

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JAN 17 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION

# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1488<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 23 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1488) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 15 July 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9331) .....	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.

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 23 July 1969, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ibrahima BOYE (Senegal).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1488)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 15 July 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9331).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### **Letter dated 15 July 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9331)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Portugal, the United Republic of Tanzania and Somalia to take places at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. B. de Miranda (Portugal), Mr. M. A. Foun (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia) took places at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have just received a communication dated 23 July 1969 [S/9350] from the representative of Kenya asking to be invited to participate in the Council's debate on the item before it. If I hear no objection, and in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the practice of the Council, I propose to invite the representative of Kenya to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. E. Osanya-Nyenneque (Kenya) took a place at the Council table.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Security Council will now consider the question before it. Before calling on the first speaker on my list, however, I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that the representative of Burundi, in a letter dated 22 July 1969, has requested that Burundi be added to the list of co-signers of the letter of 18 July 1969 [see S/9340 and Add.1-3].

4. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the Soviet Union, on whom I now call.

5. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, before I proceed to state the position of the Soviet Union on the item on the agenda of the Security Council, may I be allowed, on behalf of the delegation of the USSR, to join in the congratulations addressed at the Council's last meeting by you, Mr. President, to the United States astronauts and to the people and Government of the United States on their outstanding success—the first landing of human beings on the moon from the spacecraft Apollo 11.

6. We should like to express our admiration for the courage and endurance shown by the astronauts of the United States of America in boldly confronting the unknown, and to wish them a safe return to earth.

7. Mr. President, this is not the first time the Security Council has considered the question of armed raids by the Portuguese colonialists against the young independent African States. In recent years, Senegal and Guinea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville), the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia have been the targets of attacks by the Portuguese armed forces.

8. Now, the tension created by Portugal on the borders of Zambia and Mozambique has reached a very acute point. Portugal's armed incursions are assuming a character which threatens the territorial integrity and inviolability of Zambia; they constitute a danger to peace and security in that part of the world, and make it necessary for the Security Council to take measures to curb the Portuguese colonialists. This was convincingly stated in the speech by the representative of Zambia, Mr. Mwaanga, who cited facts attesting, in particular, to the deliberate bombing of Zambian territory by Portuguese armed forces, causing bloodshed in the village of Lote and occasioning material damage. The representatives of Algeria, Somalia and Tanzania also spoke of this in their statements before the Security Council. The representative of Hungary, Mr. Csatorday, made a well-reasoned statement on this subject at the Council's last meeting.

9. Portugal's actions on the Zambian border constitute a link in the chain of Portugal's colonialist policy which is aimed at crushing the national liberation movements in southern Africa and maintaining the African peoples under the domination of the colonialists and racists. The action taken by the representatives of thirty-four independent African States on 18 July 1968 in addressing a letter [see S/9340 and Add.1-3] to the President of the Security

Council on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, constitutes an impressive condemnation of Lisbon's policy; that letter emphasizes Africa's concern at the perpetual threat posed by the Portuguese mercenaries in their war against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau).

10. For eight years, Portugal has been waging a war of annihilation against these peoples, a war which arouses the indignation of hundreds of millions of people of goodwill throughout the world. Portugal disregards the numerous decisions of the United Nations calling for the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

11. Portugal's latest actions once again clearly demonstrate that it is not worth waiting for any kind of "evolution" or "liberalization" from the Portuguese colonialists, which some may have expected. The facts show that Portugal is not only not cutting down, but, on the contrary, is intensifying its military operations against the national liberation movements of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau); Portugal is increasing its military expenditure and its army; it is strengthening its military and police forces in those Territories; it is establishing in those territories an increasing number of new paramilitary organizations which are called upon to carry out punitive actions against the forces of national liberation; it is increasing the strength and expanding the activities of the political police force which is waging a campaign of bloody terror against the freedom fighters. All this shows that the Lisbon régime, together with its partners in Pretoria and Salisbury, is nurturing far-reaching plans against the peoples of southern Africa.

12. Portugal is one of the active participants in the racist colonialist bloc, the "unholy alliance", which unites the South African and Southern Rhodesian racists and the Portuguese colonialists. The aim of this military and political bloc is to crush the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa for freedom and independence.

13. While the Government of Portugal is waging war against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), the South African racists, having established a régime of *apartheid* and oppression in their country, illegally maintain Namibia under their domination, and openly render military, economic and other assistance to the Portuguese colonialists. As was shown recently when the Security Council considered the question of Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and the Republic of South Africa are assisting the régime of the Southern Rhodesian racists in every way possible. All this is aggravating the situation in southern Africa and constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in that part of the world.

14. There are plenty of facts attesting to the co-ordination of action between the parties to this "unholy alliance", and to the assistance which they render each other in crushing the national liberation movements. Recent events show that this criminal alliance, which is a weapon of the imperialists for the collective suppression of the liberation movements in southern Africa, constitutes a threat not only to the national liberation movements, but to the newly independent African States too.

15. It is clear, of course, that neither Portugal nor the fascist racist régimes in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia would be able to resist world public opinion, disregard the United Nations, incur their enormous military expenditure, and wage wars were they not receiving direct or indirect political, economic, financial and military aid from international monopolies and from the NATO military bloc. It is precisely by force of arms and by relying on NATO aid that the Portuguese colonialists are seeking to maintain their domination. As the representatives of the national liberation movements showed during the recent meetings of the Committee of Twenty-Four<sup>1</sup> held away from Headquarters, Portugal is making wide use of NATO weapons in order to wage its colonial war in Africa. The overlapping of the military and political interests of the Portuguese colonialists and their NATO partners is also responsible for the support which, as we all know, Portugal receives in the United Nations from certain States.

16. The liberation of southern Africa, which is one of the last areas of colonial domination, is of particular significance for the future of Africa and the cause of peace and it is the duty of all freedom-loving States to support the national liberation movements in colonial Territories. The Soviet Union fully supports this just and heroic struggle.

17. Portugal's actions on the Zambian border are part of a plan designed to strike a blow at one of the countries which uphold Africa's right to full and final liberation from colonialism. These actions on the Zambian border should be considered in connexion with other facts which have been reported recently: the concentration of large Southern Rhodesian and South African contingents along the Zambesi river and on Zambia's southern borders, the constant reconnaissance flights of South African aircraft over Zambian territory, dropping spies and saboteurs from Southern Rhodesia into that country. In resorting to armed provocation against independent African States, Portugal and the racist régimes of the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are trying to prevent free Africa from giving assistance to the national liberation movements, which are constantly expanding their military activities against the colonialists, and to intimidate the African countries bordering on the colonialist and racist strongholds of southern Africa.

18. The increasingly frequent acts of aggression committed by Portugal against the independent African countries demonstrate the danger which the maintenance of the vestiges of colonialism represents to the cause of peace in the African continent and the whole world. Even in the resolution [218 (1965)] which it adopted on 23 November 1965, the Security Council drew attention to the fact that the situation resulting from Portugal's policy towards the African population of its colonies and towards the neighbouring African States was seriously disturbing international peace and security. As we all know, the General Assembly has strongly condemned the colonial war being waged by the Government of Portugal against the peaceful peoples of the Territories under its domination, a war

<sup>1</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

which the Assembly has described as "a crime against humanity and a grave threat to international peace and security" [resolution 2270 (XXII)].

19. The Security Council should draw the necessary conclusions from all this. Our times demand that our planet be purged of the evil of colonialism, that its last vestiges be removed, and that its re-emergence in new and disguised forms be prevented.

20. The Soviet Union, as its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, stated in his report to a meeting of the Supreme Soviet on 10 July 1969, is true to the principles of support for national liberation movements, and of strengthening the political and economic independence of States which have appeared on the map of the world as a result of the downfall of the colonial system. The Soviet Union is in favour of friendship and active co-operation with the African States.

21. The Security Council has an obligation to put the Portuguese colonialists in their place, to call them to order.

22. The USSR delegation supports Zambia's just demands that the Council should severely condemn the aggressive acts of the Portuguese colonialists against that African country; that it should invite Portugal to put an immediate end to the violation of Zambia's territorial integrity and to unprovoked attacks on that country; that Zambian citizens who have been kidnapped by the Portuguese armed forces should be released and that all property illegally seized by Portugal's troops on Zambian territory should be returned without delay. The Council must warn Portugal that if Portugal fails to comply with these demands the Council will take further measures in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

23. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on the list is the representative of Portugal, on whom I now call.

24. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): When my delegation took the floor at the 1486th meeting on 18 July, we had not yet had time to read and analyse in detail the statement that had been made earlier in the meeting by the representative of Zambia. We could do little more than refer to his letter of 15 July 1969 [S/9331] to the Security Council and to rely on some notes which we had taken as he spoke. Now that the provisional verbatim record of his intervention of 18 July [1486th meeting] is available, we are in a position to complete our answer to his allegations.

25. The Council will have noticed that the Zambian letter calling for a meeting of the Security Council makes a single concrete allegation, referring to an incident said to have occurred at the village of Lote on 30 June 1969. We gave our answer to that allegation. We rejected it as false. We reiterate that position.

26. In his intervention the representative of Zambia indicated, first, that he had intended to deal only with incidents covering the period between 30 June and 3 July, and, secondly, that he would have to deal with one more incident—namely, that of Balovale—which he alleged had taken place since the filing of his complaint.

27. Later, the representative of Zambia gave his version of the alleged incidents at the village of Lote. According to him, bombings of the same village took place on 30 June, 2 July and 4 July. If the first time the village was bombed was on 30 June and the last time was on 4 July, we fail to understand his earlier reference to 30 June and 3 July as the outside dates of the incidents. There is obviously some confusion. Besides, he mentioned no incident dated 3 July. The three dates he mentioned in connexion with Lote were 30 June, 2 July and 4 July. From a single day he passes to three days. All this is highly confusing to my delegation.

28. What happened at Lote? It is difficult to know for certain from this distance. To clarify issues such as these, the Luso-Zambian mixed commission has been a very useful instrument in the past and could have been used in this instance to mutual advantage but for the fact that Zambia came rushing to the Security Council. It still can be used. Meanwhile, all that my delegation knows is that between 30 June and 3 July Portuguese security forces, having been attacked by armed raiders coming from Zambia, mounted a clean-up operation in a locality situated at 14° 22' 5" south latitude and 32° 10' east longitude—that is to say, well within Portuguese territory and a good distance away from the Zambian frontier. The attacking raiders fled back into Zambia and possibly went to the village of Lote.

29. I now come to the alleged Balovale incident. There was no incident involving Portuguese security forces in Balovale or anywhere else in that part of Zambian territory. However, on 23 June there was an encounter inside Portuguese territory, in the vicinity, between Portuguese security forces and raiders infiltrating from Zambia. The place of the encounter is situated at 13 kilometres north of the southern frontier of Angola with Zambia and 36 kilometres west of the eastern frontier.

30. In that encounter several raiders were wounded. They fled back to Zambia, where some of the wounded men might have died. Among the things left behind by the raiders there were membership cards of the United National Independence Party, the Zambian governmental party. My delegation is prepared to exhibit or to circulate those cards in the Security Council as soon as they are received in our Permanent Mission. Meanwhile, we are led to formulate the following hypothesis: either the raiders were members of the Zambian governmental party or, at least, there were Zambians among the infiltrating raiders. In either case, it would reveal the support, or at least the connivance, of the Zambian Government in the hostile activities being conducted from Zambia against Portugal.

31. That incident of 23 June, which took place well inside Portuguese territory, is known to have been invoked by the Zambian Home Minister and was also mentioned here in the Security Council by the representative of Zambia. Between the two, there seems to be a difference as to the number of Zambians alleged to have died.

32. What is the conclusion to be drawn? Incidents are provoked inside Portuguese territory by raiders coming from Zambia; the raiders flee back to Zambian territory where they are given shelter; then Zambia alleges that the incidents took place inside Zambian territory. This was in

fact the sequence of events bearing on the alleged Balovale incident as on many other similar Zambian allegations. May it not be that the same sequence has occurred also in connexion with the alleged Lote affair?

33. Although it falls outside the scope of the original Zambian complaint, I shall comment on another allegation made by the representative of Zambia in his intervention on 18 July, because it refers to a recent date. I refer to the case of Mr. Jeremiah Lushindi. My delegation cannot help expressing great surprise that that case has been brought up here. The case was fully explained to the Zambian High Commissioner in London by the Portuguese Ambassador in that capital. The High Commissioner was told that, following an investigation conducted by the Portuguese authorities, it had been found that no Portuguese forces were involved in the incident. On the night of 25 June, some elements of the local population of Rivungo, in Angola, angered by the ill-treatment meted out in Zambia to a woman of their tribe, apparently crossed the frontier and captured an Angolan, resident in Zambia, whom they considered responsible for the ill-treatment. The name of the Angolan in question is known to be Jeremiah Lispuvui Niyinka. It is possible that he is the same person as Jeremiah Lushindi. That matter is still under investigation by the Portuguese authorities. After that information conveyed by us in a spirit of co-operation to one Zambian diplomat, it is hardly proper for another Zambian diplomat to raise the point here with a different objective.

34. The Zambian representative went on to recite a long litany of other allegations going back to 1966. Those allegations are wholly irrelevant to this debate not only because, by the Zambian representative's own declaration, they fall outside the scope of this debate—they are not incidents which may have occurred between 30 June and 3 July—but also because all of them have been investigated and settled by bilateral agreement. As I stated at the 1486th meeting, many of those alleged incidents were found to have been provoked from the Zambian side. In one or two cases, where the fault lay with the Portuguese side, we expressed regret and paid the compensation asked for by Zambia. Although the situation which gave rise to even those incidents had been created by Zambia—namely, by authorizing armed raids from its territory against the neighbouring Portuguese territories—we paid the compensation as a gesture of goodwill in the hope that Zambia would thereafter put an end to those raids, as indeed it ought to do in the fulfilment of its obligations as a member of the international community.

35. In his statement on 18 July, the representative of Zambia referred to the bilateral agreement arrived at in June 1968 between Zambia and Portugal. That is a clear admission that all previous allegations were dealt with and considered by both sides as liquidated. Why does the Zambian representative bring them up now? I cannot help commenting that thereby Zambia is seeking to buttress a case which does not exist. I refer to its present complaint against Portugal. There is obviously more than meets the eye in Zambia's attitude. But let us proceed with the analysis of the Zambian representative's statement; he said:

“The Zambian side, on its part, reassured the Portuguese delegation”—at the bilateral talks in 1968—“that

the Government of the Republic of Zambia would continue to take appropriate measures to ensure that Zambian territory would not be used as a base for hostile activities against Portuguese territory.” [1486th meeting, para. 12.]

Zambia thus recognized and accepted its international obligation and made a definite promise to Portugal. Has it fulfilled that promise? Can Zambia deny that since June 1968 there have been hundreds of armed raids carried out from Zambian territory into Portuguese territory? I mentioned some of them in my last intervention, and they are by no means few: not less than 110 attacks against the Benguela Railway alone between 1 January and April 1969. Nevertheless, we have kept the Benguela Railway open for Zambian traffic, knowing its vital importance to Zambian trade.

36. The conclusion cannot be avoided that Zambia makes promises in bad faith, proceeds in bad faith in its dealings with Portugal. The latest evidence of that bad faith, as I have already had occasion to point out, is the treacherous way in which the Zambian immigration authorities tricked two innocent Portuguese officers, by inviting them to leave behind their arms and approach the frontier and by detaining them afterwards. Since then the Zambian Government has itself become a party to this serious breach of international good conduct.

37. At the 1486th meeting, the Zambian representative quoted some words attributed by the press to one of the two detained Portuguese officers. Those words make sense only as an expression of his joy and surprise at the prospect of being released as ordered by the Zambian High Court. Surely he would not have uttered them had he known that he would continue to be detained by the arbitrary orders of the Zambian Government. How is one to characterize this sort of conduct on the part of a Government? The Security Council cannot be indifferent to the fact that two innocent Portuguese are faithlessly held in Zambia. My delegation has already formally requested the Council to call upon the Zambian Government to release them forthwith and unconditionally, and to place them back on the Angolan frontier. I now reiterate this request.

38. The representative of Zambia has tried to create the impression that the Luso-Zambian talks have been abandoned by the Zambian Government because the Portuguese “have become intransigent”. Lacking arguments, he tries slogans: Portuguese intransigence, Portuguese arrogance, words which have no definite content and are purely demagogic. I take this opportunity to refer to the wild accusations he levelled in this style against the Portuguese armed forces in the concluding part of his main statement. My delegation indignantly repudiates these allegations as false and unworthy of attention. My delegation also expects that the Zambian representative, after further thought, will also withdraw the grossly insulting epithet which he has applied to the Portuguese security elements in Angola and Mozambique. That epithet is not only unjust, but also in bad taste.

39. As I have said, the representative of Zambia has tried to make out that his Government left the Luso-Zambian

talks because the Portuguese became intransigent. In what way did they become intransigent? The Zambian representative admits that his Government believes it wiser to negotiate on a bilateral basis. We, on our side, have always been ready for bilateral negotiations, and our attitude remains unchanged. Where, then, is the Portuguese intransigence?

40. The Zambian side has made allegations to the effect that Zambian territory has been violated by Portugal. Zambia admits, on the other hand, that hostile elements cross from its territory in order to attack Portuguese territory. This admission has been made publicly on a number of occasions. No law, no article of the Charter, no resolution of the General Assembly or even of the Security Council can exonerate a Government which authorizes such activities against a foreign territory, for the good reason that such activities are the stuff of which frontier tensions are made. If the contrary were the case, that would strike at the very root of the rule of law in international relations.

41. Either the Zambian Government can control its frontiers but does not wish to do so, or it cannot. If it cannot, its responsibility is grave enough; it is even greater if it can control its frontiers and will not do so. In either case the Zambian Government cannot escape responsibility for the attacks made on Portuguese territory by elements proceeding from its territory and fleeing back for sanctuary, which is given them in Zambia. And Zambia, as I pointed out a while ago, had already promised Portugal not to allow such activities across the frontier.

42. In the course of this debate there have been allegations to the effect that Portugal is using NATO arms in Africa. We have rejected such allegations in the past and we do so again. My delegation challenges anyone who makes such allegations to prove that arms supplied to us under NATO arrangements are being used anywhere outside the NATO area.

43. Many other allegations have been made here, both by the Zambian representative and by other speakers who have later taken the floor, in regard to matters that have nothing to do with the present debate. My delegation does not feel bound to deal with such allegations and limits itself to rejecting them.

44. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have just received a letter dated 23 July [S/9351] from the representative of the United Arab Republic asking to be invited to participate in the Council's debate on the question before it. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the practice of the Council, and with the consent of the members of the Council, I shall invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to participate in the Council's debate, without the right to vote and to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when his turn comes to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. El-Erian (United Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

45. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Kenya, on whom I now call.

46. Mr. OSANYA-NYNEQUE (Kenya): Mr. President, I thank you for inviting my delegation to participate in this important debate. On the face of things, the debate is a confrontation between Portugal and the Republic of Zambia. At bottom, however, what is happening here represents a general confrontation between, on the one hand, an obnoxious system dying hard in the face of contrary forces, to wit, European colonialism in its final throes, and, on the other hand, the forces of liberation determined never to yield to the former. The debate is thus justly a cause for pan-African concern.

47. I should, parenthetically, at this point like to convey to you, Mr. President, the wishes of my delegation that your term as President of the Council will be crowned with success. It is not that we doubt the competence with which you will preside over the proceedings of the Council this month. On the contrary, my delegation feels sure that your term will bring to the deliberations of the Council that wisdom characteristic of your country, so well known as a home of outstanding African scholarship.

48. My delegation followed with keen interest the statements made in this Council on 18 July 1969, both by my brother the representative of Zambia and by the representative of Portugal, who has this afternoon seen fit to go over the same terrain. My delegation is easily convinced that my distinguished brother, Mr. Mwaanga, has "told it like it is"; the Portuguese representative, on the other hand, has told it very much "like it is not".

49. In his brilliant statement on 18 July, Mr. Mwaanga gave a very detailed, if also comprehensive, account of unprovoked raids carried out by Portugal on Zambian territory. That account seems to have been deliberately misunderstood by the representative of Portugal. He, for example, does not like the fact that Mr. Mwaanga recounted events which took place as far back as 1966; he would have the Council disregard those events on the pretext that bilateral talks between Portugal and Zambia have been taking place since then. He even expressed surprise that Mr. Mwaanga mentioned those events in spite of the so-called bilateral talks. Yet, is it not precisely because of those talks that the events of 1966 become a significant part of the sorry affair now before the Council?

50. By the admission of the Portuguese representative, Portuguese raids on Zambian territory have continued despite the talks by which he now purports to set so much store. All the more surely is Zambia justified in seeking a different solution. Quite correctly, the solution which Zambia has chosen is that of bringing the matter to the attention of the Security Council. The fact that three years have elapsed since what is considered by the Portuguese representative as the first incidents, in 1966, should not lead us to treat those incidents as forgotten episodes. On the contrary, they provide evidence, to which the Portuguese raids in 1967 and 1968 and the current ones are mere additions, to Portuguese culpability. Above all, the fact that Zambia has not up until now brought those Portuguese acts of aggression before the Security Council is but a demon-

stration of the patience with which the Zambian Government has handled the provoking, cowardly imperialist exploits of Portugal.

51. The Portuguese representative has indeed taken issue with the fact that Zambia has raised this matter here at all. He seems to imply that Zambia is the guilty party by so doing. This is a heinous perversion of logic which more than amply demonstrates Portuguese disregard for principled conduct. My delegation appeals to the Council to view the situation in its proper perspective, namely, that the Zambian complaint is a legitimate one brought before the Council by a young, peaceable nation surrounded and menaced by shamelessly hostile neighbours that, after all, have no right to be its neighbours.

52. As every member of this Council knows, the presence of Portugal as a colonizing Power in Africa is bitterly abhorred by all Africans. That Zambia has not taken up arms against Portugal for the latter's suppressive presence on African soil contiguous to Zambian territory should not be taken to mean that Zambia accepts the anomalous situation. As we have already observed, Zambia, while its patience still lasts, is merely pursuing, as is the rest of independent Africa, a policy of "live and let live", even though this means, for the time being, living next door to the devil. Zambia's policy is that of a reasonable and peace-loving country, and one dares to hope that Portugal will learn to appreciate that fact.

53. The Council, of course, is aware that the unprovoked raids on Zambian territory by the Portuguese forces of occupation are but manifestations of the general menace emanating from the unholy alliance of Portugal itself, the fascist régime in South Africa and the rebel régime in Zimbabwe. These three latter-day pedlars of imperialism present a gigantic threat which, unfortunately, draws heavy support from outside Africa. It is a sorry state of affairs that some of that outside support comes from members of this Council.

54. Still, my delegation hopes that it is not yet too late for the supporters of *apartheid* and colonialism to relent and join forces with the United Nations in seeking to see freedom and good governance established on the African continent. My delegation hopes in particular that at the end of the debate the Council will, at the very minimum, dissociate itself from the hostile activities of Portugal against the Republic of Zambia. Actually, we can see no reason why the Council should not merely condemn Portugal for carrying out against Zambia premeditated and unprovoked military aggression, needlessly causing death and destruction to innocent civilian life and property.

55. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Kenya for his kind words with regard to my country and myself.

56. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): Human history has witnessed many turning-points, but never before has there been such a giant leap forward as the successful voyage of Apollo 11. The lunar landing has inaugurated a new era for mankind. It has extended the frontier of knowledge and raised the horizon of hope. The searching spirit of man could not have been better satisfied.

57. On this happy and historic occasion, I wish to associate myself with you, Mr. President, and with other previous speakers in expressing my heartfelt congratulations to the United States representative and, through him, to the people and Government of the United States for their epoch-making success in landing mankind's first ambassadors on the moon. We salute the genius and ingenuity of the space scientists and technicians and the astounding feat of the three astronauts and join in prayer for the safe return of those brave men.

58. In this connexion, I should also like to express our satisfaction at the atmosphere of growing cordiality and co-operation between the space Powers, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Outer Space Treaty.<sup>2</sup> This indeed augurs well for the peace and progress of mankind. As the moon has always symbolized a message of peace and tranquillity, so also will this new moon era, we hope, bring a more stable peace on earth and better understanding and co-operation among all peoples.

59. Opening the discussion on the question before the Security Council, the representative of Zambia outlined a series of violations of Zambian territorial integrity by Portuguese armed forces over the past three years. We have carefully heard and read his statement. We have paid equal attention to the statement made by the representative of Portugal in reply to the Zambian complaint.

60. The representative of Portugal has dwelt at length on the theme of bilateral negotiations—the usefulness of such negotiations, their relevance in the context of the present Zambian complaint, and the obligation of the parties to pursue these means under Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation holds the view that bilateral negotiations constitute the best means of settling differences between States. We fully believe in the usefulness of bilateral negotiations.

61. However, when the representative of Portugal alleges bad faith on the part of Zambia for abandoning bilateral negotiations and bringing the question before the Council, we are a little sceptical of the veracity of that allegation. As the records of the Council show, the incident of 30 June in the village of Lote is not an isolated one that has occurred in the frontier areas between Zambia and the Portuguese colonial territories. The fact that the Government of Zambia has come before the Council after more than 60 violations of its territorial integrity by Portugal over a period of three years shows the restraint and moderation with which it has conducted itself in its relations with Portugal. Evidence submitted in the Council indicates that Zambia had exhausted all possible means of bilateral negotiations with Portugal before it deemed it absolutely necessary to bring the question before the Council for its consideration.

62. Zambia is a small, newly independent State of Africa, handicapped on two counts. First, it is a land-locked country, and secondly, it is surrounded on three sides by hostile territories under the yoke of colonial Governments

<sup>2</sup> Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

which, moreover, preach and practise the doctrine and system of racial supremacy. Therefore, we are in sympathy with the desire of the Government of Zambia to seek the protection of the Council against the threat posed by those hostile elements against its territorial integrity.

63. But that is not the only reason. The records of the Council are replete with justifiable complaints by many African States which have suffered the loss of life and property as a result of extremely hostile Portuguese activities. Thirty-four States, on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, have announced their active solidarity with Zambia on this question. As their letter to the President of the Security Council [see S/9340 and Add.1-3] bears out, not only Zambia, but the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal, Guinea, the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville), and the United Republic of Tanzania have, at one time or another, suffered violations of their territories by Portugal. It would appear that Portugal has opened a policy of all-out hostilities against every African State whose territory adjoins those of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). It can be seen that in these circumstances Zambia and those thirty four States are quite justified in bringing the matter before the Council for its consideration.

64. The third reason for our sympathy with the Zambian complaint in this respect involves a much more fundamental question of principle. We sympathize with Zambia, and indeed with all those States whose territories have been violated, because all those infringements are the result of Portugal's attempt to perpetuate its domination over its colonial Territories in Africa, in violation of United Nations decisions and all canons of morality and also the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and fundamental freedoms.

65. As my friend the representative of Hungary so aptly remarked yesterday: "The Portuguese colonialists are conducting a threefold war: a brutal colonial war against the African peoples, a political and immoral war against the United Nations and a desperate struggle against the changing times" [1487th meeting, para. 21]. That, more than anything that I could say now, sums up the very core of the problem involved in these discussions.

66. In my statements before the General Assembly, the *apartheid* Committee,<sup>3</sup> the Security Council and elsewhere, I have repeatedly outlined the gravity of the situation which obtains in southern Africa. The situation is very serious, more serious than we seem to have realized up till now. The triangle of unholy alliance between Lisbon, Salisbury and Pretoria, based as it is on the concept of colonialism, racialism and discrimination, portends an ultimate, if not imminent, risk of a prolonged and bitter racial war and bloodshed in Africa. Those among us who have the responsibility, the capability and the means to prevent this from happening have refused to realize the danger so far. On the contrary, if I may say so, they have, by their material assistance, encouraged, willy-nilly, the racial and colonial régimes to persist in their defiance of United Nations decisions and in their obnoxious policies of

suppressing the natural legitimate aspirations and rights of the African peoples. Ironically, all evidence points to the fact that in those acts of repression arms received from the military allies of the colonial and racial régimes have been indiscriminately used against the professed policies of the arms-supplying Powers. My only hope is that those Powers will recognize the gravity of this situation before it is too late.

67. Finally, let me say that my delegation would be as prepared as ever to support any measure by the Council aimed at ameliorating the present dangerous situation.

68. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Allow me, first of all, to add the congratulations of my delegation to the many already received by the delegation of the United States on the spectacular success of a unique enterprise in the history of man. For us in Pakistan, the brilliant accomplishment of Apollo 11 will be a memorable background to President Nixon's most welcome visit to our country. Poets will no doubt rhapsodize over the event of man's reaching the moon. Philosophers will long brood over its consequences. To lesser mortals, harried diplomats like us, it offers a certain challenge. The challenge is that of bringing a modicum of man's enlarged capacities to bear on the task of better organizing his relations on earth, especially in the international sphere.

69. The present debate in the Security Council is not the first occasion on which the Council's attention has been directed to one of the most troubled areas in the world, the region of southern Africa. We believe that the Council cannot consider either the complaint lodged by Zambia or the reply to it made by Portugal except in the context of the situation caused in that region by the persistence of colonialism and its concomitant evils of racial segregation and minority rule.

70. My delegation has carefully studied the statements made by the parties at the opening of this debate. Our study leads us to the conclusion that there have undoubtedly occurred incursions into the territory of Zambia, resulting in loss of life and property, for which the Portuguese authorities are responsible. The representative of Zambia has supplied the Council with concrete evidence of violations of the territorial integrity of his country. The representative of Portugal has attempted to refute this evidence. If it were a normal case of border incidents between two neighbouring States Members of the United Nations, our instinct in the Council would have been to suspend judgement and either to call for bilateral negotiations, with hope for an amicable settlement between the parties, or to institute an investigation of the situation. But it is not a normal case. The usual perspective is radically altered by the facts registered and the legal considerations laid down in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. These facts and considerations are as follows.

71. First, the African Territories under Portuguese administration do not constitute the territory of Portugal but are Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. I refer to resolution 1542 (XV) of the General Assembly and all

<sup>3</sup> Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

other subsequent resolutions which have confirmed that declaration.

72. Second, the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples are fully applicable to the Territories under Portuguese administration. I cite here resolution 1699 (XVI) of the General Assembly and all other resolutions based on it.

73. Third, Portugal's continuous refusal to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of those Territories for self-determination constitutes a permanent source of international friction. Considering this, Member States have been requested by the General Assembly to deny Portugal any support and assistance which may be used by it for the suppression of the peoples of those Territories. I recall resolution 1742 (XVI), which referred to the situation in Angola, and resolution 1807 (XVII), in which the General Assembly upheld without any reservations the claims of the peoples of all these Territories for their immediate accession to independence.

74. Fourth, "the colonial war being carried on by the Government of Portugal"—in the words of General Assembly resolution 1819 (XVII), which refers explicitly to Angola and by implication to other African Territories under Portuguese control—constitutes "a serious threat to world peace and security". Resolution 2022 (XX) noted the increasing co-operation between the authorities of Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal. Resolution 2270 (XXII) condemned the colonial war waged by the Government of Portugal as "a crime against humanity". The most recent resolution of the General Assembly on the subject, resolution 2395 (XXIII), stated that the grave situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination had "aggravated the explosive situation in southern Africa", condemned the collaboration between Portugal, the minority racist régime in South Africa and the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, and expressly referred to the violations by the Government of Portugal of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States. The General Assembly's condemnation of those violations is most pertinent to this debate in the Security Council.

75. In recapitulating the compelling facts and considerations of this case, I have referred only to some of the General Assembly resolutions which have been adopted on the subject by the vote of an overwhelming majority. An examination of the record shows that the Security Council has endorsed the view taken by the Assembly. By its resolution 163 (1961), the Security Council called upon the Portuguese authorities to act in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1603 (XV). In resolution 178 (1963), the Council deplored any incursion by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory. When in 1963 the Security Council took cognizance of the whole question relating to Territories under Portuguese administration, it not only deprecated the attitude of the Portuguese Government in claiming these Territories as overseas territories but, in resolution 180 (1963), made the determination that the situation in those Territories was seriously disturbing peace and security in Africa. This affirmation was repeated in its resolution 218 (1965).

76. These authoritative pronouncements of the General Assembly and the Security Council constitute the basic element of the case now before us. However, in weighing the respective responsibilities of the two parties, Zambia and Portugal, for the situation brought to the Council's attention, an equally basic consideration is the principle laid down in many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. This principle was first adumbrated in resolution 2105 (XX) of the General Assembly, which, recognizing the legitimacy of the struggle by the peoples under colonial rule to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, invited all States to provide moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements in colonial Territories. We recall that this appeal was repeated, in one context or another, in General Assembly resolutions 2022 (XX), 2107 (XX), 2184 (XXI), 2270 (XXII) and 2395 (XXIII). As far as the Security Council is concerned, this principle has been unreservedly upheld in its resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 13, relating to the situation in southern Rhodesia.

77. Bearing that principle in mind, my delegation cannot accept the allegations made by the representative of Portugal in attempted justification of the actions of Portuguese authorities in relation to the territory of Zambia. We believe that it is only natural that a resistance movement should grow in all Territories where the right of a people to self-determination, recognized by the United Nations, is thwarted and that such a movement should draw assistance from other friendly peoples, especially those in neighbouring States.

78. Pakistan does not and cannot subscribe to the notion that the spontaneous help and sympathy rendered to a resistance movement should expose the country that accords it to the penalty of reprisals. This notion is advanced not only by colonial Powers but also by all those who seek to efface a distinct people's individuality and to suppress its demand for self-determination. But it is a notion which has been exploded by the international law that is progressively developing in the post-colonial age. It is this law which refuses to recognize the so-called right of pursuit. The Council cannot but refuse to countenance the claim to such a right, whether it is invoked in southern Africa, in the Middle East or elsewhere. We regret that much of the case which the representative of Portugal sought to make out, if analysed, rests ultimately on nothing but the assertion of this right of pursuit under the guise of self-defence.

79. Lastly, I would join my other colleagues in this debate in referring to the importance of Zambia as a truly independent African country in southern Africa. The deplorable state of affairs in that important region is known to the Council, which is also seized of the questions of Namibia and Zimbabwe.

80. If the Security Council is interested, as it undoubtedly must be, in remedying the situation in southern Africa, if the turmoil and turbulence there are to be eased, one of the prerequisites is for the Council to extend the fullest moral and political support to Zambia in defence of its freedom and territorial integrity.

81. Under the leadership of its President, one of the great sons of Africa and an outstanding statesman of our age, Zambia is holding aloft the banner of freedom and human dignity in a dark area where one of these values is suppressed and the other relentlessly denied. Zambia is also making a great economic sacrifice as a result of the measures adopted by the Council against the racist majority régime in Southern Rhodesia, even though these measures have so far proved to be ineffectual. The United Nations has done little to recompense Zambia for that sacrifice. Considering these important political facts, an imperative for the Council in this debate is to ensure that its result will not cause a further disappointment to Zambia and thereby to the African States.

82. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. President, before speaking on the item before us, I should like to say how very sincerely the Finnish delegation shares the sentiments which you were good enough to express so eloquently yesterday on behalf of us all in conveying the congratulations of the Council to the delegation and Government of the United States on the occasion of the historic event of the flight to the moon of Apollo 11.

83. The Council was summoned on 18 July 1969 to consider a complaint by Zambia against Portugal on the grounds that Portugal had violated the territorial integrity of Zambia and that units of the Portuguese air force had struck on 30 June 1969 against civilian targets in Zambia, resulting in loss of life and in material damage. In his statement the Zambian representative told us that this was but the most recent of a series of similar incidents beginning early in 1966.

84. The representative of Portugal, while disclaiming responsibility for the incident of 30 June, does not deny that numerous incidents did in fact take place earlier along the borders of Zambia and the Territories under Portuguese administration in Africa. He maintains, however, that the origin of these incidents lies in the fact that the Zambian Government allows its territory to be used by armed elements infiltrating into Angola and Mozambique, and that this takes place with the knowledge and the approval of the Zambian authorities.

85. In our opinion, these incidents cannot be viewed in isolation. They are but symptoms of the underlying serious tension in the area. The Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly expressed serious concern over this situation. They both have affirmed that the situation resulting from the policies of Portugal in Africa seriously disturbs international peace and security there. In spite of repeated requests by the Security Council and the General Assembly, Portugal has refused to act in accordance with the basic principles set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

86. It is the view of the Finnish Government that this Declaration is fully applicable to the African Territories under Portuguese administration and that the peoples of these Territories therefore have the right to self-determination and independence. The failure of the Government of Portugal to accept the Declaration and to heed the

pertinent resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly is the main cause for the continuous tension in the area and the steady deterioration of Portugal's relations with neighbouring independent African States.

87. Chapter XI of the Charter and the Declaration based upon it stand for peaceful change from colonial rule to self-determination. The substance of the resolutions approved by the United Nations consists in a request to the Government of Portugal to co-operate with the United Nations in this peaceful endeavour. It would be tragic indeed if, by its persistent refusal to take into account not only the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council but also the present realities in the African Territories under Portuguese administration, the Government of Portugal were to create a situation where one day a peaceful solution would no longer be possible.

88. Having dwelt at some length upon the underlying reasons for the present situation in the area, my delegation is no less aware of the fact that the Council is at present seized of the particular complaint presented by Zambia. No doubt the parties have an obligation to settle disputes of this kind in the first instance by means envisaged in Article 33 of the Charter. The parties should in fact do their utmost to find a solution to such disputes by negotiation and conciliation. If, however, efforts to resort to that procedure fail, every State is within its rights in bringing its complaints and anxieties to the Security Council in order to find an adequate remedy to the situation.

89. Mr. CHAYET (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, yesterday you expressed our feelings perfectly with regard to the extraordinary feat of Apollo 11, a feat of which the technicians, the scientists, the people and the Government of the United States of America may justly be proud. It is true that we followed the flight of the astronauts with intense emotion, and our fervent good wishes accompany them on their return trip which, although fraught with danger, is nevertheless already more familiar. The lightning course of this feat has made Jules Verne's old dream come true, and has pushed back the frontiers of the inaccessible. It has expanded our field of knowledge.

90. But this triumph of the human mind also enables us, here in this chamber perhaps, more than elsewhere, to measure the gap which exists between technological progress and the imperfection of relations between peoples. It takes less daring perhaps but more daily courage to conquer hunger, disease, ignorance and oppression throughout the world.

91. I now come to the subject of our debate. The French delegation has listened carefully to the statements made by the representatives of Zambia and Portugal to the Council at its 1486th meeting on 18 July, statements which have been supplemented today by Mr. Miranda's speech.

92. Mr. Mwaanga has given us a detailed list of specific incidents dating back to 21 November 1966, incidents that arouse a concern which is all the more legitimate in that some of these incidents have caused loss of life. We

understand, however, that several of these incidents have been settled by bilateral negotiation, a fact which we should note with satisfaction. It appears, moreover, from the statements made here by the official representatives of the two States concerned, that mutual and specific commitments were made by both sides in June 1968 with a view to ensuring the maintenance of peace on the common borders of these two States. The Council should take note of this, express its approval of this desire for peace, and see that it is once again fully implemented.

93. There is no doubt that new incidents, which have given rise to the present debate in the Council, have occurred since that time. Regrettable though they may be, however, they should not constitute an obstacle to a return to a normal situation, especially if the State responsible is determined, as it should be, to make reparations for the consequences. Indeed, under Article 33 of the Charter, it is first of all by means of negotiation that the parties to a dispute should seek to settle it. In this connexion, it is regrettable that the bilateral procedure which, according to the two parties concerned, produced satisfactory results for a certain time, has been abandoned. This being the case, however, we are happy that the Zambian Government, instead of exercising its right of self-defence, has, as stated in its letter of 15 July [S/9331] addressed to you, Mr. President, preferred to bring its dispute with Portugal before the Council.

94. The representative of Portugal, for his part, has referred to other incidents in which members of its own armed forces were allegedly victims. He has assured us of Portugal's desire for peace and of its desire to resume bilateral negotiations. We also take note of that statement.

95. We know, of course, that the incidents reported by both sides are only a few elements in the disturbed situation prevailing in southern Africa. That situation cannot be improved in any truly lasting manner until the time when all the peoples of that region are in a position to exercise their right to self-determination.

96. In the immediate future, it is the duty of this Council to encourage and assist the two parties to maintain peace on their borders. My delegation is ready to support any appeal, any constructive proposal which would further that end.

97. Before concluding, I should like to refer to the fact that the representative of Zambia mentioned that rockets of French origin had been discovered after the bombing of the village of Chimpopi and its surroundings on 1 October 1968. All the information provided has been immediately transmitted to the French Government for verification and investigation.

98. In any case, I am authorized to inform the Council that my Government had already informed the Portuguese Government, last year, that unless the latter undertook to take all necessary measures to ensure that war material supplied by France was not used against an African State friendly to France, the French Government would be obliged to discontinue the export of such material to Portugal. Satisfactory assurances to that effect were given by the Government of Portugal.

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and I give him the floor.

100. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to thank you, and through you, the members of the Security Council, for allowing it this opportunity to express its views on the complaint of the Republic of Zambia against Portugal. The Council is convened to discuss the recent Portuguese violations of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia, the bombing of villages, the killing and wounding of civilians, and the destruction of property. In his letter to the President of the Security Council dated 15 July 1969, the representative of Zambia has pertinently brought to the attention of the Council the threat to international peace and security constituted by the policy of aggression pursued against his country by Portugal, and the serious situation inherent in the continuation of that policy.

101. In his statement before the Council at its 1486th meeting on 18 July 1969, the representative of Zambia furnished the Council with documented facts and conclusive evidence in support of his complaint which established the responsibility of Portugal for the violation of the territorial integrity of Zambia and other aggressive acts committed against it.

102. The position of the United Arab Republic on the question under discussion is consistent and clear. It is based on our faith in the principles of the Charter, our support of the independence and territorial integrity of States and of the inherent right of peoples to self-determination in equality and dignity. It is equally based on our opposition to aggression in all of its forms and to the repressive denial and suppression of the rights of peoples, rights enshrined in the Charter and reaffirmed and enunciated in a number of basic resolutions of the world Organization, as well as regional organizations, and supported by a number of world-wide conferences of Asian-African and non-aligned countries.

103. In extending our support to our sister African country, the Republic of Zambia, we do not do so solely in compliance with our obligations under the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, which obliges all member States "to promote the unity and solidarity of the African States" and "to eradicate all forms of colonialism from Africa". We do so also as a member of the world community dedicated to the proposition that aggression against one State is aggression against the international community and that repelling the aggressor is the collective responsibility of all the members of the international community inasmuch as aggression is a world problem which no country can ignore, whether it is moved by its concept of national self-interest or its conviction and vision regarding a common world interest.

104. The aggression against Zambia, serious as it is, becomes even more disturbing when one views it, as it should be viewed, in its true dimensions and inevitable implications and in the context of Portuguese repressive policy and colonialist patterns. For the recent violations by

Portugal which constitute the subject of the complaint before the Council are not the first series of aggressive attacks against Zambia by that country. As stated in the Council by the representative of Zambia: "Up until two weeks ago, that is to say, in the period between 18 May 1966 and 30 June 1969, there have been no fewer than 60 Portuguese military incursions into the Republic of Zambia" [1486th meeting, para. 8]. Moreover, it should be noted that in December 1966 the representative of Zambia pointed out to the Council that from 26 July 1966: "These aggressive acts of the Portuguese colonialists in Angola are increasing along our common border and are a continuous source of turmoil and instability; they are no doubt threatening the peace and security not only of Zambia but of Africa as a whole." [S/7612]

105. Nor is Portuguese aggression confined to Zambia alone. That aggression has also been directed against other African States, some bordering the Territories under its administration and some situated farther away, like the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Senegal, the Republic of Guinea and the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville), as indicated in the letter [see S/9340 and Add.1-3] submitted by thirty-four African States to the President of the Security Council.

106. The African States victims of these aggressive acts are told by Portugal that they should bear the responsibility for their policies. It appears that in the view of the Portuguese Government those countries are committing the unforgivable sin of supporting the African peoples who are still denied their inherent right of self-determination and are struggling for the attainment of their recognized right to national independence. It is appropriate in this regard to ponder the question: who bears the responsibility for the serious situation prevailing in Africa? Is it the African countries which support the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea? Or is it the colonialist Power, which, through its obstructionist and repressive policies, is causing these African peoples to make the great sacrifices they are making for their liberation and emancipation?

107. Does the responsibility lie with the African countries which stand for the prompt and effective implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, resolution 1819 (XVII) on Angola, and related resolutions on other Territories under Portuguese domination? Or does the responsibility lie with the Portuguese authorities, who are persisting in their policy of disregarding these resolutions and defying the political and moral authority of the United Nations?

108. The delegation of the United Arab Republic extends its full support to the request made by the representative of Zambia to the Council to condemn Portuguese aggression and to take effective measures to compel Portugal to desist from any further aggression. It also supports the demands of Zambia for full compensation for the damage caused by that aggression.

109. In concluding this statement, may I also express the hope that such action on the part of the Council will promptly set into motion an effective process to remove the continuous threat to the integrity of Africa and to international peace and security caused by the policy of Portugal. Portugal is duty bound to discharge its responsibilities and honour the obligations which it has assumed as a Member of the United Nations and to implement the resolutions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

110. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Since we have apparently exhausted the list of speakers on the item on our agenda today, I felt that although I had thanked you yesterday, Mr. President, for your collective expression on behalf of the Council with regard to the Apollo 11 landing, I would be remiss if I did not say an additional word of appreciation to each of those representatives who have individually spoken with regard to the landing on the moon. Therefore I do convey my deepest gratitude to those who have had such kind words to say: to the representative of Algeria, for the spontaneous and very warm remarks on the launching which he made already last week; to the Ambassador of Hungary, who has been both generous and obviously sincere in his compliments; to the Ambassador of Nepal, who spoke to us in an inspirational vein, to Ambassador Shahi of Pakistan, who dealt with this on both a warm and a personal basis; to the representatives of Finland and France for their kind remarks; and last but not least, to my colleague from the Soviet Union, Ambassador Zakharov who was especially generous, I thought, in his praise of the bravery of our astronauts, and I cannot but note on this occasion that bravery, like outer space, really knows no national boundaries. The courage of Soviet cosmonauts has already been demonstrated, and it is indeed in tribute to that courage that the crew of Apollo 11 has taken to the moon the medals given to Colonel Borman by the widows of two Soviet cosmonauts who died in the service of their country.

111. Now we can only hope, and hope with all our hearts, that as we enter this whole new world that fraternity of spirit which has already been clearly manifest among those who travel in space will grow and flourish and lead to greater co-operation both in space and on the earth.

112. I should like to assure all of those who have spoken that we shall forward the text of each individual statement to our Government for transmittal to Houston, and ask that they be brought to the attention of the astronauts on their return. I am sure they will be tremendously gratified and touched by these expressions. Again, I thank you all.

113. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As no representative wishes to take the floor at the present stage in the debate, I propose to adjourn the meeting. Following consultations with members of the Council, it has been agreed that our next meeting will take place on Thursday, 24 July, at 3 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.*

---

#### **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 librairie 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.

---