

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

JUN 2 1982

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

UN/SA COLLECTION

2139th MEETING: 28 MARCH 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2139)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa: Letter dated 16 March 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13176) . .	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.

2139th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 28 March 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Leslie O. HARRIMAN (Nigeria).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2139)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 16 March 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13176)

The meeting was called to order at 4.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 16 March 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13176)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings [2130th, 2132nd, 2133rd, 2135th and 2138th meetings], I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table and the representatives of Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, the Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Togo, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia 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 and Mr. Bouayad-Agha (Algeria), Mr. Hougavou (Benin), Mr. Tlou (Botswana), Mr. Yankov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mondjo (Congo), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Worku (Ethiopia), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Sekyi (Ghana), Mr. Yansané (Guinea), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Tubman (Liberia), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Honwona (Mozambique), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Gelaga-King (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussén (Somalia),

Mr. Rodrigo (Sri Lanka), Mr. Sahloul (Sudan), Mr. Kodjovi (Togo), Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Chale (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2132nd meeting, I invite the representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gurirab (South West Africa People's Organization) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that the delegation of Gabon has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document S/13197.

4. I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of NIGERIA.

5. The complaint against South Africa contained in the letter dated 16 March 1979 from the representative of Angola [S/13176] is the subject of our present debate. The letter does not reflect the degree and intensity of the atrocities committed by South Africa against Angola and neighbouring States.

6. We recall the alliance between South Africa and the former Fascist Portugal to maintain their stranglehold on Angola and Mozambique. We yet recall with considerable consternation that even the reality of Angolan independence appears still to be unaccepted by the racists, who in desperation are contriving to reverse the inevitable course of history and the southward thrust of nationalism in southern Africa. We cannot but recall also the massive invasion of Angola in 1975, with the support or connivance of some Western Powers. Even today those Powers wear blinkers and remain in their fixed grooves. They glibly equate the struggle for freedom, self-determination and independence with the ideologies and doctrines of those friends of African redemption who afford nationalist forces material support to fight their enemy and to fight for their independence.

7. We should remind ourselves that South Africa revels in illegality and musketeers with Ian Smith to harass independent African States in order to muzzle them.

8. The Angolan tragedy becomes more tragic when those who extol noble values in their foreign-policy posture appear convinced that the nationalist forces are the enemy because of their apparent ideological orientation. The real

enemy is South Africa, and we must not lose sight of that. The crimes are committed by South Africa and punitive measures for such crimes are prescribed under the Charter of the United Nations.

9. Political power-play may be diplomacy for some, but it cannot lead to the search for truth and justice in honour. Even in our world today, power, prestige and profit cannot suppress honour, truth and justice.

10. The value systems in societies evolve as man becomes more civilized. Yet in recent times the dominant influence has not been religion or truth but, rather, the expediency of power—the power that money can buy. In consequence, race is pitched against race, colour against colour, rich against poor, and technology is used at the expense of humanism.

11. The conflict-types—or, rather, the antitheses of truth, honour and justice—could be unravell'd and their dialectics synthesized in order to attain greater heights in human relations. Instead, the world is involved in a melodrama, the evolution of idioms and rhetoric, and clichés and double talk. Where do we go from here? After the long years of the subjugation of the black race, after the enslavement of Africa, after the colonization of the continent, after settler usurpation and plunder of the richest part of Africa by settler racist colonialists, one would have thought that these same colonial Powers and their allies should pay due attention to the cries of Africa for freedom and human dignity. But, alas, we continue to see a head-on collision on the horizon: white versus black and power conflicts *par excellence*. Yes, we see the whole world versus a few hard-core elements holding forth for kith and kin.

12. I have dwelt on this at considerable length because I am one who, on a daily basis, has had to deal with the tragedy of southern Africa in the course of my duty over the last three years. Mine is therefore a very different perspective. I see no silver lining at all.

13. In southern Africa we continue to see a situation unfolding which goes beyond our preoccupations over Angola today.

14. We recall when the United Kingdom and the United States accepted the voluntary arms embargo. That voluntary embargo had a loophole through which France, a non-participant in NATO military planning, supplied South Africa with arms without in any way blemishing NATO, while the former Fascist Portugal acquired NATO materials and the wherewithal to keep the outer flanks of South Africa secure. The mineral basket of copper, chrome, diamonds, gold and uranium of South Africa was thereby made the preserve of the West and therefore had to remain in white hands. A partnership was brought into play. The wealth and economic power of the United States, on the one hand, and the technology of Europe, on the other, were brought together, resulting in a quantum leap in technology in the West. This was made available to South Africa on a kith-and-kin basis. In contrast, African and non-European countries were bypassed in this new economic axis.

15. South Africa is now a real military power in Africa. Its marauding incursions into neighbouring independent

States in southern Africa are possible because of a number of factors that have already been mentioned, including the following:

— First, the continued economic and social support from Western States, particularly resource and technology transfers.

— Secondly, the lack of military capability of front-line States, the colonial Powers having left Africa militarily defenceless. In our independence, we rejected defence pacts. Even efforts to build up military capacity for self-defence are often resisted. We have been left too weak and balkanized to afford the diversion of resources to self-defence.

— Thirdly, the cautious defence support provided by the major Powers is no match for the flow of military hardware to South Africa. Even the modest Cuban co-operation with Angola in the defence of its territorial integrity and independence is maligned for ideological reasons.

16. I recall a meeting of the Council exactly two years ago to deliberate on the South African invasion of Angola in the wake of Angola's independence. South Africa's massive invasion led to the occupation of vast areas of southern Angola for several months. The occupation was characterized by murder, wanton destruction of property, and the pillage of bank vaults, as well as the theft of numerous other movables. Thousands of Angolans, under armed coercion and intimidation, were herded into Namibian territory.

17. It is obvious that the immediate objective of this exercise was to destabilize Angola. This destabilization was in the long term aimed at limiting the role and possible support of Angola for the southward liberation thrust of the oppressed black people. Even though the withdrawal of the racist armed forces was effected, the destabilization of Angola continues unabated through UNITA [*União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola*] elements which constitute the surrogates of the racists and their supporters on Angola's borders.

18. We also recall Kassinga, a place where about one thousand innocent women and children were murdered in cold blood in a further racist invasion of Angola by South African forces. Many of the victims of Kassinga were shot in the back as they fled. This, like other blind incursions into and invasions of States neighbouring South Africa and Rhodesia, is automatically witnessed by Western media from thousands of miles away as attacks on guerrilla camps.

19. The staggered approach to the problems of southern Africa has created growing apprehension. The process of peaceful negotiation has given greater leverage to South Africa and its minions in Southern Rhodesia to commit, in growing dimensions, genocide against Africans in their own land. Yet we persevere and persist in pursuing this peaceful option to save life and restore sanity in southern Africa.

20. One cannot fail to question the apparent schizophrenic posture of South Africa as well as that of Rhodesia. South African forces, by their war footing, are in a state of war with front-line States. Yet South Africa claims to be a party to the evolving of a negotiated settlement of the

Namibian problem. They are exalted for playing a role in solving the Rhodesian problem. South Africa talks about confidence building in a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. Yet it sends its forces to attack Angola on the eve of and during the talks called to refine outstanding issues on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

21. The authors of the Anglo-American proposals, who promised to deliver Southern Rhodesia, have abandoned their programme, all except on paper. They have progressively allowed a few among the 200,000 whites in Rhodesia to continue to control power. We witnessed the first phase of the internal settlement process in Rhodesia in March last year. Next month the international community will be faced with a situation in Rhodesia which liberals and conservatives in Western countries will gloat to embrace. The South Africans also appear to have the same game plan in Namibia.

22. SWAPO has accepted all the aspects involved in the report of the Secretary-General based on resolution 435 (1978). Yet an impression is being created that both SWAPO and South Africa are in default. A second series of internal elections in Namibia following the pattern of Rhodesia is in the offing.

23. We appear to have been faced with a *fait accompli* all along. But Nigeria, for its part, in co-operation with other front-line States, has played a full part in helping to move the peaceful process along in recent years and thereby avoid a racial conflagration in southern Africa. We hope that these peace initiatives will not be registered as failures. There is no way in which we can be convinced that a small band of whites led by Ian Smith can continue to defy the world and the will of 6.5 million blacks and whites alike in Rhodesia. I wish to repeat for the umpteenth time that we cannot believe that where the honour, power and prestige of those two great nations have been brought to bear on issues of this puny nature, they can report failure.

24. The Western five have still to reaffirm their commitment to deliver South Africa so that we can move forward in achieving Pretoria's exit from Namibia. One week after the end of the proximity talks, there is no word—no whisper—from South Africa.

25. The Western Powers cannot continue to veto peaceful measures envisaged under the Charter of the United Nations and, in the same breath, continue to collaborate in the economic, military and nuclear fields with their valued ally South Africa—or so we see the scenario. One can see a credibility gap in the issue here.

26. It is one thing to react to issues like Sharpeville, Soweto and the murder of Steve Biko and other South African heroes; it is another to bring pressure to bear on South Africa. It is one thing to shore up support against the Cuban presence in Angola; it is another thing to look into the root-causes of that presence there. It is one thing to support Western interests in Shaba; it is another to end the causes of tension in that whole area—tension caused by colonialism and the existence of racist régimes in the region.

27. For its part, Nigeria continues to uphold the principles of the Charter and to fulfill its responsibilities and obligations. We will also continue to abide by the objectives and decisions of the non-aligned States and the Organization of African Unity. Our solidarity with and support for the Government and people of Angola, together with other front-line States, is as consistent today as any challenge to their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We continue to affirm that the rights of the black man are certainly not negotiable.

28. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

29. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to a vote on the draft resolution which is before it. A number of delegations have asked to speak in explanation of vote before the vote and I now call on them.

30. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): South Africa's acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola are undoubtedly linked this time with the efforts of the Pretoria régime, while counting on the support of certain Western States, to win further concessions from SWAPO and the front-line States on the issue of the liberation of Namibia, and even to achieve further compromise concessions in favour of South Africa, at the expense of the interests of the Namibian people.

31. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the Security Council should strongly resist South Africa's manoeuvres by adopting all necessary measures to ensure compliance with United Nations resolutions aimed at giving the Namibian people genuine independence. We should not go on trying to exert pressure on SWAPO, which is the only legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. What we should have long been doing is exerting really effective pressure on those occupying Namibia—the racists of Pretoria—and trying to force them to assume full responsibility for their aggressive policy towards sovereign African States and for their refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council on the question.

32. The results of the Security Council's discussions of South Africa's acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, and the Pretoria régime's total disregard of Council resolutions, with the connivance of certain Western circles, show that mere condemnations by the Council of repeated acts of aggression by the South African racists are far from effective. Therefore, the Czechoslovak delegation, in the course of this discussion in the Council, has supported the complaints of the Angolan Government against the aggressive actions of Pretoria and upheld the demands of African delegations that the Council should finally take measures to force South Africa to comply with United Nations decisions, ensure the Namibian people the earliest possible independence and put an end to South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against sovereign African States. In this context, we supported the entirely natural demands of the People's Republic of Angola and other African States that the Council should finally decide to impose sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. Unfortunately, however, we have seen that individual representatives, even some who have quite strongly

condemned the Pretoria régime in the Council, in actual fact have not supported the just demands of Angola, the victim of aggression, for the adoption of genuinely effective measures against the aggressor.

33. The Czechoslovak delegation views the provisions of draft resolution S/13197 as inadequate and not in keeping with the demands of the moment, taking into account the provisions of paragraph 8 of resolution 428 (1978), unanimously adopted on 6 May 1978, in which the Council decided

“to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People’s Republic of Angola by the South African racist régime in order to consider the adoption of more effective”—and I stress “more effective”—“measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof”.

However, my delegation will vote for this draft resolution because it is acceptable to our Angolan friends.

34. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom’s unswerving commitment to an early and peaceful settlement in Namibia is well known. The negotiations on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have reached possibly their most delicate state. I should like to draw the Council’s attention to the Secretary-General’s appeal in his report of 26 February 1979 to all parties “to exercise restraint and refrain from actions which might jeopardize the settlement” [S/13120, para. 18]. The United Kingdom fully supports the Secretary-General’s appeal.

35. We naturally deplore South African attacks on Angola, as we condemn attacks and violence coming from whatever quarter. The loss in human life and the destruction caused by this violence must end now. The best way to bring about an end to the violence is for the cease-fire provided for in the proposal of the Western five and in the Secretary-General’s report to be put into effect as urgently as possible. It must be recognized, however, that progress towards a cease-fire can only be achieved if all those involved are now prepared to take the positive actions necessary to put into practice the peaceful settlement of the Namibia problem.

36. We earnestly hope that the proximity talks held by the Foreign Ministers of the Five in New York last week will have helped to ensure a return to the path of peace. We do not believe, however, that this process will be helped by adopting this draft resolution at this very delicate juncture, only shortly—we must hope—before agreement is reached on a cease-fire.

37. It will not help to bring about a cease-fire to argue about the aggressive or violent activities of either side. Nor is condemnation by the Security Council in itself a substitute for an actual end to the fighting through a cease-fire. The recent escalation of acts of violence has underlined the urgent need to secure an agreement which will make it possible to introduce an effective United Nations presence in Namibia. We can well understand the inflamed passions that the recent raids and acts of violence have aroused. A new course must be charted in

order to overcome the cycle of violence that has for so long oppressed the Namibian people as well as bringing death and destruction to neighbouring States.

38. We want to see resolution 435 (1978) implemented as soon as possible. We reaffirm our commitment to the initiative which the Governments of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States have undertaken. We are determined to pursue it and so bring about an internationally recognized peaceful independence for Namibia. This initiative is at a critical stage. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. We well understand the wish of the sponsors to describe in the strongest terms the incursions by South Africa into a neighbouring sovereign State. My Government does not, however, read or accept operative paragraphs 1, 6 or 7 as constituting determinations under the Charter. Nor does it read or accept those paragraphs as constituting any commitment to the future action of the Council in this matter.

39. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The debate which began on 19 March has given us an opportunity to hear more than 40 speakers, most of them Africans, first and foremost among whom was the representative of Angola, who introduced the complaint of his country against South Africa. It is clear from his testimony, to which the French delegation listened with great attention, that the South African army has once again launched a series of attacks in Angolan territory.

40. France can only condemn and censure such a use of force. The loss of life has aroused our indignation and horror. These tragic events move us particularly because they have taken place in a part of Africa and in the midst of a people which have been experiencing great hardship for many years. The French delegation wishes to express its profound sympathy to the families who have recently been the victims of these incidents.

41. The armed incursions by South Africa have, moreover, violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. This is inadmissible conduct that might very well jeopardize the security of the region.

42. There is hardly need for me to stress that South Africa’s raids do not facilitate a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. Indeed, they make it more difficult, and that settlement is clearly at the heart of the problem. It is clear that the northern borders of Namibia may very well remain an area of tension and the scene of serious incidents until Namibia achieves independence as a result of a democratic process recognized by the international community.

43. We must then direct our efforts to the implementation of the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council. France, with its four Western partners, is continuing to work along these lines. The ministerial talks that took place in New York on 19 and 20 March made it possible to define views and identify the final difficulties that need to be overcome on both sides. The front-line States represented in these talks and SWAPO gave assurances on certain points which may well remove certain apprehensions. It is to be hoped that the South African Government will overcome whatever reluctance it may still have to accept certain details relating to implementation.

44. At this critical stage of the plan for Namibia, it is, in the opinion of my delegation, now more necessary than ever before for the parties concerned to refrain from any act of violence. It is essential that a climate of confidence should be created, paving the way to free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

45. Turning now to the draft resolution that has been submitted in document S/13197, the French delegation shares its general spirit and direction. We associate ourselves with the concern it expresses on various points and it can endorse several of the recommendations and warnings it contains. But certain formulations seem inappropriate. The members of the Council will understand that France, which with its Western partners is playing an active part in the settlement of the Namibian question, must continue to maintain a position that is in keeping with that situation. Consequently, the French delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

46. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution sponsored by Bangladesh, Bolivia, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria and Zambia, contained in document S/13197.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: None

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.¹

47. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations have asked to be allowed to speak after the vote, and I shall now call on them.

48. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): Norway voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/13197 since the recent attacks by South Africa against Angola and other front-line States constitute serious violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those countries and must be condemned by the international community.

49. I should like to emphasize, however, in relation to paragraph 5, that the Norwegian Government, in accordance with its long-standing policy, will continue to provide only humanitarian and economic assistance to the front-line States.

50. With regard to paragraph 7 and the question of sanctions, the wording therein should not prejudice the outcome of the Council's future deliberations on these matters. The various conflicts in southern Africa are inextricably linked. Measures taken by the Council must therefore be carefully examined also in terms of their over-all impact on the situation in the region, especially as regards their impact on ongoing attempts to reach negotiated settlements.

51. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): As has been demonstrated by the consideration in the Security Council of the question of the aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola, these actions on the part of Pretoria represent a most flagrant violation of the elementary norms of international law and an open defiance of the United Nations. South Africa's aggressive actions against Angola are designed to impede that country in its peaceful and creative activities. South Africa's goal is to prevent the attainment by the people of Namibia of genuine independence and to keep possession of the Territory of Namibia, which it illegally occupies. It would appear that the Pretoria régime is attempting in this way to "teach a lesson" to Angola and to other African States which have been providing rightful support for the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO.

52. Obviously South Africa could not persist in this policy if it did not enjoy the support and protection of a number of Western States. Surely a manifestation of that protection is the fact that the delegation of the United States and certain other Western States abstained in the vote on the Council resolution just adopted. It was only in May last year that those same Powers voted in favour of considering the question of applying sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter if there were further acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola. And now they have refused even to consider this matter.

53. The criminal actions of the Pretoria régime and its policy aimed at the perpetuation of colonialism and racism in southern Africa have been universally condemned. The overwhelming majority of representatives of countries taking part in the meetings of the Council have expressed themselves unambiguously in favour of the adoption by the Council of the most vigorous measures in order to put an end to the acts of aggression of the South African régime against neighbouring States, to call an immediate halt to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to ensure that the people of Namibia will achieve genuine independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

54. In the course of the Council's work the manoeuvres of the Pretoria régime aimed at hindering the free expression of the will of the people of Namibia have been unmasked and condemned. There has also been criticism of the attempts of the Western Powers to demand further concessions from SWAPO and the front-line States in connexion with the United Nations operation in Namibia.

55. In confirmation of its position on resolution 435 (1978), the Soviet delegation would like to recall in this regard the misgivings it expressed as to where this operation might lead and whether it could really ensure the exercise by the people of Namibia of its right to self-determination. In the light of the manoeuvres of South Africa, it is becoming very clear that the Security Council should thoroughly scrutinize the question of how to implement that resolution; this is all the more necessary since the Council has so far not implemented resolution 439 (1978), which provided that the Security Council would meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions

¹ See resolution 447 (1979).

under the Charter if South Africa did not cancel the illegal elections in Namibia.

56. The Security Council has repeatedly warned South Africa of the possible consequences of its policy. The Soviet delegation believes that the Council should by now have considered the question of the application against the Pretoria régime of concrete sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter and it expresses its regret that the resolution adopted by the Council does not go far enough and does not provide for the immediate adoption of effective and decisive measures against South Africa but once again postpones consideration of this question.

57. At the same time the Soviet delegation wishes to point out that the resolution does contain a strong condemnation of South Africa for its acts of aggression against Angola. The resolution also commends the firm position of Angola and the other front-line States which have supported the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia and contains an appeal to Member States to give to Angola and the other front-line States all the necessary support to strengthen their defensive potential. On this basis the Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): On behalf of the Government of the United States, I wish to present some additional considerations on the situation in Namibia and to explain our position on the resolution which has just been adopted.

59. As you know, my Government, together with the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada, has been intensively involved in an effort to find a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. Our vote on this resolution should be seen in the light of our role as mediators in this dispute. The United States strongly condemns the attacks on SWAPO bases and refugee camps in Angola and Zambia which South Africa has undertaken in recent days. We believe that this kind of action is certainly not justified. We also condemn all other acts of violence by any party which have taken place in the Namibian context. If the events of recent days make anything clear, it is that the pattern of violence which has taken hold in Namibia and is now spreading into neighbouring States must be broken.

60. In our view, the way to the solution of the Namibian question is clear. The recent proximity talks in New York and subsequent discussions have produced, in the view of my Government, a basis on which we can now move toward a cease-fire and the deployment of the United Nations presence in Namibia and the initiation of the transitional period. We hope that no further impediments will emerge.

61. Turning now to the text of the resolution which the Council has just adopted, I should like to make some specific observations.

62. First, we have reservations regarding the procedure established in paragraph 6 for obtaining information on the effects of the South African raids. The Council should, wherever possible, use methods of proven impartiality to obtain information. That is particularly true

since the resolution goes on to state that the information thus obtained should be used by the Council to determine the most effective sanctions which might be applied against South Africa—a most serious matter indeed. It is our view that it is up to the Council to decide on the question of further action.

63. As I have indicated, my Government is strongly of the view that the appropriate course, indeed the only course, for resolving the problem, is to begin the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

64. Secondly, my Government does not believe that a solution to the problem of Namibia can be found through the introduction of more arms and other forms of military assistance in an area which is already clearly suffering the effects of too many arms. Again, the only real solution is a peaceful one; force will not ultimately solve the problems of southern Africa and will only bring greater problems in its wake. Consequently, my Government does not interpret this resolution as condoning the presence of foreign military personnel in Angola or elsewhere in southern Africa or as implying that violence can resolve the issue.

65. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Angola.

66. Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): I have asked to speak once again in order to do two things.

67. I should like to express the appreciation of my Government and my delegation to all those colleagues and delegations that offered their unstinting support and co-operation to us during this debate. Many of them worked long hours, both in the Council and outside it.

68. Our special thanks go to those delegations which not only verbally expressed their solidarity with us by making a statement in the Council but also supported us in our attempts to place the murderous and continuing barbarous acts of aggression of the racist South Africans in their proper context, that is, as a threat to international peace and security—hence the applicability of Chapter VII of the Charter.

69. We are also aware of those delegations which, while recognizing the correctness of our position, nevertheless sought to protect South Africa from the sanctions which we feel are justified and inevitable.

70. To those delegations which abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, despite the fact that it was a much milder one than the circumstances warranted, all I can say is that once again Africa has been made painfully aware of their position, of their paying lip service to principles of international law and humanitarian concepts, and of their continued allegiance to imperialist and colonialist links. In that sense, every act of aggression against us in southern Africa is perpetrated not only by the racist régime of South Africa but also by its Western imperialist allies. We construe that as support for the *apartheid* system, for imperialist exploitation and repression, all protestations to the contrary.

71. Ultimately, we shall triumph. Until then, the struggle continues.

72. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): Portugal shares the deep concern of the international community about the repeated aggressive actions taken by South Africa against Angola and other front-line States, which certainly need to be condemned unequivocally. The Portuguese delegation therefore voted in favour of the resolution just adopted.

73. Nevertheless, we have difficulties in accepting certain passages of the resolution, namely, paragraph 7, which seems to prejudge the issue and predetermine the conclusions to be drawn by the Council from the report of the Secretary-General.

74. On the other hand, we believe that an agreement leading to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is the best possible way to put an end to South Africa's acts of aggression. We therefore can only hope that the ongoing negotiations will quickly lead to that result.

75. Bearing all this in mind, the Portuguese delegation wishes to reserve its position in relation to any future action to be taken by the Council on the present matter.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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