



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2693  
18 June 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 18 June 1986, at 3 p.m.

|                   |   |   |
|-------------------|---|---|
| <u>President:</u> | Mr. RABETAFIKA  | (Madagascar)  |
| <u>Members:</u>   | Australia<br>Bulgaria<br>China<br>Congo<br>Denmark<br>France<br>Ghana<br>Thailand<br>Trinidad and Tobago<br>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics<br>United Arab Emirates<br>United Kingdom of Great Britain and<br>Northern Ireland<br>United States of America<br>Venezuela | Mr. WOOLDETT<br>Mr. ISVETKOV<br>Mr. HUANG Jiahua<br>Mr. GAYAMA<br>Mr. BIERRING<br>Mr. de KEMOULARIA<br>Mr. DUMEVI<br>Mr. KASEMSARN<br>Mr. ALLEYNE<br>Mr. SAFRONCHUK<br>Mr. AL-SHAALI<br><br>Mr. MAXEY<br>Mr. OKUN<br>Mr. PABON GARCIA |

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

\*ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

COMPLAINT BY ANGOLA AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 12 JUNE 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ANGOLA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18148)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at the 2692nd meeting, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Velazco San Jose (Cuba), Mr. Richter (German Democratic Republic), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Skofenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam), Mr. Ludunge Kadahi Chiri-Mwami (Zaire) and Mr. Mfula (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of India, Mongolia and Czechoslovakia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite

(The President)

those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr Krishnan (India), Mr. Nyamboo  
(Mongolia) and Mr. Kovacic (Czechoslovakia) took the places reserved for them at  
the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/18163, which sets forth the text of a draft resolution sponsored by Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates.

I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/18167, which contains the text of a letter dated 17 June 1986 from the Permanent Representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

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

Mr. KOVACIC (Czechoslovakia): First of all, I wish to thank the members of the Security Council for allowing our delegation to speak at this meeting and to address the question under consideration.

I also wish to congratulate you, Sir, upon your accession to the office of President of the Security Council. Your country is well known for its active support of the national liberation movement, for its struggle to prevent interference in the internal affairs of African nations, for the development of relations among States, for peace and disarmament and for the security of nations. I am convinced that your experience, wisdom and principled action in implementing the policy of your country will make an effective contribution to the Security Council's discharge of its duties and that under your leadership the work of the Council will be successful.

I should also like to express appreciation of the work of your predecessor in office, Ambassador Gbeho, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Ghana, which was characterized by competence, objectivity and responsibility.

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

The memory of the Security Council's deliberations on the aggression by South Africa against three front-line States is still fresh, and the Council is already discussing yet another act of aggression committed by South Africa. This time it is an attack on the port of Namibe and upon unarmed merchant ships of the Soviet Union and Cuba in that port. This act constitutes a further degree in the escalation of the violence prohibited in international relations. The racist régime has expanded its aggressiveness to other countries. The threat to peace and security, not only on the African continent but world wide, has increased. The aggressive terrorist act of the apartheid régime that is now being discussed has once again confirmed the correctness of the conclusion that the policy of apartheid poses a lasting danger, in terms of both domestic and foreign policy, and that, as such, it is incompatible with the norms of international law. The aggressiveness, terrorism and destabilization pursued by Pretoria serve as the main instruments of that inadmissible policy, which has been sharply criticized and rejected by the relevant organs of the United Nations. Such conclusions of United Nations organs are even followed by new threats against neighbouring countries by the racist régime. In other cases, United Nations decisions are viewed as a threat to the stability and development of all of southern Africa.

In this connection, it is only natural to ask how Pretoria can dare act in this way. We join the numerous delegations that see the roots of that attitude in the practical support provided South Africa by certain imperialist States. To be more precise, the apartheid régime is well aware of the military, political, economic and ideological interests of imperialism in southern Africa. That is why it is absolutely sure of substantial support from imperialism, through both governmental and non-governmental channels. Sufficient evidence of the close relations between imperialism and apartheid is contained in factual United Nations documentation. No wonder those imperialist States with the strongest interests in

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

such relations have been trying to divert attention from South Africa and to prevent the adoption of measures that would compel the apartheid régime to respect the legitimate interests of the nations of southern Africa.

We regard the imposition against South Africa of effective sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter as one such measure. However, we have no illusions about the possibility of such sanctions being adopted. The growing financial and strategic involvement of the United States and Great Britain in South Africa will undoubtedly result, now as before, in a veto of proposals for the adoption of such sanctions. On the other hand, such an approach gives the international community and each of its members the right to put in the pillory, beside the Administration in South Africa, the Administrations of the United States and the United Kingdom.

An important part of the United States overall approach to the developing world is embodied in the concept of assistance. United States strategists see the advantage of that concept in separating economic and technical penetration from state-based forms of domination. The granting of such assistance is based on the benefits it may bring in strengthening the United States: that is, the granting of such assistance is designed to assist the donor itself.

An extraordinarily telling example of such assistance is given by the practical involvement of the United States in the activities of UNITA, whose evil practices are known to Czechoslovakia. For example, in 1983, that group, in an act of banditry, abducted 64 Czechoslovak citizens - 28 men, 17 women and 21 children from 2 to 15 years of age - from Alto Catumbela in Angola. Our citizens had gone to Angola to help build that developing country and thereby secure its independence from any external Power. No wonder that co-operation was a thorn in the flesh of those who have a different model of assistance and who have not reconciled themselves to Angola's struggle for true independence. Not only did UNITA's

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

terrorist action halt the work of the aforementioned Czechoslovak nations designed to provide development aid; it also exposed our citizens to physical and psychological pressure for almost a year. Thirty-seven-year-old Jaroslav Navratil, who had helped to build, in Alto Catumbela, a paper and pulp mill, one of the most sophisticated complexes of its kind on the African continent, fell victim to that deliberate and gangster-like act. UNITA terrorists virtually pushed Jaroslav Navratil to his death. The detained Czechoslovak citizens suffered from parasitic diseases, pneumonia and joint and liver disorders. Some of them contracted malaria.

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

Having had that experience, the Czechoslovak people asks how the United States Administration dares to speak about human rights in other countries when, through its policy of constructive engagement, it shares in the blame, among other things, for terrorizing people, which resulted, inter alia, in the death of the father of two children, aged 15 and 8 years.

There is only one explanation: the double dealing of United States representatives, which has had a long tradition in this country. For example, the same pens that signed the Declaration of Independence also signed agreements for the purchase of slaves. Another case in point which illustrates such practices is the political declarations and the actual deeds of President Lincoln, who was quoted by the representative of the United States in connection with human rights. Warning memorials of this hypocritical policy can be found in numerous places in the United States.

Our delegation reaffirms its condemnation of all forms of direct or indirect co-operation with the South African régime and with the bands that disrupt peaceful development in the front-line States. The countries and nations in southern Africa must feel effective support on the part of the United Nations in their legitimate struggle against the aggressiveness of South Africa and against oppression and racial discrimination, a struggle which is aimed at the true elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Security Council should continue to seek ways and means of taking effective action to improve the situation in southern Africa until a just settlement of relations is achieved in that part of the world.

Our delegation strongly demands that the Security Council adopt concrete measures aimed at eliminating the aggressiveness of South Africa, preventing subversive acts by South Africa designed to undermine conditions for the social

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

development of the front-line States and the promotion of humanitarian and other assistance granted by a number of United Nations Member States to the front-line States which are confronted with the rejected policy of the apartheid régime.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic resolutely condemns the terrorist act committed by South Africa in the Angolan port of Namibe and demands that the aggressor provide compensation for the damage caused. Czechoslovakia also calls upon those States that have until now given the apartheid régime assistance - assistance also given in the United Nations - to abandon that dangerous policy. Indeed, the experience gained so far shows that that policy directly encourages the apartheid régime to escalate further its aggressiveness beyond the borders of South Africa.

In conclusion, I feel compelled to respond to the statement made by the representative of the United States, who mentioned my country. I agree that the year 1968 entered the history of Czechoslovakia as a year of invasion: an invasion of agents and subversive elements, mostly directly financed by the United States. Their aim was to change the social system in Czechoslovakia to conform to the ideas of imperialist circles. The calculations of those subverters were wrong: they did not take into consideration the force stemming from the experience of the Czechoslovak people during the period of capitalist development of the country. Our peoples did not give up the certainties gained under socialism, and that invasion of the subverters thus ended in a fiasco.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for his kind words about my country and about me personally.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, my delegation is most pleased to see you presiding over the Security Council for this month. Your experience and great courtesy have always been of benefit to us and, at the same time, have always commanded the respect due you as an outstanding diplomat.

Very close relations unite our two Missions, just as they do our respective countries - the Congo and Madagascar - in the solidarity with which they strive for the liberation of the African continent, in particular its southern part from the scourge of apartheid, which justifies the full confidence that we have in you at this decisive moment in the history of South Africa.

Furthermore, Sir, you have succeeded another distinguished representative of Africa, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, whose effective discharge of the functions of President last month won our esteem and admiration.

We are at an indeed decisive moment, characterized by the conjunction of such major events as the commemoration of the Soweto massacre on 16 June 1976 and the opening in Paris, last Monday, of the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, on the one hand, and the development of the struggle within that country, with the unprecedented awareness of the international community, of the moral challenge posed by the system of apartheid, on the other.

One would have thought that, in order to meet this situation which is becoming more untenable each day, the neo-Nazi racist minority in power in Pretoria might commit itself courageously to acceding to the aspirations of the great majority of the South African people, which enjoy the support of the international community. But that is to misunderstand the situation. In its essence as in its manifestations, apartheid is not, nor can it be anything other than, a phenomenon devoid of any positive aspects. It is an evil in itself.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Apartheid cannot be conceived or maintained without oppression and tyranny. The number of victims that have fallen under the bullets of the police and army of the racist régime has reached almost 2,000 over the past year and a half. The existence of the apartheid system is conditioned upon injustice, necessary for its development, and upon violence and hatred, useful to justify it. It is a system based on illegality and the denial of law; it feeds on the unending flow of the blood of its victims, which waters its parched structures and is its very reason for existence.

Thus the apartheid system operates entirely by scheming and bad faith. Its manifestations are intimidation and assassination, aggression and terror.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The attack of 5 June on the People's Republic of Angola follows that logic, which was responsible for the unwarranted provocations in May against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

It is almost a year to the day since the apartheid régime launched a commando raid against the Angolan province of Cabinda, in the extreme north of that country. It should be emphasized that all the aggressions and the violations of Angola's territorial integrity have taken place even while Pretoria's troops have been occupying, as they have for many years, the southern part of Angola, which they have attacked without provocation since 1978. That does not include their involvement alongside UNITA in 1975 in the war for Angola's liberation, which was done in disregard of the elementary principle of respect for States' sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, which it is the duty of all States to observe.

Those occupation troops strove to bring about, through the UNITA puppets, the destabilization of the legal Angolan authorities, a goal that they have had great difficulty in realizing, despite their powerful support for the traitor Jonas Savimbi, their ally.

All of that has happened as if, being incapable of having the slightest credibility within its own borders, the racist Power had found an easy way out by gaining a few Pyrrhic victories outside the country. It could thus integrate itself within the strategy of what is described as the anti-communist struggle, in order to gain for itself, at little cost, some semblance of recognition and respectability.

It is clear that in carrying out its aggression against the port of Namibe, even damaging ships of third countries, South Africa is seeking to balance its renewed apartheid policy, a threat to international peace and security, against the support and good will of certain Powers, through "constructive engagement" or declared opposition to all forms of sanctions against it.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The Congolese Government has always said that it is fallacious and dangerous for States worthy of the name to turn the policy of aggression against other States into a principle of normal conduct in international relations.

The fact that Angola's political institutions are not to Pretoria's liking in no way gives Pretoria a mission to attack or occupy Angola - or, for that matter, any other front-line State. State terrorism is an odious policy, and Congo has always condemned it, in keeping with the norms and principles of international law.

South Africa has for long benefited from the immobility of the international community, and especially the Security Council, thus carrying out at will its policy of apartheid and aggression against its neighbours, as well as its illegal occupation of Namibia. The negative vote often cast by certain permanent members of the Council, which has meant that the apartheid régime has had no cause for concern, has always had in Pretoria the effect that it was bound to have - open encouragement to persist in its policy and its actions, even though they have been condemned by most Governments and by public opinion in most countries. The Security Council has already issued repeated warnings to Pretoria. Is it not time to act?

At this decisive stage in the struggle of the South African people to eradicate apartheid, all the peoples of the world, in whose name the United Nations Charter sets out its principles, have taken an unambiguous position. All that is needed to speed the end of the tragedy suffered by the South African and Namibian peoples and the front-line countries is the determination of some countries, including the most powerful ones, to end economic, military and political support for South Africa.

The decision that it is open for the Council to take now, as set out in the draft resolution, of which my delegation is a sponsor, could usher in for South

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Africa and the whole of southern Africa in general a new era, whose main beneficiaries would be international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Congo for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. KASEMSARN (Thailand): On behalf of the Thai delegation, I wish to join other delegations in extending to you, Sir, my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. We are delighted to see a true son of Africa, whose proven ability, wisdom and diplomatic skill are well recognized, presiding over the Council's work for this month. Allow me also to convey my delegation's deep appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho of Ghana, for his diplomatic skill and the exemplary manner in which he conducted the Council's business last month.

My delegation listened with concern to the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Angola, who appeared before the Council for the fifth time in the past 12 months as a result of South Africa's continued and premeditated acts of aggression against his country.

The latest naval attack on the Angolan port of Namibe on 5 June, destroying merchant ships, fuel and port installations, came only three weeks after South Africa's armed aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe. It demonstrated the intransigence and arrogance of the Pretoria régime as well as its lack of respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and norms of international law.

On 3 October 1993 I told the Council that

"any foreign occupation and violation by one country of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another country constitutes a gross violation of international law and the United Nations Charter." (S/PV. 2612, p. 42)

(Mr. Kasemsarn, Thailand)

South Africa deserves to be condemned by the world community, not only for its latest act of aggression against the Angolan port of Namibe, but, even more, for its continued occupation of Namibia and the presence of its troops on Angolan soil. In the light of the continuing situation in South Africa, the Pretoria régime also deserves to be condemned for its policy of apartheid, which is the root cause that has exacerbated the tension and conflicts in the southern African region.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that stronger measures by the international community are required to convince the Pretoria régime that aggression does not pay and that its repugnant policy of apartheid must end if it wishes to live in peace with its neighbours.

The Thai delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Thailand for the kind words he addressed to me.

Members of the Council have received a copy of the text of a communication from His Excellency Mr. Allan Wagner, Foreign Minister of Peru and President of the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, which is now meeting in Paris. That communication will be published tomorrow as a Security Council document S/18168.

Mr. PABON GARCIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset I should like to express the great pleasure of the delegation of Venezuela at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the work of the Security Council this month. Your long experience, your dedication and your devotion to the United Nations and its principles guarantee that you will conduct the affairs of the Council successfully.

My delegation would also like sincerely to congratulate Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, Permanent Representative of Ghana, on the wise and effective manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council last month.

The delegation of Venezuela cannot fail to speak as the Council considers yet another complaint by Angola, against the most recent aggression by South Africa. This is one more act of aggression to be added to the long and apparently endless list of acts of aggression and State terrorism committed by the racist régime against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the front-line States.

The attack of 5 June 1986 in Namibe against port installations, oil depots and vessels belonging to countries friendly with the People's Republic of Angola took place a few weeks after open acts of aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe in open violation of the elementary norms of international law and the resolutions of the Security Council and in undisguised defiance of world public opinion, which is constantly demanding that the Pretoria authorities put an end to the real causes of all the problems of that part of the world: the system of apartheid.

Although it might seem that everything has already been said about apartheid, the continuation of a régime of that kind, which is an affront to human dignity and a violation of fundamental human rights, forces us repeatedly and tirelessly to state how abominable, intolerable and hateful that régime truly is.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

As a result of the obstinate, perverse and cynical actions of the minority racist régime of South Africa and its policies of internal repression and external aggression, the situation in southern Africa is becoming worse day by day, and South Africa represents an increasing threat to peace and security in that part of the world.

The rebellion and virtual civil war that exists in South Africa as a result of its policies of bloody internal repression has taken the form of acts of aggression against neighbouring countries in vain attempts to justify beyond its borders the racial discrimination and the abject system of apartheid prevailing within its own territory.

At the beginning of this week, in South Africa and throughout the world, another anniversary of the Soweto massacre was commemorated. The declaration of a state of emergency and the restrictions placed on the media could not prevent the black people from commemorating the date peacefully, nor could it prevent the world from receiving information about events called subversive or the deaths that occurred as a result of repression.

But the oppressed people of South Africa are not alone in their struggle. The World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa is now being held in Paris. Recently too there have been meetings on an arms and oil embargo, and soon the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia will take place in Vienna.

For my delegation it is at the very least disappointing that the Council has not yet been able to impose sanctions or apply effective measures against a Government that so brazenly, repeatedly and persistently violates the Charter, the principles governing relations among States and the rights of all citizens.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

We firmly reiterate our belief that the time has come to apply enforcement action - effective action that will without delay lead to a change in the conduct of the Pretoria Government and the dismantling and eradication of apartheid.

The international community, with very few and regrettable exceptions, agrees that more effective action must be taken against South Africa. Appeals are not enough; nor are negotiations or compromises, though they might be called constructive - for the régime will no longer heed even its allies. All efforts, though made with the best of intentions, have yielded not the slightest result. Now there must be binding sanctions in accordance with the provisions of the Organization's Charter.

We have recently all too frequently heard that the application of binding sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII is not advisable, because that could delay the efforts being made by the racist régime. Frankly, that régime deserves not the slightest credibility, especially since, while it promises a dialogue with the black majority, it persecutes their genuine leaders even outside its borders and does not cease its acts of aggression against neighbours.

Furthermore it is also argued that binding sanctions would have an impact mainly on most of the black population of South Africa and would indirectly damage the weak economies of neighbouring sovereign States. But it is obvious that the defenders of the dispossessed and the weak are precisely those with the greatest economic investments in South Africa.

Recently, 12 votes in this Council contradicted that singular excessive zeal. Regrettably, two vetoes confirmed it. A clear minority does not seem to understand that the human person and the desire for freedom are more important than commercial advantage or economic profit.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

My delegation is confident that on this occasion the draft resolution (S/18163) will obtain favourable votes from all the members of the Council. The attacks, the armed invasions and violations by South Africa of the territory, territorial waters and airspace of Angola and the military occupation of part of its territory, even with the establishment of so-called linkage and conditions, and the use of the territory of Namibia as a launching pad, must not go unpunished. Hence we must condemn them as vigorously as possible. They are deeds that must receive due punishment. The imposition of selective economic or other sanctions would be an appropriate first step towards forcing that régime to abandon the apartheid system, and would contribute to the establishment of peace and stability in the region. In this respect the recent recommendations by the Group of Eminent Persons of the British Commonwealth are most important.

If draft resolutions continue to be vetoed in the Council and those adopted continue to be ignored; if the South African régime continues to follow its wayward policies with the support of its allies; if there is no real desire to isolate South Africa, to force it to respect the standards of international life and to put an end to apartheid - then it should not come as a surprise if the oppressed majority uses other means to express its desire to survive, to change the inferior status assigned to it by South Africa.

Venezuela is proud and honoured to continue participating in the process of decolonization mankind has undertaken. We have uninterruptedly and impartially supported the noble cause of the peoples of Africa.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

So long as the apartheid régime continues to exist, and until the desire for an independent and sovereign Namibia is realized and South Africa's aggression against its neighbours ceases, Venezuela will continue the political, diplomatic and humanitarian efforts to which it is committed in a just and legitimate cause. We cannot be passive witnesses to the serious events which take place daily in southern Africa.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Venezuela for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana): Your personal eminence and wisdom, Sir, coupled with your remarkable sense of humour are qualities we in the Ghana delegation have come to admire. My country, Ghana, has excellent relations with Madagascar, which you represent. For those reasons it is a great pleasure for us to see you presiding over the affairs of the Security Council for the month of June. We are confident that under your guidance we shall be able with resolve and purpose to address the serious issue before us today.

The Security Council is meeting again to focus on South Africa. In his statement on Monday, 16 June, the representative of Angola complained about aggression by South Africa against his country. Specifically, he stated that on 5 June 1986 South African commandos attacked the Angolan port of Namibe, causing considerable damage to property, including three cargo ships, one of which was sunk. Seven battalions of South African soldiers, he disclosed, are now on Angolan territory and are reported to have carried out, jointly with the Savimbi guerrillas, a series of attacks against Angola in May 1986, killing 53 Angolan soldiers.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

The representative of South Africa has denied the involvement of South African forces in the 5 June attacks, attributing them to forces opposed to the Angolan Government. Significantly, the representative of South Africa made no mention of the reported presence on Angolan soil of South African forces seven battalions in strength; nor did he refer to the series of attacks against Angola in May, in which South African forces are reported to have collaborated with Savimbi's UNITA guerrillas.

South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against Angola are well documented in the records of the Security Council. The objective in all cases is to destabilize Angola and thereby pressure its Government into denying support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and other liberation movements. Indeed, that is the cardinal principle of South Africa's policy towards the other countries in the region. The South African representative's denials cannot therefore convince anybody except the racist white minority régime that he represents.

Ghana condemns this unabashed act of aggression against Angola, which took place barely three weeks after the air raids on Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana - particularly since the sinking of one cargo ship and the damage caused to two others could have the effect of widening the conflict in the area. In a statement issued on 11 June 1986 and issued as a Security Council document dated 13 June, the Government of Ghana was unequivocal in its condemnation of the recent aggression, and particularly of the fact that the attitude of some members of the Security Council has been the principal factor encouraging the racist régime to treat the Council with contempt. I wish to read out an extract from that document:

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

"The latest aggression by Pretoria is an act of desperation of a régime clearly on its last legs. This misguided display of arrogant power is made possible by the support, both direct and indirect, which the South African authorities enjoy from certain Western Powers which have persistently thwarted action by the international community to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria for continuing to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours." (S/18152, p. 2)

The 5 June aggression brings into sharp focus fundamental outstanding issues that should be addressed in order to eliminate hostility and instability from the area. The first is the abolition of apartheid through the economic isolation of South Africa. There is growing acceptance within the international community of sanctions as an effective weapon to bring Botha and his régime to their knees. Yet when the issue of sanctions is raised some permanent members of the Council prefer to settle for verbal condemnations. Even the selective sanctions proposed three weeks ago when the Security Council found itself in a similar situation met with a double veto. Such attitudes have only helped to harden the intransigence of the apartheid régime. As the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, Mr. Obed Asamoah, said this morning in Paris at the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa,

"In the light of the failure to get the South African régime to negotiate for the transfer of power to the black majority in South Africa, the world has no other option but to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime."

We urge those who profess by their words to be against apartheid, but who by their deeds have prolonged the life of that evil system, to change.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

The second fundamental matter we need to address relates to overcoming the current political impasse on the question of Namibia's independence. A framework for Namibia's independence exists, in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is therefore a matter of deep regret that resolution 435 (1978) has remained unimplemented for over eight years because the racist régime - regrettably with the tacit support of a permanent member of this Council - wants Namibia's independence to come about on its own terms, namely, the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In his statement on Monday, 16 June, the representative of South Africa, apparently playing to the gallery, made a fetish of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and of the importation of Soviet-made weapons by the Government of Angola. As a sovereign, independent country, Angola is free to make any practical arrangements it may deem appropriate for the defence of its territorial integrity. Furthermore, as a developing country which does not manufacture weapons, Angola has the sovereign right to import its weapons from any country it chooses. In any case, if Angola met its weapons requirements from a Western European country, would anyone be raising a hue and cry? Ghana totally rejects any attempt to link the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

The third basic issue is that an urgent review of attitudes, particularly by permanent members of the Council, towards the Savimbi guerrilla movement is necessary, for there can be no moral or political justification for putting weapons worth millions of dollars into the hands of the Savimbi group to enable it to kill its own compatriots. It is well known that South Africa has been aiding Savimbi to prosecute internecine war against his own people; this is deplorable. It is even more so, as reports indicate, for a permanent member of the Council to have decided to supply Savimbi with sophisticated anti-aircraft and anti-tank missiles. The decision does not only imply open alliance with the racist régime in destabilizing Angola but seriously undermines prospects for peace in that country. The support of a rebel group attempting to overthrow a legally constituted Government is a flagrant violation of every known principle of international law. The principal concern of the people and the Government of Angola, as the representative of Angola himself said on Monday, 16 June, is a peaceful atmosphere which will enable them to rebuild their country. The members of the Security Council collectively have a responsibility to ensure Angola the peace and stability it needs.

The tasks before the Council are clear. Having regard to the seriousness of the matter, it should proceed beyond the verbal condemnations of the past; it can do this by sending the appropriate message to the apartheid régime. The message should not only be unequivocal in condemnation of the recent violation of Angola's sovereignty contrary to conduct of civilized behaviour, but it should take the form of firm commitments to apply punitive measures. In doing so, the Council would not only be reflecting the mood and feeling of the international community but also demonstrating to the Botha régime that even traditional allies have now come to view its policies as an embarrassment.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

Let me now turn briefly to the draft resolution before the Council (S/18163). It is modest in its objectives. It calls upon Member States to refrain from any action that would undermine the independence and territorial integrity of Angola, and also calls for the imposition of selective sanctions as minimum punitive measures against the racist régime. The proposed measures are already being applied by national Governments and multinational organizations. In particular, they form part of the specific measures agreed upon in the Nassau Accord at the end of the November 1985 Commonwealth Summit in the Bahamas. What the draft resolution seeks to do is merely to bring these measures under the ambit of the Security Council. My delegation recommends the draft resolution for support.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Ghana for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. KRISHNAN (India): At the outset, may I thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for having made it possible for my delegation to participate in this meeting of the Security Council. May I also extend to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for June. We are pleased to see you in this capacity for the second time during the current term on the Council of your country, Madagascar, with which India has historical ties and friendly and co-operative relations. It is difficult to be objective in speaking about you - a widely respected and highly regarded colleague who is also a close personal friend. Therefore, I shall not go beyond expressing our confidence that your impartial stewardship and wise guidance will sustain the capacity of the Council to act effectively and expeditiously.

(Mr. Krishnan, India)

May I also pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during May.

Ironically, the subject of discussion at that time was what it is today - as, indeed, it has been on occasions beyond memory's ready computation in the Council - the arrogance and perfidy of a recalcitrant régime in South Africa towards its own people, towards its neighbours and towards the whole world.

Namibe joins the litany of places on Angola's sovereign soil which have been chosen by Pretoria as its laboratories of State terrorism. We have not forgotten the attacks on Luanda and Lobito or the attempts to raid Cabinda. Nor can we forget this outrage. In a statement issued on 6 June 1986 the Government of India declared:

"We are shocked at South Africa's brazen and unprovoked attack on the Angolan port of Namibe, which reportedly resulted in the sinking of an Angolan ship and damage to its oil and harbour installations. Some other ships were also damaged.

"The latest instance of Pretoria's aggression, by instalments, against a peaceful, independent non-aligned country shows that the racist régime will stop at nothing to destabilize by all possible means neighbouring sovereign African States. It also shows that South Africa is extending its aggression to various parts of Angola, including its economic infrastructure, in clear violation of its own obligations under the Lusaka accord of 1984 with Angola. The Government of India strongly condemns South Africa's continuing acts of aggression against Angola and calls upon the international community to take effective action to stop these outrages. There is no other alternative but to apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Krishnan, India)

"We extend our deep sympathy to Angola and express our solidarity and support to its Government and people in the face of these heavy odds. We are confident that the struggle against apartheid will be intensified and that the people of South Africa will soon be able to put an end to this hated system which has been at the root of so much oppression and injustice within South Africa and aggression in the region."

Only days before the attack on Namibe, the Minister of External Relations of the People's Republic of Angola addressed a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which has been circulated as a document of the Security Council (S/18129) on 5 June 1986 - the very day of the most recent act of aggression by Pretoria. In his letter the senior government leader of Angola has recounted how the month of May 1986

"was marked by almost daily violations of Angola's airspace and the build-up of South African regular troops inside its national territory". (S/18129, annex)

The Minister has drawn specific attention to the attacks near Xangongo, in the south of Angola, where 53 lives were sacrificed on the altar of Pretoria's pathetic attempts to sustain its own immoral and constitutionally offensive régime by brute physical force.

(Mr. Krishnan, India)

The Angolan Foreign Minister's letter is not only an indictment of a wrong that we are all able to discern but which we seem powerless to remedy; it is also an appeal for support in the face of the increase in human and material losses incurred by a Member State. The report of the United Nations Resident Co-ordinator in Luanda that Angola used almost half a billion dollars of its foreign exchange to purchase food last year is a pointer to the grim situation in a land ravaged two years ago by drought. It is a situation that South Africa has exploited with care and selectivity. Attacks have been targeted on civilian areas, on medical centres and clinics, on water wells and even on schools. Instances have been documented of the effort and expense with which seeds and fertilizer have been provided to farmers who have been unable to market their produce because of the mining of roads by criminals nurtured by the Pretoria régime.

We are aware that the Secretary-General is even now engaged in preparing his report to the Council on the implementation of resolution 577 (1985). India and our fellow members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries will continue to do whatever our resources allow to assist in the reconstruction of fraternal Angola. This was reaffirmed at the highest level by the Chairman of the Movement, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, during his visit to Luanda last month. The members of the Non-Aligned Movement saw the heroism and resolve of the brave Angolan people at the time of the Co-ordinating Bureau's meeting in Luanda last autumn. South Africa has dared to ignore canons of international law, but we have seen proof of its failure to break Angola's spirit and will. The statement we heard at the start of this debate from the Permanent Representative of Angola is a reaffirmation of this spirit, which the international community salutes.

This debate began on a poignant anniversary. Even as we speak here today we have little knowledge about what precisely is happening in South Africa at the

(Mr. Krishnan, India)

moment. A shroud of secrecy, wreathed in barbed-wire and gunshot, emergency decrees, press gags and media blackouts, has been cast over a proud people by a régime that has imposed itself by brutality and terror upon them. These solemn meetings of the Security Council are a reaffirmation of the will of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations to act with decision and speed. Through its failure in the past, the Council has sent the wrong signals to South Africa. Clinging to life only by the thread leased to it by its protectors outside, the Pretoria régime tramples mercilessly and defiantly upon those within South Africa whose colour and courage it finds impossible to harmonize in a single, democratic society.

Never has the chasm between professed values and practised politics been greater or more ludicrous. Never have beliefs universally cherished and respected been so easily flouted by a small coterie of entrenched interests. Never has the stereotype satire of the United Nations as a forum immensely capable of speech but flaccid and shy of action been truer than in the chronicle of its failure in South Africa. And, let us not forget, never has the chance to redeem our promise been greater than it is now, if we can only summon the courage and united purpose that we need. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has long since pointed the direction - imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

In a message to the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa being held at Paris, the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, reaffirmed:

"The time for verbal denunciation is over. The time for concrete immediate action has come. There should not and cannot be any encouragement to efforts for the so-called reform of the evil system of apartheid; it has to be totally uprooted and destroyed.

(Mr. Krishnan, India)

"India has been in the forefront of the struggle against racism even before its independence. We have consistently held the view in common with the non-aligned countries and the enlightened sections of world opinion that the only peaceful way to end apartheid is to enforce mandatory sanctions against Pretoria. The alternative is violence and bloodshed.

"We cannot wait indefinitely and helplessly in the face of daily destruction of the real values of civilization. Freedom and racial equality cannot be sacrificed at the altar of economic and commercial interests."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of India for the very kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): First, my delegation heartily congratulates you, Sir, on your assumption of the duties of President of the Security Council for the month of June. We hope that under your skilful guidance and with your many years' diplomatic experience the Council will successfully discharge its functions.

Also, our delegation expresses deep gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Gbeho, Permanent Representative of Ghana, for the skilful way in which he guided the Council's work last month.

Again we are witness to the fact that the racist South African régime has committed yet another crime against the People's Republic of Angola. The facts prove incontrovertibly that on 5 June this year South African forces carried out armed attacks against the oil depot in the port of Namibe in the People's Republic of Angola as well as against civilian merchant vessels of the Soviet Union and

(Mr. Nyamdoe, Mongolia)

Cuba which were unloading cargo there. As a result of those barbaric attacks great damage was done not only to Angola but also to the Soviet Union and Cuba; it is also a fact that one ship was actually sunk. Those and many other earlier acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring sovereign African States have pursued the specific goals of crushing the people's struggle, imposing its will on others and perpetuating the criminal system of apartheid, which is the root cause of the unstable situation in southern Africa.

The current actions of the racist South African régime are illegal, since South Africa is deliberately violating generally accepted principles and norms of international law regarding the inviolability of the territorial integrity of States and disregarding the freedom of navigation.

(Mr. Nyamboo, Mongolia)

Consequently, such actions are subject to strict condemnation and appropriate punishment. From that viewpoint, Pretoria's actions are rightly condemned by the overwhelming majority of the world's States. The question of the situation in southern Africa is the focus of attention by many international organizations, both intergovernmental and social. Here, it is appropriate to mention the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa that is now being held in Paris.

The international community as a whole demands an immediate end to such acts of aggression by the Pretoria régime. However, South Africa frequently resorts to acts of aggression against neighbouring African States without heed to the voice of the international community. One wonders: Why does South Africa behave in such a manner? In the opinion of our delegation, and others, the principal cause of such behaviour by the racist régime is the policy of connivance with the racists being followed by the United States and some other Western countries.

In that connection, we should bluntly state that the recent thwarting by the United States and the United Kingdom of the adoption of effective measures against South Africa for its aggression against three front-line States clearly served to encourage the racist régime to continue its policy of terror and aggression against neighbouring African States. Such terrorist acts by the Pretoria régime are creating a serious threat to international peace and security.

Expressing the will and the aspirations of its people, the People's Republic of Mongolia categorically condemns South Africa's criminal acts and demands that they cease forthwith. We feel that South Africa should bear full responsibility for those aggressive acts against Angola. Our delegation takes this opportunity to express once again its solidarity with those States and peoples directly affected by South Africa's aggression. We call upon the Security Council strongly to condemn the attack on the port of Namibe and to adopt effective measures to end

(Mr. Nyamboo, Mongolia)

South Africa's aggression against neighbouring States, including the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Mongolian People's Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

I should now like to make a brief statement in my capacity as representative of Madagascar.

For the thirteenth time since 1976 the Security Council has before it a complaint by the People's Republic of Angola against South Africa. As the representative of Angola stated, since 1981 South African troops have been illegally occupying parts of Angolan territory and 7 battalions are still stationed in Angola.

Those same troops, allied with bandits in the pay of Pretoria, have killed more than 53 Angolan soldiers and wounded dozens of others near Xangogo, in Cunene Province, in late May 1986.

On 5 June 1986 South African commandos attacked the port of Namibe, sinking a Cuban merchant ship, damaging two Soviet merchant ships and striking at three oil storage tanks, two of which were destroyed.

In 11 years of independence the People's Republic of Angola, although it has no common border with South Africa, has been the victim of premeditated and persistent armed attacks by the South African racist régime. Xangogo, in Cunene Province, is located some 100 miles north of the border between Angola and the International Territory of Namibia, illegally occupied, militarized and used as a base for South Africa's armed attacks and destabilizing actions.

Members of the Security Council bore all of those geopolitical factors in mind when they adopted 12 earlier resolutions on this subject - resolutions that condemn South Africa, demand that it withdraw its troops from Angolan territory and cease

(The President)

the use of Namibia for its aggressive designs against Angola, and call for redress and compensation for the material damage suffered by the victim.

Speaking in the Council on 20 June 1985, prior to the unanimous adoption of resolution 567 (1985), I had an opportunity to express my delegation's concern at the scope of the condemnations, appeals and warnings addressed to South Africa. At that time, I asked what assurances we had that such reprehensible actions on the part of Pretoria would not be repeated? To what extent can we trust the apartheid régime, which has constantly ignored its obligations? Are we to continue counting on the pragmatic gradualism of some and the reformism of others?

Since I put those questions, which some might describe as pessimistic and others as disillusioned, the Council has adopted three more resolutions condemning South Africa for renewed acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Indeed, the apartheid régime, a specialist in State terrorism, sure of impunity and of being protected within the Security Council itself, albeit on the basis of shoddy pretexts, specious arguments and pseudo-humanitarian considerations, has publicly threatened to continue to commit acts of aggression against front-line States and other countries in southern Africa.

Pretoria's rulers, stubbornly determined to repress, destroy and subject by violence, if not by deceit, did not hesitate to carry out their threats by ordering three simultaneous military raids against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe on 19 May 1986.

Such gratuitous acts of aggression, which form a systematic pattern of violations of international law, are aimed at influencing the policies of the front-line States in a manner favourable to South African designs. They were perpetrated in defiance of resolution 581 (1986), adopted on 13 February 1986,

(The President)

which condemned the threats of South Africa and strongly warned the racist régime of South Africa against committing any acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilization against independent African States.

(The President)

For reasons of which we are all aware but which we do not endorse, the Security Council has not been in a position to censure the wanton acts of 19 May 1986 of which Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe were the victims.

Turning now to the People's Republic of Angola, the systematic destruction of its economic infrastructure and the cessation of its support to the Namibian people in their struggle for freedom and national liberation are two priority objectives of the apartheid régime. The attainment of those objectives would make it possible for the racist régime of Pretoria, on the one hand, to affirm, as its representative did with impudence in the Council last Monday, that the internal difficulties in Angola paradoxically constitute a threat to the security of the region and therefore justify intervention by South Africa and, on the other hand, to challenge the political and international commitment of the People's Republic of Angola, regionally and internationally.

Angola, whose only defence against might is the rightness of its cause, has come to the Security Council for the thirteenth time to ask for assistance and protection. The time for procrastination has passed. Severe condemnations and solemn warnings have been issued in vain.

There is a general outcry on all sides against the racist régime of South Africa and a concerted effort is being made to put an end to the unlawful occupation of Namibia and to apartheid with its violence and human suffering. I might note, in particular, the appeal published in Harare on 20 May 1986 by the Ministers of the Front-line States, as well as the unequivocal conclusions of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Commonwealth recommending "speedy and broad sanctions by the international community" since continuation of the discussions would lead to nothing in the present circumstances. I might also mention the message that was sent by Mr. Allan Wagner, Foreign Minister of Peru, addressed to

(The President)

the President of the Council in his capacity as President of the World Conference on Sanctions against South Africa.

The Democratic Republic of Madagascar, steadfastly behind the People's Republic of Angola in the many trials that it has undergone since independence, joins once again in the demand for global and binding sanctions against South Africa.

The draft resolution introduced to the Council by the representative of Ghana, of which my delegation is a co-sponsor, meets the expectations of the international community. If we are to enter into a constructive commitment with respect to the peoples of southern Africa, it is our common duty not to disappoint the international community once again.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is prepared to vote on the draft resolution before it. If there is no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

Since there is no objection, it is so decided.

First, I shall call on those members of the Council who wish to make a statement before the vote.

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, there is no need for me to tell you that, with the greatest pleasure, I join our colleagues who have paid a tribute to you. We often speak here of diplomatic experience. I should simply like to recall that when we are speaking about you that expression is completely valid. Moreover, I would recall the very deep links which exist between your country and mine. There is therefore no need to say that your presidency gives my delegation great pleasure and that we are assured on all sides of complete objectivity during your presidency.

(Mr. de Kemoulaia, France)

I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Gbeho, who also demonstrated great diplomatic talent in the difficult debates that took place last month.

France deeply deplores South Africa's persistence in its policy of armed actions against the territory of neighbouring countries and condemns those attacks most strongly. I should like to repeat once again that the Government of South Africa is in error and that such an attitude on its part contributes nothing to settling the true problems which it has to confront.

The French delegation would have deeply wished that the international community's condemnation of those repeated acts might be translated into a vote not marred by reservations on the part of Council members.

France, like other countries, has not hesitated to take measures against South Africa, at the national level, following the adoption of Security Council resolution 569 (1985).

My delegation does not think it appropriate to transform those voluntary measures into mandatory sanctions as provided for in the draft resolution before us. For this essential reason and, moreover, because the draft contains certain formulations that we cannot accept, my delegation will abstain in the vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of France for his very kind words addressed to me.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/18163.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Denmark, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: France

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 12 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has not been adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

I shall now call on those members who wish to make a statement after the vote.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): My country enjoys friendly relations with Angola. No one, I feel sure, is more conscious of this than Angola's Permanent Representative, who is also his country's Ambassador to the Court of St. James. We deplore violations of Angolan territory. We joined in condemning South African incursions into Angola on four occasions last year. There is no room for doubt as to where the United Kingdom stands on this issue.

But my delegation was unable to support the draft resolution just put to the vote for reasons which are familiar to the Council. The draft resolution, like that submitted following the South African raids on Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe last month, to which it bears a strong resemblance, calls for the imposition of mandatory sanctions based on Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. This is unacceptable to us. We remain opposed to economic boycotts because they do not work.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

The Council's condemnation of South Africa's actions last month was strong and unambiguous. In his statement on 23 May Sir John Thomson observed that the raids on the three front-line States could only deepen South Africa's isolation. He stressed that South Africa must understand that we would never in any circumstances countenance cross-border violations by South Africa against its neighbours. There was no disagreement that South Africa had committed an illegitimate and unprovoked act of force against three neighbouring States. There was no question but that South Africa had acted in violation of one of the fundamental principles of the Charter - the obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations.

Those same considerations remain valid in the case before the Council today, a case, I am afraid, of a depressingly familiar kind. Let me reiterate that we see absolutely no justification for this latest armed attack on an Angolan port facility. We utterly condemn all violations of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

It is a matter of very considerable regret to my delegation that the Council's repeated calls upon South Africa to withdraw completely its forces from Angola and to respect that country's sovereignty have gone unheeded, as have the Council's assertions that acts of force cannot but undermine the prospects for peace and stability in the southern African region. We have heard the categorical denial by the representative of South Africa of any responsibility for the latest military operation. To that I can only respond that admitted armed incursions into Angola caused the convening of the Council no fewer than four times last year. Actions speak louder than words. Let South Africa give practical effect to its declarations of peaceful intent.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

It is tragic that on an issue where we have always stood at one with other Council members we should on this occasion be faced with language that the sponsors knew was unacceptable to us, even before they drafted their resolution. I refer, of course, to the proposal in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution that selective economic sanctions should be imposed on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. My Government has shown itself willing to implement a range of measures against South Africa. We are looking now, with our partners in the Commonwealth and the European Community, at what further effective steps we can all take to increase the pressure on South Africa to put an end to apartheid and its policy of destabilization. But our aim is to bring down apartheid, not the South African economy, and we are not prepared to be pushed into adopting particular measures in advance of such consultations. We made our position clear last month, when we voted against precisely the same provisions in the draft resolution tabled by the non-aligned countries.

It is hard to see what is gained by submitting a draft resolution that is certain to be vetoed. Of course, there are those on the Council who welcome what they see as an opportunity to encourage divisions between us and our African friends, but we are bound to ask whether a draft resolution that contained language acceptable to all would not have served far better as a signal to the South African Government of the international community's position than no resolution at all, which is now, unfortunately, the outcome.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): There is much in the draft resolution that the United States supports. Like other delegations seated around this table, the United States is concerned about the military escalation in the southern African region.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

We have in the past joined other Council members in condemning South Africa's aggression against its neighbours. We have gone along with demands that, pursuant to the findings of a United Nations Commission of Investigation, the South African authorities pay appropriate compensation for the damage caused by their defence forces.

There are, however, a number of elements in the draft resolution that my Government finds unacceptable. First, we note the difficulty in ascertaining the truth in a part of the world largely inaccessible to independent and unbiased fact-finding. The South African Government has denied that it carried out the military actions of which it has been accused. It would perhaps have been worthwhile to consider dispatching a fact-finding commission to investigate thoroughly the Angolan charge.

Secondly, as my Government has so often stated in the past, the United States continues to condemn cross-border violence, whatever its origin. We welcome unreservedly the operative paragraph that

"Calls upon all Member States to desist from any action which would undermine the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of ... Angola",

(S/18163, para. 5)

But we would go further and urge restraint on all parties. The only way to put an end to the cycle of violence is through peaceful negotiations, a process that the United States has supported and will continue to support. The Council's goal should be to quell intransigence, not fuel it.

With that in mind, the United States cannot accept the call to assist the military capabilities of the Angolan Government. We have rejected this call to arms in the past, in the conviction that the region is in need of fewer guns and more concerted efforts to resolve disputes through peaceful means.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

Finally, we cannot go along with the imposition of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. We acknowledge that much of the unrest in the southern African region can be attributed to South Africa's system of apartheid. With that clearly in mind we have over the years taken a number of unilateral steps to accelerate the dismantling of apartheid.

We instituted an arms embargo in 1962, fully 15 years before the Security Council voted a mandatory arms embargo, which we supported. Our current laws are stricter than those of Security Council resolutions 418 (1977) and 558 (1984), and those laws are being strictly enforced.

Beginning in 1981, we have carried out assistance and scholarship programmes for deprived South Africans. These have included human rights grants and legal assistance. Twenty million dollars has been budgeted for such programmes in the fiscal year 1986.

We have enacted numerous measures curtailing credit assistance to those organs of the South African Government that serve to support apartheid.

We enforce regulations to ensure that treatment of black workers employed by American companies in South Africa is equal to that accorded white workers.

President Reagan's Executive Order of 9 September 1985 implemented additional restrictive measures against South Africa to express our dissatisfaction with the pace of reform.

Our aim is thus to promote the end of apartheid in South Africa through peaceful means. Our policy is designed to help all forces of justice and progress within South Africa to promote the early emergence of a non-racial form of government through appropriate pressures.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

The United States, however, has long opposed mandatory economic sanctions for reasons we have outlined in the Council on numerous occasions in the past. Our view has not changed. Punitive economic sanctions against South Africa would represent an abdication of our responsibility to support the efforts of those in South Africa who are seeking to bring about a peaceful end to apartheid. It would foster even greater intransigence on the part of extremists in South Africa and impede the path to negotiations between the Government and its opponents. Such negotiations are essential to any peaceful outcome of the struggle against racism in South Africa.

Further, sanctions would damage both South Africa's economy and the economies of the region, which should not be victimized because of apartheid. Broad sanctions would result in indiscriminate damage to the entire South African economy. Such sanctions target not apartheid per se but 28 million people.

Other sovereign States are free to enact the measures they deem most appropriate in the common effort to bring about a Government in South Africa based upon the consent of the governed. The United States asks other States to respect our deeply held conviction that comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa are flatly inimical to peaceful change.

The United States voted against the draft resolution with regret. I am hopeful, however, that I have made our reasons clear to Council members and to other delegations. We are working to help the forces of reason in South Africa prevail in time to prevent increased bloodshed and chaos. The United States remains opposed to mandatory sanctions. We shall not turn our backs on the innocent in order to punish the guilty.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of Angola wishes to speak. I call upon him.

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, please accept my delegation's deep appreciation for the extremely able manner in which you have handled the proceedings of this debate.

I have asked to speak once again also to express the appreciation of my Government and my delegation to those of our friends here at the United Nations who have responded with statements of solidarity during the Council's deliberation of our complaint on South African racist aggression against the territory and the people of the People's Republic of Angola.

While I wish to express the gratitude of Angola to those members of the Council that have supported my country's quest for justice and respect for the United Nations Charter in the form of a condemnation of the violation of Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity by the racist imperialist minority régime of Pretoria, I would like to point out that this expression of support is primarily for the principles and the work of the United Nations and the Security Council.

The position of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States should come as no surprise. But I must admit to a feeling of frustration and even despair of the usefulness of the Council, indeed of the raison d'être of the United Nations itself, when two of the permanent members of the Council, virtually guardians of the United Nations Charter, see fit to defy it and to violate their mandate.

The position of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on all the troubling and urgent issues that plague southern Africa at present is well known. No amount of pontification on the evils of apartheid will have any effect

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

or carry any weight when those two Powers refuse to join in the international community's otherwise unanimous call for sanctions against the sole plague of southern Africa: the racist régime in Pretoria.

A report was compiled towards the end of last year by the Secretary-General based on information from the Security Council Commission of Investigation established under resolution 571 (1985). It is contained in document S/17648, and it outlines the human, material and financial losses suffered by Angola as a result of the various South African attacks. However, no amount of statistics, reports, facts or figures can fully relate to the sum total of what these constant racist attacks mean in terms of the national life of my country, in terms of Angola's efforts to overcome the handicaps of its past and the immense difficulties of its present. And figures certainly do no justice in terms of the human suffering the people of Angola undergo as their loved ones die or the fruit of their labour is destroyed time and time again, with the constant threats of the troops and aerial bombardments of racist South Africa.

What does civilized society do when its criminals are guarded by gaolers who are themselves corrupt? Who guards the gaolers? Or perhaps we are not still living in a civilized world, for that term cannot be applied as long as apartheid and its collaborators exist and are free to do as they please, when protest is muted and effective action is disbarred. All that is allowed in the way of dissent is simply platitudes.

Laws and principles are supposed to apply to all segments of society, to the victims, to the criminals, to the gaolers and the guardians. The latter cannot have a different set of rules for themselves.

I do not wish to sound unnecessarily pessimistic, but I cannot help feeling that we have not seen the last of South African imperialist military adventurism,

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

and therefore I do not feel that this is my last appearance before the Council on this particular issue.

Not until South Africa is made to change its imperialist posture, not until South Africa is truly decolonized and has a majority Government freely elected - not until then will peace and stability come to southern Africa.

We have pride in being what we are in dignity and courage. We have an intense desire for freedom, for we fought for it, and self-determination and independence. Africa has sons and daughters enough to fight long and hard until racism and imperialism are rooted out from southern Africa.

The population option is ours, and the history of southern Africa will be written in blood since that is the only language the racists employ. It may be the only language they understand.

In every moment of our lives history is being made. And when it is finally recorded it will be remembered that we rejected colonialism, racism and imperialism. It will be remembered that we all along sought to negotiate, for life is precious. But freedom is dearer. For that, we will fight in any and every language, on any and every battlefield.

The dialectics of the situation demand that history will be written on our terms. If I may quote Burke, the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing. I hope all of us sitting here are good men.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.