

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1489th MEETING: 24 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1489)	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-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 24 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/1489)

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 of the Council, I invite the representatives of Portugal, the United Republic of Tanzania, Somalia, Kenya and the United Arab Republic to participate in the debate of the Council, without the right to vote. In view of the limited space available at the Council table, I propose to invite the representative of Portugal, who is directly concerned, to take a seat at the Council table, and to invite the representatives of Tanzania, Somalia, Kenya and the United Arab Republic to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when their turn comes to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. B. de Miranda (Portugal) took a place at the Council table, and Mr. M. A. Foun (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia), Mr. A. E. Osanya-Nyenneque, (Kenya) and Mr. A. El-Erian (United Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have just received a letter [S/9355] signed by the representatives of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Tunisia and also a letter [S/9356] from the representative of Gabon requesting that they be invited to participate in the debate of the Council on the item before it. With the consent of the Council, and in accordance with the rules of procedure and

the customary practice, I shall invite the representatives of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Tunisia and Gabon to participate in the debate, without the right to vote, and to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that when one of these representatives wishes to speak he will be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. H. Diggs (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. F. B. Savage (Sierra Leone), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. J. Davin (Gabon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before calling on the first speaker on the list, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that the representative of Nigeria, in a letter dated 24 July, has asked that Nigeria 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 Gabon. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and I give him the floor.

5. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for kindly allowing me to present the views of the Gabonese delegation on the acts of aggression committed by Portugal against the friendly and fraternal State of Zambia.

6. First, however, on behalf of my Government, I should like to associate myself with the stirring and unanimous tribute which has been paid here to the genius of the American people on the magnificent feat it has just accomplished with Apollo 11. I hail with enthusiasm the glorious return of the three gallant astronauts who, according to the latest press reports, landed safe and sound a little over two hours ago.

7. The Security Council is meeting at the request of Zambia, following attacks launched against its territory by the Portuguese armed forces illegally stationed in Mozambique and Angola. This request for a meeting of the Council was supported by the African States, acting on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, which thereby wished to demonstrate Africa's unwavering solidarity in the face of Portugal's policy of aggression and its expansionist aims in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), where its occupation troops have illegally stationed themselves.

8. I say "illegally" deliberately, since neither Angola nor Mozambique nor Guinea (Bissau) has recognized Portugal's

right to occupy its territory, let alone to use it as a base for aggression against the sovereign and independent States of Africa. In his statements, the representative of the Lisbon Government has spoken of Portuguese frontiers and territories. This is a ridiculous assertion which should be rejected categorically. As everyone knows, Portugal is a European country, and does not and cannot have common frontiers with an African country. Portugal is located in the Iberian Peninsula, which it shares with Spain. It is therefore Spain with which Portugal has a common frontier and certainly not Zambia, which is in Africa. Zambia has common frontiers with Angola and Mozambique, which are in no way Portuguese provinces like Estremadura and the Algarve. The geographical inaccuracies deliberately put out by the representative of Portugal are a manoeuvre designed to sow confusion in our minds and to give credibility to the absurd hypothesis of the alleged legitimacy of the Portuguese presence on African soil. Nobody here will have been taken in by this crude and futile manoeuvre.

9. The distinguished representative of Zambia has drawn attention here in the Council to the numerous acts of aggression committed by the Portuguese troops against the integrity of Zambian territory. The list of such attacks and the toll they have taken is a very long one. More than 60 aggressive acts are on record. This state of affairs clearly shows that, despite the repeated appeals to common sense and reason, and despite the many condemnations to which Portugal has been and continues to be subject because of its aggressive policy, the Lisbon Government pays scant attention to international norms and morality, or to the right of the peoples of Africa to live in peace in their own countries.

10. Not only does Portugal claim the right to occupy Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) against the will of the population of those Territories, but the Lisbon Government no longer even hesitates to attack sovereign and independent African States openly and deliberately.

11. Today, following many other countries, it is Zambia which is the target of Portuguese commandos and bombers, who have caused many innocent victims and considerable material damage in that country. The armed attacks against Zambia clearly demonstrate Portugal's aggressive policy, since they have been going on for many years now despite the efforts made by Zambia to put an end to them by peaceful means.

12. It is high time that the Lisbon Government understood, once and for all, that its insane policy of colonizing Africa by force can lead nowhere. Sooner or later, the peoples of Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Angola will manage to secure the triumph of their legitimate claim to a free and independent existence.

13. The Council should therefore display firmness toward Portugal, and invite it to cease its aggression immediately and to grant Zambia due compensation for the damage caused by the attacks of the Portuguese forces.

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

15. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*translated from French*): My first words shall be to express my thanks to you, Mr. President, and through you to the eminent members of the Security Council for having permitted my delegation to take part in your debate acting on the authority delegated by the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity to my country's Minister for Foreign Affairs, whom I represent here. We share with other States a mandate which was conferred upon us in 1963 by the African Heads of State and we intend to carry it out conscientiously, bearing constantly in mind the aims of our common Organization. That mandate is the expression of our deep-rooted solidarity, of our unity of purpose in the struggle against colonialism and its manifestations, and of our unanimity in seeing certain principles as the conditions for trusting and mutually beneficial relations between peoples and nations.

16. Before taking up the item on the Council's agenda, and speaking now on behalf of my own delegation, I should like, with your permission, Mr. President, to express our warm congratulations to the United States delegation on the unique exploit which has just been achieved. The honour reflects mainly upon the United States people, but we share with that people the pride which can only arise from the certainty that there are now no limits to human genius but those which it imposes on itself. This programme is the culmination of efforts in which traditions, ways of thinking and knowledge, as well as substantial material resources, have been drawn upon so that all mankind might benefit. May it always be thus for the progress of this world, a necessary condition of man's freedom!

17. At its 1486th meeting on 18 July 1969, the Council heard a detailed statement of Zambia's complaint and we have no intention at this stage of going over once again all the arguments and counter-arguments advanced in support of the cases presented. We must, however, express our keen anxiety, and, indeed, our condemnation in the face of deliberate repetition of acts which, in our view and according to international law and practice, are beyond all doubt acts which run counter to the peaceful intentions professed by those who enjoy the status of Members of this Organization.

18. There have been bombings of villages causing the death of innocent victims; there have been raids into foreign territory by military units; there have been violations of air space; regular military formations have occupied Zambian territory and taken up positions there, although only temporarily. All these acts, which have been proved and admitted in certain cases, represent so many acts of defiance of the principles contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations. The circumstances do not matter if the facts are established, and the Council's view of the subject can only be based on the results of an impartial analysis of the incidents and the reasons and motivations behind them.

19. In our view, it would be normal for the international community to feel a concern commensurate with its sense of responsibility over a situation where the use of force seeks to prevail over recognition of, and respect for, the sovereignty of a Member State of this Organization, in this

case Zambia. Small countries such as those belonging to the Organization of African Unity expect that, in relations between nations, through the commitment and good faith of the members of our Organization, principles should retain their full validity and should at no time become subject either to unilateral interpretation or to partisan or partial application. It is at this price and at this price only, that we can be sure of being able to safeguard our independence and freedom.

20. Portugal may claim that the acts committed were dictated by considerations essential to the maintenance and defence of the internal or external security of Angola and Mozambique. In what way can Zambia, which has no territorial claim to assert and whose energies are devoted to other than military ends, threaten the external security of those two Territories? To claim that it could would be tantamount to reverting to the practices of the distant and not so distant past when any problems arising in relations between nations and peoples had to be settled by systematic or occasional recourse to threats, force and violence. This we categorically condemn, since it is clear that such practices cannot offer us the slightest guarantee of stability, peace or security.

21. As for the internal security of Angola and Mozambique, can one in all conscience hold Zambia personally responsible for it? Liberation movements exist in the Portuguese colonies, and their existence is not the result of outside influences. They are inspired from within and are, as we know from experience, the living expression of a people's aspirations, aspirations which may often be ignored but which will triumph in the end, if not through the solidarity and sympathy which the world shows them, at least by virtue of their own merits. If insecurity prevails in the Territories of Angola and Mozambique, Portugal is primarily responsible, since, despite the recognized laws of peoples and nations, Portugal refuses to grant the peoples of those Territories the right to self-determination. That right, as we understand it, is defined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and confirmed in resolution 183 (1963) adopted by the Security Council on 11 December 1963.

22. It pertains to man to be able to choose his fate freely and in accordance with what he believes to be his interests. Similarly, it pertains to a people and to a nation to determine its own destiny according to methods and objectives which will safeguard its personality and assure it that its aspirations have not been in vain. It is unwise to impose on a people criteria which are basically alien to it whatever the intrinsic value of those criteria elsewhere. It is also unwise to direct the mind of a people towards forms which do not correspond to its real wishes in the definition and construction of its political future. As long as Portugal refuses to admit that it is urgent and necessary to give its concept of self-determination the meaning accepted by the international community, the liberation movements will continue to exist despite the repressive actions which endanger security and peace in that part of the world.

23. A dispute has arisen between Zambia and Portugal, as a result of acts which have been described as acts of aggression. Negotiations have taken place between the

parties concerned. The representative of Zambia has told us that these negotiations, or at least their outcome, have not satisfied his Government's demands and claims which are aimed at obtaining recognition of its rights and adequate guarantees against any repetition of such acts. Zambia considers that the negotiations, which have been conducted in various places and at various levels, have not succeeded in settling its dispute with Portugal, and the Charter offers it the opportunity of submitting the dispute to the Security Council.

24. Negotiations, the virtues of which are recognized in the Charter and in the practice of this Organization, are binding to the extent that the parties concerned decide to make them so, and provided that the situation arising from a dispute lends itself to negotiations conducted in good faith. This means that, at any time and for reasons inherent in the defence of its own interests and respect for its own obligations; either party may choose to proceed in whatever way seems most appropriate to it.

25. It is obvious, moreover, that the continuation and deterioration of the situation now being considered by the Council, involving the repetition of acts of aggression against an independent and sovereign State, may constitute a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security in that part of the world. It is, accordingly, up to the Security Council, which has been informed of the facts and their development, to recommend the procedures, measures and methods laid down in the Charter. Respect for the principles of our Charter demands that we should denounce aggressive acts such as those committed by Portugal. International morality demands that Zambia's legitimate claims should be satisfied and, in doing this, we shall not merely be stating the law, we shall also be performing an act of justice.

26. We wish to appeal once again to the great Powers and to remind them, if this is necessary, that the Security Council, in its resolutions 180 (1963) of 31 July 1963 and 218 (1965) of 23 November 1965, requested: "that all States should refrain forthwith from offering the Portuguese Government any assistance which would enable it to continue its repression of the peoples of the Territories under its administration"—and—"to take all the necessary measures to prevent the sale and supply of arms and military equipment to the Portuguese Government for this purpose, including the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition to be used in the Territories under Portuguese administration". A strict application of this recommendation, whose effects over six years might have completely changed the nature of the problem, would have had the advantage of preventing those reprehensible acts and of making a decisive contribution to the liberation of our brothers in Angola and Mozambique.

27. The great Powers agree with us that recognition of the right to self-determination is essential in order that the relations between peoples and nations may finally be rid of this obsolete feature of a bygone age and the traces of an outdated philosophy. They should agree, on the basis of conviction and tradition, that it is the duty of us all and that it is their responsibility, in particular, to ensure that

the exercise of this right is not hindered by considerations incompatible with the professions of faith we have all made and which we have defended in this Organization.

28. We turn to the Security Council since, for us, its authority is itself the guarantee of the principles upon which our sovereignty, our independence, and our freedom rest. We have, of course, the firm intention of defending them and the moral force to do so, and indifference and inaction should therefore not drive us to resort to violence, since the main responsibility for such violence would lie not with the desperate, but with those who have driven them, possibly unconsciously, to desperation.

29. On the decisions which the Council takes and on the measures it recommends will depend our estimate of the importance which the specific case you are considering—and hence all questions relating to the exercise of self-determination and to the independence of peoples and respect for their sovereignty—can assume in the eyes of world public opinion.

30. Formal commitments have been undertaken under the United Nations Charter and they have been confirmed many times in the General Assembly and in this Council; it is hardly fitting that the helplessness of the weak should be compounded by the frustration of those who rightly believe that history and right are on their side.

31. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have just received a letter [S/9357] from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo asking to be invited to participate in the debate of the Council on the question before it. In conformity with the provisional rules of procedure and the practice of the Council, and if I hear no objections, I propose to invite the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. K. Nguza (Democratic Republic of the Congo) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

32. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Liberia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and I give him the floor.

33. Mr. DIGGS (Liberia): Mr. President and eminent members of the Security Council, my delegation would like to take this occasion to thank you for acceding to our request that we be allowed to join the debate on this very important item.

34. Permit me to join other delegations and to extend the sincere congratulations of my delegation to the representative of the United States on the successful completion of the epic Apollo 11 moon flight. It is hoped that now that man has conquered space travel and proved that mankind is able to achieve the impossible, we will now apply some time, effort and money to the solution of our pressing earthly problems.

35. The matter before us concerns the repeated air and ground attacks by foreign Portuguese armed forces on

Zambian territory and the killing, maiming and kidnapping of Zambian nationals in what can only be described as deliberate attempts by Portugal to create an atmosphere for the armed invasion of the territory of a Member of the United Nations and the commencement of sophisticated warfare on the African continent by foreign Portuguese troops, and the widening of a conflict that will involve more and more African countries.

36. It is the opinion of my delegation that this sad state of affairs has been brought about by the refusal of Portugal to abide by the decisions of the United Nations, and by other members of this Organization who have openly aided and abetted the Portuguese régime and who engage in international wheeling and dealing with that fascist régime.

37. The decision of the African countries to show their solidarity against Portuguese imperialism is an indication not only that we are allied in fact but that the collapse of the Lisbon régime is imminent because of its illegitimacy. No régime in the world built on such specious, illogical and shaky claims can survive.

38. When the Portuguese attempted to settle in Mozambique, the African population resisted; and if the representative of Portugal does not know about the battles of the Zulu wars of 1893 and 1896 under Chief Gungunhana and the revolt of the Macua tribes, I am not the one to enlighten him. But since we did not come here to recite history, suffice it to say that no claim that Portugal makes in Africa remains valid today or has any legal base,

39. My delegation is aware that certain alliances, the product of long-past fears, have been responsible for our present difficulties with the fascist régime of Portugal; but we are also convinced that our friends here, whether they support us or not, cannot but know that Portuguese chicanery or legal gymnastics with the Portuguese Constitution will not bring to a halt the onward march of the African people to self-determination and a place in their own sun. I should like to remind the representative of Portugal that there was once an integral part of Portugal called Goa.

40. We are embarrassed by the fact that an otherwise impoverished European State seeks to maintain its *status quo* by clinging to another part of our continent, claiming that it is a part of Europe; we are embarrassed that a substantial number of Member States, whilst proclaiming their adherence to the United Nations Charter, are members of an alliance that has nothing to do with the furtherance of the highest aims and aspirations of the African people and their continent, and at the same time give support to that tottering régime. We are embarrassed at the fact that the Union of South Africa, a Member of the United Nations, gave Portugal \$145 million in 1968, and has, this year alone, already advanced to that country \$120 million to shore up an anachronistic régime that negates all the aspirations and hopes of mankind. We are embarrassed at the fading and frayed glory of the Portuguese empire.

41. We do not desire to humiliate any country. There are many places in Liberia bearing Portuguese names; we do not wish to deny the Portuguese their well-deserved niche

in the history-making process. But now the pendulum seems to have gone full circle, and Portuguese terrorism in Africa has assumed new facets which the people of Africa, from Guinea (Bissau) in West Africa to Mozambique in East Africa, have experienced with an ever-increasing brutality and disrespect for the fundamental human rights of the African population of those Portuguese colonies.

42. The countries of Africa are united and are resolved to use all efforts to stop the uncivilized and inhumane policy of Portugal backed by the weapons of NATO and the gold of South Africa.

43. The representative of Liberia, Mr. Padmore, when addressing the Council on 15 March 1961, nearly eight years ago, concerning this same problem, stated:

“We are concerned here with no transient problem which the mere passage of time will palliate. You may seek to avoid the issue today, but the problem will come to haunt you tomorrow and for a series of tomorrows, in an even more acute and aggravated form, until eventually you are driven to take your stand on one side or the other.” [946th meeting, para. 161.]

44. There is no doubt that the Republic of Zambia has been the victim of foreign Portuguese aggression, and the victim of that aggression has come before this Council to seek redress. The representative of Zambia, in his factual and detailed statement at the 1486th meeting on 18 July 1969, gave us a blood-curdling account of foreign Portuguese aggression against Zambia. It is also a well-known fact that Portuguese aggression is not limited in its scope. This atavistic attitude manifests itself from the harassment of innocent African passengers, including Liberians, at the airport in Lisbon to the atrocities so well documented by the representative of Zambia.

45. The Foreign Minister of Liberia, Mr. Grimes, speaking before this Council on 22 July 1963, in relation to this question, said:

“The Portuguese Government is now faced with a historic choice to continue to rely on the use of force, with the inevitable miseries, economic losses and expanded military action that this would certainly entail; or to respond to world opinion, to the request of the United Nations to take immediate measures to reassure the population, ensure the return of the refugees, and to build a new relationship with the peoples of the Territories, a relationship based on self-determination and independence. Much time has been lost in a critical situation, with heavy casualties and bitterness. The independent African States are not prepared to wait much longer.” [1040th meeting, para. 80.]

46. In his statement made at the 1486th meeting, the representative of Portugal refused the offer of sympathy made in good faith by the representative of Zambia. He would have done well to accept it, because in the not too distant future he will need all the sympathy he can get.

47. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Tunisia. I invite

him to take a place at the Council table and I give him the floor.

48. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): The Tunisian delegation is very grateful to the Security Council and to you, Mr. President, for giving it the opportunity to express its views on a problem which is of the greatest importance to the African continent as a whole.

49. I should also like to associate myself with those who have congratulated the United States delegation on the extraordinary feat achieved by the United States scientists, technicians and astronauts, who have succeeded in an enterprise which will for ever leave its mark on the history of mankind.

50. As our joint letter [S/9340 and Add.1-3] indicates, Tunisia is one of the 35 countries to which the Organization of African Unity has entrusted the task of following the question of the Portuguese colonies in this Council. The aspect of this question which you are considering today is of outstanding importance since it shows how, and to what extent, the colonial war which Portugal is waging against the African peoples constitutes a direct threat to international peace and security. Now the Council is once again confronted with the problem of colonial wars spreading to the territories of neighbouring independent States. The Council has, unfortunately, already had long experience of this kind of problem, since it is inevitable that the powerful armies which wage colonial wars—wars which, by definition are doomed to failure—should try to overcome the frustrations inherent in such wars by diversionary operations against neighbouring independent States. At times they claim some alleged right of pursuit, and at others the right of legitimate self-defence, as though the word “legitimate” could be used by a colonial régime.

51. Today, more than ever, it is clear that a colonial régime can in no case claim any legitimacy whatever, let alone legality. Since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the General Assembly has on many occasions proclaimed the inalienable right of the peoples under Portuguese domination to self-determination, to freedom and to independence. It has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle which the national liberation movements are waging against the colonial Powers. On several occasions also, and most recently in its resolution 2395 (XXIII) of 29 November 1968, the General Assembly has expressed its grave concern over the Portuguese Government's constant threats against and violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the African States bordering on the Territories under its domination.

52. This means that the question now before the Council only confirms what the United Nations has always stated, namely, that the deterioration of the situation in the Territories under Portugal's domination is a serious threat to international peace and security.

53. The case we are considering today is only the latest in a long series of incidents of varying gravity which the representative of Zambia described to us in his first statement before the Council. That statement was charac-

terized by dignity and moderation, the moderation of those who believe in the justice of their cause and the inevitability of victory. Although subject to constant harassment both from the east and the west, Zambia has never abandoned its attitude of moderation, an attitude which, however, does not preclude a firm resolve to put an end to these flagrant and repeated violations.

54. The representative of Portugal has chosen to regard this moderation and the Zambian Government's desire to settle these incidents amicably, as far as is possible, as a kind of weakness and passive acceptance of Portuguese colonial activities on its borders. It is clear, however, that after having exhausted all other means, the Zambian Government's patience has reached its limit and it has no choice but to have recourse to the Council to try to bring Portugal to its senses.

55. By emphasizing the bilateral discussions in what he thought was a clever way, the representative of Portugal has only succeeded in demonstrating Zambia's goodwill, on the one hand, and, on the other, he has demonstrated the impossibility of fruitful negotiations with a State which has deliberately flouted the resolutions adopted by the international community by an overwhelming majority. He even goes so far as to attempt to draw the most astounding conclusions from Zambia's co-operative attitude. Thus, he says, the fact that the Zambian Government agreed to talks meant that it "was satisfied with the honesty and reasonableness of the Portuguese Government and its desire to negotiate in good faith" [S/PV.1486, para. 76]. It is difficult to understand how the distinguished representative of Portugal arrived at such conclusions, since it is obvious that if the Zambian Government requested this meeting of the Council, it did so because it is entirely convinced to the contrary. In this the Zambian Government is not alone, and we may even say that no Government in the world considers Portugal's colonial policy reasonable, not even those countries inclined to be very indulgent towards the Lisbon Government.

56. The representative of Zambia has read out to us an impressive list of incidents provoked by Portuguese military personnel in Zambian territory. He has given us very specific data regarding the places and dates of these incidents. He has cited the names of persons who have been kidnapped, killed or wounded. The representative of Portugal, for his part, has confined himself to denying these accusations in general terms without refuting the specific points mentioned. Nevertheless, he has recognized in passing that in certain cases the colonial authorities have recognized their responsibilities and have even agreed to pay reparations to Zambia and to apologize. And to think that he, who throughout his statement reproached Zambia for having recourse to the Council, is surprised that Zambia has waited so long to denounce these aggressive acts before you. In fact, this contradiction hardly conceals the embarrassment of the Portuguese representative, who can neither refute the facts nor deny the goodwill shown by Zambia, a goodwill which runs headlong into the wall of obstinacy of the occupation troops. To explain the failure of their enterprise, those troops can only look for scapegoats in the neighbouring independent countries which are being publicly reproached for the aid they give the anti-

colonial struggle. They are reproached even more however, for being independent, thereby giving the subject peoples a bad example of freedom, which is always contagious. In this kind of situation, we should also ask ourselves how far the Government of the colonial Power controls its armies which are constantly frustrated by an incomprehensible failure against an enemy they consider weak, the concept of freedom and of the invincible moral force attached to freedom being so alien to them.

57. The statement of the Portuguese representative also contains some other curious features: thus, he speaks quite calmly of Portuguese frontiers in Africa before a United Nations organ which, as he knows very well, has on several occasions condemned Portugal's presence in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, a presence based solely on armed force. I shall not dwell on this attitude, which is unfortunately not new and which justifies the accusation of arrogance made against Portugal, but I must also say that it is extremely disappointing to those who, like ourselves, had thought that in the recent changes which have occurred in the Portuguese Government they perceived a source of hope, those who, like ourselves, had asked Portugal at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly to make the necessary effort to rejoin at last the community of just nations, to reform and modernize itself, and to identify itself with the world's present course.

58. There is another aspect which cannot have escaped the attention of representatives. The representative of Portugal has informed us that in just a few weeks over 100 acts of sabotage have been committed by the liberation forces against the occupation troops. He has even added that some of them have been extremely serious. Yet the Portuguese Government has always maintained that resistance in the Territories under its domination was insignificant. Here, at last, is an admission that will enable those countries which still hope to entertain doubts on this subject to become convinced that Portuguese colonialism in Africa has already entered its final stage and that the most important thing today is to awaken Portugal to this reality and to remind it of its responsibilities as a Member of this Organization.

59. Such a reminder could only be beneficial at the very moment when Portuguese colonialism is in its death throes and when, in the face of approaching panic, the expeditionary corps is likely to try to carry the war to other African countries, thereby adding a new dimension to the already existing threat to international peace and security.

60. The danger is becoming increasingly apparent: what is today only a threat to international peace and security may become a reality tomorrow, enveloping the southern part of the continent in the flames of a horrible racial war. There is a great temptation among the frustrated colonial armies to resort to such extremes. That is why it is important that the Security Council should take the necessary measures now to prevent such developments.

61. There can, of course, be no true peace as long as Portugal continues to subjugate the African peoples of the region. Others have said this here in other words. When the representative of France stated: "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" [S/PV.1488, para. 95], he was saying what we are saying. It would be ideal if the Security Council could cut off the evil at the root and rid southern Africa of the colonialism and racism which, in the middle of the twentieth century, the European minorities—supported, it is true, by a formidable military and industrial complex—cause to prevail in that area.

62. We have heard some delegations advocate that the two parties should resume what have been termed here bilateral negotiations, although it is evident that the attempts Zambia has made in this respect have failed. To demand a return to this procedure would be tantamount to punishing the Zambian Government for the goodwill it has shown. We think it is the duty of the Security Council to condemn this latest act of aggression committed by Portugal against the village of Lote, as well as all the previous violations, and to demand in the firmest possible terms that Portugal should refrain from committing any further violations against the territorial integrity of Zambia and other territories bordering on the Portuguese colonies, and to do so immediately.

63. In so doing, the Security Council will be doing justice to Zambia and a service to the Portuguese people, who cannot and should not support colonial wars which are all the more futile in that they are lost before they have begun.

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

65. Mr. SAVAGE (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, permit me to convey to you and to the members of the Security Council the profound gratitude of my Government and myself for inviting me and my delegation, at our request, submitted conjointly with Liberia, Madagascar and Tunisia [S/9355], to participate in the current meetings of the Security Council, convened to consider the complaint of the Republic of Zambia regarding the recent Portuguese violation of the former's territorial integrity.

66. The representative of the Republic of Zambia has drawn attention to the numerous instances of aggression his country has suffered at the hands of Portugal. Starting from 1966, no less than 66 cases of Portuguese military and air incursions into Zambian territory and harassment of its people have taken place, often resulting in the loss of human lives.

67. After listening to the exhaustive details provided by the representative of Zambia in his address to the Council on 18 July [1486th meeting] my delegation does not consider it necessary to waste the time of the Council by recounting those incidents. Attacks of this type by Portugal against the African States bordering its Territories is not new. It is a common facet of its disposition, containing evidence of premeditation, and can be explained as a deliberate and systematic policy to try to bring to their knees all States which share common frontiers with Portuguese Territories and from which there is a likelihood of freedom fighters receiving assistance.

68. A few years back, the Council was seized of a complaint by Senegal of attacks from Portuguese soldiers stationed in Bissau—so-called Portuguese Guinea. Similar raids were organized and carried out by Portugal against the Republic of Guinea and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Since then, the young Republic of Zambia seems to have become the target of Portugal's atrocities.

69. What has Zambia done to deserve such rabid hostility from its aggressor? Its geo-political position in Africa makes it imperative for Zambia to provide shelter and assistance to Africans struggling for self-determination as well as human respect. In so doing that country is merely implementing the various resolutions adopted by overwhelming majorities in the General Assembly.

70. We have seen a demonstration on the part of that country of its readiness to be on good terms with Portugal in spite of the latter's reluctance to observe and comply with decisions of this world body. Zambia has again and again indicated its willingness to hold bilateral talks on a number of problem situations with the Portuguese, arch enemies as they are of African liberation. But, notwithstanding its exemplary demonstration of restraint and goodwill, Zambia has had cause to bring this matter before the Security Council.

71. Why was this necessary? It was necessary because of the lack of good faith on the part of the Portuguese authorities. In spite of the joint declaration resulting from one of those meetings held between Zambia and the Portuguese delegation, which read in part: "The Portuguese delegation formally accepted the incidents as unfortunate and promised to recommend to its Government, in face of this concrete evidence and in accordance with the agreement reached in New York, that it apologize and pay to the Zambian Government a fair and reasonable compensation for the damage" [see the 1486th meeting, para. 111], we have learned that several other similar incidents of aggression against Zambia have taken place. It is only natural for Zambia to conclude that bilateral negotiations and other means for the pacific settlement of disputes detailed in Article 33 of the United Nations Charter are a sheer waste of time when dealing with a determined and resolute enemy of Africa such as Portugal.

72. The representative of Portugal has told the Council, in passing, of unspecified instances of Zambian aggression on Portuguese territory. If there is any foundation to his statement, I am certain the Council would like to hear more of it; otherwise, such a statement should be automatically dismissed for what it is worth. Had there been an iota of truth in their allegations, the Portuguese authorities in Lisbon would certainly long before now have drawn world attention to them.

73. My delegation firmly adheres to the Charter of the United Nations and lays emphasis on General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); it is doubly convinced that as long as part of the continent of Africa remains enslaved, the rest stands a risk of losing its freedom. Over and above this, the continued aggressive actions of Portugal against Zambia, in defiance of the collective will of Member States and in spite of the numerous resolutions passed both in the General

Assembly and in this important body, constitute a serious threat to world peace and stability. In the circumstances, therefore, my delegation supports the complaint brought forward by the representative of Zambia against the Portuguese aggressors and requests the Council to take appropriate measures to see that just compensation is made to that young nation for the damages done to it.

74. My delegation would be remiss if it concluded this intervention without congratulating the Government and people of the United States for their extraordinary achievement in sending the first human beings to the moon and bringing them safely back to earth. Such an achievement is an indication of man's prowess and accomplishments when he gears himself seriously to attaining a goal. We trust that the knowledge gained from the vast research programmes entailed will be used for the benefit of mankind.

75. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, before speaking on the item on the Council's agenda, I should like to associate myself with the words of congratulations which you extended, on behalf of us all, to the delegation of the United States of America and, through it, to the people and Government of that country, on the success of the voyage of Apollo 11 to the moon. We whole-heartedly endorse these congratulations. The complete cycle of the journey to the moon and the successful return to earth was concluded just a few hours ago. The magnitude of the feat performed by the United States astronauts, supported by a host of almost anonymous scientists and experts, is such that it is difficult to find fitting words to express our profound admiration.

76. We give thanks that these three astronauts went to the moon on a mission of peace. We give thanks that they have returned to earth safe and sound. And we give thanks, too, that, thanks to modern communications media, we have had the good fortune to be eyewitnesses to this extraordinary event which ennobles the twentieth century.

77. Some obvious conclusions can be drawn. First and foremost, perhaps, we now have incontrovertible proof of the almost unlimited possibilities open to man when determination, talent and science are harmoniously combined with that element which is as unpredictable as it is indispensable—man's courage. Another conclusion is that seldom, if ever in our time, have three men—only three men—been so representative of the human species. Our common hopes went with them, and our prayers accompanied them. In return, they have opened up a vastly broader horizon far beyond the hitherto known boundaries of earth.

78. With these few words I wish to hail this feat achieved by the United States and the gallantry of its astronauts.

79. I come now to the item on our agenda, namely, Zambia's complaint concerning violations of its territorial integrity by Portuguese military forces and the bombing of a village resulting in the destruction of property and the loss of lives.

80. In other circumstances, a debate on such a complaint might easily be confined to the complaint itself and to the

actions relating to it. In the particular case before us, however, it is clear that we sense the shadow of situations going far beyond the aforementioned complaint. I refer, of course, to the general situation in the area, which is the most critical situation in the entire African continent and which is characterized by the struggle being waged by the peoples of Angola and Mozambique to acquire the full exercise of their right to self-determination; to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, where the Zimbabwe people groan in oppression; to the Territory of Namibia, which is awaiting the hour when it can become the master of its own destiny, and to the policy of *apartheid* applied by the Government of South Africa, which is oppressing millions of human beings.

81. Personally, I cannot put this general situation from my mind. Nevertheless, I shall try to confine myself strictly to the subject. I must point out, however, that incidents which are serious in themselves become much more serious when they occur in an area where peace and security are so precarious. Having heard the parties concerned, and in particular the statements made at the 1486th meeting, we would have preferred to have these parties seek a satisfactory solution through use of the means provided for this purpose under the Charter. Nevertheless, even if these means had been used and the parties, that is to say, Zambia and Portugal, had reached an agreement they considered mutually acceptable, the fact would still remain that one or more incidents have occurred, that these incidents have a tendency to be repeated, and that each repetition, however slight it may seem, introduces a further disturbing element to add to those which constantly endanger peace and security in southern Africa where, I repeat, peace and security are indeed precarious.

82. We are determined advocates of the most scrupulous respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, and of unwavering observance of the norms governing the relations between States. Our own security as a small country depends on universal respect for those principles which today are sanctioned by international law, independently, moreover, of concurrent obligations as a Member of this Organization.

83. This being so, we cannot and, moreover, we should not pass over in silence acts which violate these principles, or which do not conform to these norms. Our main function in this Council is to seek the means at our disposal to prevent international peace and security from being threatened and, if they are threatened, to find ways and means of putting an end to such threats.

84. My delegation has acted and will continue to act in this Council in accordance with these principles, and in that spirit it will seek, together with other delegations, mutually acceptable formulas which will represent the Council's views on the acts which have given rise to our debate.

85. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Zambia to exercise his right of reply.

86. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to intervene again in this debate in exercise of my right of reply.

87. Mr. President, you have already, on behalf of all of us in this Council, expressed our profound admiration and wishes for that one historic small step by man, which is indeed a great leap by mankind, that over the weekend crowned American ingenuity, perseverance and courage. But in the light of the successful return of those noble astronauts, I crave your pardon to be allowed personally to say a few words of congratulations to my friend and colleague, the representative of the United States of America. I hope that my friend will not be embarrassed when I say that he should consider himself as being in the shoes of the most attractive young lady at a party who should be prepared for the most generous remarks and offers. To lessen my colleague's embarrassment, however, apart from admiration and genuine praise, we shall only offer him, unlike the glamorous young lady, our best wishes for further exploits for the good of the American people and of mankind as a whole. May this success be crowned with several more.

88. I shall now turn to the item on the agenda. In the course of his interventions at the 1486th and 1488th meetings, the Portuguese representative asked us if Zambia's request for this meeting was not strange. Having done that, he surprisingly tried to mislead the Council by stating: "It may be that a clue is given by the reports which have appeared in the press regarding the case of two Portuguese military persons unlawfully and faithlessly detained in Zambia" [1486th meeting, para. 63]. Is it not asking too much for my friend, whose Foreign Minister in response to our letter dated 15 July [S/9331] sent a telegram dated 16 July [S/9335] addressed to you, Mr. President, requesting his participation in the discussion, to begin his contribution in that negative manner? Why should he draw a red herring across our smooth path? In case he did not do his homework properly, I shall, at the expense of my colleagues' time, tell him all this once again.

89. Zambia brought the Lote incident to this Council because, despite our proven restraint, Portugal has for four years been violating our territorial integrity. We came to the Council because over these four years Portuguese armed forces have killed many innocent civilian men, women and children in my country. I cited no fewer than 20 on Friday out of a long list of well over 60. In addition to the specific cases I referred to, I drew the attention of the Council and, I hope, of the Portuguese representative to the many Zambians who have been wounded in these unprovoked Portuguese raids. Many have been kidnapped, and women have been violated. Zambian property has been destroyed, in other cases stolen. Our cattle have also been unlawfully taken.

90. But, of course, when even he himself could not hold any further to the judiciary-executive myth, the resourceful Portuguese representative discarded it rather unceremoniously. Having categorically rejected the Lote incident, he considered us very credulous when, out of obvious frustration, he told the Council that bilateral negotiations were in hand between Zambia and Portugal to settle this incident. We were called upon to be content with continued Portuguese aggression because a mythical Luso-Zambian commission was already dealing with the issue which he described as "devoid of any foundation". For a country

whose intransigence is only too familiar to this Council to appear that ready to investigate issues which it claims are devoid of any foundation, Portugal must have undergone what may be considered a revolution.

91. But we in Zambia, having lived with Portuguese aggression for four years, know that Portugal's premeditated acts of aggression have been on the increase. They have become more intense and frequent.

92. In recognition of the need to settle disputes peacefully, and in light of the customary denials on the part of the aggressor, we tried, in respect of three series of incidents, to prove to the Portuguese that our complaints were not only serious but also genuine. We invited their representatives to come to Zambia to see for themselves the results of their shameful aggression. Despite all the available evidence, they rejected two of these, which were extremely grave, and accepted responsibility in respect of only one, where a village of 40 houses was completely wiped out. While admitting that their armed forces were responsible for the aggression in respect of the other two as well, they arrogantly claimed that they attacked in exercise of the so-called right of pursuit. It was irrelevant to the aggressor that the victims of these incidents were all Zambian civilians who had no intention whatsoever of attacking Portugal. Nor did the total lack of so-called elements hostile to Portugal induce them to adopt a more reasonable attitude. Following this unreasonable rejection, we came to the sad conclusion that pacific settlement had no meaning to the Portuguese. Our efforts would have been fruitful had the aggressor been ready to accept full responsibility for the hostile actions of its armed forces against Zambia.

93. The Portuguese representative accused Zambia of negotiating in bad faith. I wish to remind him that during the investigation of one of the three incidents referred to above, and despite assurances that instructions had been issued by Lisbon to the effect that there should be no aggression against Zambia, at least not during the investigations, two serious attacks were made. While the investigations were going on, Portuguese forces struck at Shangombo and the Luangwa Bridge was blown up. If that is not negotiating in bad faith, what is? , I ask the aggressor.

94. But, as many speakers pointed out, Zambia is an unfortunate victim of colonialism, racism and imperialism in southern Africa. We have been accused by Portugal of authorizing in our territory "the establishment of training and supply bases for armed attacks" against Portugal. Time and again we have made it absolutely clear, and I make it clear again, that all Zambia has done is to carry out its responsibilities to the Organization of African Unity and to the United Nations. Thus, despite all our difficulties created by the unholy alliance of Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia, we have adhered to the principles of the Charter by opening our doors to hundreds of thousands of refugees from those oppressed territories bordering on Zambia. It is worth noting that while we adhere to the United Nations in this regard, the Portuguese have planted mines all along the Zambian-Mozambican border, and inside Zambia, in an effort not only to make it impossible for refugees to run away from their oppressive régime, but also wickedly to prevent refugees already in Zambia from going back to

harvest their crops. Naturally, when one notes the thieving character of the Portuguese soldier, one can see why the Portuguese forces feel very happy when hundreds of refugees leave behind their ripening crops. It is in their nature to take away what does not belong to them.

95. The Portuguese representative tried to mislead this Council concerning the year 1966, claiming that in that year my country departed from its policy of good-neighbourliness. He would wish us to believe that up until 1966 there was tranquillity in Angola and Mozambique, and that trouble started only when so-called Zambian-trained "elements" began to infiltrate into those Territories in that year. I wish to inform him that the Council knows only too well that, following many years of fascist oppression, the peoples of Angola and Mozambique had taken up arms as early as 1961 against the Portuguese invader. In 1961 alone, over 1,500 Portuguese colonialists were killed, and 100 administrative posts and towns and over 3 districts within 30 miles of Luanda were either wiped out or taken. The economy of Angola was almost paralysed. Whom does the representative of Portugal blame for that disaster to his Government? And how about the uprising in Mozambique which followed immediately?

96. I can only conclude, naturally, that our friend from Goa, who is now masquerading as the representative of Portugal, has spent the last few years hopelessly and unconvincingly trying to defend Portuguese oppression against the Angolan and Mozambican peoples and has had too little time to learn Portuguese colonial history.

97. In case he is unaware of it, I wish to reiterate that the struggle for freedom and independence is as indigenous in Angola as it was in India; it is as indigenous in Mozambique as it was in the American colonies; it is as indigenous in Guinea (Bissau) as it was in Algeria. That being so, neither he nor the Portuguese armies of oppression can reverse the tide of history. Africa has chosen the course of liberation, the course of democracy, and no amount of collaboration, not even within the unholy alliance, can halt that momentous march to total victory. Already it must be meaningful that in all Portugal's attacks on Zambia only white Portuguese soldiers have been involved. The enemy continues to look over his shoulder and his defeat is imminent.

98. I do not intend to afford the representative of Portugal another excuse for wasting the Council's time by referring to the facts I have presented to the Council as slogans. I wish, therefore, to take up one of his ridiculous assertions, namely when he said, rather astonishingly, that he considered because his Government had accepted responsibility for only 1 of the 60 acts of aggression, all the rest were settled. Is it conceivable that any Government worth the name would abandon so many of its nationals, kidnapped by the enemy? Is there any credibility in the suggestion that because the Portuguese have paid compensation for 42 houses destroyed by their armed forces, the Zambian Government has forgotten so many of its nationals who have been killed in cold blood, or the many scores who have been injured? Or our innocent women who have been violated? Or our cattle that have been stolen by the invader? But, of course, to the Portuguese mind government is an instrument for oppression and not

for the protection of human rights, individual liberty and the right to life.

99. I was amused when the Portuguese representative unashamedly referred to our detaining the two invaders as an act that would be regarded "as shocking by all those who have a sense of propriety and justice". All I can do is to advise the Portuguese representative to call upon his Government to exercise this propriety and justice with regard to the 13 million people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). If Portugal were to do that, there would be no need for it to send poor students like Freitas to fight anachronistic colonial wars, nor would there be any need for my Government to detain any Portuguese in self-defence.

100. In any case, while the representative of Portugal can call on the Council for the release of Freitas and his colleague, I can only inform him that in another recent incident two of three of our nationals who had gone hunting near the Angola border were shot dead without warning by the Portuguese, who suspected them of having crossed the border. As for Freitas and his colleague, we see no justification for the Portuguese representative further to burden the Council with this matter. If they release our kidnapped nationals today, we shall hand over the invaders, despite the fact that Freitas was the leader of the earlier invading unit on 24 January 1969, to which I referred, that was repulsed after an exchange of fire in which three of the invaders were killed.

101. The false assertion that our Air Force has displayed aggressive intentions against Portugal is too ridiculous and tenuous to be pursued in this Council.

102. Perhaps, at this stage, I should take up the question of Portuguese aggression on Lote again. You will recall that, in stating our case on 18 July [*1486th meeting*], I pointed out that two weeks had elapsed before my Government appealed to the Council for a hearing. I had then pointed out that the delay was due to our desire to settle this and other similar matters outside this chamber. We therefore drew the attention of the aggressor to that grave incident. But typical of their behaviour, they rejected our complaint. The Portuguese representative here also rejected the complaint on 18 July. Only yesterday, the Council heard him say: "We gave our answer to that allegation. We rejected it as false. We reiterate that position." [*1488th meeting, para. 25.*] Is it surprising that, faced with such intransigence, we decided to come to this Council?

103. In reiterating their rejection, the Portuguese told us that they did this because when I made the claim, which they rejected, they did not have the text of my speech; presumably, they wanted some time to study our complaint. If this were so, why reject it off-hand on 18 July, even before studying the text of my speech? Besides, was it not the subject of my letter requesting a meeting of the Security Council? They knew what I was complaining about. Their representative in London had earlier rejected it, so it needed no further study on their part. It is significant that the Portuguese representative, out of step with his colleague in London, gave this Council his version of the incident, despite his having denied it earlier.

104. In the light of our irrefutable evidence, the Portuguese representative, having said it was difficult to know what happened at Lote from this distance, proceeded to give us a "yarn" about clean-up operations. "The attacking raiders"—he suddenly concluded his little story—"fled back into Zambia and possibly went to the village of Lote [*ibid.*, *para. 28*]. He does not, however, tell us what followed. There was no clean-up operation. There were, I agree, attackers, Portuguese attackers, who flew to the village of Lote and committed the aggressions I recounted. They struck on 30 June and on 3 and 4 July. The story of "clean-up" operations cannot be plausible when you recall that the border is mined by the Portuguese. To cross it from Mozambique to the village of Lote in Zambia, one needs a plane; and, of course, that is what the Portuguese aggressors used.

105. The reference made by the representative of Portugal that the Zambian authorities are not quite clear about the boundary line is not only mischievous but also misleading. His own words have left no doubt that he has recognized Lote as a Zambian village. The map we have continually displayed, in any case, should leave no room for any more doubts.

106. In regard to the kidnapping of our national, Jeremiah Lushindu, the Council has been told a fantastic story. It is claimed that Lushindu was a victim of an international love affair. Are we to believe that this African "Helen" of Rivungo was so popular with the white Portuguese forces that they considered it worthwhile to engage a launch, violate Zambia's territorial integrity, and mount a big man-hunt just for her? Since when have Portuguese forces shown any concern for the rights of an Angolan?

107. But, of course, the representative of Portugal is the paragon of contradictions. Only yesterday, we saw him exemplify this very amply. Accusing Zambia of hostility, he stated:

"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." [*Ibid.*, *para. 41.*]

And yet, having given us that interesting lecture, the Portuguese authorities do not pause to realize that it is Zambia which should give them that lecture in respect of Lushindu. After all, even according to their version of the incident, Lushindu was kidnapped by elements from the colonial territory of Angola.

108. With regard to the only exhibit the Portuguese side has promised to produce before this Council—that of party cards of the ruling United National Independence Party—I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the fact the Lushindu was a regional official of the United National Independence Party. Besides, we have reported here that several cases of kidnapping have taken place. Naturally,

some of the people kidnapped are members of the ruling United National Independence Party. We are happy that in promising that evidence the Portuguese representative may in fact be providing us with more evidence to prove his country's acts of aggression against Zambia.

109. I am gratified that no sooner had the Portuguese representative challenged this Council to prove that NATO arms were used against us than my illustrious friend the representative of France confirmed that, as a result of proven cases, France had warned Portugal not to abuse its NATO privileges regarding arms. If our overwhelming evidence was rejected with customary impunity by the Portuguese side, perhaps the French warning will bring them face to face with facts at long last. We would also hope that other NATO members will follow the excellent example of France.

110. To conclude, my Government wishes to make it quite clear that, despite all their sweet words here or elsewhere, the Portuguese have proved to be extremely intransigent in their persistent aggression against Zambia. My Government, gravely concerned about the tension in southern Africa, has done everything in its power to help reduce that tension. If anything, our restraint over the past four years should be a testimony to our desire for peace. It is significant that it was in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia, that the Fifth Summit Conference of the Heads of State of East and Central Africa adopted the Manifesto on Southern Africa, a copy of which I now submit, with the request that it be circulated as an official document of the Council, since it has such a bearing on this subject. The Portuguese would do well to study that document before they accuse us of being hostile to them. In view of the celebrated Portuguese tradition of reading United Nations resolutions and decisions upside down—and this in a way explains their upside-down logic—we hope that the Secretariat will be kind enough to translate the Manifesto for the benefit of the Portuguese delegation.¹

111. We are grateful to those delegations which expressed their desire to see these acts of aggression brought to an end through discussion between the parties. But, alas, even while they were making vague appeals for bilateral talks, the Portuguese aggressors were adding insult to injury by shamelessly rejecting our genuine complaints. We are convinced that, in keeping with their attitude towards the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, they have chosen the path of intransigence and continued aggression.

112. We believe that, since our only mistake is our support for self-determination and our giving shelter to genuine refugees in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Organization has a duty to listen to our case. We expect, in this regard, that other Members of the world body will come to our support instead of helping to increase tension in the area. Having done everything possible to avert the threat to international peace and security for as long as we have done under such difficult

¹ Subsequently circulated as document S/9363 dated 28 July 1969. For the text of the Manifesto, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

conditions, we should not be held responsible for any consequences of Portuguese aggression. While those farther removed from the area of conflict may find refuge in palliatives or appeasement, the blood of our dead, the silent cry of the kidnapped and the wounds of the injured demand that we stop this aggression forthwith. The question is whether the Council is prepared now to help us repel the aggressor. We hope that all peace-loving people the world over who respect our territorial integrity and who would like to see lasting peace in our crisis zone will join us in condemning Portuguese aggression against Zambia and in

rejecting the Portuguese rejection of our complaint with all the contempt it deserves.

113. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no other speakers on my list and if no representative wishes to speak at the present stage in the debate I propose to adjourn the meeting. Following consultations with the members of the Council, it has been agreed that the next meeting will take place on Friday, 25 July, at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.25 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. Приводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете 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 dirijase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
