

forces in the West. Cuba voiced a similar opinion, saying the refusal by the United States to allow the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa meant a manifest decision to protect the aggressor. The German Democratic Republic and the USSR said it was time for the Council to act in accordance with its June 1980 resolution on Angola and South Africa, when it decided to meet again in the event of further South African violation of Angola's territory in order to consider more effective measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII.⁽³⁶⁾ The German Democratic Republic favoured an appeal to States to provide Angola with all necessary assistance in order to bring South African aggression to an immediate end.

Tunisia said international peace and security, as well as the Council's authority and credibility, would be reinforced by the adoption of mandatory sanctions. The call for sanctions was supported by several others, such as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Uganda. Yugoslavia said the demand of the non-aligned countries for sanctions had become more acute and more universal. In Brazil's view, the Council would have no other resort but the use of Chapter VII if South Africa did not meet the request to withdraw its troops and pay full compensation for the human and material losses caused by its invasion.

Ireland charged that South Africa had utilized its illegal occupation of Namibia to attack Angola on the pretext of a pre-emptive strike; Ireland wondered whether those attacks might not ultimately be aimed at promoting instability throughout southern Africa. In Japan's opinion, South Africa's military actions in Angola went against all United Nations efforts to find a settlement of the Namibian problem.

Kenya, as Chairman of OAU, said Angola was the target of the invasion, not SWAPO and its bases. Mozambique believed that South Africa's invasion of Angola and its January attack on Matola, Mozambique (p. 211, were meant to destabilize the situation in both countries and make it more difficult for them to express political and material solidarity with national liberation movements. The Niger remarked that the conduct of the operations, their timing and objective ruled out the possibility of improvisation or chance; they were outright acts of aggression, backed with sufficient means. The Philippines saw the invasion as part of South Africa's scheme to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. India expressed a similar opinion and urged the Council to take appropriate and resolute action, including the application of Chapter VII.

Uganda saw four South African objectives in

committing aggression against Angola: to make the world safe for apartheid; to eliminate all patriotic elements within and outside Namibia so as to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory and frustrate self-determination; to intimidate the front-line States and inhibit them from expressing solidarity with the liberation movements and refugees; and to weaken the economies of the neighbouring States so as to make them dependent on South Africa.

In Canada's view, the situation re-emphasized the acute need for a solution to the Namibia question. France said South Africa's argument that it was acting in self-defence against incursions by SWAPO fighters was not at all valid, as South African territory was not in danger; the direct cause of the dangerous situation in southern Africa was the unjustified maintenance in Namibia of a South African presence and Pretoria's refusal to accept the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia. The Federal Republic of Germany expressed the conviction that efforts for a peaceful solution to that question could succeed only if all parties exercised the utmost restraint and desisted from any action likely to endanger peace and security in the area.

Mexico stated that South Africa's impunity was largely the result of the Council's ambiguous conduct; it had not reacted with sufficient decisiveness when faced with an obvious fact. Panama said the gravity of South Africa's aggression required the adoption of forceful coercive measures; States could not remain neutral when faced with the constant institutional erosion produced in the United Nations by that country's stubborn and delinquent attitude.

FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS (SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER). On 3 September⁽¹⁹⁾ and 8 September,⁽²⁶⁾ respectively, Bangladesh and Pakistan transmitted government statements denouncing the acts of aggression against Angola, expressing solidarity with it and calling for international action to terminate the attack and ensure withdrawal of the South African troops.

The Acting Chairman of the Committee against Apartheid, by a letter dated 10 September,⁽³⁾ transmitted to the Secretary-General a Declaration on the Aggression by the South African Racist Regime against the People's Republic of Angola, adopted on 31 August by the International Seminar on Publicity and the Role of the Mass Media in the International Mobilization against Apartheid, held at Berlin (p. 204). The Seminar, condemning the invasion, requested that the Security Council declare South Africa as the aggressor, demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces, declare its liability for full reparations, adopt comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and call on all