

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

**1905**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 31 MARCH 1976 LIBRARY

DEC 20 1984

NEW YORK

UN/SA COLLECTION

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1905) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola: Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007) .....	1

#### NOTE

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

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

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

## 1905th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 31 March 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1905)

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

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

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

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

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions adopted earlier [1900th to 1904th meetings], I shall invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table and the representatives of Congo, Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.
2. In accordance with the decision taken at the 1902nd meeting, I shall also invite the President of the

United Nations Council for Namibia and the members of his delegation to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should also like to inform the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Bulgaria, Guinea-Bissau and Portugal in which they request to be invited, under Article 31 of the Charter, to participate without the right to vote in the Council's debate. If I hear no objection, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite those representatives to participate without the right to vote in the debate.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ghelev (Bulgaria), Mr. Fernandes (Guinea-Bissau) and Mr. Galvão Teles (Portugal) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Angola, on whom I now call.

5. Mr. LUVUALU (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked to speak in order to clarify what was said yesterday by the representative of South Africa [1904th meeting]. We should have liked the representative of South Africa to be here in this chamber so that he could rebut what we are about to say.

6. The South African representative, in his hypocritical, fallacious and demagogic statement spoke about the "limited participation" of his country in what he called the "civil war" in Angola. He said that the aggressive forces of his country were in the region of Calueque and Ruacaná only to protect the hydro-electric project of the Cunene River and the workers who are working there. But in fact the regular South African army entered Angola in force on 23 October 1975 and occupied almost half of Angola. These are the battalions which invaded Angola: Natal, Zulu, Orange and two specialized tactical combat units. Those forces, supported by armoured vehicles, tanks and aircraft, successively occupied Pereira de Eça (province of Cunene), Sá da Bandeira (province of Huíla), Moçâmedes (province of Moçâmedes), Lobito and Benguela (province of Benguela) and Novo Redondo (province of Cuanza-Sul). Please note that Novo Redondo is situated about 800 kilometres from the frontier with Namibia. We have a map here for those who want to confirm this, on which can be seen the frontier with Namibia and the town of Novo Redondo.

7. From Novo Redondo to Celaï and Luso, the South Africans had occupied all these territories. However, the dam at Calueque and Ruacaná, which they claimed to be protecting, is located about 15 kilometres from the Namibian border. The South African forces were stopped by our forces on the Keve River in the centre of the country without having reached their target, that is, without having seized Luanda, the capital of Angola, in order to prevent the proclamation of independence and to suppress the vanguard of the Angolan people, the MPLA [*Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola*]. They turned towards the eastern central area where they occupied the towns of Nova Lisboa (province of Huambo) and Silva Porto (province of Bié), where their lackey, Jonas Savimbi, was located. The objective of the South African forces in the east was to gain control of the railways in order to get them running, but they failed.

8. Then the South Africans occupied the town of Luso (province of Moxico), near Katanga and the frontier with Zaire. The occupation lasted three months, in the course of which South African soldiers engaged in the massacre of the civilian population and pillage, destruction and theft, as we have already declared in our previous statement [*1900th meeting*]. Violent fighting took place on the Keve River in the town of Celaï, in the centre of the country, between our troops and the South African troops. In the course of this fighting South African soldiers were taken prisoner. Some of these prisoners were presented to the international press in Angola and outside. We have here photographs of the soldiers taken prisoner in the centre of the country; we have here evidence of the destruction of bridges by the South African army when it was retreating. Anyone who wants to confirm this can look at these photographs.

9. Now where is the truth about what was said by the representative of South Africa, namely, that these aggressive South African forces never fought our troops, that they withdrew from Angola themselves and that their presence in Angola was limited to Calueque and Ruacaná in the region of the Cunene dam? As all here are aware, aggressive or occupation forces never willingly withdraw from a country. What is true is that the myth of white invincibility and supremacy of the Vorster régime was shattered by FAPLA [*Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*]. The débâcle, which the representative of South Africa described yesterday as "voluntary withdrawal", began once the South African troops had received severe blows in Celaï and Novo Redondo, leaving on the field a large amount of military equipment of the most sophisticated kind.

10. If the South African troops withdrew from Angola of their own free will, why do they not withdraw from Namibia in the same way? In retreating into this Territory, they should be aware that the people of Namibia has understood that the *apartheid* régime is in a situation in which its days are numbered. The time has come when the Namibian people will throw out of its Territory the forces of aggression and *apartheid*.

11. In his futile statement the South African representative sought to give the impression that the South African racists were providing humanitarian services to the Angolans. There is a proverb that says charity begins at home. How could South African troops be rendering humanitarian services to our people when they do not even render them in their own country, where Africans languish in misery? What he called "refugees" are Angolans who were forced by his régime to leave their country. But we know clearly that the essential purpose of this operation was military and political.

12. As to what he called the guarantees which the People's Republic of Angola was alleged to have given to the racist Government of Pretoria, all we need do to refute this claim is repeat the statement of the Political Bureau of our Party, dated 20 March. We stress once again that the People's Republic of Angola has no common frontier with South Africa and does not recognize South Africa's right of sovereignty over Namibia.

13. The Cabora Bassa project and the construction of the dam on the Cunene, the objective of which was political and military, were resisted and condemned by the international community because South African racism, in collusion with Portuguese fascism, wanted to establish in the Cunene area a state with 1 million whites, a buffer state providing a kind of cordon for the Pretoria régime which would enable it to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. The idea of this plan was also to create an economic infrastructure in Angola and Namibia which would enable the colonizers

of these two countries to entrench themselves and strengthen their colonial system. In spite of our protests and those of international public opinion, the dam was built against our will.

14. But the struggle of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies, and that of the Angolan people in particular, changed the course of history. Portuguese colonialism was swept out of Africa. The project of creating a white buffer State was killed in its cradle, but the aftermath persists, that is, the South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

15. The Cunene dam and all other property left by colonialism is the property of the Angolan people. Inasmuch as the Cunene and the dam are situated in the territory of Angola, a sovereign, independent State, we do not see why we should allow the South Africans to protect this dam in violation of our sovereignty. We are a sovereign and independent State, and it is our right to protect our people and its interests, and not the right of any other country. Similarly, with regard to our foreign policy we are a non-aligned country. We have incorporated non-alignment in our constitution. We will never agree to bargain away our right to sovereignty.

16. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Romania would like to take this opportunity warmly to welcome the delegation of the People's Republic of Angola under the leadership of Ambassador Pascal Luvualu.

17. The Socialist Republic of Romania has consistently upheld the right of all peoples to existence, freedom and independence. My country has always stressed the need to respect the right of every people to choose freely and independently the path of its economic and social development in conformity with its fundamental aspirations.

18. For more than a decade the Romanian people have been following with feelings of brotherhood, friendship and sympathy the heroic struggle of the Angolan people to recover its freedom and national independence. The Romanian people has demonstrated its militant solidarity with the just cause of the Angolan people by giving material, political and diplomatic assistance. The attainment of independence by the Angolan people once again confirms the invincibility of the struggle of the peoples of the world to exercise their right to be masters of their own destinies, their right to eliminate colonial domination and oppression.

19. Romania welcomed the declaration of independence of the People's Republic of Angola and established relations of co-operation with the Government created by the MPLA, the legitimate representative of the Angolan people. Relations between Romania and Angola are based on reciprocal respect for independence and national sovereignty, equal rights and the principle of mutual advantage.

20. It is undeniable that several months ago the armed forces of South Africa entered Angolan territory and occupied a large part of that country, including the area near the Calueque dam. That has been recognized by even the South African authorities in the statement of the Prime Minister of the Pretoria régime appearing in document S/12019 which constitutes a veritable admission of guilt.

21. My country has resolutely pronounced itself in favour of the withdrawal from Angola of the armed forces of South Africa and the cessation of all forms of imperialist intervention in Angola.

22. The invasion of a part of the territory of Angola by the South African troops is an act of aggression against an independent State that is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law. We consider that the use of armed force by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola falls within the provisions of article 3, paragraph (a) of the Definition of Aggression adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. These provisions are the following:

“Any of the following acts, regardless of a declaration of war, shall, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of article 2, qualify as an act of aggression:

“(a) The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack”.

23. We believe that the arguments invoked by the régime in Pretoria to justify its acts of aggression against Angola are unacceptable. Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Definition of Aggression states: “No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression”.

24. Furthermore, the fact that South Africa has withdrawn its armed forces from Angola cannot relieve it of political, legal and material responsibility for its act of aggression. We consider that the cessation of an unlawful act cannot have the effect of rendering non-existent an act that has already been committed. The principle of the international responsibility of a State that has committed an act of aggression is well established in international law, and I do not believe that it needs to be proved that, in addition to political and legal responsibility, the act of aggression entails material responsibility on the part of the guilty State.

25. The representative of Angola, in his statement last Friday and in his statement just a few minutes ago, has presented us with some very enlightening facts and data regarding the scope of the injury caused the Angolan people and its economy by South Africa.

26. Romania considers that the Security Council has a duty to condemn the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. The Council must call upon South Africa to refrain from committing such acts in future. It must take measures to ensure that South Africa unconditionally and strictly respects the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. South Africa does not have the right to impose any conditions on the Government of Angola for the withdrawal of South African armed forces from Angolan territory. Angola's sovereignty covers its entire territory and cannot be made subject to conditions imposed by force from abroad.

27. Furthermore, we consider that the South African armed forces that have been withdrawn from Angola should not be stationed on Namibian territory, since any South African presence in Namibia is illegal. Hence, South African armed forces must leave Namibia; they must be transferred to South Africa.

28. We also support the legitimate request by the People's Republic of Angola regarding the return by South Africa of the goods that its armed forces took away with them. Similarly, we regard as completely justified the request that South Africa compensate the People's Republic of Angola for the damage caused on Angolan territory.

29. My country believes that it is the duty of the Organization and of all the countries of the world to support Angola's independence and territorial integrity and to give assistance to the Angolan people and its legally constituted Government in order that they can devote their entire energy to the peaceful reconstruction of their country and to its economic and social progress.

30. Furthermore, we sympathize with the very natural desire of the People's Republic of Angola to be admitted as soon as possible to membership of the United Nations.

31. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm the Romanian people's solidarity with the Angolan people's struggle to strengthen its national independence, as well as our firm support for the other peoples of southern Africa that are waging a courageous struggle against colonial and racial oppression, a struggle to free themselves from foreign domination and to assume their rightful place in the community of independent nations.

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

33. Mr. GHELEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first to express my gratitude to you and, through you, to the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to

explain the views of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola.

34. The fact that these deliberations of the Council are being held under the distinguished presidency of a representative of Africa—the Permanent Representative of Benin—at a time when the Council's agenda contains an item of undeniable importance and urgency for the destiny of Africa is a guarantee that the results of these deliberations will be in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles contained in the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and also with the sacred right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

35. The history of the struggle of the peoples of the world for liberation from the colonial yoke has been long and filled with suffering. Wherever it has appeared, colonialism has been equally cruel and inhuman. However, the path of the African peoples towards freedom and independence has been particularly difficult and tragic. For decades, indeed centuries, the whole African continent appeared, practically speaking, on the maps of the world in the colours of their metropolitan colonial masters, carved up by geometrical lines. The colonial night that fell over Africa seemed impenetrable. However, far-reaching political and social changes in the world began after the great October socialist revolution and the historic victory over the forces of fascism and reaction in the Second World War. The path to the national and social liberation of the peoples and the path towards the rapid and final elimination of the colonial system, including the liberation of Africa, were opened up.

36. After many years of heroic struggle, the peoples of the last colonial empire, following so many others, have won their great struggle for independence. The alliance of the southern African racists and the Portuguese colonialists has been broken. The people of Angola, following the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Cape Verde and Sao Tome and Principe, has also won its independence. That courageous people, which so fully merited the right to embark upon the path of its economic and social development in conditions of peace and security, became the target of a vast conspiracy by international imperialism and reactionary forces. Indeed, this conspiracy was launched even before the independence of the People's Republic of Angola was proclaimed, and its object was the MPLA, the vanguard of the Angolan people. Its purpose was to suppress the tried and true leader of the Angolan people, MPLA, and to prevent the proclamation of the independence of the new State. Furthermore, the young Republic became the object of naked armed aggression by the fascist régime of South Africa, which used as its point of departure for that aggression the Territory of Namibia, illegally occupied by the South African racists. That flagrant

intervention was inspired and generously financed by international imperialism and the multinational companies, without the support of which the Pretoria régime would long since have ceased to exist. The vast propaganda machine of the imperialist forces was brought into action to cover up this conspiracy, to divert attention from the aggression committed by their tool of oppression, South Africa, and also to prevent the deep changes which will inevitably come to the entire southern part of the continent: South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. The aim of this conspiracy was also to destroy the achievements of the struggle for national liberation by the patriotic forces of Angola.

37. The events in Angola have in a most tragic fashion amply confirmed how justified were the many and repeated warnings issued by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations that the racist régimes in southern Africa constituted a grave and constant threat to the peace and security of the continent and to the independent development of the African States.

38. And now the other element in this monstrous plot has turned out to be the policy of a State which is a permanent member of the Security Council and which both before the liberation of Angola and after the proclamation of its independence rallied to the side of the enemies of peace and social progress. That, of course, should come as no surprise to anyone any more. The behaviour of reactionaries, of the adversaries of peace, has a logic of its own. It is entirely logical for those who preach the need for a new world cataclysm and are hoping for a holy alliance against the countries of the socialist community and against socialism itself to find themselves side by side with those who are striving to annihilate the achievements of the long national liberation struggle of the Angolan people and to prevent its independent development. In the difficult days when there was a serious threat to the independence and territorial integrity of the young Angolan Republic, the Maoists, together with all the world's reactionaries, gave their support to the puppet counter-revolutionaries and the agents of neo-colonialism in Angola, and hence to the intervention of South Africa.

39. Today, while the threat to the independence of Angola from the South African racists continues, we have been witnessing scandalous manoeuvres aimed at nothing less than justifying the aggression of the Pretoria régime and, in the final analysis, at preventing the Angolan people from embarking resolutely on the course of social progress. After the failure of this unsavoury enterprise, and in order to conceal their activities and ambitions, the united forces of reaction have been striving to divert attention from the aggression against Angola and are resorting to slander and unscrupulous distortion of the facts, which by now are well known to the entire world. And what is even more edifying, they are displaying at the same

time a hypocritical concern for the independence of the Angolan people. In this regard the representative of the People's Republic of Angola quite rightly stated on 26 March to the Council "We should like to make it abundantly clear here that any concern of this kind about our country is unquestionably an unjustified interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola. We vigorously reject that interference, just as our people have vigorously rejected the enemies of our country in their courageous struggle for freedom." [1900th meeting, para. 19.] In the same way, it seems to me that we can say with equal justification that in the flames of the struggle of the Angolan people against imperialism and for the defence of their hard-won liberty many illusions were destroyed, and the peoples of Africa and of the whole world can now unerringly distinguish their friends from their enemies.

40. The threat of aggression from South Africa against the national independence and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola persists. The statement we heard yesterday afternoon in this very chamber from the representative of the Pretoria régime is further proof of this. Indeed—and this has been stressed by many speakers before me—this is a threat to the peace and security of the whole African continent. Therefore, in the view of my delegation, it is urgent to eliminate this threat. No one can now doubt that this threat exists and will continue until effective measures are taken to guarantee respect for the national independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and until South Africa ceases to use the Territory of Namibia to commit acts of aggression against the young Republic. The international community and the United Nations has a duty to provide decisive support for the People's Republic of Angola in its efforts to achieve its programme of national reconstruction.

41. We are convinced that the Security Council will not fail to discharge its responsibilities and that it will not only vigorously denounce South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola but will call insistently for the unconditional withdrawal of all its armed forces from Angolan territory, demand that South Africa strictly respect the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and call upon South Africa to pay full compensation for the enormous injury caused the Angolan people by its aggression.

42. The People's Republic of Bulgaria—which from the very beginning, side by side with the Soviet Union, Cuba and the other countries of the socialist community and together with all the progressive forces in the world, has provided unreserved assistance and fraternal support to the Angolan people and its vanguard, the MPLA, in their struggle for freedom and independence—will continue to support the People's Republic of Angola in its efforts to consolidate its independence and to provide all necessary assistance

to the Angolan people in its struggle for democracy and social progress.

43. Just two days ago, on 29 March, in Sofia, the Eleventh Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party was opened. From the rostrum of that Congress the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council, Todor Zhivkov, declared:

“In spite of the brutal interference of the imperialists, the Angolan people, supported by the countries of the socialist community and by progressive forces in the world, has inflicted a defeat on the aggressors and on internal reaction and thus succeeded in safeguarding the People’s Republic of Angola.”

44. Before concluding, I cannot fail to convey the warmest greetings of the Bulgarian delegation to the representative of the People’s Republic of Angola, a long-standing friend of mine, Ambassador Luvualu, and to tell him how happy I am to see among us here the representative of a free and independent Angola. We are certain that the People’s Republic of Angola will become a full Member of the United Nations in the very near future and that it will thus be able to make its valuable contribution to the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and to the efforts for peace and understanding among peoples.

45. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): The independence of Angola marks the end of the oldest colonial empire in Africa. The valiant people of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, and Sao Tome and Principe fought an adversary which was stubbornly entrenched and refused to recognize even their right to independence. We pay a tribute to the determination, courage and valour of all the people of the former Portuguese colonies. Their struggle has been one of the longest and the most tenacious waged by any people fighting for freedom.

46. In Angola—whose representative we welcome here—the struggle was complicated and prolonged by factors both internal and external. Of these, we are concerned today with one element, reprehensible in any light, that is, the incursion of South African forces into Angolan territory.

47. The world knows that the racist régime in South Africa long supported Portuguese colonialism and viewed it as a bulwark against the rising tide of African nationalism. The fall of the Salazar-Caetano régime in Portugal and the triumph of the freedom fight in Portuguese colonies in Africa undoubtedly came as a great blow to the misguided rulers of South Africa, but evidently it did not bring home to them the realities of the new situation. That they should have ventured out from their own misruled country, across the territory of another country which is under their

illegal occupation, namely, Namibia, and set themselves up as protectors of refugees and dams in the territory of yet another shows with what little respect the régime in Pretoria regards the norms of international behaviour, the provisions of the Charter and the decisions of the United Nations. The justification advanced by the Government of South Africa for entering into Angolan territory, that is, to protect the Calueque dam on the Cunene River and to look after the Angolan refugees, is totally unacceptable and inadmissible under international law and the Charter. Nothing that was stated here yesterday by the representative of South Africa justifies his Government’s action in any manner whatsoever.

48. Furthermore, the fact that the South African troops may have left Angola by now is a vindication of the determined stand taken by the people of Angola and the result of the adverse international reaction aroused by their action. It does not in any way extenuate the seriousness of the original offence. South Africa’s action must therefore be rightly and unambiguously condemned by the international community.

49. The Council heard the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia [1903rd meeting], a Council of which Pakistan has the honour to be a member. In his statement he expressed the views of the Council for Namibia, views which my delegation shares and endorses, about South Africa’s continued and illegal presence in Namibia and the problems that it poses for that region.

50. Speaking for the African Group, the representative of Kenya [1900th meeting] raised the issue of South Africa’s use of Namibia for aggressive purposes against the People’s Republic of Angola. We agree with his view that Angola would have no grounds for giving assurances about its boundaries to a Government that illegally dominates Namibia and that the Council for Namibia is the proper authority to obtain such assurances from Angola. We endorse his demand that the Security Council should call once more upon South Africa to vacate Namibia as soon as possible.

51. Angola has rid itself of the colonial yoke at the cost of the blood of its martyrs and the determination and patriotic struggle of all its people. It sets out now as a free, independent and sovereign country on the road to progress and the promise of a peaceful and prosperous future. Angola is possessed of vast territories and endowed with great resources. Its geographical situation gives it special importance in its own region and elsewhere. Its people have been steeled in a long and arduous fight for freedom. We welcome them to the comity of nations and applaud their determination to protect and consolidate the independence of their country and to maintain the independence of their policies.

52. The representative of Angola was within his rights in suggesting that, as a sovereign and inde-

pendent country, Angola may choose to seek help where it wishes, even to invite and retain within its borders the military forces of foreign countries which it considers friendly to its cause and whose assistance it feels it needs. As the representative of Tanzania said:

“one can have his own views on the merits and demerits of the request made by Angola; one can even question whether the Government of Angola had the right to ask for any assistance.” [*Ibid.*, para. 76.]

Speaking for my delegation, all I would like to say in this matter is that the consequences and implications of such actions must be carefully weighed—all the more so in the case of newly independent countries and liberation movements—in the light of the realities of the present-day world, its cleavage of views and its conflicts of interest, a reflection of which we have witnessed in the course of the present series of meetings. In this context we have noted with the seriousness which it merits the statement of the representative of Angola that:

“The People’s Republic of Angola belongs to no international military bloc, nor does it allow foreign military bases to be established on its national territory.” [*Ibid.*, para. 17.]

53. My country has recognized the People’s Republic of Angola. We wish it well, and we look forward to developing our relations with it in this forum in due time and in others where the countries of the third world get together.

54. We would be lacking in candour, we would be remiss in friendship, if we did not voice our doubts as to the advisability of inducting foreign military forces into the fight for liberation. Liberation movements have the right to seek moral as well as material support from their friends and supporters in all parts of the world. Indeed, it is the duty of their friends to come to their assistance in the appropriate manner. When it comes to the fight for freedom—when, as sometimes happens and as well might happen again, the unity of their struggle is troubled by differences, of whatever nature these might be, tribal or ethnic, ideological or social—the introduction of a foreign element can prove to be an additional complicating factor. That much said, we express the hope, indeed the conviction, that in its quest for peace and progress for all its people the Government of Angola will make national reconciliation one of its primary objectives.

55. For Africa, the most difficult struggle and the most stubborn battles still lie ahead. In that struggle Africa will need the support and sympathy, moral and material, of all its friends and supporters all over the world. Indeed, the sympathies of the entire world are with the peoples of Zimbabwe, of Namibia and of South Africa. It is they who must fight the battle

for freedom, justice and dignity. In this context, and in conclusion, I should like to cite the words of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who 10 days ago in this message on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, said:

“The independence of Mozambique and Angola has brought the racist régimes in Pretoria and Salisbury face to face with the historically unfolding realities and just and militant aspirations of Africa. The struggles for self-determination and equality in Zimbabwe, Namibia and in South Africa have been intensified. The liberation can be achieved only through a people’s struggle and sacrifice. We are confident that the peoples in southern Africa will ultimately triumph through their own resolute efforts. While no external power can fight their wars or win their victories, it remains the duty of all Members of the United Nations to give all moral and material help to these peoples in their just cause.”<sup>1</sup>

56. Mr. VINCI (Italy): The complaint against South Africa submitted to the Council by the delegation of Kenya on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations has been considered by the Italian delegation on its objective merit and with all the seriousness it deserves. My Government and my delegation are fully aware of the motivations and the facts which led the Government of Angola to send a special envoy, the roving ambassador Pascal Luvualu, to address the Council and to attend its meetings. I should like to offer Ambassador Luvualu the sincere welcome of my delegation and to assure him that we have listened to what he has said very sympathetically and with great attention. We fully understand his position and sincerely appreciate the wisdom and restraint with which he has spoken. My delegation has also taken due note of the interesting point of clarification he has made this morning on the extensive area of Angolan territory initially occupied by the South African forces.

57. We have also listened attentively to the statements made on behalf of the African Group by the representative of Kenya [*1900th meeting*], by the representative of Zambia [*1901st meeting*], also in his capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*1903rd meeting*], and by the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [*1901st meeting*], as well as the statements made by other African colleagues and by the representatives of countries in other parts of the world. We have studied these statements with all due care.

58. The Italian Government officially recognized the accession of the Angolan people to independence on 11 November 1975. On 18 February 1976, a spokesman for the Italian Government stated:

“The Italian Government, upon recognizing the People’s Republic of Angola, renews its heartfelt

hope that it may realize a condition of peace and national unity through the cessation of all foreign military intervention and the participation of all Angolans in the reconstruction and the development of the country, also in the interest of security and co-operation in the entire region. The Italian Government expresses the conviction that such developments will contribute to strengthening the bonds of friendship which unite the peoples of Italy and Angola and to furthering the ties of co-operation between the two countries."

That statement was shortly followed by a message to Luanda expressing the intention of the Italian Government to establish diplomatic relations between Angola and Italy. In his cable to the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Angola, Mr. José Eduardo dos Santos, the Italian Foreign Minister, Mariano Rumor, stated, *inter alia*:

"The establishment of these relations will contribute to reinforcing the links of friendship which unite the peoples of Angola and Italy and to promoting, on a basis of equality, fruitful contacts between the two Governments, as well as firm relations of co-operation."

The prospects for this friendship and co-operation have recently been enhanced by the visit to Luanda of the Italian Minister of Transport and the signing, on that occasion, of an agreement for the development of the Angolan airlines. We believe we have thus provided a substantial example of the kind of friendly co-operation we wish to build up with the People's Republic of Angola.

59. If I have quoted extensively from these statements and given these facts, it is for one simple reason. I just wanted to show the confidence the Italian Government and people place in the will of the people of Angola to stand on their own as a free and independent new nation in the international society and soon, we hope, as a Member of the United Nations. We do not wish to enter any competition with other Powers. To begin with, we do not pretend to be inspired, in our actions, by entirely unselfish interests and aims—we are, after all, human beings—but we certainly try our best to serve in the first instance the interests of the people of Angola, of Africa and of the world community as a whole, at least as we see them.

60. The Italian Government has from the outset watched the development of the process leading to the establishment of Angola as a free African country favourably and sympathetically. Italy did not fail, even before the felicitous conclusion of that process, to give its support to the legitimate aspirations for independence of all the populations of the former Portuguese territories. As I recalled on 17 March [1891st meeting], Italy, acting unilaterally or with its partners and allies, never ceased in past years to press Portugal for the

fulfilment of the rightful aspirations of the peoples of its African colonies. The re-establishment of democracy in Portugal came at the same time as freedom for Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde and Sao Tomé and Príncipe. Italy can only rejoice and wish all these newly born African States fast and fruitful development on the road of welfare and prosperity.

61. Turning now to the events which have motivated the convening of the Council, I should like first of all to say that Italy and its eight partners of the European Community very clearly stated their position on 23 February. The statement issued on that occasion was officially welcomed by the Organization of African Unity as a clear reaffirmation of those rights of self-determination and independence the fulfilment of which motivated the previous steps undertaken by the nine countries in Pretoria in order to speed up the withdrawal of South African forces from Angola.

62. The five basic principles stated in the European Community's declaration of 23 February are, therefore, at the basis of our position on the matter we are considering. I am taking the liberty of reading the entire text, which was circulated as under cover of a note of the Secretariat dated 5 March:

"1. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine countries of the Community, meeting in Luxembourg and recalling the decisions taken by them with regard to the People's Republic of Angola, have considered the questions arising in that part of Africa.

"2. The Ministers have followed carefully and with considerable concern the course of the conflict in Angola, which has caused great suffering and heavy loss of human life and serious damage to the economy. They appeal for restoration of the harmony necessary for the country's reconstruction and development.

"3. They consider that it is for the Angolan people themselves to decide their own destinies. They therefore keenly appreciated the efforts made by the Organization of African Unity to find an African solution to the problems involved and refrained from any action that might jeopardize the success of those efforts. With that consideration in mind, they condemned all outside military intervention and expressed the sincere hope that a speedy end would be put to such intervention. In the interests of the prosperity of the region, they look forward to the establishment of peaceful and constructive co-operation, which will call for good-neighbourly relations between the African States of the region.

"4. The Ministers confirmed the basic positions of the nine member States of the Community:

—Readiness of the Nine to develop ties of co-operation, in so far as they are desired by the

African States, and rejection of any action by any State aimed at establishing a zone of influence in Africa;

—Respect for the independence of all African States and their sovereign right to decide their national policy without foreign interference;

—Support for the action of the Organization of African Unity to promote African co-operation;

—The right to self-determination and independence of the Rhodesian and Namibian peoples;

—Condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa.”

63. The withdrawal of the South African forces from Angola three days ago is a positive development. We should like to see similar moves follow from other sides. In this connexion, I should like to read a communiqué delivered a few days ago at Luxembourg by the current Chairman of the European Community:

“The member States of the European Community welcome the withdrawal by the Government of the Republic of South Africa of its forces from Angolan territory. Convinced that the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angola will contribute to the solution of the problems of the area in the direction advocated, on 16 March 1976 the Nine made the following representation to the South African Government.

“The member States of the European Community, which through their ministerial declaration of 23 February condemned foreign military interventions and expressed the firm hope that they would be rapidly brought to an end, for that purpose insist that the South African Government immediately proceed with the withdrawal of its troops from Angolan territory.’ ”\*

64. We shall abstain, for our part, from entering into a detailed examination of the motivations put forward by different parties on the basis of some disclosed facts, which it would take too long to verify, as well as of many unknown facts which we shall not learn about for a long time to come, if ever. What we have essentially in mind is the gradual consolidation in Angola of those conditions which we feel are indispensable to enable any country to attain unimpeded development of its institutions and social and economic life. My delegation identifies those conditions in this case in the absence of any use of force or threat of aggression from South Africa, in freedom from all outside interference and in unhampered efforts for the unity of the country, together with its full participation in the international common quest for peace and security.

65. From what I have said it should be clear, I believe, that my delegation would look favourably on any proposal based on the following points: first, the interests of the Angolan people; secondly, the lack of justification for the violation by South Africa of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and the utilization of the international Territory of Namibia to the same effect; thirdly, the responsibility of the Security Council, which transcends the interests of each of its members; and fourthly, the ending of any outside interference in Angola which would increase the present danger of power politics and negatively affect any prospect for a peaceful and positive solution of the whole complex situation in the southern part of Africa. We feel that there is no better way to help the people of Angola, after many years of fighting, peacefully to build their new nation, which deserves the respect of all of us.

66. In spite of contentious circumstances and in spite of a situation characterized by terrible human suffering in Angola, as I have already said, we have faith in the future of the Angolan people. We believe in more favourable prospects; we pin our hopes on peace.

67. We take this opportunity to assure the Angolan people and Government of our support. We extend our hand in friendship to them. We rejoice in particular over the news that they intend to join the Organization. We wish them well and we wish them the cessation of any act of aggression. For our part, we assure them of deliveries and expeditions only of the sort that have already taken place in the field of economic collaboration.

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

69. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, permit me, first of all, to thank you and the other members of the Council for providing me with the opportunity to take part in the Council's present consideration of South Africa's aggression against the people of Angola. The Arab nation, victim itself of racist and colonialist aggression, cannot but express full support for and solidarity with the heroic struggle of the African brother people against one of the few, yet the ugliest, of the remaining racist régimes in today's world.

70. The South African racist régime was not content, apparently with its criminal policy of *apartheid* against the indigenous majority of the South African people, nor with its continued aggressive and illegal occupation of Namibia. It is now using the usurped Territory of Namibia to invade Angolan territory, thus aggravating even further an already grave act of continued aggression on the African continent.

\* Quoted in French by the speaker.

71. The statement of the Prime Minister of the South African racist minority régime in Cape Town 10 days ago [S/12019, annex I], is not only an arrogant admission of the colonialist nature of that régime, but also, as is clear from the letter of 23 March from the representative of Portugal to the Secretary-General [S/12023], a shameful collection of lies and deliberately distorted facts. The letter of the representative of Portugal affirms clearly that South Africa's troops penetrated Angolan territory on 9 August 1975 without the knowledge or the authorization of the Government of Portugal, which was at the time still claiming for itself the exercise of sovereignty over Angola.

72. The pretext advanced by the leaders of the racist régime in Pretoria, in a vain attempt to justify their premeditated aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, is the customary pretext used by all colonialists and aggressors: "We did this solely for the purpose of protecting the lives of the workers and safeguarding the installations"; "because of the complete breakdown of law and order we were forced to occupy the dam sites"; "they asked us to hang on until such time as they could do it; they never came, and it is solely for that reason and not for any ulterior motives that we are still there".

73. How obedient those racists of South Africa are! They are there just because they were asked to be there, allegedly, by one country, Portugal. If they are so obedient, why then do they not heed the other repeated requests by some 140 Member States to evacuate Namibia and cease their policy of *apartheid* against the legitimate South African majority? All aggressors try to justify their aggression by using the pretext of protecting lives and property. Yet in committing their aggression they do not hesitate to spread death and destruction in the territories which fall under their occupation.

74. The representative of Angola, Ambassador Pascal Luvualu, whose presence my delegation salutes as the representative in the Security Council of his heroic people, described in his statement on 26 March [1900th meeting] the atrocities and the barbaric massacres that were committed by the South African racists against the civilian Angolan population. He also enumerated the pillaging, looting and destruction carried out by the Pretoria soldiers and the abduction of thousands of persons. Nothing whatsoever could justify those crimes by South Africa's white minority régime, much less, of course, the ridiculous claim by that racist régime of wanting to protect the lives and interests of the people of Namibia. For how could an aggressor and oppressor of that very Namibian people like the racist South African régime pretend to protect the people who are its victims?

75. South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia, in addition to constituting an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a continued violation of their national and human rights, has proved to be a

threat to international peace and security and a danger to the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia's neighbours. South Africa has no common borders with Angola, and without its illegal occupation of Namibia its present aggression against the People's Republic of Angola would not have been possible, or at least would not have been that easy.

76. Therefore, in addition to the need to verify the claimed completion of the withdrawal on 27 March of South African troops from the People's Republic of Angola, the Security Council must also ensure the complete withdrawal of South Africa's forces from Namibia and must take effective measures to prevent any repetition of the South African aggression against Namibia, the People's Republic of Angola or any other African country having or not having common borders with South Africa. South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola must not remain unpunished. It must be condemned most severely by the Council, and the racist white minority South African régime must compensate the Government and people of Angola for the great losses in human lives and material property which resulted from South Africa's aggression. The South African aggressors should release all the prisoners and hostages that they have abducted from Angola and restore all the equipment and property that they looted during their invasion.

77. In this connexion, the draft resolution distributed in document S/12030 and sponsored by Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Panama, Romania and the United Republic of Tanzania is the minimum that the Council can do. My delegation does not interpret the last paragraph of the preamble of that draft, "Noting the letter of the Permanent Representative of South Africa", as giving any credence to the false and rejected arguments contained in that letter.

78. It is very significant that the representative of the Pretoria régime in his intervention yesterday followed the same pattern which is usually used by all colonialists and aggressors. Mr. Botha wondered why the Council was meeting to discuss his régime's aggression against the Angolan people, saying "there are other flash-points in the world which should demand the urgent attention of the Council" [1904th meeting, para. 93]. A similar stupid argument was used only a few days ago by the representative of another racist régime, in Tel Aviv, who also wondered why the Council was wasting its time considering the Israeli crimes against the Arab population in the occupied territories.

79. This common racist logic is not surprising, given the identical nature of the racist settlers in South Africa and the racist settlers in occupied Palestine and other Arab territories. It is also not surprising that the representative of the racist South African régime should, in an attempt to divert the Council's attention from the crimes of his authorities, remind it

of similar crimes being committed at this very moment by the Zionist racist régime against the Arab population in the occupied territories, for newspapers and television screens these days are full of photographs of girls and boys and elderly men and women subjected to the atrocious brutalities of the Israeli soldiers.

80. The repeated crimes and acts of aggression committed by the South African racist régime against the African people inside and outside South Africa would not have been possible without the overt and covert encouragement and support of certain colonialist Powers, just as the crimes and repressive acts committed by the Zionist racist régime would not have been possible either, without the strong support of such Powers and sometimes of the same Powers.

81. Our African brothers in Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe and, in fact, in all the African continent no doubt realize why the Arab countries are so enthusiastic and so sincere in their unconditional support of the struggle of the African people against racism and colonialism. It is because the Arab people suffer from the same evils and because they are determined to struggle against colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and zionism and any other oppressive ideology wherever it exists. The Syrian Arab Republic feels that in defending the cause of the Angolan people it is defending its own cause, for the cause of freedom is indivisible.

82. In concluding, permit me to express once more the warmest sentiments of welcome to Mr. Pascal Luvualu, the representative of the People's Republic of Angola, and the hope to see his heroic country occupying the seat it deserves in the Organization as soon as possible.

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

84. Mr. GALVÃO TELES (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): On 25 April 1974, almost two years ago, the Portuguese people freed itself from the political régime which had been oppressing it for almost 50 years. Since its liberation it has realized that its struggle was also that of the peoples which were under Portuguese colonial domination, that its victory was also that of those peoples. Thus, with the fall of the Portuguese colonial régime, new prospects opened up for the peoples of Africa in their struggle against oppression and foreign domination. The independence of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Sao Tomé and Príncipe and Angola was a first, albeit an essential, stage. From that moment on, the political-military balance was profoundly changed in southern Africa. Both Rhodesia and South Africa realized this, as did the great Powers. The debates which have been going on this month in the Council—that concerning Mozambique and Rhodesia and the present one in which Angola and South Africa confront each other—are

proof of this. And it is precisely within this context that we should analyse them. They are a promising augury for the total liberation from oppression, aggression and interference that will come quite soon to the peoples of Africa, and this in spite of that very oppression, aggression and interference.

85. Mr. President, the honour is yours to preside over these most important proceedings. We the Members of the United Nations have the satisfaction and the benefit of knowing that our work is being conducted with such competence and dignity. It is a pleasure for me to acknowledge this and to thank you and the other members of the Council for having given me this opportunity to participate in this work.

86. The way in which the South African authorities have tried to justify their illegal occupation of part of the territory in southern Angola has changed curiously over the last few months, and this fact of itself illustrates the total lack of justification for their claims.

87. In November 1975, Mr. Botha, Defence Minister of South Africa, claimed publicly that South African troops had penetrated Angolan territory with the knowledge and prior agreement of the Portuguese Government in order to protect work on the hydroelectric installation at Calueque. This argument of the South African Government—which, incidentally, was put forward after my statement in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 21 November,<sup>2</sup> in which I repeated in quite unambiguous terms the protests of my Government against the invasion of the territory of Angola by South African troops—was immediately rebutted and rejected by my Government, as can be seen by reading the press release published by the Permanent Mission here in New York on 24 November last.

88. This falsehood was denounced by the Portuguese Government, which had no knowledge whatsoever beforehand of the invasion committed by the South African forces, and South Africa was accordingly obliged to abandon its initial version of the facts and consequently presented a new official argument. Indeed, on 21 March in the statement circulated as document S/12019, Mr. Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa, claimed that troops from his country had entered Angolan territory on 9 August 1975 to protect the Calueque installations and that the Portuguese Government had been immediately apprised of this. There was no longer any question of prior permission given by the Portuguese Government but simply of knowledge *ex post facto* of the invasion and of a supposed request to the South African Government that it would undertake protection of the dam until this task could be performed by the military forces of my country. But this version is not true either. That is why I was determined to deny it categorically in the letter which I sent on 23 March to the Secretary-General, distributed in document S/12023. The feeble argument which the South African Government tried

to use in order to justify its illegal occupation of a foreign territory was thus totally undermined. The various countries which in the course of this debate have mentioned our letter of 23 March understood this perfectly.

89. That was sufficient to make the Government of South Africa feel obliged to present a new version of the facts or, more precisely, new proof, timid and quite unconvincing, of a so-called request on the part of Portugal that South African troops should remain in Angolan territory. Indeed, in his statement yesterday [1904th meeting], the representative of South Africa, in presenting a detailed version of the events and in an attempt to demonstrate that the Portuguese Government had agreed that South African troops should remain on Angolan territory then under Portuguese administration, recalled certain facts which I propose to analyse.

90. First, according to claims of the representative of South Africa, the Ambassador of his country in Lisbon is supposed to have received instructions on 8 August 1975 to request the Portuguese authorities, as a matter of urgency, to ensure the security of the region of the dam in order to protect the workers and safeguard the equipment; but it was only on 11 August that a brief memorandum to this effect was handed to the Foreign Minister of Portugal. Now Mr. Vorster expressly acknowledged in his statement of 21 March that the occupation of the Calueque zone by troops of his country had taken place on 9 August, or two days before the transmittal of this memorandum to the Portuguese authorities. This then once again demonstrates that the Portuguese authorities had no prior knowledge of the invasion of the territory of Angola by South African forces.

91. Secondly, again according to the representative of South Africa, on 12 August the Portuguese Ambassador to Pretoria was summoned to the Foreign Office of South Africa in order to be informed of an armed action undertaken by South Africa—three days earlier, as can be seen. What the representative of South Africa omitted to say was that the Portuguese Ambassador there and then protested in clear-cut and unequivocal terms against such a serious violation of frontiers and against what consequently constituted an attack on the sovereignty of Angola. This is explicitly mentioned in the diplomatic note handed over on 2 September by the Portuguese Government to the South African Government.

92. Thirdly, the representative of South Africa also claimed that the Ambassador of his country had in the meantime been called to the Foreign Ministry in Lisbon where once again the concern of the Portuguese Government at the conduct of the South African military authorities was communicated to him; this, too, is contained in the afore-mentioned diplomatic note. In this regard, the representative of South Africa made an ambiguous quotation in this Council which

we must clarify. Saying that it was a quotation, he stated: “ ‘the present situation must be accepted, but that they’—the Portuguese—‘requested that everything possible be done to avoid any direct confrontation’ ” [ibid., para. 103]. It is apparently this sentence, the paterinity of which has not been revealed to us, which forms the basis of South Africa’s argument as to the consent of the Portuguese Government with regard to the presence of South Africa troops in the Calueque region. Now I should like to state most categorically that my Government has no idea from what document this sentence—this shred of a sentence, I might say—was taken. It is certainly not any document subscribed to by the Portuguese authorities. Quite the contrary, everything suggests that it is simply an assumption made by the South African Ambassador and communicated to this Government following the interview I have mentioned. It is therefore a communication devoid of any value.

93. Fourthly, again according to the statement of the representative of South Africa, on 2 September the Foreign Ministry of Portugal addressed a note to the South African Embassy in Lisbon, and, indeed, in this note the Ministry reminded the Embassy of the conditions in which the violation of Angolan territory in Calueque had taken place and the protests consequently made by the Portuguese Government to the South African Government. It is regrettable that in transcribing certain passages of this note the representative of South Africa should have omitted precisely those paragraphs which correspond to the protests made at that time, as we have just pointed out, and which removed all the legality that is claimed for the armed occupation of Calueque. It should be noted that paragraph 5 of the note quoted by the representative [ibid., para. 105] contains a request to the South African Government to take the necessary steps for the removal of the South African forces from Calueque, and this following upon paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the note, which state in absolutely clear terms that Portugal in no way considered legitimate the presence of South African military forces on the territory of Angola.

94. Fifthly and finally, the representative of South Africa claimed that:

“in the last week of September an emissary from the Portuguese High Commissioner in Luanda informed the South African authorities that the High Commissioner had asked him to say that the Portuguese authorities would like our troops to stay until a take-over by the new Government of Angola, and he implied it would be the MPLA”. [Ibid., para. 108.]

Here then is the second “fact” on which the South African Government is apparently basing its allegation of the agreement of the Portuguese Government to the stationing of South African troops in the Calueque region, the first being the quotation without an author which I mentioned just now and which

appears to originate with the South African authorities themselves, a circumstance which quite obviously deprives it of all significance. It is quite clear that this second "fact" has no value either and cannot possibly be used to justify the attitude of the South African Government. Indeed, the representative of South Africa himself recognizes that the question of the presence of his country's troops in Angola in the Calueque region was dealt with between the two Governments at the highest level, through the diplomatic representatives accredited to the two capitals, and this was even the subject of a diplomatic note the content of which was communicated to the Secretary-General.

95. In the circumstances, how can the South African Government now claim justification for its action or, what is even more serious, attempt to make my Government equally guilty of that action by basing itself on the statements of an imaginary envoy of the High Commissioner, statements supposedly made at a time and a place which are not made clear, and which, furthermore, are not in writing? How can it now claim greater significance for the imaginary oral statements of an unknown envoy of the High Commissioner in Luanda than for the written and oral statements made by the Portuguese Government and transmitted at the appropriate time by diplomatic channels to the Government of South Africa, which latter statements leave no doubt whatsoever as to the categorical and formal rejection by my Government of the invasion of the Calueque region by South African troops?

96. Whatever the cost to South Africa, Portugal is not ready to provide unjustly any shield, pretext or justification for the invasion of the territory of Angola. A quotation of unknown source, which in the final analysis seems to have come from the South African authorities themselves, and an imaginary statement of an envoy of the Portuguese High Commissioner cannot possibly destroy the validity of diplomatic protests, of written notes and of public statements in which Portugal has repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed its opposition to the armed action undertaken by the Pretoria Government, an opposition which I once again confirm here in all solemnity.

97. It is to be pointed out that the allegation of the South African representative that his Government had received a request from the Portuguese Government to remain in the territory of Angola is not only untrue, it is not even relevant. If such a request had existed, it would only have been relevant in so far as it meant that South Africa maintained troops in Angola because its presence there had the agreement of the Government responsible for the territory, which agreement could legitimize the stationing of its troops in foreign territory.

98. But what is true is that, at least from the moment when the sovereignty of Portugal as administering Power in Angola came to an end, it became even more absurd to claim that South African troops were in Angola—at least they were until three days ago—with the consent of the respective Governments. In other words if the South African Government were really convinced that the occupation of Calueque was made legitimate by the consent of the responsible Government of the territory, and if South African troops were there only for that reason, the South African Government should have withdrawn them immediately after the proclamation of Angola's independence on 11 November 1975. We cannot see the purpose of claiming the existence of a request which never existed and which in any case could not have justified keeping South African troops in Angola until 29 March 1976, just as it could not have been used to justify other incursions of the same troops into Angolan territory. Furthermore, these incursions, which were at the time condemned by the Portuguese Government, particularly in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly, cannot fail to raise the most well-founded doubts about the true reasons for the presence of South African troops in the Calueque region.

99. In making this statement the Portuguese delegation wished primarily to clarify certain questions, as it was its duty, and to present the correct version of the facts brought to the Council's attention. That seemed to the Portuguese delegation the most useful and constructive contribution it could make to the Council's deliberations at this time.

100. However, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing, on behalf of my Government—and I do so with the greatest satisfaction—our support for the Government of the People's Republic of Angola in its struggle to ensure, in the full exercise of its prerogatives as a sovereign State, that its territorial integrity is guaranteed and respected. Angola is now an independent country, and its true freedom is being built day by day. That independence was won at the price of so much sacrifice. There is still a long and hard path to tread before that freedom is truly attained. A new Portugal too is under construction. It is on behalf of that new Portugal that I greet the people of Angola, in the certainty that it will build a new Angola, truly free, independent, progressive and unified.

*The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> A/AC.115/L.430, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2414th meeting.*

---

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

### 如何购取联合国出版物

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

### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---