tal organizations and that the Chairman of the Committee had addressed letters to a number of potential donor countries, as well as to certain intergovernmental organizations, appealing in each case for an urgent contribution to assist Zambia in restoring its most important bridges. A number of Member States and international organizations had responded positively to that appeal, and, as of 31 January, the target figure of 14,618,000 kwachas stipulated by the Government of Zambia for the restoration of the bridges had been met. Nevertheless, the *Ad Hoc* Committee stressed that further assistance to Zambia was needed in order to facilitate the reconstruction of that country's economic infrastructure as a whole.

COMPLAINT BY ANGOLA AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

Decision of 6 May 1978 (2078th meeting): resolution 428 (1978)

By letter[1692] dated 5 May 1978 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of Angola requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to deal with the most recent aggression by South Africa against Angola.

A number of letters[1693] condemning the invasion of Angola by South Africa and calling upon the Security Council to take urgent measures against South Africa had been received by the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council.

At the 2077th meeting on 5 May 1978 the Security Council adopted[1694] the agenda and considered the item at the 2077th and 2078th meetings on 5 and 6 May 1976.

In the course of its deliberations the Council invited the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cuba, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1695]

The Council also extended invitations under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and to the President of the Council for Namibia.[1695]

At the 2077th meeting on 5 May 1978 the representative of Angola stated that the latest aggression of South Africa against Angola was not aimed only at attempting to destroy SWAPO and the liberation struggle of the Namibian people; it was also intended to destabilize the situation inside his country. The abstention of the Western Five on the just programme of action adopted at the ninth special session of the General Assembly gave Pretoria the encouragement it needed to embark on the invasion of Angola. He appealed to the Security Council to condemn strongly South Africa for its invasion of Angola, implement the embargoes on arms and oil and observe economic sanctions against Pretoria.[1696]

The representative of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the African Group of States, called upon the Security Council to adopt prompt measures to stop South African aggression against Angola, to censure the *apartheid* régime for using the international territory of Namibia as a launching pad for committing acts of aggression against Angola, and to impose mandatory and comprehensive economic sanctions, an oil embargo and an arms embargo under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.[1697]

At the same meeting the representative of Mauritius introduced a draft resolution sponsored by Bolivia, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria and Venezuela.[1698] He emphasized that in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution the sponsors intentionally used the word "recalling" in respect to the resolution 387 (1976) and not "reaffirming", bearing in mind the fact that some members did not vote in favour of that resolution. Referring to the last operative paragraph of the draft resolution he said that the Council would decide 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 régime in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII. He emphasized that the sponsors had intentionally used the words "to consider the adoption of more effective measures" meaning that at the appropriate time members of the Council would have the opportunity to consider the application of such measures.

In the course of the 2077th and 2078th meetings a number of speakers called for the imposition of measures stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.[1699]

At the 2078th meeting on 6 May 1978 the draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 428 (1978).[1700]

The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the letter dated 5 May 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Angola transmitting a communication from the First Vice-Prime Minister of the People's Republic of Angola and the letter dated 5 May 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations,

---

[1692] S/12690, *OR, 33rd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1978*, pp. 46-47.

[1693] S/12688, *ibid.*, pp. 45-46 (from Sri Lanka); S/12689, *ibid.*, p. 46 (from Angola); S/12691, mimeographed. For the text of the statement, see *GA OR, 33rd session, Suppl. No. 24*, vol. I, para. 366 (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia); S/12693, *OR, 33rd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1978*, p. 47 (from Zambia).

[1694] 2077th mtg., preceding para. 1.

[1695] For details, see chapter III.

[1696] 2077th mtg., paras. 5-22.

[1697] *Ibid.*, paras. 40-55.

[1698] *Ibid.*, paras. 68-69. S/12692 was adopted without change as resolution 428 (1978).

[1699] *Ibid.*, para. 35 (Mr. S. Nujoma), para. 54 (Zambia), 2078th mtg., para. 15 (Kuwait), para. 63 (Nigeria), para. 74 (USSR), para. 107 (India), para. 143 (Benin), para. 167 (Cuba), para. 196 (Miss Konie).

[1700] *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1978*, pp. 9-10.

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of Angola,

Having heard the statement of Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization,

Bearing in mind that all Member States are obliged to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State and from acting in any other manner inconsistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its resolution 387 (1976) of 31 March 1976 in which, *inter alia*, it condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned at the armed invasions committed by South Africa in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola and in particular the armed invasion of Angola carried out on 4 May 1978,

Grieved at the tragic loss of human lives, including those of Namibian refugees in Angola, caused by the South African invasion of Angolan territory,

Concerned also at the damage and destruction done by the South African forces in Angola,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the enjoyment of such rights as set forth in the Charter,

Reaffirming that the liberation of Namibia is one of the prerequisites for the attainment of justice and lasting peace in southern Africa and for the furtherance of international peace and security,

Reiterating its grave concern at South Africa's brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and its aggressive military build-up in the area,

Reaffirming its condemnation of the militarization of Namibia by the illegal occupation régime of South Africa,

1. *Strongly condemns* the latest armed invasion perpetrated by the South African racist régime against the People's Republic of Angola, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola;

2. *Condemns equally strongly* South Africa's utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola,

3. *Demands* the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African forces from Angola;

4. *Further demands* that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola;

5. *Reaffirms* its support for the just and legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia for the attainment of their freedom and independence and for the maintenance of the territorial integrity of their country;

6. *Commends* the People's Republic of Angola for its continued support of the people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle;

7. *Demands* that South Africa put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia without any further delay, in compliance with relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976,

8. *Decides* 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 measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof.

At the same meeting the representative of France demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. He stated that the maintenance in Namibia of a South African occupation totally devoid of any legal basis was the cause of the events which the Council was considering. Namibia had to accede to independence as quickly as possible, after free elections under United Nations control and supervision. The only chance of achieving that goal was to ensure the implementation without delay of a peaceful process which excluded violence.[1701]

The representative of the United Kingdom referred to the terms of the resolution which had been adopted concerning the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia and stated that his Government had always supported the struggle for self-determination but its views on the limits of legitimate struggle and its commitment under the Charter to peaceful means were well-known.[1702]

Decision of 28 March 1979 (2139th meeting): resolution 447 (1979)

By letter[1703] dated 16 March 1979 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Angola requested the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council in connection with the question of the South African aggression against Angola, especially in the light of that régime's recent and continuing acts of aggression and violations of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Security Council received other letters[1704] also condemning South Africa's aggression against Angola and calling upon the Council to take appropriate measures against the Pretoria régime.

By letter[1705] dated 19 March 1979 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of South Africa transmitted the text of a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, in which he stated, among other things, that the action by the South African security forces had been directed at what he termed terrorist bases and was an operation aimed at protecting the territorial integrity of "South West Africa" and the safety and security of its inhabitants.

At the 2130th meeting on 19 March 1979, the Security Council adopted[1706] the agenda and considered the question at the 2130th, 2132nd, 2133rd, 2135th to 2139th meetings between 19 March and 28 March 1979.

In the course of its deliberations the Council invited the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, the Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Romania,

[1701] 2078th mtg., paras. 44-49.
[1702] *Ibid.*, paras. 113-118.
[1703] S/13176, *OR, 34th year, Suppl. for January-March 1979*, p. 158.
[1704] S/13154, *ibid.*, p. 120 (from Ethiopia). S/13158, mimeographed (for the text of the statement, see *GA OR, 34th session, Suppl. No. 24* and corrigendum, vol. II, para. 52, item 3) (from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia). S/13168, *OR, 34th year, Suppl. for January-March 1979*, p. 147 (from Angola). S/13177, *ibid.*, p. 158 (From Angola).
[1705] S/13180, *ibid.*, pp. 160-161.
[1706] 2130th mtg., preceding para. 1.

Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Togo, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1707]

The Council also extended invitations as requested under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mishake Muyongo and Theo-Ben Gurirab of SWAPO, Mfanafuthi Johnstone Makatini of ANC and David M. Sibeco of PAC.[1707] Under the same rule of its provisional rules of procedure it also extended invitations to the following persons: at the 2130th meeting to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab;[1708] at the 2132nd meeting to Mr. Mishake Muyongo;[1709] at the 2133rd meeting to Mr. Johnstone Makatini;[1710] and at the 2135th meeting to Mr. David Sibeko.[1711]

At the 2130th meeting on 19 March 1979, the representative of Angola stated that his country faced continuing threats to its sovereignty and territorial integrity from the racist minority régime of South Africa. He emphasized that the timing of the latest South African attacks on Angola was a rude and arrogant gesture aimed at international mediation efforts in Namibia, and in southern Africa as a whole. He said that the Security Council meeting would not deter South Africa from its course unless there was concerted action by those Powers that supported it, and unless mandatory sanctions were involved against the racist régime.[1712]

The representative of Zambia stated that the South African acts of aggression against Angola were launched concurrently with its rejection of the report[1713] of the Secretary-General of 26 February 1979, intended to give effect to the proposal for the settlement of the question of Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which South Africa had pretended to accept. South Africa was, on the one hand, committing the acts of aggression and, on the other, attending the proximity talks arranged by the Western countries on the question of Namibia. South Africa could not expect Angola to ignore the acts of aggression even during the proximity talks when its people were being bombed, killed and maimed. He called on the Council to address an urgent appeal to all States to render material and other forms of assistance to the front-line countries. Urgent and particular consideration should be given to the need to strengthen their defence capabilities. South Africa's persistent refusal to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) could no longer be tolerated and one of the members of the Council should block the adoption of enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.[1714]

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR declared that the aggressive actions of South Africa against Angola and other African States were a serious threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of these States, and to peace and security in southern Africa and were directly aimed at maintaining the last bastions of racism and colonialism in the region. He said that the Security Council had to take all the steps necessary to ensure the implementation of the Council's resolution aimed at granting genuine independence and sovereignty to the Namibian people. It was necessary to formulate clearly all the concrete provisions in regard to the conduct of United Nations operations in Namibia and to place them before the Council for adoption, so that any possiblity of an attempt by South Africa to interpret those provisions to its own advantage during the implementation of the United Nations operation would be excluded. The security of the front-line States had to be ensured.[1715]

At the 2132nd meeting on 20 March 1979, the representative of Norway reiterated his Government's view that it was the responsibility of the international community to provide effective economic and humanitarian assistance to the front-line States. He supported the efforts by the Western contact group to break the impasse in the negotiations over the Namibia question saying that inconclusive negotiations might have far-reaching consequences for the whole region and might represent a serious threat to international peace and security.[1716]

At the 2133rd meeting on 22 March 1979 the representative of Bulgaria said that in its arrogance and cynicism the South African racist régime had gone so far as to suggest formally a draft resolution, contained in a letter from its Foreign Minister, whereby the Security Council was called upon, in defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions, to condemn SWAPO for its struggle for the self-determination and independence of the oppressed people of Namibia. He went on to say that the development of events in South Africa might erupt at any moment into an even more dangerous conflict. The last acts of aggression committed against Angola confirmed it. This unbearable situation required that effective mandatory actions be taken against the racist régime of South Africa. He emphasized that it was high time that all States strictly complied with the United Nations resolutions.[1717]

At the 2136th meeting on 23 March 1979, the representative of Liberia condemned the attacks by South Africa against Angola as attacks against the United Nations and against world peace. He stated that the Charter placed primary responsibility upon the Council to curb aggression and to maintain peace. For that reason, it was not enough that the Security Council should repeatedly condemn South Africa's continuing aggression while at the same time doing nothing to halt it. The fact that proximity talks on Namibia—not on Angola—were taking place at that time was no reason why the Council had to go back on its promise in

[1707] For details, see chapter III.
[1708] 2130th mtg., preceding para. 3.
[1709] 2132nd mtg., preceding para. 4.
[1710] 2133rd mtg., para. 4.
[1711] 2135th mtg., para. 4.
[1712] 2130th mtg., paras. 5-39.
[1713] S/13120, *OR, Suppl. for January-March 1979*, pp. 89-91.
[1714] 2130th mtg., paras. 21-39.
[1715] *Ibid.*, paras. 46-66.
[1716] 2132nd mtg., paras. 5-9.
[1717] 2133rd mtg., paras. 7-21.

resolution 428 (1978) to consider invoking enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter if Angola were again attacked by South Africa.[1718]

At the 2137th meeting on 26 March 1979, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania viewed the violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola not as isolated incidents but as part of a much larger conspiracy to disrupt the peace process in the area. These attacks not only jeopardized the prospect of peace, but constituted total defiance by South Africa of all Security Council resolutions. The Security Council should keep its commitment to move forward, thus preserving its credibility and its prestige and the honour of the Organization.[1719]

In the course of the discussion a number of representatives expressed the view that the Security Council had to condemn South Africa's aggression against Angola and impose sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter.[1720]

At the 2138th meeting on 28 March 1979, the representative of Zambia introduced the draft resolution sponsored by Bangladesh, Bolivia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria and Zambia.[1721]

At the 2139th meeting on 28 March 1979, the President informed the Council that the delegation of Gabon had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.[1722]

Speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom reaffirmed the commitment of his Government to the initiative of the five Western countries. He said that the initiative was at a critical stage; therefore the delegation of the United Kingdom was going to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. He expressed understanding for the wish of the sponsors to describe in the strongest terms the incursions by South Africa into a neighbouring sovereign State. But he said that his Government did not, however, read or accept operative paragraph 1 or operative paragraphs 6 or 7 as constituting determinations under the Charter. Nor did it read or accept those paragraphs as constituting any commitment to future actions of the Council in that matter.[1723]

Similar views were expressed by the representative of France.[1724]

[1718] 2136th mtg., paras. 47-57.

[1719] 2137th mtg., paras. 21-38.

[1720] For texts of relevant statements, see 2130th mtg., paras. 46-66 (USSR), *ibid.*, paras. 70-81 (Ethiopia), 2132nd mtg., paras. 11-19 (Kuwait), *ibid.*, paras. 20-26 (Jamaica), *ibid.*, paras. 27-40 (Czechoslovakia), *ibid.*, paras. 41-55 (Bangladesh), *ibid.*, paras. 90-105 (Yugoslavia), *ibid.*, paras. 108-122 (Benin), 2133rd mtg., paras. 9-21 (Bulgaria), *ibid.*, paras. 24-37 (Viet Nam), *ibid.*, paras. 50-64 (Ghana), 2135th mtg., paras. 6-16 (Congo), *ibid.*, paras. 56-63 (Egypt), *ibid.*, paras. 66-72 (India), *ibid.*, paras. 75-89 (Cuba), 2136th mtg., paras. 18-27 (Sierra Leone), *ibid.*, paras. 30-45 (Madagascar), 2137th mtg., paras. 4-17 (German Democratic Republic), *ibid.*, paras. 21-38 (Tanzania), *ibid.*, paras. 41-48 (Sudan), *ibid.*, paras. 51-59 (Guyana), *ibid.*, paras. 62-73 (Somalia), *ibid.*, paras. 75-85 (Mr. Makatini), *ibid.*, paras. 89-98 (Mr. Sibeko), 2138th mtg., paras. 5-12 (Zambia), *ibid.*, paras. 15-23 (Ukrainian SSR), 2139th mtg., paras. 30-33 (Czechoslovakia), *ibid.*, paras. 51-57 (USSR), *ibid.*, paras. 68-71 (Angola).

[1721] 2138th mtg., paras. 4-12. S/13197 was adopted without change as resolution 447 (1979).

[1722] 2139th mtg., para. 3.

[1723] *Ibid.*, paras. 34-38.

[1724] *Ibid.*, paras. 39-45.

The President then put to the vote the draft resolution which was adopted[1725] by 12 votes to none with 3 abstentions as resolution 447 (1979).[1726]

The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the request of the Permanent Representative of Angola contained in document S/13176, as well as his letter dated 16 March 1979 transmitting the text of a communiqué issued by the Ministry of Defence of the People's Republic of Angola,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Angola,

Having heard the statement of the Vice-President of the South West Africa People's Organization,

Recalling its resolution 387 (1976) of 31 March 1976, by which, *inter alia*, it condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa should scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Bearing in mind its resolution 428 (1978) of 6 May 1978, by which, *inter alia*, it solemnly warned that, in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, it would meet again in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof,

Gravely concerned at the premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions committed by South Africa in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Convinced that the intensity and timing of these acts of armed invasion are intended to frustrate efforts at negotiated settlements in southern Africa, particularly in regard to the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976 and 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978,

Grieved at the tragic and mounting loss in human life, including that of civilians and Namibian refugees in Angola and other front-line States, and concerned about the damage and wanton destruction of property caused by the South African armed invasions of Angola launched from Namibia, a Territory which South Africa illegally occupies,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in accordance with resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the exercise of such rights as set forth in these resolutions,

Reaffirming also its condemnation of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the militarization of the Territory, through which it persists in its suppression of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence as well as in its armed invasions against neighbouring African States,

1. *Condemns strongly* the racist régime of South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola, which constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country as well as a serious threat to international peace and security;

2. *Condemns strongly also* South Africa's utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed invasions and destabilization of the People's Republic of Angola;

3. *Demands* that South Africa cease immediately its provocative armed invasions against the People's Republic of Angola and that it respect forthwith the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country;

4. *Commends* the People's Republic of Angola and other front-line States for their steadfast support of the people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle against the illegal occupation of their territory by South Africa and for the enjoyment of their inalienable rights to self-determination and national independence,

[1725] *Ibid.*, para. 46.

[1726] *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1979*, pp. 17-18.

5. *Requests* Member States urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People's Republic of Angola and other front-line States, in order to strengthen their defence capacities;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to obtain available information from the People's Republic of Angola on the human casualties and material and other damage resulting from repeated acts of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa;

7. *Further requests* the Secretary-General to submit such information to the Security Council not later than 30 April 1979, in order to enable it to determine the most effective sanctions in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations so as to ensure the cessation by South Africa of its acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States.

Speaking after the vote the representative of Norway emphasized that in relation to paragraph 5 of the resolution the Norwegian Government, in accordance with its long-standing policy, would continue to provide only humanitarian and economic assistance to the front-line States, and with regard to operative paragraph 7 and the question of sanctions, the wording therein should not prejudge the outcome of the Council's future deliberations. The various conflicts in southern Africa were inextricably linked. Measures taken by the Council had therefore to be carefully examined also in terms of their overall impact on the situation in the region, especially attempts to reach negotiated settlements.[727]

At the same meeting confirming the position of his delegation on Security Council resolution 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978, the representative of the USSR recalled the misgivings it expressed towards the United Nations operation in Namibia as to where that 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 was becoming very clear that the Security Council should thoroughly scrutinize the question of how to implement that resolution. That was all the more necessary since the Security Council had so far not complied with resolution 439 (1978) of 13 November 1978, which provided that the Council would meet forthwith to initiate appropriate action under the Charter of the United Nations if South Africa did not cancel the illegal elections in Namibia. He expressed his regret that the resolution which was just adopted did not go far enough and did not provide for the immediate adoption of effective and decisive measures against South Africa but once again postponed consideration of that question.

At the same time he pointed out that the resolution did contain a strong condemnation of South Africa for its acts against Angola. The resolution also commended the firm position of Angola and the other front-line States which had supported the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia and contained an appeal to States Members of the United Nations to give to Angola and the other front-line States all the necessary support to strengthen their defensive potential. On that basis the Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.[728]

The representative of the United States said that his vote on the resolution should be seen in the light of the United States role as mediators in the dispute. Turning to the text of the resolution, he expressed 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. He reiterated his Government's belief that a solution to the problem of Namibia could not be found through the introduction of more arms and other forms of military assistance in an area which was already clearly suffering the effects of too many arms. The only real solution was a peaceful one; force would not ultimately solve the problems of southern Africa and would only bring greater problems in its wake. His Government did not interpret that resolution as condoning the presence of foreign military personnel in Angola or elsewhere in Southern Africa or as implying that violence could resolve the issue.[729]

Decision of 2 November 1979 (2170th meeting): resolution 454 (1979)

By letter[730] dated 31 October 1979 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of Angola requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council in connection with the question of South African aggression against Angola, especially in the light of recent and continuing acts of aggression and violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country.

In other communications[731] to the Security Council, the representative of Angola transmitted information on the details of the South African attacks on Angola.

By a note[732] dated 27 July 1979, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 447 (1979), forwarded a report prepared by the Government of Angola on "the human casualties and material and other damage resulting from repeated acts of aggression" by South Africa.

By letter[733] dated 2 November 1979, addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of South Africa transmitted the text of a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, in which the South African Government denied that it had committed any acts of aggression against Angola, attributing the occurrence to civil war in Angola.

The Security Council included the item in its agenda[734] and considered it at the 2169th and 2170th meetings on 1 and 2 November 1979.

---

[727] 2139th mtg., paras. 48-50.

[728] *Ibid.*, paras. 51-57.

[729] *Ibid.*, paras. 58-62.

[730] S/13595, *OR, 34th year, Suppl. for October-December 1979*, p. 45.

[731] S/13403, *ibid., Suppl. for April-June 1979*, p. 201; S/13446, *ibid., Suppl. for July-September 1979*, p. 12; S/13532, *ibid.*, p. 131; S/13557, *ibid.*, p. 145; S/13560, *ibid.*, p. 148; S/13561, *ibid.*, S/13599, *ibid., Suppl. for October-December 1979*, pp. 47-48.

[732] S/13473, *ibid., Suppl. for July-September 1979*, pp. 77-92.

[733] S/13604, *OR, 34th year, Suppl. for October-December 1979*, pp. 52-54.

[734] 2169th mtg., preceding para. 2.

In the course of its deliberations the Council invited the representatives of Angola, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1175]

At the 2169th meeting the representative of Angola stated that the South African attacks in the past few days were nothing new. His country had been subjected to those attacks since 1975. However, the extent of those armed attacks and the damage they had inflicted necessitated the request of an urgent meeting of the Security Council. He charged that Pretoria's strategy was to prepare for total war against the people and territory of Angola, against the people of Namibia and SWAPO and in short, against black Africa and against African plans for the liberation of the entire continent. Pretoria's nuclear capability would play an increasingly bigger role in the South African efforts to protect its *apartheid* system and minority rule, to threaten sovereign States and liberation movements. He called on the Council to adopt a resolution asking for total sanctions, as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter.[1176]

At the 2170th meeting the representative of Zambia emphasized that the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes were continuing the acts of aggression against front-line States in the midst of negotiations on Zimbabwe and Namibia. Some appeared to be sensitive when the Security Council was justly called upon to react to these acts of aggression in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter suggesting that meetings such as the current Council meeting could complicate the negotiations. He announced that all the front-line States remained committed to the search for negotiated settlements in Zimbabwe and Namibia. Those States or the liberation movements were not to be blamed for the problem. The problem was that the racist minority régimes continued to resist change, even by peaceful means. On behalf of the delegations of Bangladesh, Gabon,[1177] Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria and Zambia, he introduced a draft resolution.[1178]

At the same meeting the representative of the United Kingdom said that he disputed the need to press for a vote with less than 24 hours' notice on a draft resolution which had been presented to the Security Council as a virtual ultimatum, with no serious attempt to engage in negotiations. He indicated that there was wording in the draft which his delegation could not support for reasons of principle and which could have been changed without altering the main drive of the resolution itself. Certain delegations made suggestions to that effect but they were swept aside and they were told that the sponsors were not prepared to negotiate one word. For that reason his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution.[1179]

In the course of both meetings some representatives stated the need of application of inforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.[1180]

At the 2170th meeting the draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none with 3 abstentions as resolution 454 (1979).[1181]

The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the request of the Permanent Representative of Angola contained in document S/13595, as well as his note dated 31 October 1979 transmitting the text of a communiqué issued by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the MPLA Workers' Party,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Angola,

Recalling its resolutions 387 (1976) of 31 March 1976 and 447 (1979) of 28 March 1979, by which, *inter alia*, it condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa should scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned at the premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions committed by South Africa in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Convinced that the intensity and timing of these acts of armed invasion are intended to frustrate efforts at negotiated settlements in southern Africa, particularly in regard to the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) of 30 January 1976 and 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978,

Grieved at the tragic loss in human life and concerned about the damage and destruction of property resulting from the repeated acts of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned that these wanton acts of aggression by South Africa form a consistent and sustained pattern of violations aimed at weakening the unrelenting support given by the front-line States to the movements for freedom and national liberation of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa,

1. *Strongly condemns* South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola;

2. *Calls upon* the Government of South Africa to cease immediately all acts of aggression and provocation against the People's Republic of Angola and forthwith to withdraw all its armed forces from Angola;

3. *Demands* that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola;

4. *Demands also* that South Africa desist forthwith from the utilization of Namibia, a Territory which it illegally occupies, to launch acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola or other neighbouring African States;

5. *Requests* Member States urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People's Republic of Angola and other front-line States, in order to strengthen their defence capacities;

6. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.[1182]

[1175] For details, see chapter III.

[1176] 2169th mtg., paras. 6-32.

[1177] Gabon joined the sponsors of the resolution, see President's statement 2170th mtg., para. 3.

[1178] 2170th mtg., paras. 20-32. S/13601 adopted without change as resolution 454 (1979).

[1179] *Ibid.*, paras. 110-117.

[1180] 2169th mtg., paras. 35-40 (Liberia), *ibid.*, paras. 41-52 (Cuba), *ibid.*, paras. 54-66 (Brazil), *ibid.*, paras. 68-81 (USSR); 2170th mtg., paras. 7-17 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), *ibid.*, paras. 20-32 (Zambia), *ibid.*, paras. 40-44 (Jamaica), *ibid.*, paras. 51-57 (Czechoslovakia), *ibid.*, paras. 100-107 (Nigeria), *ibid.*, paras. 138-147 (Yugoslavia), *ibid.*, paras. 150-160 (Mozambique), *ibid.*, paras. 164-170 (Viet Nam).

[1181] *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, pp. 18-19.

[1182] By letter dated 5 November 1979 (S/13608, *OR, 34th year, Suppl. for October-December 1979*, p. 56) the representative of South Africa transmitted the text of a letter from the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs who rejected resolution 454 (1979) and charged that SWAPO was persistently using Angola as a spring-board for hit-and-run attacks across the border.

Decision of 27 June 1980 (2240th meeting): resolution 457 (1980)

By letter[1743] dated 26 June 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Angola requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council in connection with the question of South African aggression against Angola.

By letter[1744] dated 27 June 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of South Africa transmitted the text of a letter from the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, rejecting the allegations of aggression against Angola.

In a letter[1745] dated 27 June 1980 addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Angola reported details about attacks by South Africa against Angola since 7 June 1980. He also indicated that the South African forces were still in Angola and disputed South Africa's argument that its actions were directed at SWAPO.

At the 2237th meeting on 26 June 1980 the Security Council adopted[1746] the agenda and considered the item at the 2237th and 2240th meetings on 26 and 27 June 1980.

In the course of the deliberations the Council invited the representatives of Angola, Benin, Cuba, Guinea, India, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania and Yugoslavia, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1747]

The Council also extended invitations as requested under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Theo-Ben Gurirab, Permanent Observer of SWAPO to the United Nations, Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations and the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia.[1747]

At the 2237th meeting the representative of Angola stated that his Government had petitioned the Security Council many times since Angola's admission to the United Nations concerning the persistent South African attacks against his country but to no avail. Sanctions were imposed on small nations which could not be considered a threat by either Western Governments or Western transnational corporations, but a racist structure that brutalized and dehumanized its own majority inhabitants, a military power with nuclear capability enough to threaten all of Africa, went unchecked and unpunished, despite strong demands from the third world. He reiterated that the only way to prevent a holocaust in southern Africa was to make South Africa realize the necessity for change, and the only way to do that, since all other methods had been tried and had failed to yield results, was through implementation of total sanctions against the minority régime.[1748]

At the same meeting, the representative of the USSR stated that by making continual armed attacks against Angola, the Pretoria authorities were aiming to subvert the process of social and economic reform which was successfully taking place in that country, to make the economic situation more complicated and to hamper the successful development of that country along its chosen path. In deliberately making unacceptable demands in the United Nations, Pretoria was obviously trying to use its participation in negotiations with the United Nations to gain time and to prepare conditions which would be conducive to the implementation of its owns racist plans for the so-called internal settlement: to set up in Namibia a puppet régime and to entrench a neo-colonialist order in that Territory. South Africa's true plans for Namibia had been quite blatantly demonstrated in its acts of aggression against Angola.[1749]

The representative of China demanded an end to the South African acts of aggression against Angola, the withdrawal of all their invading forces and a guarantee against the recurrence of similar incidents. He expressed the view that the Security Council should support the various correct ideas put forward by the African States, including the demand for South Africa to compensate for the losses incurred.[1750]

At the same meeting the representative of Zambia introduced the draft resolution[1751] sponsored by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia.

At the 2240th meeting the representative of Benin said that the adoption of the draft resolution would not represent any progress at all and would have no impact on the situation in southern Angola. That resolution had nothing to do with the serious events which the Security Council had met to discuss. The path of sanctions against the Pretoria régime was the only way to put an end to all the threats which were hovering not only over Africa, but also over the world as a whole.[1752]

The representative of the United Kingdom regretted that his delegation could not support the draft resolution because it still contained unacceptable language in some preambular and operative paragraphs. If adopted, the draft resolution would not amount to a determination under Chapter VII of the Charter.[1753]

The representative of France stated that he was unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution because of some formulations in the text. He noted, in particular, that two preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1, 5, 6 and 7 contained language which might be interpreted in different ways and give rise to serious difficulties. It would have been preferable to negotiate with the sponsors a consensus text. The resolutions of the Council had much greater authority, indeed, if they were adopted unanimously.[1754]

[1743] S/14022.
[1744] S/14020.
[1745] S/14030.
[1746] 2237th mtg., preceding para. 1.
[1747] For details, see chapter III.
[1748] 2237th mtg., paras. 4-25.
[1749] *Ibid.*, paras. 58-68.
[1750] *Ibid.*, paras. 69-74.
[1751] *Ibid.*, paras. 220-222. S/14024 was adopted without change as resolution 475 (1980).
[1752] 2240th mtg., paras. 23-40.
[1753] *Ibid.*, paras. 87-89.
[1754] *Ibid.*, paras. 90-94.

The Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia said that the Council for Namibia, in its programme of action adopted in Algiers, invited the attention of the Security Council to the present critical situation in Namibia and requested that it convene urgently to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The Council for Namibia, furthermore, called upon the international community to intensify efforts for the complete and effective isolation of South Africa, and in this regard called for the exposure to the widest international scrutiny of those foreign economic and other interests whose collaboration with the racist Pretoria régime buttressed the machinery of exploitation in Namibia and contributed to the perpetuation of the subjugation of the people of the Territory.[1755]

In the course of both meetings a number of speakers called for the imposition of measures stipulated in Chapter VII of the Charter.[1756]

At the same meeting the draft resolution was put to the vote and was adopted by 12 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions as resolution 475 (1980).[1757]

The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the request by the Permanent Representative of Angola contained in document S/14022, in which he requested the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of Angola,

Recalling its resolutions 387 (1976), 428 (1978), 447 (1979) and 454 (1979), by which it, *inter alia*, condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned at the escalation of hostile, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression and sustained armed invasions committed by the racist régime of South Africa in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Convinced that the intensity and timing of these acts of armed invasion are intended to frustrate efforts at negotiated settlements in southern Africa, particularly in regard to the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978),

Grieved at the tragic loss in human life, mainly that of civilians, and concerned about the damage and destruction of property, including bridges and livestock, resulting from the escalated acts of aggression and armed incursions by the racist regime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned that these wanton acts of aggression by South Africa form a consistent and sustained pattern of violations aimed at weakening the unrelenting support given by the front-line States to the movements for freedom and national liberation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa,

Conscious of the need to take effective measures to maintain international peace and security,

1. *Strongly condemns* the racist régime of South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola, which constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country as well as a serious threat to international peace and security;

2. *Strongly condemns also* South Africa's utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a spring-board for armed invasions and destabilization of the People's Republic of Angola;

3. *Demands* that South Africa should withdraw forthwith all its military forces from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, cease all violations of Angola's air space and, henceforth, scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola;

4. *Calls upon* all States to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in Security Council resolution 418 (1977);

5. *Requests* Member States urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People's Republic of Angola and the other front-line States, in order to strengthen their defence capacities in the face of South Africa's acts of aggression against these countries;

6. *Calls* for the payment by South Africa of full and adequate compensation to the People's Republic of Angola for the damage to life and property resulting from these acts of aggression;

7. *Decides* 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 measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof;

8. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

TELEGRAM DATED 3 JANUARY 1979 FROM THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER IN CHARGE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA

Decision of 15 Jaunary 1979 (2112th meeting): rejection of the seven-Power draft resolution

By a telegram[1758] dated 3 January 1979, the representative of democratic Kampuchea requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting of the council "to condemn Vietnamese agrression and to take such measures as may be necessary to ensure that Viet Nam ceases its aggression and respects the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Democratic Kampuchea".

At its 2108th meeting on 11 January, following statements by the representatives of the USSR, China and Czechoslovakia, and by the President, the Council included the item in its agenda.[1759] The representatives of the USSR and Czechoslovakia objected to the Council's considering the communication in document S/13003 on the grounds that the situation in Kampuchea was purely an internal affair of that country. The representative of China stated that in view of Viet Nam's aggression against Democratic Kampuchea, it was entirely just for the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, a State Member of the United Nations, to request a Council meeting.[1760]

The Council considered the question at its 2108th to 2112th meetings held from 11 to 15 February 1979. At its 2108th meeting the Council considered requests to participate in its consideration of the question, under article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure, from the representative of Demo-

[1755] 2240th mtg., paras. 96-105.

[1756] 2237th mtg., para. 68 (USSR); *ibid.*, para. 81 (Jamaica); *ibid.*, para. 93 (Yugoslavia); *ibid.*, para. 141 (India); *ibid.*, paras. 164-166 (Pakistan); *ibid.*, paras. 174-176 (Cuba); *ibid.*, para. 218 (Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO); 2240th mtg., para. 13 (Tunisia); *ibid.*, paras. 27-34 (Benin); *ibid.*, para. 49 (Nigeria); *ibid.*, para. 61 (Guinea); *ibid.*, para. 104 (Mr. Eralp, United Nations Council for Namibia).

[1757] *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1980*, pp. 21-22.

[1758] S/13003, *OR, 34th yr., Suppl for Jan.-March 1979*, pp. 3-4.

[1759] 2108th mtg., para. 30.

[1760] *Ibid.*, USSR, paras. 9-15, China, paras. 17-22, Czechoslovakia paras. 26-27.