



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

DEC 1

UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2766

24 November 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 24 November 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan)

<u>Members:</u>	Argentina	Mr. BEAUGE
	Bulgaria	Mr. TS VETKOV
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Congo	Mr. ADOUKI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Germany, Federal Republic of	Count YORK von WARTENBURG
	Ghana	Mr. GBEHO
	Italy	Mr. BUCCI
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. TIMERBAEV
	United Arab Emirates	Mr. SHIKIR
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. BIRCH
	United States of America	Ms. BYRNE
	Venezuela	Mr. PABON-GARCIA
	Zambia	Mr. MFULA

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 3.35 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

COMPLAINT BY ANGOLA AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

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

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Nogueira-Batista (Brazil), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Santos (Cape Verde), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Mangwazu (Malawi), Mr. Ould Boye (Mauritania), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Matos Proença (Portugal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Colombia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe and the Syrian Arab Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance 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. Peñalosa (Colombia), Mr. Ononaiye (Nigeria), Mr. Branco (Sao Tome and Principe) and Mr. Masri (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 24 November 1987 from the representatives of the Congo, Ghana and Zambia, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'Complaint by Angola against South Africa' the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/19293.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Gurirab in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedures.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them document S/19291, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of Congo, may I say what a pleasure it is for me to congratulate you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. Your qualities as a seasoned diplomat are appreciated by all and there can be no doubt that thanks to your skilful guidance the work of the Council this month will be crowned with success.

To your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci of Italy, who was President for the month of October, I express the satisfaction and gratitude of my delegation.

Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to welcome and congratulate Count York, who has recently taken up his post as Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. I can assure him of the co-operation of the delegation of Congo.

Alleging sometimes that freedom has been compromised, sometimes that there is a civil war in Angola and sometimes that there are foreign troops present, the South African apartheid régime has unleashed and conducted against the young People's Republic of Angola, whose heroic people, under the leadership of the MPLA, triumphed 12 years ago over colonial occupation, a new war of invasion which is skilfully programmed, undeclared and unfair and should be condemned.

Angola, after the euphoria of the victory celebrations of 11 November 1975, was very swiftly attacked and occupied deep in the southern part of its territory by a combination of treachery and the superiority of the offensive machinery available to the enemy.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Security Council resolution 387 (1976) and the debate which clarified its provisions revealed to the international community and to progressive forces everywhere the dark designs of the South African apartheid minority régime with regard to Angola and the whole region.

Since 1976 repeated violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, acts of military aggression perpetrated by the racist South African Government and the intensification of those acts have become a disquieting and persistent feature of the work of the Security Council within the framework of its essential responsibility, for maintaining international peace and security. The situation was such that the frightening rate of four debates and four resolutions in 1985 alone was reached as the Council sought to deal with the stepping up of the acts of destabilization and aggression against Angola. Thus, a new war was foisted up on the Angolan people, which had only just emerged victorious from its long national liberation struggle. It was cruel and unfair.

The fighting which was resumed in October and at the beginning of November between the army of the People's Republic of Angola and the enemy forces is noteworthy because of the military scope of the engagement and its profound significance. Fighting has been resumed in the airspace above Angolan territory and on land in the southern provinces which border on the international Territory of Namibia, which has been illegally transformed by the racist South African Government into a forward base from which it can launch and intensify acts of aggression against neighbouring States, particularly Angola.

The apartheid régime has deployed against the People's Republic of Angola and on its territory more than 3,000 men from the South African army equipped with armoured vehicles and heavy artillery.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The grotesque parade of President Botha and some of his Ministers still to be seen on Angolan territory, in flagrant violation of the hard-won sovereignty and independence of that country, far from confirming their superiority in this battle, betrays the confusion and disarray of the puppet bands which are pitted against Angola but which, in the words of Tacitus, are rushing headlong into enslavement to the apartheid régime and its accomplices.

That is not saying too much, when the South African leaders, in the declaration of Magnus Malan, the Minister of Defence, publicly acknowledged that the racist troops were fighting against the Angolan army in order to avert the dismantling of "their" complementary forces, the UNITA terrorists. Therefore, the situation is perfectly clear, and let us not be distracted by self-styled freedom fighters, unless it be to reaffirm the freedom to act of the apartheid régime, which some people support, indeed encourage.

Mr. da Silva de Moura, Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola, in his excellent address to the Council when he presented his country's complaint against South Africa, told us that the Government of Angola, and Angolan men, women and young persons are not resigned to, cannot accept and do not desire servitude. They are resolved more than ever before to fight and to win.

Undoubtedly, the soul of the new Angola is with those of its worthy sons who have taken up arms to defend the sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity and self-determination of their country.

In fact, despite all the attempts made to reduce tension in the southern subregion of Africa, as is stressed by the President of the Republic of Angola in a letter dated 19 November 1987 to the Secretary-General, issued under the symbol S/19283, the racist Government of South Africa seeks by all means to sabotage these

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

efforts by intensifying the acts of destabilization against neighbouring countries, particularly the People's Republic of Angola. The letter of President Dos Santos warns us furthermore that one of the most important South African military units, the Eighth Tank Division, with all its equipment, is advancing in combat order towards Cunene province under heavy air cover.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The international community must support the Government of Angola and oppose the deliberate policy of aggression and oppression practised by the apartheid régime. That persistent policy is at variance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is undoubtedly a threat to international peace and security. Unanimous, forthright condemnation of that policy and of the racist minority Government which carries it out should be accompanied by a demand for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Compensation for damage caused should also be taken into account.

In present circumstances, my country, together with other members of the international community, would be acting as accomplices of the apartheid régime and in its atrocities were they not to demand and indeed bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from the territory of Angola.

The message from the Security Council, therefore, should be clear cut and unanimous, so that the puppet groups and the enemy would realize that they cannot with impunity violate international laws and customs, despite the appearance of having won battles. For the efforts of the Angolan people, like those of all the victim peoples in the southern part of Africa defending their independence, will be co-ordinated and relentless. That will necessarily lead, with the support of the international community, to victory by triumphing over the frightful conspiracy of the pathetic apartheid régime.

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

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): Allow me, Sir, to begin by expressing my delegation's warm and sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are all

(Count York von Wartenburg,
Federal Republic of Germany)

the more pleased to see you in the presidency since you represent a country maintaining very friendly and cordial relations with my own. We are certain that your long diplomatic experience and political wisdom will lead our deliberations to a successful conclusion.

My delegation would like also to take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Maurizio Bucci, for the competent and highly professional manner in which he handled the work of the Council for the month of October.

I should like, with your permission, Sir, to thank Ambassador Adouki of Congo very warmly for his kind words and express my gratitude to all others who have bidden me such a warm welcome here in my new function.

Once more the Security Council has to deal with the situation in southern Africa. This year no fewer than four sets of Security Council meetings have focused on this region, an incidence which demonstrates how much turmoil South Africa's policy has brought to that part of the world. Beside stepped-up repression in South Africa itself, and in addition to the illegal occupation of Namibia, it has been Pretoria's policy of destabilization towards its neighbouring States which has figured more and more on the Council's agenda in recent years. Yet another deplorable example of this policy has been furnished by South Africa's most recent intervention in Angola.

The Ministers of the European Community, at their meeting in Brussels yesterday, 23 November 1987, vigorously condemned South Africa's military activities in Angola.

Fully in keeping with this ministerial declaration, the Federal Government strongly condemns the continuing intervention of South African armed forces in the

(Count York von Wartenburg,
Federal Republic of Germany)

territory of the People's Republic of Angola, as well as the visits which President Botha and other members of his Government paid to the forces fighting in Angola. Through its action the South African Government violates the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola; moreover it contravenes contractual commitments which it undertook under the Lusaka Agreement of 16 February 1984. South Africa's intervention in Angola is a violation of international law and an escalation of the vicious circle of force and counter-force, thwarting all peaceful efforts to find a peaceful settlement to the conflicts in southern Africa.

During his recent visit to Luanda, Federal Foreign Minister Genscher again took the position that the repercussions of the system of apartheid are not restricted to South Africa but endanger the political and economic stability of an entire region far beyond the frontiers of South Africa. Apartheid is the essential cause of the unrest in southern Africa. Among the victims of South Africa's policy of destabilization Angola and Namibia figure prominently. Namibia is being misused as a springboard for South African acts of aggression. Foreign Minister Genscher also pointed out that South Africa's cross-border acts of violence contravene international law and existing agreements. We condemn South Africa's military intervention and demand its immediate and unconditional termination.

The Federal Government rejects both the South African policy of destabilization and apartheid itself. Racial discrimination and apartheid cannot be reformed: they must be abolished. We side with those who are being denied their human and civic rights in their own country. We demand that a national dialogue between the white minority and the black majority be instituted immediately with a view to putting an end to apartheid in a peaceful manner. Indispensable pre-conditions of such a dialogue are the lifting of the state of

(Count York von Wartenburg,
Federal Republic of Germany)

emergency, the release of Nelson Mandela and the other political detainees and the repeal of the ban on the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the other organizations of the black majority.

The Federal Government advocates that Namibia be granted its independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any further conditions.

Angola must be able to pursue its national interests without foreign influence being exerted. In this context the Federal Government welcomes the current negotiations between the American and Angolan Governments. The Federal Government hopes that those negotiations will be successful and will result in the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Angola. Far from wishing to burden Security Council resolution 435 (1978) with extraneous issues, the Federal Government holds the view that an agreement between the United States and Angola could improve the chances of implementing resolution 435 (1978). The Federal Government calls upon the South African Government to withdraw its armed forces from Angola immediately and unconditionally and to abstain in future from cross-border military actions. Not acts of violence but only negotiations will create the necessary prerequisites for the peace and stability so urgently needed in that region.

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

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

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to congratulate you sincerely, Sir, on your election to the presidency for this month of the Security Council, which is the supreme international organ entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security. We are confident that your great diplomatic abilities and your distinguished political expertise will ensure that the Council carries out its heavy responsibilities successfully. I am also pleased to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci, Permanent Representative of Italy, for the able manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council last month, leading to the adoption by the Council of its historic resolution 601 (1987), on the implementation of the United Nations peace plan.

A few weeks ago, the Security Council was seized of the question of Namibia's future and a new initiative to restore peace and security to southern Africa. The international community welcomed Security Council resolution 601 (1987), in the hope that it would rid the region of one of the most serious causes of the tension and instability, which result from South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

While the international community called upon the Pretoria Government to respond to the international will and co-operate with the peace efforts, the racist régime persisted in its policies of aggression and its threats to the security of neighbouring African States.

The arrogance of the rulers of South Africa has led them to escalate the bloody events in the southern part of Angola, where the occupying forces have continued to wreak havoc for years. Pretoria made a point of escalating its aggression and entrenching its occupation with unprecedented ferocity.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The Egyptian Government is deeply concerned over the serious news about the continuing and increasing racist aggression against the sovereignty and independence of Angola and the increasing threat to its territorial integrity, and has warned of a further deterioration of the situation which may lead to explosive results in that region of the African continent.

It is regrettable, in this connection, to have to say that the grave deterioration of the security situation came as no surprise to us in Egypt or in Africa as a whole; it was only to be expected. We have repeatedly warned of such a deterioration and drew attention to it on a number of occasions.

The deterioration of the situation in southern Angola was no surprise. It was expected. There is no one that deters the Pretoria régime. Its leaders do not have sense knocked into their heads. There is a lack of decisiveness and sanctions in the United Nations resolutions and the stance of the international community.

This latest deterioration was expected and came as no surprise. The Pretoria régime, which is absolved of responsibility, finds it within its power to become an outlaw. It disdains legitimacy and finds neither difficulty nor embarrassment in continuing and escalating its terrorism and sabotage against independent sovereign States.

Angola had recourse once again to the Security Council and has lodged a complaint regarding the aggression by South Africa against its territory, the penetration by the occupying troops some hundreds of kilometres into that territory and the attendant devastation and destruction and loss of innocent lives.

The persistence of Angola in having recourse to the Security Council time after time affirms its respect for international law and its abiding faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter which uphold the rights of every State to live in security and peace and reject the use or threat of force or violence in international relations.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The fact that Angola has had recourse to the Security Council, with the support of all the African countries must put the Security Council face to face with its responsibilities and competence. The Council is required to take immediate and firm action to deter the aberrant Government of South Africa and force it to renounce its policies of aggression and terrorism. We call on the Security Council apply a unified and strong stand and to apply the appropriate measures to bring about the speedy withdrawal of the occupying forces of aggression from the Angolan territory.

We call on the Security Council to exercise its competence in protecting the independence and sovereignty of an African State whose capabilities as a developing country are insufficient to enable it to face up to the might of the tyrannical racist forces.

Taking its point of departure from our firm belief in the common destiny and the common struggle of all those who have been liberated from colonialism and those who are still struggling for their political and economic freedom, Egyptian diplomacy has reaffirmed at all times and on every occasion, a firm commitment to the common cause of the struggle to the victorious end against racial discrimination and the remaining vestiges of colonialism in the southern part of the continent as well as against exploitation and terrorism.

The Egyptian diplomacy believes that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions is the only effective way to uproot the apartheid régime, halt its blatantly aggressive practices and put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and southern Angola. It has become amply clear that neither logic nor principles can convince the racist minority to accept the alternative of peace. It has become clear that the new strategy of the racist Pretoria régime is to continue its onslaught on African dignity and to its massacres of women and children in a non-stop hysterical bloody escalation.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Egypt reiterates its absolute support for the right of the Angolan people to peace and security and calls upon the Council to take effective international action to enable them to start a normal life, after all the suffering that has been their lot since independence, 12 years ago.

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

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I am very pleased to see you, Mr. President, an outstanding representative of Japan, a friendly neighbour of China, presiding over the Security Council this month. On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I should like to offer you our congratulations. Your rich diplomatic experience and proven ability will certainly enable you smoothly to guide to success the work of the Security Council in November. I should also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute and to express appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci of Italy, for his remarkable performance as President of the Council last month.

At the meeting of the Security Council last Friday, the Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Venancio da Silva de Moura, forcefully denounced South Africa's crimes of wanton aggression against Angola. Recently the South African authorities have launched another round of large-scale invasions into four southern provinces of the People's Republic of Angola and are now amassing troops for further aggression. Meanwhile, Botha, the chieftain of the racist régime of South Africa, led five of his Ministers to enter illegally into Angolan territory and stayed there for as long as 26 hours in an attempt to boost the morale of the South African aggressor troops. In thus violating blatantly the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a neighbouring country, the South African authorities have brutally trampled upon the principles of the United Nations Charter and the norms governing international relations, at which we wish to express our great indignation and strong condemnation. At the same time, we express our profound sympathy and resolute solidarity with the Angolan Government and people, which have put up a heroic resistance in defence of their State sovereignty and independence.

Since the founding of the People's Republic of Angola in 1975, the racist régime of South Africa has never ceased its aggression and sabotage against it.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

The Security Council has adopted resolutions on many occasions, condemning South Africa's crimes of aggression and calling for the complete withdrawal of its troops from Angola. Turning a deaf ear to all this, the South African régime has imposed an undeclared war on Angola and is still occupying some southern parts of that country. Because of this, the Angolan people have not been able to engage in the peaceful reconstruction of their homeland and have suffered tremendous losses of life and property during the 12 years since their independence.

The South African authorities' recent wanton aggression against Angola and their intensified interference in its internal affairs are not isolated actions, but part of their reactionary domestic and foreign policies which they have been pursuing with heightened truculence. Over the past few years, despite the strong resistance by the broad masses of the South African people, and the stern condemnation of the international community, the racist régime has shown no remorse but has persisted in maintaining, by hook or by crook, its savage system of apartheid. While strengthening its repressive machinery at home, it has intensified its activities of military aggression, political subversion and economic sabotage against neighbouring countries. In defiance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the South African régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and it has launched repeated incursions and harassments against Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Botswana, in addition to its aggression against Angola. Its perverse acts have exacerbated the already perilous situation in the entire region of southern Africa and pose a threat to international peace and security.

The recent invasion of Angola by the South African authorities was carried out just after the Security Council had adopted its resolution 601 (1987) and when the United Nations General Assembly was considering the Namibian question and the question of South Africa's apartheid policy. This shows that South Africa acted

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

deliberately to obstruct the efforts of the international community to achieve a peaceful settlement of the southern African question. This was also an undisguised provocation to the international community. The Chinese delegation believes that the Security Council must react strongly to this. We suggest that the Council first, severely condemn the South African authorities for stepping up aggression against Angola and occupying its territory; secondly, strongly urge the South African authorities immediately to stop their aggression and sabotage against Angola and unconditionally withdraw all their troops from Angolan territory; and, thirdly, call upon the international community to provide assistance to the Angolan Government and people. Lastly, if the South African authorities do not mend their ways, the Security Council should immediately consider adopting effective sanction measures against them in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

As has been clearly pointed out by many delegations, the Security Council has a solemn responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Confronted with the unbridled outrages of the South African authorities, it is imperative for the Security Council to adopt necessary and decisive actions to check South Africa's aggression and uphold Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Only by so doing can we, the members of the Security Council, live up to the trust which the international community has placed in us.

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

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

Mrs. ASTORGA GADEA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): First of

all allow me on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council this month. Your skill and your diplomatic experience ensure the success of the important deliberations of this Council. Similarly, we should like to express our appreciation to Ambassador Bucci of Italy, on the skilful manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Council in October.

Once again the international community has witnessed the genuine threat to peace and security posed by the system of apartheid. Not satisfied with brutally repressing its own people, the racist Government is committing acts of violence and terror against neighbouring countries whose sole crime is that they have repudiated the system of apartheid.

The arrogance of the leaders in Pretoria knows no bounds. When the leaders of the front-line countries met in Lusaka to discuss machinery for co-operation and development, South Africa increased its aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, which is the prime target of the destabilizing policy of "total strategy" undertaken by that apostle of apartheid, Pieter Botha.

In spite of repeated initiatives and displays of flexibility by the Government of Angola, South Africa is doing its utmost to frustrate any attempt to bring about a negotiated political settlement of the problem of Angola, Namibia and the whole of southern Africa.

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

Racist troops have penetrated Angola up to a distance of 500 kilometres. All kinds of sophisticated military equipment such as aircraft, helicopters, armoured tanks and heavy artillery have been used by the racists to perpetuate these acts of aggression.

The famous élite troops of the Eighth Armoured Division of the South African Army have been advancing from occupied Namibia into Angolan territory and are supporting the more than 3,000 racist troops now illegally occupying Angola. But even more notable for its boldness and defiance of the international community was the recent visit by Pieter Botha to Angolan territory.

These latest acts of State terrorism by Pretoria should not be viewed in isolation. We must also take into account other factors related to the present situation: first, in the platform put forward by the National Party of South Africa to win the so-called white elections, the National Party and the racists gave Botha a clear mandate to strengthen and perpetuate white supremacy domestically and to reaffirm South Africa's military power as a means of intimidating and destabilizing neighbouring countries; and, secondly, the inevitability of the victory of the armed forces of Angola, as on past occasions, means that the racists must do whatever is necessary to prevent their imminent defeat.

Furthermore, a serious analysis of the situation must take into account the consequences of this policy of constructive compromise. In addition to having the effect of encouraging Pretoria to commit aggression against its neighbours, such a policy - now that the Clark amendment has been defeated - provides direct assistance to UNITA's mercenaries. This policy, which has been condemned by the Organization of African Unity and by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, must change if we really want peace and stability in southern Africa.

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

The Security Council recently adopted resolution 601 (1987) relating to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Today, the Security Council is discussing South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola which have been committed from the illegally occupied territory of Namibia. This illustrates the kind of respect that South Africa has for the Security Council and the Organization. What more does South Africa have to do to earn condemnation from those who have systematically vetoed all attempts to have the Security Council discharge its responsibilities?

For the terror, the destabilization and the threats to the peace in southern Africa to disappear, apartheid must disappear. The peoples of South Africa and Namibia are fighting heroically for their liberation, and this Council and the international community must play their part and match the sacrifices of the people caught up in this struggle, which truly involves us all.

Comprehensive binding sanctions continue to be the most effective peaceful means available to the international community to force Pretoria to dismantle its inhuman system.

Similarly, we must match the sacrifices of the front-line countries, and in particular, at this time, those of Angola, where the people have so valiantly resisted South Africa's aggression. We would stress that the struggle against apartheid includes, most importantly, economic and material assistance for those countries and the liberation movements. Therefore, we earnestly appeal for increased international assistance for the AFRICA Fund, which was established by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, and the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC).

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

We sincerely hope that the members of the Security Council and especially those who have good relations with apartheid, will act with the sense of responsibility that the situation requires. We hope that the interests of mankind will be placed above the economic benefits provided by that inhuman system, and we trust that all will support the dictates of justice so that our brothers in Africa will finally be allowed to build their future in peace and dignity.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nicaragua for her kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): May I first congratulate you, Sir, on so successfully discharging your responsible functions as President of the Security Council for the current month. I should also like to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Bucci, for his competent guidance of the Security Council during the month of October and to thank you and, through you, the members of the Security Council, for the opportunity afforded our delegation to participate in the discussion of the item on the Security Council's agenda.

Just a few days ago, the General Assembly discussed and adopted resolutions on the policy of apartheid practised by racist South Africa. At the end of October the Security Council considered the situation in southern Africa and adopted its resolution 601 (1987). And now the Security Council is again forced to return to the explosive situation in southern Africa brought about by the aggressive acts of the Pretoria racists against the People's Republic of Angola. As is stated in the letter of the People's Republic of Angola in document S/19283, over the last few

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

days the South African army has been carrying out large-scale armed incursions in Kuando-Kubango province in south-east Angola, and is preparing to introduce heavy military equipment into the provinces of Cunene and Huila in the south-west. The letter also states that the Angolan Government has clear indications that one of the most important South African military units, the Eighth Tank Division, with all equipment, is advancing in combat order towards Cunene province under heavy air cover. These events were discussed in detail in the statement to the Security Council on 20 November by the Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. da Silva de Moura. In the letter of the President of Angola, the Security Council is requested "to take all necessary measures to put an end to these actions, which are a flagrant, disrespectful challenge to the United Nations Charter and the most basic norms of international law".

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that the Security Council should with all seriousness consider the situation that has arisen and take resolute steps against the incorrigible racists in Pretoria. An international legal foundation for such steps has been in existence for some time, that is, the Charter of the United Nations, the definition of aggression adopted by the United Nations in December 1974, other decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. That Convention states that apartheid is a crime against humanity and that inhuman acts resulting from the policies and practices of apartheid are crimes violating the principles of international law and constituting a serious threat to international peace and security. The aggressive acts of South Africa against Angola are the most recent confirmation of this.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

There can be no doubt - and this has been frequently emphasized in the course of the present discussion - that the South African racists would be unable to behave in such a brazen fashion if they did not enjoy direct and indirect support from Western countries, first and foremost certain permanent members of the Security Council. It is they which in fact prevent the Security Council from taking more decisive and effective steps against South Africa.

The system of apartheid and racial discrimination is at variance with the purposes of strengthening peace and developing co-operation. The policy of aggression, destabilization and State terrorism, which is practised by the Pretoria régime, its continuing illegal occupation of Namibia and its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons - all represent a constant and genuine threat not only to peace and security in the southern part of Africa - but even beyond the region.

Of particular importance and relevance now is the policy aimed at achieving a fundamental breakthrough in international relations on the basis of a new kind of political thinking and a new approach to international security. These purposes are fully served by the initiative taken by the group of socialist countries, including the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, to create a comprehensive system of international peace and security, including resolving regional conflicts, eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and eradicating racism and apartheid. To achieve this, it is essential that there be co-ordinated efforts made by the entire international community. As has been emphasized by Mr. Gorbachev in his article "Reality and safeguards for a secure world":

"A more concerted effort to combat apartheid, as one of the destabilizing factors of international significance, would also be justified." (S/19143,

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

Since the racists in Pretoria have shown no desire to heed what has been said by the overwhelming majority of States of the world, international pressure on the apartheid régime should be stepped up. The Byelorussian SSR favours a boycott and isolation of the racist régime. It believes that all States should faithfully observe the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the Security Council. In keeping with our consistent policy in the struggle against apartheid, the Byelorussian SSR at the current session of the General Assembly joined in sponsoring resolution 42/23 C, which states:

"3. Urgently requests the Security Council, therefore, to take immediate action under Chapter VII of the Charter with a view to applying comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa and urges the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and others that are opposed to the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions to reassess their policies and cease their opposition to the application of such sanctions by the Security Council".

The Byelorussian SSR faithfully fulfils and implements the relevant decisions of the United Nations and has never maintained any relations with South Africa in the political, economic, military or any other areas; it strictly complies with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions aimed at the total international isolation of the racist régime of South Africa.

In its indignant condemnation of South Africa's overt aggression against the People's Republic of Angola the Byelorussian SSR believes that the Security Council should not only severely condemn the aggressive acts of South Africa against Angola but also take effective steps to put an end to such provocative acts which pose a threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

In order to ensure peace and security in the southern part of Africa, it is essential that an end be put to any acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African countries, that genuine independence be granted to the people of Namibia, and that the inhuman system of apartheid be abolished once and for all.

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

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

Mr. SANTOS (Cape Verde) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you for having acceded to Cape Verde's request to participate in the current debate in the Security Council and to congratulate you warmly, and to offer best wishes for success, as you carry out your mandate as President of the Council this month. We are sure that your diplomatic and personal qualities, together with the prestige of your country, will make it possible for the Council to meet the challenges before it.

Our appreciation also goes to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Maurizio Bucci, Permanent Representative of Italy, for the competent manner in which he guided the proceedings in the Council last month.

Once again this Council has before it a serious situation caused by acts of military aggression perpetrated by the régime in Pretoria against Angola, a country which has always borne the brunt of the acts of aggression and warlike adventures of South Africa's army against the front-line countries.

Notwithstanding the repeated condemnations of its acts of aggression by the Council, the General Assembly and all other international forums, the fraternal people of Angola are continuing to sustain immense human and material losses caused by the wanton acts of incursion and illegal occupation of Angolan territory. The

(Mr. Santos, Cape Verde)

present invasion is one more episode in what has already begun a long painful chapter of destruction and suffering of which the people of Angola have been victims ever since their independence.

The Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola, His Excellency Mr. Venancio da Silva de Moura, whose presence we warmly welcomed, gave us a detailed report of the most recent and most brutal act of aggression of the South African army on Angolan territory.

In the face of this new escalation, we could not let this occasion pass without reaffirming our complete solidarity with the heroic people of Angola and their Government, which directly after their victory over colonialism were forced to face barbaric aggression by the powerful army of South Africa, under the compliant eye of all those who directly or indirectly contribute to the continuation of apartheid, a system the maintenance of which depends on constant acts of aggression and destabilization of neighbouring countries.

As a peace-loving country committed to the search for peace in Africa, but also as a country linked to Angola by a common history and struggle against colonial domination, Cape Verde is thus adding its own voice to the indignant voices of Africa and all those nations that cherish peace and justice in this serious situation, which has led to the convening of the Council.

(Mr. Santos, Cape Verde)

The enormous damage that the war imposed by South Africa has caused in the front-line countries, in particular the People's Republic of Angola, seriously jeopardizes any development effort undertaken in the region, for a considerable part of the energy of those countries must be devoted to the preservation of territorial integrity, not counting the loss in terms of human lives and destruction of infrastructure.

Quite aside from the barbaric nature of the racist army's acts of aggression, the most recent of these have special characteristics which seem to mark a new stage. The military means used, the violence and the duration of the fighting, the fact that there has been public recognition of the violation of Angolan territory, contrary to the most elementary norms of international law and the United Nations Charter, the illegal entry of President Botha into Angolan territory and his meeting with armed UNITA bands, together amount to an escalation which outrages the international conscience.

Pretoria would have us believe that the problems of South Africa have been caused by factors in neighbouring countries, that is, the front-line countries; and, according to this logic, the solution is to be found in acts of aggression against those countries.

However, it is now clear that the repugnant system of apartheid is the cause of all the disruption, and all the suffering in the region, for it is incompatible with the social and political realities of Africa in the world of today, and because it is inhuman, unacceptable and not in keeping with universal morality.

The cause of the evil is domestic, not external. It is clear that any peaceful solution in the region will necessarily involve the eradication of apartheid. It has been repeatedly stated that not only the black majority but also the South African people as a whole must work to eliminate apartheid, making way

(Mr. Santos, Cape Verde)

for a society in which all South Africans will have the same rights and the respect to which every human being is entitled, whatever his social origin or the colour of his skin.

Angola is a country that only wants to live in peace within its boundaries and create well-being for its people. We note with regret that once again an act of aggression has been launched from Namibia - that is, from a Territory under United Nations responsibility. It is time for the international community and the United Nations in particular to shoulder their responsibility and demand the immediate withdrawal from Angola of South African troops, and that South Africa cease its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. It is high time to end Pretoria's murderous folly and find a speedy, peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa.

Before concluding this statement, we should like to pay a tribute to the people of Angola and the courageous combatants of the Angolan army, who are paying with their lives for the defence of the sacred homeland of Agostinho Neto. We appeal for international solidarity so that Angola may soon regain that peace which is indispensable to its development.

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

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

Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): May I first tell you, Sir, how genuinely pleased I am to offer you my warm congratulations on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November 1987. My pleasure is increased by the fact that you represent a country which is an example of ability and ingeniousness which has won the admiration of

(Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

the entire world. Your qualities as a seasoned diplomat, together with your personal experience, are a guarantee that under your wise leadership the work of this session will be crowned with success.

To your predecessor, Ambassador Maurizio Bucci, the Permanent Representative of a friendly country, Italy, I wish to say how much we appreciate the skilful and authoritative way in which he directed the work of this body last month.

Barely a month ago, on 30 October, the Security Council, by adopting resolution 601 (1987), on Namibia, almost unanimously, gave the peoples of southern Africa hope of a cease-fire, the first step towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), in which the international community unanimously mapped out a plan for the independence of that Territory. It thus showed its concern and that it was tired of the red herrings and obstacles which the apartheid régime of Pretoria has constantly used to block the way to peace and harmony in that part of the world.

Unfortunately, this peaceful gesture was not properly appreciated by the apartheid régime, which, by its massive, brutal and unprovoked attack against the sister Republic of Angola, once again demonstrated to the world something that has been obvious for generations - that apartheid is the very antithesis of peace. This further attack on the territorial integrity and sovereignty of an independent State expresses more clearly than anything else the consistent contempt of the Pretoria régime and the disciples of apartheid for world public opinion and the decisions or recommendations of the Security Council.

Furthermore, although this attitude is by no means new, this time it has taken the form of open provocation of the Security Council and the world: first, because of the number of troops involved, the extent of the areas occupied and the continuous build-up of military strength in the northern part of Namibia, clearly

(Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

indicating that preparations are being made for further acts of aggressions; secondly, because of the visit to the southern part of Angola by the Head of the Pretoria clique, Botha, accompanied by senior members of his racist minority Government; and, thirdly, because of the clear evidence that the avowed aim is not so much pursuit of the South West People's Organization (SWAPO) nationalists as destabilization of the Government of Angola.

In the face of such insolence and impudence one cannot remain silent. To do so would be equivalent to stripping our Organization, particularly the Security Council, of all moral credibility, and emasculating the ideals which the Organization so fully embodies.

(Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

That is why my Government believes that the Security Council, because of its special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, must not only condemn this new affront but also have recourse to the relevant provisions of the Charter in Chapter VII to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that outlawed State.

All the tragedies of the peoples of southern Africa stem from the odious system of apartheid. Until that system, which is a crime against humanity, is completely eradicated there will be no peace in the region. The system can be kept going only by violence, which necessarily calls forth reaction and leads to the vicious circle of repression, reaction and repression. There is therefore an urgent need to take effective steps for its total elimination.

I cannot conclude without once again expressing my country's solidarity with the courageous struggle of the peoples of the front-line countries, particularly Angola, against the crimes of the odious system of apartheid, the source of every evil in the region. My country is also in solidarity with the liberation movements, the African National Congress of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization, which, in extremely difficult conditions, are struggling valiantly to recover the rights of their respective peoples to self-determination, freedom and dignity. Their struggle is the struggle of us all.

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

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): It is a pleasure for my delegation to see you, Sir, presiding over the Council's affairs for November. Your well-known qualities as a skilled and experienced diplomat and negotiator will no doubt inure to the Council's benefit during this month.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Ghana delegation also warmly congratulates Ambassador Maurizio Bucci, Permanent Representative of Italy, on his energetic and skilful handling of the Council's business in October.

Once again the Security Council has been convened at the request of Angola and the other member States of the Non-Aligned Movement to consider Angola's complaint against South Africa over the latter's renewed acts of aggression and its continuing military occupation of Angolan territory. It is a course of action open to any Member State under the Charter, and the Ghana delegation finds the initiative legitimate and of the utmost urgency. It may be said that the numerous acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States by South Africa, which are well documented by the Security Council, acts carried out in repeated violation of its resolutions, are such a direct affront to the Council's authority that the Security Council itself could have considered convening these meetings even without the prodding of the initiators of the debate.

Indeed, meetings convened on its own motion by the Council to ensure compliance with Security Council resolutions would come well within the purview of its responsibilities under the Charter. The merits of such a course of action, in the specific circumstances of the continuous and unceasing infractions of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity by South Africa, are so obvious that they need no repetition - the more so when viewed in the context of the Council's own previous decisions to apply effective measures in the event of South Africa's failure to comply with its resolutions in the matter. Alas, perhaps we yearn for too much, and the scales have not completely fallen from our eyes.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The character and extent of the present illegal course of action pursued by Pretoria in and against Angola give cause for alarm. Viewed in the context of the exceptional military build-up in Namibia in recent months, they make it clear that South Africa has intensified acts of destabilization and aggression against Angola and other neighbouring States. In this period the expansion of South Africa's military bases in the Caprivi Strip, particularly that of Mpacha, coupled with the significant movement of troops towards the northern frontier of Namibia, has led to a reported concentration and deployment of 10,000 regular members of the South African Defence Forces, threatening Angola's southern Provinces of Namibe, Cunene and Huila.

It is apparent that the immediate objective of the South African military build-up along the south-western flank of the Angolan border is to engage and tie down Angolan forces in that part of the country, thus enabling the advance of an estimated eight battalions of the South African Defence Forces into south-eastern Angola to rescue the beleaguered mercenary forces of Jonas Savimbi in Kuando Kubando from total defeat. In this military advance, heavy air cover has been provided from the Mpacha air-base in north-eastern Namibia for infantry units of the South African Defence Forces in their incursions into Angolan territory, as well as providing air cover for the UNITA headquarters in Jamba. The illegal incursions are reported to have reached as far as 350 miles into Angolan territory.

It is also well known that in the south-eastern corner of Angola a sizeable deployment of South African Defence Forces has gone on for the last several years on behalf of UNITA. The new element is that the recent confrontation of Angolan and South African forces in the area has been extremely bloody, with the death toll

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

estimated to be in the hundreds, accompanied by the destruction of villages and surrounding areas.

It is the considered view of the Ghana delegation that the deployment of 10,000 or more troops on the south-western flank of Angola is not merely a tactical or threatening posture assumed by South Africa to assure UNITA's survival. The stepped-up activity and military preparation at the air-base of Grootfontein in north-central Namibia, the advance of the Eighth Tank Division and the concentration of heavy artillery - indeed, the total fire-power amassed by South Africa on this front - reveal a strategic purpose behind the commission of Pretoria's latest illegality, a purpose which I fear does not discount the imminent invasion also of Cunene and Huila Provinces in Angola.

There is no doubt that a premeditated pattern exists in the violations of Angola's territorial integrity and sovereignty by South Africa, a pattern which has at its core four central objectives:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

first, to exert pressure on Angola to cease diplomatic and material support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO); secondly, to create a veritable cordon sanitaire along the Angolan-Namibian border as a key operational element in containing the wrath of SWAPO in its legitimate struggle against South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia; thirdly, to weaken the Angolan economy and that country's defences through a combination of aid to UNITA, cross-border State terrorism executed by the South African Defence Forces into Angola, and commando operations by those forces against strategic and economic targets; and, fourthly, acting through UNITA to prevent the reopening of the Benguela railway, thereby reinforcing the dependence of the front-line States on transport routes through South Africa.

These insidious objectives are replicated with minor variations in other neighbouring States. In the full articulation of South Africa's policy, its objective of achieving regional dominance in order to assure the continuity of its illegal occupation of Namibia and its stranglehold over the economies of the front-line States is evident. Of course, these violent policies are executed to ensure the ultimate survival of the hateful system of apartheid.

It has been argued that South Africa's pursuit of its "legitimate security" interests provides a measure of plausibility to its illegal and violent actions. In consequence of those interests, between \$15 million and \$20 million in military hardware in the form of Stinger anti-aircraft missiles, anti-tank missiles and other equipment is supplied to UNITA gratis. Those interests today find South Africa rushing to prevent the liquidation of UNITA forces in southern Angola. They are interests the pursuit of which, in the view of the Ghana delegation, violates international law, the Charter and the decisions of this body.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Perhaps we may ask in all sincerity, and quite legitimately too, whether these Stinger missiles, supplied in furtherance of a military alliance with South Africa to topple the Luanda régime, are not really part of a search for a more pliant customer?

If, indeed, apartheid South Africa can be said to have legitimate interests in securing its borders, it is the contention of the Ghana delegation that in the context of the matter before the Council, South Africa's borders end at the northern reaches of the Orange River, to the south of Namibia. It has no common border with Angola.

The undeclared war on two fronts by the racist régime against Angola, together with the known incursions of UNITA detachments operating from the Kamina base into north-eastern Angola, must be condemned by the Council. Such nakedly aggressive policies, if they go unchecked, undermine the foundations of the Charter and impose dangerous strains on the course of international relations, not only in the area of conflict but globally. Our response must move beyond a benign solicitation for Angola's well-being and towards actions consonant with the clear danger to regional and international peace and security inherent particularly in the frequency of South Africa's armed attacks on its neighbours.

What has been the consequence of South Africa's illegal policies against Angola and in the region as a whole? An Economic Intelligence Unit assessment of the impact of the continuing war on Angola asserts that:

"It is impossible to quantify the economic losses attributable to the war conditions suffered without respite since independence, but they are clearly enormous. These losses have been incurred at several levels:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

- (a) direct damage resulting from attacks;
- (b) the disruption of economic activity;
- (c) the diversion of government revenue and foreign exchange resources into military expenditure;
- (d) the diversion of scarce skills into the armed forces; and
- (e) indirect and multiplier effects ...".

As of 22 September 1985 it was estimated by the Angolan Government that the damage caused by the war was in the region of \$12 billion. Such are the pernicious consequences of the illegality to which we bear witness and against which the Council must act to terminate it if the Charter has concrete meaning for the upholding of the rule of law and those guarantees of peaceful, economic and social development enshrined in its principles, to which we will subscribe.

I wish now to turn to some of the reasons given by the representative of South Africa in justification of his Government's actions in and around Angola.

In his statement the South African representative claimed, in a series of rhetorical questions, that the Government of Angola had contravened the Alvor Agreement, suffered from massive opposition by the majority of Angolans, not held elections, relied on foreign troops and amassed weapons and foreign personnel. There are many reasons for which my delegation would take issue with each of those claims, but let us put the accuracy or falsehood of the claims aside for a moment. Let us rather examine, albeit hypothetically, whether South Africa, or any other State for that matter, has a right under international law to invade Angola for these reasons. It should be clear to any fair-minded arbiter that matters of the Alvor Agreement, the holding of elections and the acquisition of weapons are all domestic matters for the Angolan Government, or any Government, and

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

therefore cannot be sufficient reason for armed intervention by any outside Power. The Charter and various international covenants prohibit interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. Furthermore, Article 2 (4) of the Charter prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. South Africa's reasons cannot therefore be excused in international law.

The South African representative also stated that his Government regarded it as its unequivocal duty to:

"protect the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia against terrorist depredations. To this extent, South Africa acts in a protective capacity in the region". (S/PV.2764, p. 8).

Two pertinent comments suggest themselves. The first is that Namibia is a United Nations administered Territory and there is no record of South Africa's having been requested to protect Namibia or its inhabitants from anybody. By which law or by what mandate, therefore, is South Africa mobilizing forces to protect Namibians? Secondly, one is forced to ask by what mandate the racist régime has become the policeman of the subregion.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Ghana delegation has noted also that the representative of South Africa confirmed that his State President Botha visited what he called the area. For two reasons that act contravened international law. First, the visit to the Kuando-Kubando area was an illegal entry into the sovereign territory of Angola; secondly, the visit even to Namibia was to a Territory that, according to the resolutions of the United Nations, and indeed the resolutions of this very Council, South Africa continues to occupy illegally. Here, too, South Africa's explanations should be rejected because they are self-serving and palpably in contravention of international law.

The last reason adduced by the South African representative to justify his country's action was that South Africa would not allow Soviet and Cuban forces to threaten its security interests. That, too, is a classic case of misrepresentation. All members of the Council know that the Cuban troops in Angola have never crossed the border into Namibia or any other neighbouring country and that on the contrary it is South African forces that are in Angola.

The reasons furnished to the Council by the South African representative for the present incursion by his Government's forces into Angolan territory and its preparations to invade that country further must therefore be rejected and deprecated because they form the basis of the violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter.

The Council now has a fairly clear idea of what is happening in and around Angola, but what will it do in the matter? To answer that question it must be borne in mind that our purpose is not only to listen to the different narratives of the serious situation in Angola. The Council's action in the matter must be decided against the background of what provisions of the Charter have been violated and what action or series of actions are likely to yield a promise of improving international peace and security.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Ghana delegation is of the firm view that there has been a wilful aggression committed against Angola, its sovereignty violated and its domestic affairs intruded into. All those are prohibited by the Charter. In our view, therefore, the Council must order South Africa to withdraw its forces from Angolan territory immediately. South Africa must also cease forthwith the use of the Territory of Namibia as a staging post for illegal incursions into Angola. Indeed it must, in accordance with past resolutions of the Council, also bring its illegal occupation of that Territory to a speedy end.

We believe that the Council must grant South Africa a reasonable time within which to withdraw its troops from Angola. In any case, the withdrawal should be accomplished in not more than two weeks from the date of the adoption of the resolution on the matter. Such a withdrawal should be monitored by the Secretary-General's team of observers on behalf of the Security Council and a report submitted to the Council at the expiry of the period of withdrawal.

Those are the actions the Ghana delegation recommends to the Council not only for dealing effectively with the dangerous situation in Angola but also for preserving the image and authority of this body. Should these orders be flouted, then the Council must meet urgently in order to consider other actions prescribed by the Charter that would bring South Africa to book.

The United Nations was founded to save the world's peoples from the scourge of war and the Security Council, its highest organ, was especially created principally to ensure actions that would bring peace. There can be no doubt that the present situation in and around Angola bears all the marks of internecine war. It is therefore time for the Council to save its credibility by acting firmly and in unison in favour of peace.

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

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

Mr. BRANCO (Sao Tome and Principe): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. I am confident that your experience and diplomatic skills will lead the Council's work this month to a successful conclusion.

May I also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to your predecessor for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during last month.

Once again the Council is meeting to consider the aggression against and occupation of the territory of southern Angola by the racist régime of South Africa. The facts are known. They have been presented before this Council time and time again during the past 12 years. The latest of these acts of aggression was brought to our attention by the letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 November by the President of the People's Republic of Angola and by the statement made before this Council by the Vice-Minister for External Relations of that country. These facts do not need to be repeated here. For one thing, they have been confirmed by the Government of South Africa. And the true intent of the latest aggression was also made clear: the intervention in Angola is aimed at saving the UNITA bandits and allowing them to continue their role of instruments and agents of South Africa in the destabilization of an independent and sovereign country.

Another element to bear in mind is the fact that South Africa is using the illegally occupied territory of Namibia as a springboard to launch its attacks against Angola just after the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) of

(Mr. Branco, Sao Tome and Principe)

30 October last, calling for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia and implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations plan for independence of the Territory.

It is clear that the South Africa racist régime is not interested in finding a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa.

If South Africa were interested in a peaceful solution to the problems of the region, instead of engaging in yet another cycle of aggression it would be considering the latest proposals of the President of Angola, His Excellency José Eduardo Dos Santos, aimed at creating the atmosphere of peaceful coexistence and understanding necessary for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

When my delegation decided to participate in this debate, after so many speakers had addressed the Council, we knew that there was nothing new we could add to the case before us.

If we are taking advantage of this opportunity so kindly afforded to us it is because we deem it necessary once again to join the international community in expressing our solidarity with the people of Angola and to call for increasing moral and material support for its Government to face South Africa's occupation, destabilization, economic sabotage and terrorism.

But our solidarity with the people of Angola is historical, permanent and well known. Our decision to participate in this debate grew out of our belief in the role that the United Nations is called to play in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Branco, Sao Tome and
Príncipe)

We believe that the United Nations Security Council, by assuming its responsibilities under the Charter, has the political authority and the necessary machinery to compel South Africa to comply with the decisions of the international community.

We believe that the majority of the members of this Council do not want to be perceived as accomplices of the apartheid régime's crimes against mankind. We are aware that some members of this Council, including permanent members, have particular interests in South Africa.

I shall not repeat here the political and legal arguments that compel decisive action by this Council. The representative of Ghana and others who have spoken previously have made that point very clear. I should like rather to raise a moral question. How long are we willing to see the apartheid régime persist in its refusal to accept the rule of law and civilized behaviour between States? How long are we, by our inaction, going to provide South Africa with one supplementary reason to feel confident enough to use its perverted power against legitimate members of our international community?

I know of the importance of problems that arise from using moral judgements in foreign policy. In this respect, I should like to quote a distinguished American, who, addressing the question of ethics in foreign policy, had this to say:

"Finally, in answering the question of how we judge moral arguments in foreign policy, one-dimensional moral reasoning makes it too easy to rationalize what is convenient. And grand appeals to national ideals or ideological motives ... can blind one to relevant facts and the two other dimensions of moral choice. All three dimensions of motives, means and

(Mr. Branco, Sao Tome and Principe)

consequences are important, and the task of weighing competing moral claims cannot be solved by the application of a simple formula but must be reasoned in the light of facts in particular cases."

In this particular case the facts are known. The motives, that is, preservation of the supremacy of one race, exploitation of a majority and destabilization of other countries, have been universally condemned; the means, that is, repression, institutional violence and the use of force, cannot be supported by any member of the international community; and the consequences, that is, destruction of lives, a state of permanent terror and threats to peace and international security, are well known.

My delegation humbly submits that the facts of this particular case call for meaningful and decisive action by this Council, and it is with this hope that we conclude our statement.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sao Tome and Principe for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, as this is the first time I have taken the floor this month, I should like to tell you that my delegation, being aware of your great qualities, is most gratified at the fact that you are guiding the work of this body. I should like also to take this opportunity to tell our colleague, the Permanent Representative of Italy, how pleased we were with the courteous and competent manner in which he guided our work last month.

Once again we are meeting to consider the complaint of a State neighbouring on South Africa that is a victim of the aggressive behaviour of that country. Once again the facts reported to us have been overwhelming and demonstrate that South Africa is obstinately committed to its policy of unwarranted use of brute force and

(Mr. Blanc, France)

pressure against the countries of the region. Once again we have noted a disturbing intensification of the cycle of violence in that part of the world because of the refusal of South Africa to accept negotiated solutions and to respect its commitments.

It is the duty of the international community to impugn the behaviour of a State which practises a policy of force and aggression against its neighbours. The peaceful settlement of disputes and abstention from the threat or use of force form the very foundations of the United Nations Charter.

Therefore France has condemned and continues vigorously to condemn the violations of the territory of independent and sovereign States in flagrant defiance of international law. As soon as we were informed of the facts with which we are concerned today, on the details of which I will not expatiate, the French Government, in a communiqué, expressed its grave concern. Once again I should like to express the sympathy of my Government to the Government and the people of the People's Republic of Angola.

The present deterioration of the situation appears to be of particular concern. The information to the effect that President Botha and various officials of the Pretoria Government inspected South African troops on Angolan territory attests to an escalation of the policy of intervention on the part of the Republic of South Africa outside its own borders. For the first time Pretoria has thus acknowledged its direct implication on the spot, as well as its violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, in defiance of the non-intervention commitment which was expressly entered into when the Lusaka Agreements of 16 February 1984 were arrived at. These lethal military actions, finally, arouse particular indignation when we remember the various difficulties the countries bordering on South Africa have to face.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

It is hardly necessary to recall here the depressing list of those who have become victims of that aggressive policy with which the Security Council has recently had to deal. After Botswana we had Lesotho and Angola in 1985, Zambia, Zimbabwe and once again Botswana in 1986, and Zambia, Mozambique and Angola this year.

However, the present debate has revealed once again that various factors have been very closely linked to the deterioration of the situation in southern Africa: the persistence of disturbances and repression in South Africa because of the maintenance of the policy of apartheid, the threats to the stability and security of States of that region and the refusal by South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia under the conditions laid down in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In this context, the position of my country is unequivocal. Reiterating its strong condemnation of South African intervention outside its borders, France requests South Africa to end all military activities in Angola and to proceed to a complete withdrawal of all its troops from that country.

The French Government is firmly convinced that a policy based on the use of force and violation of the sovereignty of neighbouring States can only worsen the present deadlock, whereas, on the other hand, it is only respect for each other's security, negotiation and dialogue that would be conducive to resolving the problems that today confront all the States of southern Africa.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

France, which has been actively involved in the adoption and implementation of measures designed to compel the Government of South Africa to put an end to this policy, is determined to continue along these lines, sparing no effort to promote the search for peaceful, negotiated solutions to the conflicts in this part of the world.

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

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

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): I congratulate you most sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. Under your stewardship the Council is in good hands.

We also congratulate your predecessor, the Ambassador of Italy, under whose leadership last month the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987), a momentous decision which, though belated, triggered off the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). We are indebted to him. We hope the fruits of his labour as represented by resolution 601 (1987) will not be wasted.

In 1974 Mr. Agostinho Neto, who was to become the first President of the People's Republic of Angola, gave a lecture at the University of Dar-es-Salaam in which he spelt out his vision of an independent Angola. He stated:

"What we want is an independent life as a nation, a life in which economic relations are just, both between countries and within the country; a revival of cultural values which are still valid for our era."

All President Neto wanted for his war-weary country was independence, which is the right of all peoples, and economic justice for his people, as well as the revival of their cultural values, which had been destroyed by almost five centuries

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

of Portuguese colonialism. His was a pragmatic vision, a simple and humble vision, forged in the crucible of a long and bitter liberation struggle.

President Neto was not only an eminent poet, but also a man of destiny who had an acute sense of history. He had not fought his war of liberation by remote control from an isolated island far from the cares and worries of our modern world. He had watched the bulk of his beloved continent of Africa break the shackles of colonialism and imperialism and emerge into independence as proud nations. His pragmatic vision of an independent Angola, free and proud, was therefore a genuine echo of the visions of his brothers on the continent whose countries had gained independence earlier.

The first order of business for Dr. Neto and the MPLA on gaining independence for Angola was "binding the wounds of war and getting the economy functioning again"; and there were many wounds to bind and a ravaged economy to resuscitate. For we dare not forget how Angola's independence was almost still-born as a result of the brutal invasion of that former Portuguese colony at the very moment of its birth as a free nation by South African troops and an assortment of mercenaries in the pay of Western intelligence agencies. Angola has not known peace since then. The end of the liberation struggle against Portuguese colonialism was immediately followed by an even more serious struggle, the struggle for the survival of the independent People's Republic of Angola.

In other words, those regional, extraregional or continental forces which had unsuccessfully tried to frustrate the birth of an independent Angola would not and did not accept defeat when finally the flag of freedom was hoisted in Luanda on 11 November 1975. They were determined to impose a new war on the new nation, and they did so.

South Africa and its friends have never left Angola alone over the past 12 years of its independence. The racist régime in Pretoria has never accepted

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Angola's independence; nor have those extra-continental forces which had conspired with the racist régime to destroy Angola at birth.

The question we ask is simple: what have the people of Angola done to deserve all this? The Constitution of the People's Republic of Angola

"recognizes, protects and guarantees private property, including that of foreigners, provided these favour the economy of the country and the interest of the Angolan people".

What is wrong with that? The President of Gulf Oil Exploration and Production Company stated before the Subcommittee on Africa of the United States House Foreign Affairs Committee on 17 September 1980:

"There is an underlying mutual respect and trust which I believe is the key to understanding the productive relationship we have in Angola, productive for Angola as well as productive for us. Gulf has not been unduly hampered by the socialist aspirations of the MPLA ... Government," he continued. "In fact, Gulf has encountered no ideological or discriminatory problems of any significance."

Is there anything wrong in that?

The late President of Angola, the founding father of that tortured nation, realist and pragmatist that he was, had never minced words in reaffirming the non-aligned bona fides of his country. He repeatedly stated that Angola would "never be enslaved by any foreign country, be it the USSR or any other Power".

Is there anything wrong with that? What is communist about that? Yet we are told that, because of the presence of Cuban troops and Russian advisers in Angola, Angola has become a communist country, its independence has consequently been compromised and its people are denied their right to self-determination, and all

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

that nonsense. That these baseless accusations are levelled by the racist régime in Pretoria and its apologists in the West, which over the past 12 years have done everything in their power to ensure that the Cuban troops will not leave Angola, is obscene enough.

Why do Angola's enemies keep ignoring and denigrating fresh historical facts? The years 1975 and 1976 are not far in the past. Do they need any reminding that Cuban troops did not wake up one morning in 1975 in Havana, or wherever, and decide to go to Angola? Why can they not be honest enough to accept the undeniable fact that the custodian of Western democracy, civilization and morality, the régime in Pretoria, is responsible for the invitation and continued presence of Cuban troops in Angola? Can they deny this fact?

I am sorry, Mr. President, I am not used to name calling, but some facts need some animation if we are to drive the message home, and I shall try to animate them.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

An American journalist, Mr. Jonathan Kwitny of the Wall Street Journal stated in his book Endless enemies: the making of an unfriendly world - a book describing how one can make enemies if one tries hard enough, and some countries have tried hard enough - that:

"The presence of so many Cubans in Angola is the direct result of United States policy, which pumped up a brief, third-rate skirmish into a major war that the United States never had any intention of fighting through - in fact, would have been crazy to fight through".

But, crazy or not, the war continues in Angola. Why did South Africa and its friends not leave Angola alone when they failed to deny its people its independence and the exercise of its right to self-determination, in November 1975? If they had allowed the people of Angola to begin their newly won independence in peace and freedom, the Cuban troops would have been justifiably accused of having overstayed their welcome in Angola if they had remained there long after the uninvited, unwanted and unloved South African troops had left. But no, that was not the case, because South Africa was still determined to destroy the infant Republic, after failing to prevent its birth. If not destroyed at birth, the new nation was to be reborn and remade under duress in Pretoria's image, personified today in the south-east corner of Angola by the leader of the UNITA bandits. If not reborn and remade in Pretoria's image through the instrumentality of Savimbi's treachery, the new Republic was to be brought up on an interminable starvation diet of destabilization, political rape, and murder by economic strangulation. Sadly, this has been the tragic pattern of life for Angola since 1975. That that tormented front-line State has survived all this is not a miracle; it is the result of the indomitable spirit of its courageous people, who will for ever, refuse to be denied their right to self-determination.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

It is said that Angola, by inviting Cuban troops to help it in its time of peril, has invited communist interference and influence in southern Africa. At the culmination of the now famous Lancaster House talks in 1979, an ultra-Conservative member of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, whose name is better left unuttered, observed stridently and angrily that the agreement which the Patriotic Front had signed with the internal parties and the British Government was a sure recipe for turning Southern Rhodesia into a rabid communist country when it became the independent Republic of Zimbabwe. According to his ideologically determined definition of the right to self-determination, Southern Rhodesia could proceed to genuine independence, freedom and democracy only under Muzorewa, or even Smith himself, because he was pro-West. Even in this wonderful country the tar-baby school of thought was thriving then, as it does now. There were those in that school of thought who most probably suspected the good Lord Carrington, who, in retrospect, brilliantly chaired the Lancaster House talks to their triumphant culmination of communist inclinations. Why did Lord Carrington not contrive the break-up of the Lancaster House Conference and send Muzorewa back to Salisbury to continue to rule Zimbabwe/Rhodesia, under the tutelage of Pretoria, the self-appointed paterfamilias of the southern African régime?

So, as can be seen, we know it all. In the civilized, democratic, Christian Western world the right to self-determination can be exercised only by those colonial peoples which attain independence and immediately declare themselves pro-West, and behave accordingly ever after. Otherwise their destabilization, the murder of their innocent people, the destruction of their economies, their total deprivation of stability and peaceful existence are justified.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

God willing, next month the super-Power of the West will sign a momentous treaty with the super-Power of the East. We are told this is perfectly all right, and we fully agree, for we unashamedly believe quite passionately in the principle of peaceful coexistence; and peaceful coexistence can only thrive when nations of this world, small or large, first-world or third-world, can cultivate friendly relations, which must, of necessity, transcend their ideological incompatibilities. Indeed, we firmly believe that the right to choose friends and identify enemies is an inalienable right, the prerogative of free nations and peoples everywhere. Inherent in this right is the prerogative of signing agreements between and/or among free nations. In these matters of self-determination we shun the blind guidance of purely ideological prejudices. So we sincerely believe that signing the intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty or improving relations between Washington and Moscow does not and cannot infect Washington with the communist virus or Moscow with the capitalist virus.

Angola is no different as far as we are concerned. Angola has not turned and will not turn communist simply because of the presence in that country of Cuban troops pursuant to an agreement between Angola and Cuba. Angola is an African country brutally denied the right to nurture in peace its own African nationalism, rooted in its own people's culture. In any case, Angola has been so preoccupied with fighting for survival, fighting against indomitable forces, that even if it had wanted to take any communist lessons from Cuban troops it had no time to do so.

'But what if, in the exercise of its sovereign right to determine its own destiny, Angola had chosen Marxism, Leninism, socialism or communism, as its guiding principles? So what? Is it not entitled to do so? Is the Western fount of justice, equity and democracy not this inalienable right of peoples to choose

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

freely their own way of life, so long as such way of life does not interfere with the ways of life of others?

I say all this to stress the obvious. No one in the Council can deny the fact that the people of Angola do not deserve the murderous invasions of their country by South Africa abetted by a country or countries claiming exclusive fatherhood of morality, decency and democracy. There is no scintilla of democracy, decency or morality in the cold-blooded murder of innocent Angolan villagers in their own country in the name of fighting the non-existent spread of communist influence in southern Africa.

Angola has come to the Security Council not to plead for mercy, but to report a grievous injustice perpetrated against its peace-loving people. The situation in Angola is very serious. The Council has listened to the speech by the representative of racist South Africa. He has left the Council in no doubt as to the intentions of his warmongering country. He has made it clear that his country's war of aggression against Angola will not end until Angola cries uncle, until the MPLA has either apologized to South Africa for its behaviour 13 years ago towards the Alvor Agreement or has embraced Savimbi.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

And yet the South African representative continues to argue that his country is not at war "with any party in the region", even as he defends the visit "made by State President Botha to the area of conflict recently" - the area of conflict being southern Angola. To do what, we ask. Why would Mr. Botha visit his troops in southern Angola if South Africa is not at war with Angola? Was Mr. Botha invited to Angola by the Government of Angola? But maybe we should at least thank Ambassador Manley for informing the Council that "senior representatives of many of the Governments around this table have also visited the area". (S/PV.2764, p. 8)

It would be interesting to know whether there are present any representatives of those Governments which send their senior representatives to southern Angola. These are the beans that have been spilt by Ambassador Manley. And, we ask, from which side of the border did they visit the area of conflict? Are we dealing here with a grand conspiracy against the People's Republic of Angola? We hope that before the end of this Security Council meeting, if there are any suspects around this table, they will own up so we can know who are the friends of Angola and southern Africa, and who are their enemies.

We have said it before many times: it is absolutely dangerous for the West to practise the kind of "constructive engagement" which gives South Africa the impression that it is all right for the apartheid State to do all over the region whatever it deems to be in the interest of the Western world - even if it means committing brutal acts of murder in neighbouring States. What is the West going to do, we ask. South Africa has announced that it is at war with Angola in support of the UNITA bandits. Pretoria's troops are no longer in southern Angola ostensibly in hot pursuit of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). No, they are there to fight Angola, on the side of UNITA - not even to fight the Cubans because the Cubans are not involved in that war. The war against Angola is a war

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

to force Angola to cry uncle, to replace the MPLA Government with a régime made in the image of Pretoria.

There you are. The Security Council has a job cut out for it. A Member of the United Nations - a small third-world country whose only wish is to be left alone to shape its own future as it sees fit - is in peril. Is the Council going to allow South Africa to get away with murder? That is the question. How much tolerance does the Council have for such brutal acts of aggression as the ones being so persistently perpetrated by South Africa against the front-line State of Angola and all other front-line States? Is the Council not encouraging anarchy in this world by tolerating such acts of aggression?

We have to be very honest with the members of the Council. As a representative of a front-line State, let me state categorically before this Council that Angola will not perish in the hands of South Africa. My country is not a super Power, and I am not saying that my country will defend Angola. But if the West has sleepless nights because of the presence of 35,000 or so Cuban troops in Angola, it ain't seen anything yet. For if the Security Council allows South Africa to threaten the existence of Angola, the next meeting of the Council to discuss the complaint by Angola will be a different ball game. The Council will soon be dealing with a far larger number of foreign troops from Cuba and elsewhere, hundreds of thousands of them, in Angola, because Angola will not allow its people to perish.

For the sake of peace in southern Africa, the Security Council must say "enough is enough" to South Africa. With one solid voice, the Council must call on South Africa to withdraw from Angola forthwith and with no pre-conditions. South African troops are not in Angola at the invitation of the legitimate Government of that country. Cuban troops are. This must be made clear to South Africa.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Failure to act decisively by the Security Council surely would render this august organ of the United Nations absolutely unworthy of its name and its place and role in the Charter of our Organization.

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

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

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. Your broad experience and well-known diplomatic qualities ensure the success of the work of the Council under your leadership.

May I also take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Bucci of Italy for the skilful and able manner in which he conducted the deliberations in the Council in October.

Similarly, I wish to thank you, and through you the other members of the Council, for affording me this opportunity to take part in the present debate.

When a Member State of the United Nations fails to abide by the provisions of the Organization, breaches the norms of international law and systematically pursues a policy of force, aggression and destabilization against its neighbours, the international community has an inescapable duty to denounce it and punish it. Such is the case of South Africa against which the People's Republic of Angola has yet again brought a complaint to the Council. The letter which President Dos Santos sent to the Secretary-General on 18 November and the presentation on Friday last by the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Angola unquestionably show that South Africa has alarmingly intensified its acts of aggression against Angola and that the international community cannot remain passive in the face of those actions.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

Clearly, what the Pretoria régime is trying to do is to defend its hated policy of apartheid. That indeed is the purpose of its repeated attacks against the front line countries and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

But as long as apartheid continues, it will be extremely difficult to restore peace and security in southern Africa. The monstrous tentacles of apartheid have embraced the entire region; and that is the direct and indirect cause of most of the evils afflicting that part of the continent. There is an overriding need then to eliminate apartheid from the world.

The arguments in support of this meeting are overwhelming. Recent attacks against Angola and violations of that country's territorial integrity and sovereignty are particularly disturbing and serious because of their impact on the entire region and the independence of Namibia, the territory of which has unlawfully been occupied and used for acts of aggression against Angola and other independent countries.

The illegal visit, without prior authorization, that was recently carried out by the President of South Africa, together with five members of the Cabinet, in Angolan territory, caused widespread indignation in all circles because it was a flagrant violation of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. Far from declining, aggressive acts by South Africa has become increasingly numerous and varied. The time has come when we can no longer wait to carry out definitive action.

The problems created by South Africa have laid claim to the attention of this Council more frequently than have many other serious problems facing the world. About a dozen resolutions have been adopted on Angola. Yet, the conflict is gradually worsening. The patience of the international community is exhausted, as indeed must be that of the Security Council. The Council must exhaust all peaceful means available to it to force South Africa to abide by the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations. The world cannot continue to be merely a reliable witness of the flagrant acts of aggression of the Pretoria régime against Angola. This passivity must be turned into resolute action, and this action must

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

begin here in the Security Council, where all the members must stand together and put an end to South Africa's impunity, that very impunity that allows it to continue to wreak havoc throughout an entire region of the African continent.

During its short life as an independent nation Angola has not been able to devote itself to the development of all its resources and to the well-being of its people. Its energies have had to be channelled to the defence of its territory. The people of Angola have an inalienable right to security and development without foreign interference in their country, the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of which must be respected by all. Every country in the world has a corresponding duty to ensure that this right becomes a reality.

Colombia, faithful to its devotion to the cause of peace and to the principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter, shares the views of numerous Members of this Organization which are opposed to and condemn the acts of aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and other front-line countries. Likewise, we are opposed to any form of foreign occupation and to the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of one country by another. Colombia is sure that this Council will discharge its responsibilities in connection with the question now before it and that it will adopt and put into practice a strong resolution that will begin the process of restoring peace and security to southern Africa and therefore eliminate one more threat to peace throughout the world.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GURIRAB: Allow me first of all to extend congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November and to wish you a successful tenure of office.

Likewise, I should like, once again, to felicitate your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Bucci of Italy, under whose productive presidency the Security Council met last month to consider the burning issue of Namibia and adopted resolution 601 (1987), which calls for a cease-fire between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Botha régime, as a first step in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In recalling the successful conclusion of that debate, I should like to express SWAPO's satisfaction at the welcome steps taken by the Secretary-General to give effect to resolution 601 (1987). The Secretary-General has already received a written communication from the President of SWAPO in which our well-known position to sign and observe a cease-fire is reiterated clearly and categorically.

Africa and peace-loving humankind everywhere are expecting from the Security Council prompt, collective and decisive action in favour of the Government and the people of a friendly country, Angola, in the face of Pretoria's latest unprovoked and massive military aggression. Let us hope that the present debate will be marked by a unanimous and solemn undertaking by all the members present here to put teeth in the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Council heard the passionate and factual statement made by Comrade Venancio da Silva de Moura, Vice-Minister for External Relations of the People's Republic of Angola. During the past 12 years of its much maligned and tortuous independence, Angola has been forced, by Pretoria's repeated destructive policies,

(Mr. Gurirab)

to bring its complaints before the Security Council on numerous occasions. The Security Council has so far adopted at least 11 resolutions on Angola, nearly one per year of Angola's independence, all necessitated by South Africa's aggression against it.

(Mr. Gurirab)

It goes without saying that this is by no means the first series of meetings, and it certainly will not be the last, on any of the target areas of the enemy's devilish adventurism in southern Africa. Lest we forget, I remind the Council that Pretoria considers the whole African continent to be an area of its so-called legitimate security interests. Today, once again, it is Angola, but other front-line and neighbouring States have also on several occasions been militarily attacked, had acts of aggression committed against them or been subverted in one way or another by the régime. As long as apartheid exists there will always be more similar complaints, for more innocent and defenceless people are going to die and more peaceful countries are going to be invaded and occupied by the common enemy, the racist South African minority régime.

Let us also not forget that the Boer racists recruited, trained, transported and deployed mercenary gangs to overthrow the Government of the Seychelles, far away from the southern African region, not too long ago. The intentions, stated or implied, of the racist Boers are bad. They always act in bad faith; they live by the sword and know only one kind of human relations - dominance. And we all know the fate of those who live only by the sword. That is the verdict of history.

For the racists the writing is on the wall. Their soldiers and officers, who are having to fight apartheid wars far away from their own country, understand what this portends. But, of course, in P. W. Botha and others like him we have ailing old men who have been enfeebled by their own racism and distorted belief in military invincibility. It is not military might but the masses that bring about the final victory. The Boers do not know it, but we do. They are flesh and blood like the rest of us. They are slowly but surely learning the hard way that our bullets kill them just as theirs kill us. When we see them transporting back home

(Mr. Gurirab)

to the land of apartheid the corpses of their boys killed by their hundreds in Namibia and in Angola, we know they are paying a high price in lives and resources, and politically at home. We know they can hardly continue paying that heavy cost indefinitely. Our aim is to increase the momentum steadily until the enemy accepts our demands for self-determination and liberation. The racists are killing Namibians and Angolans alike in the name of racial hegemony.

That the Afrikaner clique is determined further to entrench apartheid is a fact. But what about the white electorate, which had a golden opportunity during the all-whites election last May to reject apartheid, but which instead chose to vote Botha back into power and added other right-wing extremists to the so-called Parliament? To us, they also share the blame and must answer for themselves. They are racists who are afraid of democracy and change. We refuse to make them our teachers, but, as an old, good comrade is fond of saying, to forgive is human; to forget is out of the question.

It was actually the Angolan people, led by the MPLA, which, by defeating the racist invaders and their renegade collaborators and traitors and driving them out of Angola, during the decisive war years of 1975-76 made a major contribution towards debunking the myth of the apartheid régime's military invincibility. Pretoria sought in vain to plant itself in Angola as a successor colonial Power in the aftermath of the defeat of the anachronistic and brutal Portuguese colonialism, which had brutalized our neighbours for 500 long years.

SWAPO whole-heartedly supports the request by the Angolan Government for the convening of urgent meetings of the Security Council in connection with the South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

The racists in Pretoria and their Western apologists must be disabused of the oft-repeated farcical notion that Pretoria's armed forces are invading and

(Mr. Gurirab)

committing aggression against Angola in hot pursuit of SWAPO fighters. That is utter nonsense. The South African army invaded our country way back in 1915, 72 years ago, during the First World War. The Namibian people did not invite it, and we have always demanded its total withdrawal from our country. The occupation army has now grown from the initial few battalions in 1915 to 100,000 troops deployed throughout the country. The racist armed forces and their allies invaded Angola in 1975, using Namibia as a staging post, not because of SWAPO, but to prevent that country's hard-won independence. Angola is being invaded and destabilized because it has rejected apartheid, has opted for socialism and is a staunch supporter of the struggles of the heroic peoples of South Africa and Namibia, led by their national liberation movements.

Naturally, the front-line States, by virtue of the history, geography and geopolitics of our region, play a central and enduring role, collectively and severally, in Namibia's fight for total liberation and national independence. We are very appreciative of this demonstration of solidarity and encouragement, and we are confident that we shall continue to receive more of the same in the difficult times ahead.

In this context, I must single out the Angolan people, the MPLA Workers Party and its Government for special tribute, and reiterate our people's respect, admiration and affection for them in the common struggle against the forces of imperialism, colonialism, apartheid and reaction, including the armed bandits and puppets.

(Mr. Gurirab)

In addition to the enemy's hatred of the Angolan Government for successfully aborting its sinister attempts to recolonize the country and for pursuing progressive policies at home and abroad, Angola is being attacked, destabilized, invaded and occupied, and innocent and defenceless citizens are being killed because of its principle position of standing shoulder to shoulder with the Namibian people and SWAPO in the common struggle until Namibia is free.

It is for this reason that Angola has come to occupy a unique place in the eyes of the Namibian masses and SWAPO combatants as a true friend, a reliable ally and a generous neighbour. The Angolan people have been second to none in defending their own independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. But they have also been dying by the hundreds for Namibia's freedom. It is our country which is being used as a launching pad for repeated and unprovoked acts of aggression by the South African régime against Angola, and in other cases against Zambia and other front-line States.

That is why it is more than a duty for us in SWAPO to express to our comrades-in-arms of the MPLA Workers' Party our wholehearted solidarity and to pay a tribute to the memory of the brave soldiers of FAPLA who were sacrificed on the battlefield for us all. Thank you, comrades, and let it be known that you will always find us in the same trenches as together we forge ahead in the common struggle in defence of Angola's true independence and Namibia's liberation, respectively. It is in this spirit that we welcomed the important words spoken here in this debate by the Angolan Vice-Minister for External Affairs, Comrade Venancio da Silva de Moura.

Two things are clear about the latest enemy aggression against Angola. First, it was a rescue operation for the UNITA armed bandits that were on the verge of being wiped out, once and for all, by the FAPLA forces. Secondly, Botha's arrogant

(Mr. Gurirab)

and illegal entry into the sovereign territory of Angola was not a sign of omnipotence but rather an act of acute desperation. It was a calculated risk to boost the morale of an invading army, along with its running-dogs, which was confronted by a well-armed and strategically placed defence of the FAPLA forces.

What the racists do not tell the world about are the heavy losses in men and the destruction of military equipment and other war materiel they have sustained. The Vice-Minister gave a detailed account of what transpired in Angola and how the enemy was routed.

Now I want to mention what the enemy's casualties were and the dilemma which has resulted in Namibia for it.

There were a series of major confrontations in Namibia between the enemy forces and the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), SWAPO's military wing, on 31 October 1987, around Okanghudi, 57 kilometres north-east of Ondangua in northern Namibia. Over 100 South African soldiers were killed or wounded. They were part of a convoy of about 70 armoured vehicles and trucks which fell into an ambush.

On another occasion, our forces laid a well co-ordinated ambush for an enemy convoy which was heading for Angola. In the ensuing fierce battle, 14 combat vehicles were completely destroyed and two others, a Buffel and a Wolf combat vehicle were captured intact. Various categories of grenade launchers, rifles, machine-guns, mortar shells, grenades, anti-personnel mines and other war materiel were captured.

During the earlier part of October, there were other significant battles inside Namibia. On 3 October, our units attacked a makeshift camp of the notorious Koevoet reconnaissance detachment at Omafo; the next day, our forces overran an enemy post at Oneya, in northern Namibia. Altogether, 18 enemy soldiers were killed.

(Mr. Gurirab)

On 10 October another unit of PLAN fighters attacked a South African base in Onavivi, 100 kilometres north-west of Oshakati, and killed seven enemy soldiers and wounded others.

One Casspir troop carrier, a fuel-tank vehicle, a water-tank vehicle, two military trucks and five dwelling tents were destroyed. Between 13 and 14 October our units destroyed a network of telephone and other types of communication grids at Omahenge, 104 kilometres west of Oshakati.

These extensive military actions by our forces against the enemy, coupled with bomb blasts in Windhoek, Walvis Bay and Oshikango on 12 November, attest to the heavy pressure being exerted on the South African occupation forces.

Since 18 November, the occupation forces, thrown into disarray and panic, have cordoned off the African township of Kuisebmund, near Walvis Bay, Namibia's seaport. Telephone lines and other means of communication to and from the township have been cut off by the racists from the rest of Namibia and the outside world. Regrettably, because of the strict press censorship and the news and information blackout, not much is known abroad about these important developments.

Tension is mounting as battleships have been deployed at Walvis Bay and more and more troops and mercenaries are being brought in in response to the intensification of the armed struggle.

Furthermore, two black battalions - 101 and 202 - of the puppet South-West Africa Territory Force, an auxiliary unit created by Pretoria to help fight its colonial war and to serve as an instrument, UNITA/RENAMO-style, for destabilizing an independent Namibia, mutinied, refusing to wear UNITA uniforms and to fight in Angola on the side of the Boers and the bandits. A large number of them are being held at Windhoek, Grootfontein, Walvis Bay and Otjiwarongo.

(Mr. Gurirab)

The mutineers protested, saying they refused to go into Angola because "we did not want to become UNITA's mercenaries against our will". About 360 of them had already been sent to Walvis Bay's military prison, while another 48 had resigned. About 500 Namibian black soldiers are involved in the mutiny.

The mutineers also accused the South African so-called Defence Force of being cowardly in that its troops fought behind the Namibian black recruits. They are being sent ahead of the white soldiers as part of P. W. Botha's desperate attempt to keep his losses to a minimum.

(Mr. Gurirab)

A former 101 battalion soldier made an appeal to all Namibians who wished to join Botha's occupationist forces. He said:

"To go and fight SWAPO in Angola is a crime against our society. To go and fight against FAPLA in their own country is a crime against God's will."

It is against the background of these major military setbacks and political crises that Botha's risky adventurist incursions into Angola via Namibia must be seen. His was a calculated but desperate spectacle to placate mounting public pressure at home and to pretend that his forces were in full control of the situation. He is fooling nobody, not even his own people, who are daily having to bury their loved ones being killed in ever increasing numbers in Namibia and in Angola where the enemy has extended its military occupation.

Collectively, we and the Angolan comrades have no choice but to continue exerting more pressure on the common enemy until Botha withdraws lock stock and barrel from the occupied Angolan territory and agrees, without any further delay, to sign and observe a cease-fire with SWAPO in order to pave the way for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). To this end the horrendous impedimenta of sponsoring armed bandits and arming and financing them, and insisting on widely discredited policies of destructive engagement and linkage and coercive diplomacy, must be abandoned forthwith in favour of freedom, peace, stability and development in our region. That is the sincere wish of the countries and peoples of southern Africa, and the overwhelming majority of humanity will support our cause.

The statement made in this Chamber on 23 November by Botha's errand boy properly belongs in the dustbin of history. It offered absolutely nothing, and merely served as a classic example of double-speak fraught with contradictions and obfuscations.

(Mr. Gurirab)

In the meantime, the Security Council should have no difficulty in adopting unanimously the draft resolution before it, in order to send a clear and serious message to Pretoria that the Security Council is firmly opposed to its lawlessness and supports Angola's right to self-defence to ensure the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its country.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Gurirab for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I warmly congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. It is our hope that your tenure will be marked by the positive and effective assertion of the responsibility of the Security Council for peace and security in our world.

We salute your worthy predecessor, Ambassador Bucci of Italy, who presided over the Security Council when it adopted resolution 601 (1987), on the related issue of Namibia, for his good and historic stewardship. We hope that the understanding that prevailed during the Council's debate on the question of Namibia will once again be exhibited on the important issue now before us.

The Security Council has been summoned to act to stop renewed aggression by racist South Africa against a sovereign and peace-loving African State, the People's Republic of Angola. The meeting of the Security Council thus accords with the intent of the founding fathers of our Organization and the framers of the Charter, who, in their collective wisdom, vested the Security Council with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The provisions of the Charter in this regard are so specific and unambiguous that they do not need to be repeated.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

The latest invasion of the People's Republic of Angola and the occupation of parts of its territory by the racist armed forces are different in many respects. For the first time in the ignoble history of racist South Africa's military intervention in Angola the Pretoria régime has openly and publicly admitted to invading the sovereign People's Republic of Angola, a Member State of the United Nations. That naked aggression was further compounded by the unmitigated arrogance of a televised visit by Mr. P. W. Botha to occupied southern Angola, along with selected members of the racist régime. There could not be a more despicable display of naked provocation. Perhaps we should not be unduly surprised by the turn of events, because such behaviour could not but represent the manifestation of desperation by a régime whose days are numbered.

For as long as the racist army held sway in southern Angola, it claimed the right of hot pursuit of freedom fighters of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The claim was as lacking in merit as it was bogus. It was deliberate defiance of the decisions of the Security Council. The new development, its open and shameless admission to being engaged in a war with Angola, can be explained only in the context of preparing the white community of the apartheid society for the news of excessively high casualties among the hitherto supposedly invincible racist army.

We seem to be witnessing in southern Africa in general and in Angola in particular a latter-day replay of the vengeful invasion and occupation of Ethiopia in 1934 by Fascist Mussolini's Italy. That invasion was partly meant to make up for the loss of Italian national pride in the famous battle of Adowa of 1896, in which the Italian army was routed by Ethiopian forces.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

However, instead of displaying the complacency with which the League of Nations handled Mussolini's act of aggression, a situation that inexorably led to the start of the Second World War, the Security Council must recognize racist South Africa's act of aggression for what it is and live up to its obligations under the Charter.

My purpose at this juncture is to indulge in some reasoning, with an appeal to those who never fail in their condemnation of apartheid but yet extend comfort and encouragement to the pariah régime.

I am a Christian and I hold dear my Christian principles. In my culture we have a saying, which I shall paraphrase for general understanding: The company and associations a person keeps determine his choice of friends. It is in the spirit of that saying that I consider it necessary to appeal to those Member States that collaborate with apartheid South Africa in military technology, those Member States that trade with apartheid South Africa in gold, diamonds and other minerals, those Member States that provide landing rights and technical facilities to South African Airways and those Member States that accommodate cultural exchanges and tourism with racist South Africa. All of them, willingly or unwillingly, are friends of apartheid South Africa. They are as responsible for the criminal activities of racist South Africa as Pretoria itself. We should like to believe that these friends of apartheid South Africa would not want history to condemn them for the sins of apartheid. We are certain that their peoples consider apartheid abhorrent and a crime against all mankind. We appeal to the Governments of all those countries, in the name of everything decent, just and moral, to cease collaboration with and support for Pretoria. They are, in our opinion, in bad company.

It is a sad commentary on the state of our world that a country which emerged from the suffocating throes of Fascist Portugal's colonialism has been denied the

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

freedom and peace necessary to chart its national destiny. Since 1975 racist South Africa, encouraged and supported, overtly and covertly, by certain friends and allies, has embarked on a most vicious act of aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring independent African States and especially the People's Republic of Angola. The recruitment and use of mercenaries for destabilization of neighbouring States have been supplemented with direct intervention of the apartheid armed forces through the latest invasion of Angola in violation of international law. Angola has thus been denied the respite necessary for nation-building. Angola has been forced to divert its limited but much-needed resources to the defence of its integrity and the survival of its independence and freedom.

It is this deplorable situation of the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a peaceful nation that the Security Council is being called upon to condemn. The international community must not fail to signal its outrage and condemnation of the illegality of aggression. The draft resolution currently before the Security Council is simple and most deserving of the unreserved support of all members of the Security Council. Its adoption, and the readiness to implement both its provisions and the requisite follow-up action in the event of racist South Africa's failure to comply, is the minimum that Africa, indeed the world community, expects of the Security Council.

We urge that there not be any prevarication. Let no one, directly or inadvertently, lend support to cold-blooded murder of Africa's sons and daughters. We hope that the Security Council will act decisively and correctly.

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

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

Mr. MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): First of all I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that your experience and ability will ensure the success of the work of the Council. I must also express thanks to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Italy, for the able manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Council last month.

The Security Council is meeting again to consider aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola, which has been the victim of this constant aggression since 1975. This is a war in which that régime employs its racist forces, groups of mercenaries and bandits to perpetrate criminal acts of terrorism against the Angolan people. Furthermore, it has occupied part of the territory of Angola since 1982.

The statement made by the Vice-Minister for External Relations of Angola in this Council sets forth clearly the details of the crimes committed by Pretoria against Angola. It also indicates the determination of the Pretoria régime to continue its racist, expansionist and aggressive policies, which violate the sovereignty of the neighbouring States and destabilize those States with the object of extending its domination over those States, so as to exert pressure on them and dissuade them from supporting the liberation struggle of the Namibian people and the people of South Africa, which are victims of the odious apartheid régime.

The Pretoria régime practises racism in its ugliest form. It employs brutal, inhuman methods which bring to mind the methods used by the Nazis during the Second World War and the Fascist methods used by the racist régime of Tel Aviv in occupied Palestine and against the Arab States.

(Mr. Masri, Syrian Arab
Republic)

The war of aggression waged by the Pretoria régime against Angola is launched from the territory of Namibia, which it continues to occupy illegally, in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which sets out the United Nations plan for the immediate independence of Namibia. South Africa is using that territory as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.

The aggression against Angola is a part of the well-known aggressive policy pursued against the whole of southern Africa. The Pretoria régime is intensifying its aggressive, destabilizing, terrorist acts. It is using its army and the mercenaries which it trains, finances and recruits against the front-line States. The continued occupation of Namibia by that régime and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States are a source of tension in the southern part of the African continent. This constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. These atrocities cannot but give rise to the indignation and unanimous condemnation of the world public.

The current invasion of Angola comes at a time when the Angolan army is defending its territory and inflicting heavy losses on the bandits and terrorists carrying out their crimes in Angola with support from outside. The undoubted aim of that invasion is to save those gangs from total defeat. The Pretoria régime has explicitly declared that its forces are fighting in Angola to prevent the Angolan army from destroying the terrorist puppets.

Pretoria's defiance has reached such a level that a number of its officials have visited a part of the territory of Angola that is under occupation, in violation of the Charter and the rules of international law designed to ensure the territorial integrity and sovereignty of every State. That invasion is undoubtedly

(Mr. Masri, Syrian Arab
Republic)

an act of defiance of the United Nations and a violation of all relevant international declarations and instruments.

It is clear that the Pretoria régime could not have been so defiant had it not been for the economic, material and political support and assistance it receives from certain Western countries and from its twin, the racist régime of Tel Aviv, within the framework of co-operation and co-ordination between the two régimes.

We call upon the Security Council to condemn this violation and not to hesitate to take all the measures necessary to end this violation of international law and the blatant acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. These measures should include the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, so as to compel the pariah régime to end all its racist and aggressive practices, withdraw all its forces unconditionally from Angolan territory and terminate its occupation of Namibia.

Finally, we pay a tribute to the Angolan people and army for their valour in facing that brutal act of aggression. We affirm solidarity with that people in its struggle for freedom, independence and dignity.

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

There are no further speakers on my list for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 25 November, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.