake that must be killed at all costs, and we would truly and warmly applaud our traditional friends if they could decide, one day, to help us administer the *coup de grace* to that abject régime.

193. In my capacity as PRESIDENT, I invite the representative of Cuba, who has asked to speak in right of reply, to take a place at the table, and I give him the floor.

194. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since it is already late, my delegation is going to be very brief, although we have to reply to more than one statement.

195. Yesterday the representative of the racist régime of South Africa tried in vain to sow confusion in the debate in this Council, but the ineffectiveness of his action is illustrated perhaps better than anything else

by the fact that that was his last appearance in this chamber.

196. The statement this morning by the representative of the People's Republic of Angola showed beyond a shadow of a doubt how South African troops had not only occupied the southern part of Angolan territory but also advanced with armored tanks as far as an area near the very capital of Angola, with the clear intention of preventing the independence of that country and of occupying the entire territory. The representative of Portugal, for his part, clarified events related to the beginning of the entry of South African troops into Angola and clearly refuted the fallacies of the delegation of Pretoria. Later some African colleagues replied adequately to that representative, and therefore my delegation does not feel it is necessary to dwell on the statement he made yesterday.

197. A few moments ago the Council had the opportunity to hear the delegation of the United States. One had the impression that we were hearing the representative of a State that had no experience whatsoever in sending troops abroad and in activities of interference throughout the world. Frankly, I feel that it is very late for me or for any representative to try to demonstrate the obvious. From the Far East to areas closest to the United States, the Government of that country has been characterized precisely by a policy of interference and aggression throughout the world and has had no concern whatsoever for the thoughts of the Governments and peoples involved.

198. One also had the impression that Mr. Scranton supposes that the United States has considered the problem of Angola from outside and that it had no participation in the imperialist and racist intervention against that country. Allow me to recall that on 10 December, last year at the morning meeting of the General Assembly,<sup>5</sup> I read for the benefit of Mr. Scranton's predecessor what had been published in *The New York Times* of 25 September, in the first column on the left on the front page, in connexion with activities of the United States in Angola. Since then the delegation of the United States has not bothered to refute that information. What did *The New York Times* say at that time?

"... William E. Colby, the director of the [CIA], had notified members of six Congressional subcommittees several months ago of the covert operations in Angola and... no serious objections had been raised."

If on 25 September the director of the CIA was announcing that several months earlier his agency had notified six Congressional subcommittees of covert CIA operations in Angola, then we can assume that the imperialist intervention in that country began even earlier than the time when South African troops crossed the international border of Namibia. But we

might say that much earlier the United States Government had participated actively in the life of the Angolan people and in its struggle for independence.

199. I do not think it is necessary to remind the Council of the agreements signed in December 1971 between the United States Government and the fascist Government then in power in Portugal, through which the United States gave substantial financial assistance—if my memory serves me aright, it was approximately \$400 million—to the Portuguese régime, certainly a very important means of allowing it to continue its colonial war against the people of Angola and against other African peoples oppressed by Portugal at that time.

200. This conclusion that United States financial assistance was important for the régime of South Africa is not something I have invented. It is not at all difficult to find in any United States publication of the time the statements made by Prime Minister Caetano, head of the fascist Government of Portugal at the time, thanking the United States for its co-operation and stressing that Portuguese efforts in Africa, after all, coincided with the general interests of the policies of the United States and nothing was more logical than if Portugal was helping the United States the United States should also help Portugal.

201. I am not going to dwell on the arguments that demonstrate this United States participation in the Portuguese colonial war. I should simply like to recall that it had more concrete expression, as the MPLA has informed us for years. At least in the province of Cabinda, it seems that some American officers and soldiers carried their solidarity with Portugal a bit further and it was actually expressed on the battlefield, but, even closer to New York, in Fort Bragg, 5,000 soldiers of the Portuguese special forces learned methods of warfare against African liberation movements.

202. Moreover, you will recall that I brought here a magazine last Monday [1902nd meeting], and I still have it with me. While the representative of the United States was speaking I glanced through a few of its pages. I repeat that this magazine is a sort of official organ of white mercenaries in this country. It is published freely in the United States—of course, this is a country where there is freedom of the press—and in its last issue it published an interesting report on the Angolan situation. This report was prepared by a South African newspaperman several months before the independence of Angola, and in it he describes the activities of mercenaries in that country. It is certainly worth while for the Council to take note of what this South African pointed out about the sort of payment that these mercenaries could receive. In this report on the war in Angola we read the following on page 23:

“A new recruit”—thereafter it refers to a new mercenary—“cannot expect to earn more than a few

hundred dollars, although this is supplemented by booty along the route.”

In another part of the article the South African gentleman, apparently trying to attract candidates in the United States for the invasion of Angola, points out that:

“The region”—he means Angola—“will see considerable military escalation before the end of the year and promises to be good hunting ground for mercenary activity.”

Details concerning mercenary recruitment in Los Angeles, New York and Chicago are given on page 6 of the magazine. We note that David Bufkin—I suppose that he is an American citizen—from Kerman, California, is in charge of those recruitment activities. It states that the salary to be paid to mercenaries who sign up for activity against the people of Angola will be \$800 per month for a six-month contract and \$1,200 per month for a 12-month contract. The rest of the publication confirms that the Government of the United States and its agencies which are devoted to this activity of promoting imperialist interests on all continents do not deal only with the question of Angola but with many other questions. Anyone who examines this issue might find it a bit surprising that those activities are so wide-ranging. I shall point out just one more detail which appears on page 2, where the magazine pays tribute to Corporal John Alan Coey, an American who died in Rhodesia fighting against the guerrillas of the national liberation movement of that country. He was with the Rhodesian light Infantry.

203. But I repeat that it is not my intention to belabour United States policy on Angola. In my statement I said that neither the Angolan people nor its Portuguese oppressors were alone during that country's decade of armed struggle. They had the assistance of their natural allies from abroad. Cuba, from the outset, from the time it attained full independence in 1959—and we have never concealed this fact—in so far as possible has helped the Angolan patriots in their struggle for national independence. The United States sustained, and not gratuitously, Portuguese fascism militarily, diplomatically, politically and financially, while its monopolies obtained vast profits from Angola as well as from the rest of the oppressed territories in southern Africa, which explain North American interest in the area. That is a fact of history, a fact reflected in the documentation of the United Nations where, as all representatives know, the United States with its vote or with its veto from the beginning to the very last moment supported the racist and colonialist régimes of Africa, and where it continues to do so now.

204. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.



205. Mr. SHERER (United States of America): Whatever ancient history may be asserted by the Cuban representative, the fact is that more than 13,000 Cuban soldiers remain in Angola. We ask again: What are they doing there? Against what threat are they staying there? Who are the real imperialists? These questions cannot be answered by distortion of history and quotations from newspapers and private publications of which it is said, perhaps jealously, that they are the products of a free press.

206. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Cuba wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

207. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The presence of Cubans who went to Angola to struggle together with the Angolan people against the invasion by the racists and mercenaries who had the moral and material support of the United States Government is a matter which concerns the People's Republic of Angola alone. The Cubans went to that country at the request of a sovereign Government, an independent Government, which has the same rights and the same attributes as any other independent sovereign State, regardless of the opinion of a racist about this matter in the western world.

208. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

209. Mr. SHERER (United States of America): The invasion is over. The South African troops are gone. When are the Cuban soldiers leaving?

210. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Cuba wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

211. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United States is very interested in giving the impression that the invasion is over, that the threats have disappeared and that the dangers for the People's Republic of Angola no longer exist. None the less, the authorities of South Africa themselves, when they announced that they were withdrawing, said that they were crossing a bridge over a river and that they would stay on the other side of the bridge to protect their interests. They feel that they have interests on the side of the river that belongs to the People's Republic of Angola.

212. Of course, I might return the question and ask the representative of the United States whether he feels that South African troops now are located where they should be, whether it is satisfactory to him that there should be South African troops occupying the Territory of Namibia, or whether he is going to urge them—which he did not do in his statement—to leave

that Territory immediately, in accordance with the oft-repeated opinion of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, in a word, of public opinion throughout the world.

213. The Government of the People's Republic of Angola has come to the Council to denounce an aggression which has not ended, to denounce the fact that the Government of South Africa invaded it, committed innumerable acts of plunder and pillage against its people and that, moreover, at no time, in no statement and in no written communication did the representative of South Africa announce that his country would not continue its aggressive attitude to the People's Republic of Angola.

214. In the United States, there is freedom of expression, as the representative of the United States likes to stress. That freedom includes his right not to recognize the sovereign powers of a sovereign and independent State of Africa. Perhaps he does not like the fact that in Angola there is today a Government of the Angolan people. Unfortunately, however, international law and the opinion of many countries outside the United States stress and express the belief that that Government has the same rights as any other Government and that through its sovereignty it can decide whether it needs foreign assistance. That is up to the Angolans to decide and not to the representative of the United States, even with all the freedom of expression that exists in his country.

215. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of the right of reply.

216. Mr. SHERER (United States of America): I am very sorry that we have got into this rather extended debate, but I should like to point out to the representative of Cuba that Ambassador Scranton in his statement did refer to Namibia. Just to refresh the recollection of the representative of Cuba, I should like to quote from that statement. Ambassador Scranton said:

“A number of speakers have already referred, quite rightly, to another case of such wrongful behaviour: the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The United States, for its part, continues strongly to support the Council's resolution on this subject, unanimously adopted on 30 January [385/1976]. The United States holds firmly to its policy of support for majority rule in southern Africa.” [*See para. 156 above.*]

217. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): It is the desire of the sponsors of the draft resolution that it be voted upon in the course of this evening—which is fast becoming tonight. In view of the specific request made to us by some of our friends, I should like to propose that we suspend the meeting and resume at approximately 10 o'clock.

218. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania has proposed, in accordance with the provisions of rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure, the suspension of this meeting for approximately one and a half hours. Are there any objections? Since there are none, it is so decided.

*The meeting was suspended at 8.25 p.m. and resumed at 10.25 p.m.*

219. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before the Council proceeds to the voting on the draft resolution, I shall call on any representative who wishes to explain his vote at this stage.

220. Mr. SUNDBERG (Sweden): Once again the Security Council has been seized of a problem connected with the situation in southern Africa. Once again the roots of the problem lie in the unacceptable policies of South Africa under its racist and repressive Government.

221. As early as August 1975, South African troops from bases in Namibia invaded Angola and took control over parts of Angolan territory. In the autumn South African regular forces were operating deep inside Angola. South Africa has tried to justify this armed incursion by referring to an alleged invitation or silent acceptance on the part of the then administering Power, Portugal. Portugal's delegation has clearly refuted this claim and pointed out that Portugal had protested this action repeatedly to the South African authorities.

222. The most prominent of the arguments used by the South African Government has been the defence of a hydroelectric and irrigation project in the south of Angola. Such arguments, however, cannot serve as a justification for the occupation of areas in Angola.

223. It is also specially noteworthy that, as was the case of the South African statement in this debate the other day, South Africa has invoked the argument that the military operations in Angola were motivated by an effort to balance the struggling factions within the country. This in fact amounts to a clear admission of interference in the internal affairs of the country.

224. Military attacks of such magnitude and duration by South African forces against Angola's territory must clearly be characterized as aggression. The fact that this time South Africa used its illegal occupation of Namibia for aggressive purposes is a further aggravating factor.

225. The Swedish delegation will cast an affirmative vote for the most unequivocal condemnation by the Security Council of this South African aggression. South Africa's action was clearly inadmissible under international law and under the Charter of the United Nations.

226. Angola's achievement of independence was preceded by a factional struggle within the country, resulting in a devastating civil war. Outside interests have used that division to intervene in various ways in the country. The Swedish Government has rejected all foreign aspirations to limit the right of the Angolan people freely to decide their own future. The principle of non-intervention must be respected by all and every one. But nothing can under any circumstances serve as justification for the clear and flagrant aggression by the Government of South Africa against this newly independent country, something to which my Government has particularly objected.

227. My delegation would like to express the hope that the Angolan people may now have the opportunity of building their country in peace and through conciliation, without foreign interference. May I also add that my delegation is looking forward to the moment—and we hope that it will be soon—when we will be able to welcome Angola as a valued Member of the world Organization, and we greet warmly here today its representative, Ambassador Luvualu.

228. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to make the following observations on the draft resolution in document S/12030.

229. China has always supported the people of Angola in their national liberation movements against the Portuguese colonialists, and we gave assistance, including military assistance, to all three liberation organizations.

230. With regard to the differences among the three Angolan liberation organizations, we have always urged them to take to heart their common interests of national liberation and to unite against the common enemy. In particular, the following fact should be pointed out. Since the Alvor agreements were reached between the Angolan national liberation movements and Portugal in January 1975, confirming the independence of Angola, China has refrained from providing new military assistance to the three Angolan liberation organizations.

231. Delegations headed by the leading members of the three organizations, namely, UNITA, MPLA and FNLA, visited China on 19 March, 29 May and 10 September 1975, respectively. During the talks the Chinese side repeatedly expressed the hope that the leaders of each liberation organization would solve their differences through peaceful consultation by holding high the banner of independence, unity and progress, so that they could achieve their independence at the earliest possible date.

232. The three organizations asked us to provide them with military assistance. In view of the existing situation of conflict in Angola, we did not agree to those requests. We hoped that they would take to

heart their national interests, do away with super-Power meddling and intervention and join in a common effort to build a truly independent and united Angola of national harmony.

233. We have always supported the Organization of African Unity in its tremendous efforts to mediate among the three liberation organizations. We have supported its positive proposals for the immediate cessation of conflict among the three organizations and the formation of a Government of national unity, and we consider this just position entirely in the interests of the people of Angola and the whole of Africa.

234. We strongly condemn the South African authorities for their armed aggression and intervention in Angola, and we firmly support the people of Angola and the rest of Africa in their just struggle against the aggression by South Africa in Angola.

235. We cannot remain deaf and silent to another serious fact in Angola. We likewise strongly condemn Soviet social-imperialism for its aggression and intervention in Angola, and we firmly hold that Soviet military personnel and its foreign mercenaries must also withdraw from Angola immediately and completely. This is the strong and righteous demand of the world opinion and the Governments of many countries.

236. Angola belongs to the people of Angola, who have the full right to solve their own problems free from outside interference. Anyone who respects the facts and upholds justice can see that our position stems from the basic interests of the people of Angola and the rest of Africa, and from the basic interests of the struggle of the people of the world against the two Powers striving in Angola for supremacy in southern Africa. The Chinese Government and people adhere to such a principled stand. Our words and deeds are open and above-board and consistent, and they can stand the test of the facts and time.

237. The serious situation in Angola was created by the fierce rivalry between the two hegemonic Powers. Now, their rivalry has been brought to southern Africa and is growing in intensity. We are duty-bound to stress that the aggression by Soviet social-imperialism and its mercenary troops against Angola is a serious event unprecedented in the history of African national liberation movements since the Second World War. This is part of its fierce rivalry with the other super-Power for world hegemony and for the South Atlantic, and it constitutes an important plan in its global offensive strategy. To this end, the Soviet Union is spreading the lie of supporting the liberation movements, while insidiously sowing discord and creating dissension among them. It has meddled directly in the internal conflicts in Angola and even launched aggression. In addition to using large numbers of mercenaries it has resorted to the

criminal tactics of making Africans fight Africans. Flaunting the tattered banner of "selfless socialist aid", it is shipping in large quantities of weapons for the very purpose of carrying on plunder and control and expanding its spheres of influence. Quite a number of Asian and African countries have had bitter experience in this respect. The facts have proved and will continue to prove that the nature of Soviet social-imperialism will not change. It can deceive people and run amok for a certain period but cannot remain successful for long. It can be said with certainty that its aggression and expansion in Angola are bound to meet with the strong resistance of more and more Angolan people and of the African countries and peoples. It will come to a more ignominious end than the old colonialists.

238. The Chinese delegation strongly condemns the South African racist régime's aggression against Angola, demands respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola by all States and condemns South Africa for the utilization of Namibia to mount provocative or aggressive acts against Angola or any other neighbouring African State. The people of Angola are entitled to demand compensation for the damage caused by all foreign aggression.

239. However, it must be pointed out that the draft resolution has failed to condemn Soviet social-imperialism and its mercenaries for their intervention and aggression against Angola, nor has it reflected the just demand for their complete and immediate withdrawal from Angola. The third preambular paragraph recalls "the principle that no State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State", but immediately after that the fourth preambular paragraph refers to "the inherent and lawful right of every State, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to request assistance from any other State or group of States". The simultaneous application of these two paragraphs to the question now under discussion in the Council means the negation of the former by the latter. The fourth preambular paragraph is bound to be utilized by Soviet social-imperialism to legalize its aggression and intervention in Angola. This will bring serious and unfavourable consequences to the just cause of the Angolan and other African peoples in achieving their liberation, defending their State sovereignty and national independence and opposing super-Power intervention. This has set a dangerous precedent for the super-Powers to create pretexts to commit aggression and intervention against other sovereign States. We absolutely cannot agree to it. Therefore, the Chinese delegation has decided not to participate in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document S/12030.

240. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The list of speakers is exhausted. May I take it that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution

in document S/12030? As there are no objections, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Benin, Guyana, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.<sup>6</sup>*

*One member (China) did not participate in the voting.*

241. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the vote.

242. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan): As I stated in my intervention this afternoon, my Government was firmly opposed to the military intervention in Angola by the South African forces. My delegation, therefore, studied the draft resolution presented by the members of the non-aligned group and other members with the utmost sympathy. In considering the action to be taken, my delegation wanted to see the Council take a realistic and constructive course, taking fully into account the situation as it has developed, including the complete withdrawal of South African forces from Angola by 27 March. We suggested several alterations to the draft text along those lines, and we are indeed grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution for their understanding and co-operative attitude in accommodating some of our suggestions.

243. While my Government fully appreciates the position and the feeling of the people of Angola and the peoples of African States on this matter, as expressed in paragraph 1 of the resolution, my Government entertains reservations on the advisability of the Council's approving this paragraph at this time, with all its legal implications under Chapter VII of the Charter. My delegation regrets that an alteration suggested by some members of the Council, including my own country, was not accepted and that therefore my delegation was constrained to abstain.

244. I should like to address a few words to the representative of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola. The Government and people of Japan have high esteem for that country's untiring struggle for freedom and independence. We give our whole-hearted support to the realization of its aspirations for nation-building. We wish to confirm our firm intention to establish relations of friendship and

co-operation with the People's Republic of Angola, as was expressed in our prime Minister's message to the President of that Republic when he communicated the recognition of Angola by my Government.

245. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): My delegation abstained on the draft resolution contained in document S/12030, and I should like to explain why.

246. In my statement this afternoon I noted that my Government had consistently opposed all forms of external intervention. One such intervention, that of South Africa, is mentioned and rightly condemned in the draft we had before us. It is our view, however, that all foreign intervention in Angola is wrong and should be condemned. We therefore found the draft resolution unbalanced.

247. We welcome, of course, the reference in the third preambular paragraph to the principle of non-intervention as set out in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. We believe, however, that it would have been more logical if the text before us had applied this principle in its operative paragraphs. What is more, the juxtaposition of the immediately following paragraph, the fourth preambular paragraph, can be construed, and perhaps it is intended to be construed, as some kind of qualification of this important principle, a principle which in our view is subject to no qualification whatsoever.

248. Furthermore, a number of references are made throughout the text to South Africa's aggression against Angola. In my statement I condemned South Africa's military intervention in Angola, but South African troops have now withdrawn from the country. We take the view that it is not the Council's task to sit in judgement on what has happened in the past. Its role, as defined in the Charter, is the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security. To that extent we believe that some of the language in this text has now been overtaken by events.

249. We do not find the holding of an inquest by the Council to be a particularly profitable enterprise. We for our part would have found it more logical if the Council had insisted that all States should respect Angola's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. In other words, we should have preferred language that looked to the future rather than to the past.

250. I would add, with reference to the seventh preambular paragraph, that infringement of Angolan sovereignty from any departure point is reprehensible as far as we are concerned.

251. We find the language of paragraph 4 equally unsatisfactory. It does not meet our preoccupations, which are concerned as much with the general principle

underlying this paragraph as with the specific question to which it relates. The Security Council is not a court of law, nor is it the appropriate forum to determine questions of restitution and compensation for damages. As Article 36 of the Charter indicates, the Council should bear in mind, in our view, that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties concerned to the International Court of Justice. In saying this, we are in no way questioning what the Angolan representative has told us. There may well have been extensive damage to installations and equipment; there may well be grounds for claims for compensation; but we sincerely believe that the Security Council is not the right place for consideration of questions of that sort.

252. Members of the Council will know that some of us proposed an alternative text which would have overcome the difficulties that we see in the present text and, at the same time, would, in our view, have maintained its essential principles. I regret that no common position could be found.

253. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the most deserving effort made by the sponsors of the draft resolution to include in it the various elements which are characteristic of the situation that has been brought to the attention of the Council. My delegation has not been able, however, to its regret, to vote in favour of the text because, in its view, it was still very unbalanced. I must repeat what I said in my previous statement when referring to the declaration of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine member countries of the European Community on 23 February. France condemns all foreign military intervention in the domestic affairs of any State. In this connexion we would have wished to see the resolution of the Council take into account more objectively the circumstances which surrounded the birth of the People's Republic of Angola. In addition, we have reservations concerning the term "aggression" which is used twice in the text of the resolution and which is applied to a situation that now belongs to the past. What is more, we have doubts about whether it was timely to recall in the context that we are discussing and without precise juridical precautions a principle of assistance which may give rise to wrong interpretations. Finally, as has been pointed out by my colleague from the United Kingdom, the Security Council is not a court of justice and does not seem to us to be qualified to judge whether or not claims for damages are well founded.

254. For all these reasons, the delegation of France was not able to vote in favour of the draft resolution just adopted.

255. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I shall be brief, since I do not need to say much in order to explain the abstention of my delegation in the vote which has just taken place. Our position was defined this morning in my statement

[1905th meeting], a position consistent with the five basic principles contained in the declaration on Angola made by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine member countries of the European Community on 23 February, which I had the opportunity to read out to the Council.

256. In all fairness I wish to acknowledge with sincere appreciation the efforts made by the six sponsors of the revised text of the draft resolution in document S/12030 in order to meet some of the main points put forward by my delegation. We have noted, in fact, the introduction of some of the main principles for which we stand. But apart from the introduction in the text of a new preambular paragraph which had never been discussed in private consultations and which we had no time to study to determine whether it was consistent with the Charter, one of the essential elements for which we stand is still missing in the text. Besides, we feel that the text of the resolution has not been brought up to date with present realities.

257. For all these reasons the Italian delegation regrets that it was not in a position to support the final text submitted to the Council.

258. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to congratulate the sponsors of the draft resolution for the extremely arduous and difficult work they have done, although it may not satisfy certain countries. However, it seems to me that it is very close to satisfying the interests of the group of African countries which submitted that draft resolution. We can congratulate the People's Republic of Angola on the adoption of that text. It is the first time that the delegation of that country has appeared in the Security Council, and it is a very good sign that in the future it will be able to make its positive contribution to the work of the United Nations.

259. In connexion with certain statements made here in explanation of vote before the vote, I should like to say a few words which relate primarily to the statement of the representative of China, who repeated again everything that he had said earlier. Unfortunately the situation is that everyone here can speak and the representative of China can listen, but he still continues as if no one had ever said anything to him. Let us analyse the situation. I shall be very brief.

260. China once again is repeating its old thesis about the super-Powers fighting for zones, for spheres of influence, for the wealth of other countries, for bases and so on and so forth. I have already said that that is nonsense, because we do not need spheres of influence or bases or the wealth of other countries or anything else referred to by the Chinese representative. I think the United States can answer for itself, and I do not need to go into that.

261. At one time our country was considered weak. Preparations were made to divide it up, and maps

indicating which country was going to possess which region were already distributed. We were indeed weak after the Revolution. But now we are strong and we are called a super-Power. Well, can we be proud of that or not? Yes, I repeat, we can be proud that we are called a super-Power, because our strength and our resources are used not to the detriment of peoples but in favour of peace and in the interests of peoples. And let the representative of China say as much as he likes about that.

262. China does not number itself among the super-Powers. I apologize to everybody else here, but I simply cannot pass over this matter in silence. Let us look at what China is doing. In terms of territory it is a colossal country. In terms of armaments, the whole country has been converted into an armed camp. There are all kinds of bunkers and dug-outs everywhere. It produces more arms than almost any other country and it interferes literally in all affairs in every corner of the world—and here it accuses the two super-Powers of doing just that!

263. All the efforts of the Soviet Union in its contacts with other countries are aimed solely at preventing war, at preventing a new world war. But what is China doing? I do not have any quotations with me now but I shall produce them some other time for Mr. Huang Hua. All they talk about in China is preparations for war, about saving the world through war. After that, how can one take seriously his words about the super-Powers.

264. Now let us take Angola. Our African friends and the President of the Council requested us to confine our remarks to one question, namely, the question of the aggression of South Africa against Angola, and I really wanted to talk only about that. It wasn't I who started the polemics or who started talking about other things. I did not even answer all the points raised by the Chinese representative; I just spoke on what concerned South Africa.

265. Today we again heard that China ceased to help whoever it was helping in Angola even as far back as January last year. That is not true. If you really want to know, read the statement of Roberto Holden, who only recently said that the Chinese not only trained his gangs but even gave them arms. This happened not only in the past but also after all these agreements. So why, when in Angola a republic was proclaimed and an independent State founded—the People's Republic of Angola—did they not do anything to help that State? Why did they not come to its assistance? Why did they not help it to drive out the South African aggressors and their accomplices? Perhaps, if they had assumed this noble mission, Angola would have been delivered from its enemies more guidely. But when the People's Republic of Angola asked us for help, we gave that help. This is not news to you. For fifteen years before the formation of the People's Republic our country was giving help to the liberation movement in Angola.

266. Ninety-four States have recognized the People's Republic of Angola. Who here has not recognized it? China. These are your friends? No, you are not among friends. Just think about that; you still have time. You may forget your injury. Help the Africans put an end to colonialism forever, and then everyone will understand that you really are the people you say you are; but in fact this is not the case at all.

267. The Angolan people acted nobly recently by allowing the troops of South Africa quietly to leave the country. That was an extremely noble act, because the Angolan people could have used military means to drive them out and increased the number of human casualties. No, the People's Republic of Angola stated that it would adhere to a policy of non-intervention. This confirms its sovereignty and independence.

268. Can we agree that now the People's Republic of Angola is enjoying security? It is difficult to say that. Where did the South African troops go? Today here we heard dozens of times that they went to Namibia. And does Namibia belong to them? Is the frontier of Namibia with Angola really the Angolan frontier with South Africa? No, Namibia is a Territory which should be controlled by the United Nations until it receives independence. But who does control it? The racists, the colonialists. But you do not want to see that. Have you really condemned South Africa? In words, yes, but what do your actions confirm? You said that the aggression of South Africa came about because there were Soviet troops there. But you are lying. Tell lies if you want to, but do not expect to be believed. Did you listen to the statements of 20 or 30 delegates? Do you think when you speak, or not? We heartily recommend to you to think.

269. Our policy with regard to China is honourable and direct. Regardless of what policy is pursued now by China, regardless of what its representatives say in the United Nations, we want to normalize our relations with China because we respect the Chinese people. I myself have been in China. I have seen a great deal in China. I have met many political leaders who are still in office now.

270. At the twenty-fifth Congress of our Party General Secretary Brezhnev said with regard to China's policy:

“The policy of [China's] present leaders is openly directed against the majority of the socialist States. More, it merges directly with the position of the world's most extreme reaction—from the militarists and enemies of détente in the Western countries to the racists of South Africa and the fascist rulers of Chile. This policy is not only entirely alien to socialist principles and ideals, but has also, in effect, become an important aid to imperialism in its struggle against socialism.”

Well said, accurately said; you could not find a better statement. He added:

"Peking's frantic attempts to torpedo détente, to obstruct disarmament, to breed suspicion and hostility between states, its efforts to provoke a world war and reap whatever advantages may accrue, present a great danger for all peace-loving peoples."

271. This is undeniable. At some meeting or other I shall read out all the things you published and the speeches you made which you have not yet published. Such a policy on the part of Peking is fundamentally contradictory to the interests of the Chinese people and of all peoples, and we shall resist such incitement as a policy because we honestly, justly and willingly are fighting for peace, to prevent a new world war.

272. The discussion of the question of aggression by the Republic of South Africa against Angola and the position of the representatives of Peking in this matter have quite obviously confirmed the correctness of our assessment of the actions and policy of Peking which were analysed at the twenty-fifth Congress.

273. But as everyone knows, we were not and are not the initiators of polemics with you. Let us take the meetings of the General Assembly, of all the committees in the United Nations. It is always you, the Chinese, who start quarrelling. Is this really the place for an ideological struggle? We have other forums for that. Let us talk about that at those forums. As Mr. Baroody said, "Let us get together and talk." You do not want to talk or to listen. We have proposed to you that we conclude an agreement on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence, that we conclude a treaty on non-aggression. You refused to do that. You want to fight? Well, that's your affair.

274. Our policy with regard to China has been very clearly defined and confirmed by the twenty-fifth Party Congress. We stated and we continue to state that the Soviet Union is ready to normalize relations with China on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. Comrade Brezhnev said:

"We can say with assurance that if Peking returns to a policy truly based on Marxism—Leninism, if it abandons its hostile policy towards the socialist countries and takes the road to co-operation and solidarity with the socialist world, there will be an appropriate response from our side and opportunities will open up for developing good relations between the USSR and the People's Republic of China consonant with the principles of socialist internationalism. The matter rests with the Chinese side."

275. In conclusion, I should like to say on my own behalf that the Americans had a very clever President, President Lincoln. He said some good things, and I should like to recall for you today: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time". You will soon realize this.

276. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): I do not know if I am one of those who can be fooled all the time, but having voted in favour of this draft resolution, it is probably not necessary for me to explain my vote, especially as at this late hour I cannot muster the passionate eloquence of the preceding speaker. However, I thought that one or two words might be in order.

277. We voted in favour of this draft because we think that it contains nothing to which we can raise any objection. On the contrary, everything that is said in it meets with our approval and our endorsement.

278. We think that when the military forces of one country invade another, for whatever reason or with whatever excuse, that is aggression, and we do not believe that the Security Council should be chary of calling a spade a spade. We do not have to dress up the facts in needless euphemisms.

279. It has been stated that this is not a court of law, that we cannot demand compensation. I do not think that the Council has set down the amount of the compensation or the manner in which it should be paid and so on. This is the duty of a court of law. We are here a political body; we have taken cognizance of the fact that South African forces went into the territory of Angola, went a great way into it and occupied it for a period of time. And I think that that fact alone, irrespective of the damage they may or may not have done or the extent of the damage they may have done, calls for compensation. We have had no trouble whatsoever on that score.

280. On the substance of the matter that has been under discussion, I had the opportunity to state my views in the Council this morning [1905th meeting] and my friends and colleagues are aware of my views from the discussions they allowed me to have with them in the lobbies. We welcome the independence of Angola, for which its people have fought so hard.

281. I said that I should be lacking in frankness—and I say it again—if I did not express our concern at the role of foreign intervention in the outcome, an outcome which in any case was predetermined by history. There was no doubt whatsoever that Angola was on the road to freedom and that the time for freedom had come. But we must express, and we did express, our disquiet at the introduction of foreign military forces into the situation. We are very grateful to our friends and colleagues with whom, in the short period that we have been on the Council, we have worked on other issues. We appreciate the hearing they gave us. We indeed appreciate the account they took of our views, and I am particularly appreciative of the fact that in the third preambular paragraph some of the concern that I expressed to the sponsors on behalf of my delegation has been taken care of. Yet we feel that the draft resolution as a whole, while it is appropriate, apt and opportune in every way, does not deal with the situation which prevailed in Angola in all



its complexity and totality. Had it been otherwise, my delegation would have been honoured, as we have been in other cases, to be a sponsor of this draft. I am offering this word of explanation not to explain why we voted in favour of the draft resolution but why we were unable to sponsor it.

282. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no more speakers who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

283. The representative of Angola has asked to speak and I now call on him.

284. Mr. LUVUALU (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): The work of the meeting is coming to an end. I feel it is my duty to thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council, as well as all the delegations of friendly countries who have helped us in the objective analysis of this problem. My delegation will take away with it very good memories of the cohesion of the African Group when it found itself presented with a just cause such as the one which the Council has just examined. All have fulfilled their duties. However, I want to thank all members of the African Group. I leave feeling comforted, for the cause of the liberation and unity of Africa is in good hands.

285. Throughout this debate we have remained calm, even when some statements sounded like encroachments on our sovereignty. In the People's Republic of Angola we have great respect for the Security Council and all other bodies of the United Nations. However, allow me to say to you, Mr. President, that my country, which has lived through a long colonial night, holds its independence dear. The help from friendly socialist countries, and more particularly from Cuba, was supplied at our request so that we could face the aggression of which my country was a victim. That request therefore was made by my country in full sovereignty. The people of Angola know the extent of this aid and the time when it can bring it to an end. I wanted to specify this point.

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

287. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. President, I asked to speak for a few moments although I realize that the hour is late and the work of the Council is nearly complete. But having, on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations, requested you to call a meeting of the Council, I would be failing in my duty if I did not take a few moments to express my thanks to you personally and to the other members of the Council for taking up the question of South African aggression against Angola and for having taken so much time and effort to see the work completed. I should like formally to thank the Council and also all those who have given support in their statements

before the Council and particularly those who have finally found it possible to give visible support through their votes. I should also like to express thanks on behalf of the African Group to those who, although supporting in their statements the issue before the Council, found it difficult to give support with their votes. Even if we do not agree in every detail with their preoccupations, we do take note of their difficulties, whether expressed or not.

288. There have been plenty of statements here about a balanced resolution. We have also noted that preoccupation with balance in resolutions. In this connexion, I should only like to say that while we continue to be preoccupied here with balanced statements and balanced resolutions, the problems which the African continent faces remain. They will not be solved by balanced statements; they will be solved only by concrete actions.

289. We are particularly grateful to those who, while not supporting the draft resolution, at least refrained from using the ultimate weapon in this chamber: the veto. We are grateful the veto was not used. Of course, we would have liked them to vote in favour, but at least they studiously avoided a negative vote.

290. This has been a long day. Many questions have been asked, both outside and within this chamber, about why it was necessary for us to proceed with the debate even after the announcements that appeared in the press on Saturday. I would say, on my behalf and on behalf of the African Group, that the debate has been useful; a number of issues have been clarified and all those who wanted to make their positions clear have had an opportunity to do so.

291. I must admit that not everything has been made clear. For some reason—partly, I would hope, because of our original appeal that the debate not be widened—a number of questions have still not been answered. It is our belief that if all the remaining questions had been answered, we would have found ourselves in a different situation this evening. Certainly the historians, who do not have to observe the diplomatic niceties, will reveal what their studies tell them about the situation we have been discussing. As diplomats at this table, we have answered those questions that we dared answer, but there are other questions that we dared not answer.

292. Because of the diplomatic niceties we have had to observe, we had the representative of South Africa making firm declarations here, which we noted, but unfortunately he did not take the opportunity to come here and listen to some things which we would have said had he been here but which we did not want to say simply for the record. South Africa knows our position, and we know South Africa's position, from its statements.

293. One fact cannot be avoided. While all this has been going on, a sovereign State—Angola—has been



born. So whatever may be the subject of our concern in the discussions here, we must not overlook the fact that another important State of the African continent has been born. Some who have expressed reservations, who have opposed this or that, may not like the way the sovereign State of Angola was born, but the fact is that Angola was born. It is like the situation when our wives go to the maternity wards and we wait patiently for the birth of a child, hoping that everything will be normal. Whether we are told that our child was born in a normal way or that the doctor was forced to perform a Caesarean operation, we rejoice in the birth—although we may regret some aspects of the operation.

294. We do hope that the State of Angola will soon join us as a Member of the Organization, taking its rightful place and contributing to the welfare of the people of Angola as a whole. All these preoccupations will have no meaning in the future; they will be forgotten if—as we trust—the State of Angola joins us with no further complications.

295. In conclusion I should like to say once again that we are very thankful that this debate has come to an end and that a positive resolution on the subject has been adopted. The passing feelings and arguments not really connected with this debate will be forgotten. I hope, however, that one of the most important interventions in this debate, an intervention concerning two super-Powers, will come to the Council or some other forum for friendly discussion, so that we shall not have to see the work of the Council and other United Nations organs constantly interrupted when we should be directing ourselves to the issues so that peaceful solutions may be obtained.

296. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Cuba wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

297. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize for speaking again. I assure members that it had not been my desire to return to this table, particularly at this time of night. However, I must do so because of the statement made by one of the members of the Council. In that respect I should like to make some brief observations.

298. In the first place, I wish to take this opportunity to clarify a situation which could be confusing if in the future we read the verbatim record of the meeting held on Monday afternoon [1902nd meeting], when I spoke and, among other things, quoted part of the statement made by the representative of China as it appeared in the Spanish verbatim record. I am referring to that part of the statement by the representative of China in which he affirmed, according to the Spanish version of the record, that what he called the Soviet intervention and what he described as the Soviet mercenaries justified the subsequent intervention by South Africa.

299. When the representative of China replied to me on that occasion he accused me of having altered his words. Subsequently, in examining the English and French versions of the verbatim record in which the Chinese statement appears [1900th meeting], I found that indeed a change had been made in this relation between socialist solidarity with Angola and the South African intervention, and in the future it could appear as if we had changed his words. I repeat that we were going by the Spanish text, in which those who know that language will be able to see that the Chinese quotation keeps appearing in the form in which I used it. Apparently, someone modified that text in the English and French versions and we have no objection to that. However, so that it may be clear that we are not inventing any position for China, I should like to put on record a brief reference to an article published by the New China News Agency, Hsinhua, on 21 March last in bulletin no. 44, which was given ample distribution in this building. In one section of that statement distributed by the New China News Agency, which has been neither modified nor retracted—I have it here in my possession—and which was published by the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations, we read the following:

“Before the scheduled independence day there were no imperialist troops in Angola; but large numbers of Soviet military personnel forced their way in.”\*

It continues more or less along the same lines, claiming that South Africa had intervened in Angola using as an excuse a supposed prior Soviet intervention. Today we have once again heard references to the so-called Cuban mercenaries in Angola.

300. On an earlier occasion I drew the Council's attention to this little red book containing quotations of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Among others, the one I mentioned recommended to Chinese militants that they try not to let their positions and expressions be confused with the positions and attitudes of the enemy. By “enemy” is meant, of course, imperialism and reactionary forces, among others.

301. I am compelled to read out some other very brief quotations from this little book. One of them reads as follows:

“He who declares himself for the revolutionary people is a revolutionary. He who sides with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism is a counter-revolutionary. He who sides with the revolutionary people in word only but not in deed is a revolutionary in word only. He who sides with the revolutionary people in deed as well as in word is a revolutionary in the fullest sense of the word.”

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

302. I was under the impression that in these Security Council debates there was interpretation into Chinese. Apparently that was not the case, for had it been so, perhaps our colleague from China would have been able to learn something from this debate, which has at least served to identify for the peoples of Africa who their friends are and who their enemies are—who are their nominal friends and who are their friends in word and deed.

303. In any event, like the author of this book and the author of the foreword to this edition, I realize that it is not always easy to assimilate revolutionary thought. Indeed, part of the foreword reads as follows:

“To assimilate effectively the thought of Mao Tse-tung it is necessary to study over and over again the many basic concepts of Chairman Mao. It is advisable to memorize his key sentences, study them and apply them repeatedly.”

304. Frankly, I apologize if perhaps the quotation I made on Monday—and the one I have just read now—was a bit too long to be learned by heart so that the Chinese delegation could assimilate and apply it. So before concluding, I wish to dedicate one to you which is brief enough to be memorized. I shall read it at dictation speed so that perhaps this time I will be more successful with this short sentence than with the previous ones: “We must support everything that the enemy fights and oppose everything that the enemy supports.”

305. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of China, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

306. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In his statement just now, the Soviet representative levelled vicious slanders against China in a shameless defence of Soviet aggression, intervention and contention for world hegemony. He asserted that China was a super-Power which is preparing for war and does not support the national liberation movements. These are out-and-out lies. The Chinese Government and people have always firmly supported the peoples of Africa and the world in opposing racism, colonialism and hegemonism. The Chinese and African peoples have forged profound friendship in their protracted common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. The sabotage and sowing of discord by the Soviet representative can only be futile.

307. The Soviet representative slandered China as a super-Power. This is a preposterous fabrication. China is a developing socialist country belonging to the third world. Today, China does not have a single soldier or base abroad. China has long declared to the whole world that it will never be a super-Power. Should China really become a super-Power in the future, the third world countries and peoples could

join the Chinese people in opposing it, because it would be unfavourable to the people of China and the rest of the world if China should become a super-Power.

308. The Soviet Union was once a socialist State, but since the late 1950s, it has restored capitalism internally and has engaged in ceaseless expansion abroad. As pointed out by Lenin, it is socialism in words and imperialism in deeds. Therefore, it is called social-imperialism. How many troops does the Soviet Union station abroad, and how many bases does it have abroad? What is the purpose in unleashing your planes and warships to run amok everywhere? And how do you explain the fact that the diplomats you send out have been exposed as spies and expelled by many countries? Are these facts not clear to everyone?

309. The Soviet representative asserted that China is belligerent. This is nonsense. To be sure, China has repeatedly explained to the people of the world that so long as imperialism exists in the world, there exists the danger of war. This is what Lenin taught us. Of course, this will never be said by the traitors of Leninism. Loyal to Marxism and Leninism, China has repeatedly told the people of the world: At present, factors for both revolution and war are increasing and the danger of war is growing. Soviet social-imperialism is the major source of danger. The people of the world must maintain their vigilance against this, otherwise they will suffer. It will be possible to delay the outbreak of war if the people of the world are fully prepared. This is precisely the reason why the Chinese people are building up their preparedness against war so as to oppose any aggressive war.

310. The Soviet representative never stops trumpeting the so-called détente, claiming that it has become a major irreversible trend. Is that really the case? In fact, you are engaging in continuous arms expansion in preparation for launching aggressive wars. Why do you manufacture such a large number of nuclear weapons? Can these weapons be used for food? Since you do not have enough grain for food, you are desperately buying huge amounts of grain abroad, leading to a sharp rise in the price of grain. All this is caused by the fact that you have turned your national economy into a war-oriented one. The so-called détente that you advertise is merely for the purpose of deceiving the people and covering up your war preparations. The gross national product of the Soviet Union amounts to only slightly more than one half that of the other super-Power, but its real military expenditure has surpassed that of the other super-Power. The number of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles has increased 14-fold within ten years. In the Khrushchev days, the nuclear strategy was strongly advocated. Now you have turned to the simultaneous and intensified development of conventional weapons. Your annual production of aircraft, tanks and guns has surpassed that of the other super-Power. The number of your warships has almost doubled in ten years,

and the total strength of your armed forces has reached 4,200,000 men. Isn't all this for the purpose of contending with the other super-Power for spheres of influence and world hegemony? What else?

311. The Soviet Union has deployed in Europe three fourths of its total armed forces and two thirds of its medium-range ballistic missiles and is continuously renewing its arms and equipment. It is building up its military deployment on the southern and northern flanks of Europe in preparation for out-flanking Western Europe and launching a pincer attack against it.

312. In their contention in the Middle East, the Soviet Union and the other super-Power confronted each other with daggers drawn and reached the point of touch-and-go during the October war of 1973. Subsequently, they were engaged in fierce diplomatic and political contention and competed with each other in large-scale weapons sales, leaving the Middle East situation in constant tension.

313. The Soviet Union has sent large fleets into the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, trying by every possible means to seize military bases. It energetically advertises an Asian security system for the purpose of infiltrating the Asian countries and filling the so-called vacuum areas left behind by the other super-Power after its withdrawal. In Africa, the Soviet Union is likewise feverishly engaged in infiltration, control and aggression. The events in Angola are the latest proof. The events in Egypt are another. Your intervention, control and subversion have compelled Egypt to expel over 10,000 Soviet experts. Recently, Egypt was compelled to terminate the so-called Egyptian-Soviet treaty of friendship and co-operation in order to safeguard its sovereignty and independence.

314. These facts have fully demonstrated that while advertising sham détente, Soviet social-imperialism is actually preparing for war. The so-called irreversibility of détente and materialization of détente etc. which they have fabricated are nothing but deceptive talk.

315. The Soviet representative also has the audacity to talk about the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. This is entirely aimed at deceiving the Soviet people and the people of the world. The basic thinking behind the Soviet strategy is still to attack in the West while making a feint in the East. The Chinese people and the Soviet people are friends, and we have hope in the Soviet people. We are convinced that the Soviet people will one day take their destiny into their own hands and will certainly sweep this super-Power's hegemonism into the dustbin of history.

316. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I am in a very difficult position. It is 12.10 a.m. now, and, strictly speaking, I am no longer President of the Council. So I am really wondering what I should do, because I have no experience of such matters. Would it not be right for my successor to take my place? I should like to pass the presidency to him. I do not know what is the appropriate thing to do. I even wonder whether I can give the floor to anyone.

317. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): If anyone asks for the floor, I suggest that the representative of Benin continue to preside, so that our work may be smoothly concluded.

318. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): On a point of order, Mr. ex-President, this is, with respect, not just a laughing matter and a silly point. There has been one occasion since I have been on the Council when it was indeed quite important that the presidency should change at the appropriate time. The rule is quite specific Mr. ex-President, you ceased to be President at midnight. It would seem that the proper thing for us to do is adjourn for a matter of perhaps five minutes, or for a sufficient period of time to allow the nameplates to be changed and the representative of China to assume the presidency. As I say, the rule is specific. I can imagine occasions on which it would be extremely important that the presidency should change at midnight on the appropriate day. Therefore, if I might, I would suggest that we do precisely that.

319. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I will be 100 times briefer than a previous speaker who will soon be Council President. I take his whole speech as an April Fool's joke on the part of the new President.

320. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think we should proceed as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom and suspend the meeting. However, as no representative has asked for the floor, the meeting is adjourned.

*The meeting rose on Thursday, 1 April, at 12.15 a.m.*

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> A/AC.115/L.430, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 721, p. 324.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 21, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2434th meeting.

<sup>6</sup> See resolution 387 (1976).

---

**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.

---