

States and also showed the culpability of those nations which continued to support Pretoria. Democratic Kampuchea, on 17 June,(49) said the attack was another premeditated crime by South Africa and demanded that it end its aggression, destabilization and intimidation against its neighbours. Italy forwarded a 19 June EC declaration,(50) stating that South Africa's action ran counter to the continuation of a dialogue aimed at seeking peaceful solutions to the region's problems. Liberia transmitted a 20 June letter(51) from Oliver Tambo, President of ANC, stating that South Africa had undertaken the raid under the pretext of dealing with so-called terrorism, when all Botswana had done was to provide refuge to people in accordance with international law and morality; ANC urged the Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Brazil expressed solidarity with Botswana on 20 June,(52) as did the Sudan, on 21 June;(53) the latter also called on the Council to take deterrent measures such as comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

SECURITY COUNCIL ACTION (June)

The Council held two meetings on 21 June to consider Botswana's complaint. It invited the Bahamas, Benin, Botswana, the German Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Seychelles, South Africa, the Sudan, Swaziland and the United Republic of Tanzania, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion. It also invited, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure,^e a Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Opening the debate, Botswana said that the invasion was the culmination of a progressively aggressive South African attitude towards Botswana that had intensified as agitation for change had grown inside South Africa. Botswana had never allowed and would not allow its territory to be used as a base for ANC guerrilla operations against South Africa, and South African commandos had not found one military camp or centre in Gaborone. However, Botswana gave political asylum to South African refugees and would continue to do so regardless of the consequences. Botswana believed that a solution to the region's problems lay solely in ending apartheid in South Africa.

South Africa said it had sent a message to Botswana expressing regret at the loss of innocent life in the operation against ANC targets. The operation was begun after repeated requests to Botswana to curtail ANC's terrorist activities against South Africa originating from its territory went unheeded. Botswana's failure to do so left South Africa no alternative but to take steps to prevent such acts from being planned and executed from Botswana and other neighbouring States. South Africa said that although it was committed to resolving differences with its neighbours

peacefully, it would not hesitate to take whatever action was necessary for its defence.

All other speakers condemned South Africa's attack and several urged the Council to act effectively. They were Benin, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, the German Democratic Republic, India, Lesotho, Liberia, the Sudan, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and the United Republic of Tanzania.

Some countries drew a parallel between South Africa's attack against Botswana and other conflicts in the region. The Bahamas, for example, said South Africa's actions in Namibia, Angola and Botswana proved that it could not be coaxed into peaceful change. France said the attack, which coincided with developments in Namibia, underlined the close interconnection of the problems of southern Africa. According to the USSR, the events in Botswana and Angola showed that they formed an inseparable part of South Africa's policy of force and destabilization of the sovereign States of the region, to preserve apartheid at any cost. However, Australia believed that notwithstanding the coincidence of three consecutive Council debates in the previous few days on developments in Namibia, Angola and Botswana, the issues had to be stated clearly and unequivocally in response to each specific situation.

A number of countries raised questions about South Africa's sincerity in explaining its reasons for the attack. Denmark said South Africa's assertion that its attack against Botswana had been carried out after careful deliberations and calculations confirmed South Africa's hypocrisy when it declared its willingness to co-operate with its neighbours in controlling cross-border violations. Egypt saw it as ironic for South Africa to call on Botswana, which had no army, to enter into a non-aggression pact. Lesotho observed that the reasons given by South Africa for its attack were nearly identical to the reasons advanced for the attacks against its other neighbours. The Sudan said all military operations undertaken by national liberation movements were being planned and executed from within South Africa itself and not from the territory of front-line States. India rejected South Africa's invoking international law to justify its attack on Botswana, and Swaziland rejected its invoking Article 51 of the Charter which recognized the right of self-defence.

Benin criticized the lack of political will on the part of some Powers to act firmly in the face of South Africa's aggressive actions. Similarly, Liberia criticized certain permanent Council members for tolerating those actions. The German Democratic Republic accused imperialist circles of collaboration with the South African régime. The Ukrainian SSR believed that certain Western Powers shared responsibility for South Africa's

^e See footnote a on p. 154.