

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JAN 17 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1486th MEETING: 18 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1486)	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-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 18 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/1486)

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 a telegram dated 16 July 1969 [S/9335], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal has requested that the representative of Portugal be invited to participate in the debate of the Security Council on the question before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to invite the representative of Portugal to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure of the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. B. de Miranda (Portugal) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now examine the complaint submitted by the representative of Zambia in his letter dated 15 July 1969 [S/9331].

3. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Zambia. I now call on him to make his statement.

4. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to you and all the members of the Security Council for accepting our request to convene this meeting.

5. Representatives will recall that in words of congratulations to you, Mr. President, upon the assumption of your high office, the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord

Caradon, stated at the Council's meeting on 1 July: "I have little comfort to offer him"—in reference to you, Sir—"except to report to him that my careful inquiries indicate that there are several highly placed representatives who hope that July will be a month devoted more to bilateral than international diplomacy." [1483rd meeting, para. 26.]

6. It is, therefore, with greatest reluctance that we had to call for this meeting of the Security Council to discuss the recent serious Portuguese violations of my country's territorial integrity and, in particular, the latest brutal bombing of one of our villages. Since our request for a meeting of the Security Council, many of our colleagues have been wondering whether this request was in respect of the widely reported incidents which took place between 30 June and 3 July 1969, and, if so, why we did not strike the iron, so to speak, while it was red-hot. I regret that, while we had hoped to come to this Council to discuss only those incidents which took place between 30 June and 3 July, there has been yet another armed attack on innocent and unarmed Zambian civilians by Portuguese soldiers, this time in the Balovale District in the North-Western Province of Zambia. As of the moment I have no details, but it has been reported that Portuguese military forces have crossed into Zambia in the last few days and attacked one of our villages, killing two persons. I have no doubt, however, that before this debate is over, I shall be in a position to give the Council more information regarding the latest incident.

7. Mr. President, you too may be wondering why it has taken us this length of time to raise this serious matter in the Security Council. The answer, Sir, is very simple. My Government has all along held the view, in regard to matters of this nature, that it is wiser to settle them on a bilateral basis. This is especially so when one realizes that in all such cases international morality and traditional international practice among States would indicate that the element of compensation cannot be ruled out. That being the case, we felt that we should not burden the Council with the intricacies of compensation-determination in respect of the damage done to Zambian life and property as a direct result of Portuguese attacks. The Portuguese, however, have become intransigent, and, as the latest incident would indicate, they have continued to be trigger-happy.

8. 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. There have been 9 such incursions in the Barotse Province, 3 in the Central Province, 1 in the Southern Province, 12 in the North-Western Province, and 10 in the Eastern Province, making a total of 35 land

violations. By air, there have been 4 in the Barotse Province, 5 in the North-Western Province, 11 in Eastern Province, 4 in the Central Province, and 1 in the Southern Province, making a total of 25.

9. As early as 5 December 1966, my predecessor, in a communication to the Council [S/7612], informed it of an incursion on 21 November 1966 by armed units of the Portuguese military forces, based in the colonial territory of Angola, which crossed the border into the Republic of Zambia, attacking our peace-loving people in the villages of Musala and Chingi with shells, hand grenades and other small arms, destroying property and seriously injuring one of our people. Since that was not the first incident—as our previous letter of 26 July 1966 [S/7430] indicated—he pointed out in that communication: “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.”

10. I need not remind the Council that the Portuguese authorities, in their letter of 12 December 1966 [S/7632] issued on 13 December, challenged the Zambian accusation. Instead of stopping the reported aggression, the Portuguese authorities threatened that they would apply an economic lever—the strangulation of Zambia.

11. Again on 8 November 1968, I myself, in a letter to the President of the Council [S/8895], drew the attention of the Council to another flagrant act of military aggression committed by the Portuguese armed forces against my country. I pointed out that on 6 November 1968 Portuguese armed forces violated Zambian territory and took up a position at the village of Kameta in the Katete district of the Eastern Province of Zambia near the Mozambique border. I pointed out in my letter that the incident was “only one in a series of similar unprovoked aggressive acts by Portuguese armed forces against Zambia”. Furthermore, in my letter of 4 February 1969 [S/8993], I again drew the attention of the Council to a skirmish which took place near Chingi in Balovale District in the North-Western Province of Zambia, when a patrol of armed Portuguese soldiers crossed into Zambia from Angola and clashed with our soldiers.

12. But up until now, my Government has remained unshaken in its policy of wanting to settle this serious problem through bilateral negotiations. The Council may wish to know, for example, that between 7 and 14 June 1968 a high level Portuguese delegation visited Zambia to see for itself what damage had been done by their soldiers to some of our villages in the Kabalo district, bordering on Angola. It is an open secret that on that occasion the Portuguese delegation accepted full responsibility for what had happened, and indicated it would recommend to the Administration in Lisbon that it pay a fair and reasonable compensation for the damage. They also promised that their Government would take appropriate measures to ensure that there would be no repetition of the attacks on or violations of Zambian territory. The Zambian side, on its part, reassured the Portuguese delegation 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. Both sides agreed that it was in the interest of the two countries to promote peace and work towards mutual co-operation within permissible limits.

13. That hope has never been realized; for Portugal has not only continued to apply military force to subjugate the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, creating tremendous instability in the area, but has also in the course of this colonial war overstepped its boundary and continued to attack the peace-loving people of Zambia.

14. I do not propose to burden the Council with a description of all these shameful acts of aggression committed by the Portuguese armed forces against my country. I will, however, take a few of these cases, for two specific reasons. The first is that, as evidenced in their letter [S/7632], the Administration in Lisbon, in spite of all the available facts, has denied the involvement of its armed forces in some of the incidents we have reported to them; the second is that we should like particularly to make available all the information at our disposal to indicate to Portugal's friends, especially the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), that such arms as they make available to Portugal through NATO are used not for the defence of Portugal or the member countries of NATO, but for the oppression of the peoples of Angola and Mozambique and, more seriously, against the peace-loving people of Zambia.

15. To do this, I will unfortunately have to delve into a lot of statistical data. I regret that at a moment like this in the history of man, when the world is being plied with statistical data from the spacecraft Apollo 11, I have to add my own data to that endless list. We intend to make this data available at the end of my statement so that representatives will have time to analyse it and draw their own conclusions. In this regard, I also must apologize for having to bring into this chamber, a chamber of peace, fragments of bombs which the aggressive Portuguese forces have used in the massacre of my innocent countrymen and women, as well as children. I shall also endeavour to provide you with maps indicating the area where most of the conflicts have taken place. While our minds are still fresh, I propose to begin by providing data which our armed forces have collected at the various scenes of Portuguese aggression.

16. Following the Portuguese bombing of Zambian villages in the Kabalo district in April 1968, a thorough examination of aerial bomb fragments and fuses collected from the villages of Kashituka and Kangombe was carried out. The bomb fragments consistently indicated their having come from a high-explosive bomb of at least 50 pounds in weight. The fuse fragments were from nose fuses which operate upon direct impact with the ground. These are usually screwed into a booster, which, in turn, screws into the nose of the bomb. This type of bomb is usually fitted below the wings of light aircraft of the Harvard type. They are fitted in banks of four under each wing, and each aircraft can carry up to eight bombs. The bomb is manufactured in two halves, and can be fitted with a mixture of a high-explosive and smoke composition—white phosphorus: high explosive and one-quarter-inch steel balls for anti-personnel effect, or

high explosive to shatter the bomb body only. The bomb is fitted with a nose impact fuse which operates on impact with the ground and explodes the bomb. The bombs are of universal type and can be manufactured by any NATO country. It is thought that the bombs dropped on these occasions by Portuguese armed forces were of Portuguese manufacture.

17. At 0730 hours, local time, on 1 October 1968, two aircraft of the Harvard type, bearing Portuguese markings, were seen flying wide apart some eight miles inside Zambia near the Mozambican border. One aircraft was flying at an estimated height of 600 feet. A Zambian army patrol opened fire on the latter aircraft with three machine-guns and six rifles. The aircraft was thought to have been hit, as smoke was seen coming from the rear as it turned away towards Mozambique. Local inhabitants later informed the Zambian authorities that the aircraft's engines had stopped thereafter and that it had begun losing altitude as it crossed the Zambian border into Portuguese territory. One and a half hours later, two more aircraft were seen flying five miles inside Zambian territory. One of the aircraft was similar to the Beaver type aircraft and had a red painted tail and red wing tips.

18. Fifty minutes later, a single aircraft was seen circling around about two miles from the village of Chimpopi and attacking an abandoned farm known as Phiri's Farm at approximately 1015 hours, local time. The same aircraft swept over the village of Chimpopi, situated two miles from the Zambian-Mozambican border, and attacked it with rockets. It is estimated that eight rockets were fired on that occasion. A contingent of the Zambian army proceeded to the village to investigate the attack and found at the scene a package containing two misfired 37 mm air-to-ground rockets and a number of fragments of 37 mm rockets.

19. The following technical data were clearly visible on the rockets and on some of the fragments which were recovered by the Zambian army authorities:

On the fuses:

- (1) SNEB 22-28 BT 62
- (2) SNEB 22-28 BT 63

On the rocket heads:

37 SNEB
TELE TYPE EXPLOSIVE
BT 4-63

On the rocket motors:

- (1) Prop type 44 BT 4-63
- (2) TT 7* 10-65 SM
37 SNEB
TYPE 447
BT 8-63

The rocket heads were painted a drab olive colour, with yellow stencilling, and the rocket motors were painted light grey, with black stencilling. These colours and markings, according to our army experts, indicate that the projectiles were manufactured in France.

The rocket heads were filled with high explosive of the TNT type. They were about 16 inches in length and 1 1/2

inches in diameter, 2 to 2 1/2 pounds in weight, and fired electrically from tubes fitted beneath the wings of an aircraft.

20. In June 1969, a number of grenades and anti-personnel mines were discovered in the border area south of Chadiza, in the Eastern Province of Zambia. The grenades are of the polyvalent type, and one of them consists of three parts:

(a) An instantaneous fuse incorporating a spring-loaded striker with a short lever, a firing cap and a powerful detonator. A safety split pin holds the striker off the striker cap. The striker lever is painted red.

(b) A cylindrical drab olive plastic body, 4 inches long and 1 7/8 inches in diameter. This is filled with TNT. The fuse is screwed into the top of this body.

(c) A spirally wound fragmentation sleeve. This sleeve is removable, and the grenade can be used with or without the sleeve in place. To avoid loss of fragmentation and ensure greater injuries to personnel, it is unlikely that the grenade will be used without the fragmentation sleeve.

This grenade appears to have been specifically manufactured for use as a booby trap. It can be attached to trees with a wire or length of strong cord fixed to the safety pin. This trip wire can then be stretched across tracks or through low undergrowth and attached at the other end. Disturbance of the trip wire pulls out the safety pin, and the grenade explodes instantaneously. It has a danger area of approximately 30 feet. The grenade can also be used in parcel bombs. The markings on the base of the grenades are: "ARM A/P FRAG M/963 1-02/67". It is not known at present who manufactures this grenade or its country of origin, but no doubt it should not be beyond the ability of the Council to find this out.

21. The mine, anti-personnel, consists of the following:

(a) A domed plastic fuse, which screws into the mine body and in which is housed: (1) a plastic striker coated with a match-head composition, and (2) a small amount of flame-producing composition.

(b) A squat cylindrical plastic body measuring 1 1/4 inches in depth and 2 1/4 inches in diameter. This is filled with an outer ring of TNT and an inner ring of gun powder.

(c) A metal detector ring which fits over the top of the mine immediately beneath the fuse.

(d) A small but powerful detonator housed in a celluloid cylinder. This is inserted into the mine body before the fuse is screwed in.

Markings on the base of the mine, which is of drab olive coloured plastic, are "SAE 8/66", stencilled in about one-eighth of an inch in yellow letters. With regard to these figures, "SAE" relates to the manufacturer, we believe, and "8/66" should indicate the month and year of manufacture. The mine can be operated by either a kick or a pressure of 20 pounds or less. When laid without the

detector ring, the mine cannot be detected without the mine detector. The mine is powerful enough to blow off a man's foot or seriously damage the front suspension of a vehicle. In spite of the markings on the base of the mines, we have not been able as yet to determine who manufactures them or their country of origin, but, again, if we in this Council put our heads together, in a spirit of co-operation, it should be possible for us to decipher these markings correctly.

22. Having delved into all these technicalities, I should now like to inform the Council of the damage done to my people and country by the Portuguese aggressors. In order not to tax the patience of members of the Council any further, I intend merely to mention some of the incidents, as I have before, and if any member of the Council is interested in more detail I should be only too glad to expatiate.

23. On 19 February 1966, Portuguese soldiers based in Mozambique crossed into Zambia and stole 21 head of cattle belonging to a Mr. Phiri of Mwanjwanthu village, in the Petauke district of the Eastern Province of Zambia. As if that were not enough, these marauders also kidnapped Mr. Phiri himself. He has never been seen since.

24. On 12 April, Mr. Goza Mwanza of the Petauke district was kidnapped by Portuguese soldiers, tortured in Mozambique for three months and then released.

25. On 15 July, the village of Chipatela in the Balovale district, in the North-Western Province of Zambia, was attacked, and 11 houses and several grain bins were destroyed.

26. On 23 September, Portuguese forces based in Angola attacked the village of Nakushowa injuring 12 people.

27. On 20 December, a Mr. Shindano of the Kabalo district was shot dead by Portuguese troops.

28. On 23 December, Portuguese soldiers invaded the village of Musala, near the Kapanda Mission in the Mwinilunga district, and in the invasion a man was killed.

29. On 30 December, armed Portuguese soldiers from Lumbala in Angola crossed into Zambia and kidnapped three men. Two of these were shot on the way to Lumbala as they tried to escape. The fate of the third man is yet to be known.

30. On 11 August 1967, the village of Mwanjwanthu, in the Eastern Province of Zambia, was again attacked. Three Zambian nationals were kidnapped, tortured for a month and then released.

31. On 31 October, Portuguese soldiers from Mozambique kidnapped a Malawian visitor to Chadiza in the Eastern Province of Zambia. He has never been seen since.

32. On 25 December, the invaders from Mozambique attacked the village of Nyanje in the Petauke district, kidnapping 16 Zambians and stealing their property. Their fate is still unknown.

33. On 22 March 1968, the Portuguese Air Force invaded the village of Mulonda, in the Kabalo district of the Barotse Province of Zambia, and bombed it from the air. Seven people were killed, 18 wounded, among them women and children and several houses and much property were destroyed. Forty-two houses in the village of Kshiluka were razed to the ground following Portuguese aerial bombardment on 29 April 1968.

34. On 3 June, the aggressor entered the village of Shangombo, in the Senanga district of the Barotse Province of Zambia, and took away seven Zambian nationals as loot. They have never been returned.

35. In the attacks against Zambia, the Portuguese invaders have not confined themselves merely to attacking villages, as was shown on 9 June 1968. On that occasion, having murdered in cold blood a guard who was in charge of one of our vital bridges, the Luangwa bridge, they proceeded to blow up the bridge, thus cutting away the entire Eastern Province from the rest of the Republic of Zambia.

36. On 10 June, the village of Katumba, in the Katete district of the Eastern Province, was invaded by the Portuguese. A man and his wife were abducted and released two weeks later, after undergoing a series of tortures and questioning.

37. On 20 July, two people were shot dead in the village of Chinkoma, in the Petauke district of the Eastern Province of Zambia. On 28 July 1968, the thieves struck again, this time in the village of Katumba, in the Katete district, where they stole 37 head of cattle. Obviously the behaviour of our friends' colonial soldiers reminds us of the thieving soldiers who lived off the land of the victims of their aggression during the Thirty Years' War.

38. Even more shameful was the Portuguese bombing of the Kanongesha Catholic Mission, in the Mwinilunga district, in the North-Western Province of Zambia, on 30 August. One man was killed in the village of Kaengo, in the Katete district, on 17 August. That incident was followed by one on 30 September, at the village of Songwe, where the Portuguese Air Force dropped 18 bombs, completely destroying 3 houses and killing and maiming several domestic animals.

39. In the invasion in Chimpopi on 1 October, six people were seriously wounded, and the fragments that were discovered on the scene have been described already.

40. On 6 October, Mr. Kalikeka Njovu of the Petauke district of the Eastern Province of Zambia was abducted and has never come back to his family.

41. On 2 November, Mr. Petolo Malimo was going about his work in his garden, well within Zambia, near the border with Mozambique, when Portuguese soldiers shot at him and he was seriously wounded.

42. Portuguese forces from Mozambique invaded the village of Kamela in the Katete district on 6 November. They kidnapped one person and proved their depravity by raping an innocent woman. On 6 November, as I have

pointed out before, Portuguese soldiers crossed into Zambia and took up positions at the village of Kamela in the Katete district of the Eastern Province of Zambia, and for a short while engaged our armed forces. A Portuguese commander was killed and four others were seriously wounded. One Zambian soldier was also wounded.

43. On 24 January 1969, a patrol of armed Portuguese soldiers crossed into Zambia from Kalipende, a Portuguese army garrison in Angola. In a clash that followed with our armed forces, three of the invaders were killed.

44. On 16 June, about 2 o'clock in the afternoon local time, a Portuguese military patrol under the command of Lieutenant José Maria Santos Silva crossed into Zambia, and two of the soldiers—José Maria Santos Silva himself and Lance-Corporal José Antonio Forgaz Monte e Freitas—were apprehended by Zambian authorities. The Zambian military patrolmen took the aggressors into custody and they are now under detention, in accordance with our emergency regulations, pending a reasonable attitude from the Portuguese side. The Portuguese administration in Lisbon should learn from our attitude that, while they kidnap and kill our innocent civilians, we do not, even when the opportunity offers itself, take similar barbaric measures against the captive aggressors. A sentence that was handed down by one of our courts against these invaders was, in fact, quashed by a higher court for technical reasons. Thus, the men are now under mere detention.

45. Under cover of darkness during the night of Wednesday, 25 June, a Portuguese launch was seen cruising on the Kwango River, heading for the village of Lyanibe in the Shangambo area of the Senanga district of the Barotse Province. Upon reaching the village, 8 armed Portuguese soldiers, in company with 15 others who masqueraded as civilians, attacked this village. They kidnapped Mr. Jeremiah Lushindu, and stole some of his property, including three sewing machines and some money. To date nothing has been heard about the whereabouts of Jeremiah Lushindu.

46. On the morning of Monday, 30 June, between 0900 and 1000 hours local time, two planes flew over the village of Lote from the direction of Mozambique. Their pilots surveyed the heavily populated area of Kabilima, Songwe, Chimpopi and Lote villages. Each of these villages has a population of over 200 persons and are quite far from the border, Lote village itself being well over three miles away from the border with Mozambique. When the planes were sufficiently low over Lote, 12 bombs were dropped on the village, two women were killed; Muonengi Phiri and Mutilire Phiri were their names. Their bodies were very badly mutilated by bomb fragments. Mutilire's head was severed from the rest of her body and thrown 200 yards away. Mr. Banda was seriously injured. He now lies in St. James Hospital, Katete, with a broken leg. Several houses were destroyed and grain bins gutted. Much property was also destroyed. Muonengi is survived by her only child, aged seven. Mutilire was only twenty-two years old.

47. Immediately after this incident a contingent of the Zambian army was rushed to the area. It helped remove the fear of the inhabitants of the area, who, as a result of the

bombing, were inclined to abandon their homes and hide in the forests. On Wednesday, 2 July, and Thursday, 4 July, the Portuguese Air Force struck again at the same village, dropping 24 bombs in all. As the inhabitants took to the bush at each approach of the invaders, no casualties were reported; only property was damaged. Zambian forces opened fire in self-defence on both occasions.

48. The representative of Portugal may wish to hear the following words of Mr. Freitas, one of the Portuguese soldiers currently under detention in Zambia as quoted in the independent *Times of Zambia* on 4 July 1969, on the occasion of the quashing of the two-year sentence imposed upon him:

"I can't believe what is happening. I can't be free. This is wonderful to think that a Zambian judge can do this for us. Zambian justice is certainly impressive. Now I just want to finish my term in the army and go back to Lisbon. We have been well treated here. We have no complaints. We certainly hold nothing against Zambia."

Of course, as a man in detention, Freitas was not aware at that moment that his Government's armed forces were continuing their cowardly and shameful aggression against the village of Lote.

49. I have stated earlier that in spite of the seriousness of the situation my Government still believed that bilateral negotiations with the Portuguese were the best course of action. My Government therefore proceeded to raise this matter with the Portuguese authorities, which explains why no action was taken in the Security Council for almost two weeks after the incident occurred. Unfortunately, the Portuguese attitude has been one of arrogance and total lack of co-operation. When we raised the serious issue of their soldiers planting mines in our territory, they turned round and said the mines were not planted in our territory but in Mozambique. As members will see from the maps which I shall make available, there can be no question as to where the aggressor planted these deadly weapons. There can be no question but that Portuguese armed military forces have violated Zambia's territorial integrity.

50. The grave bombing of the village of Lote on three successive days, which I have referred to before, has been dismissed merely on the grounds that—and I quote the official Portuguese reply—"the bombed locality is in Portuguese territory". Apart from the implications of that dismissal, it is in itself a shocking admission. I should like, however, to point out that an examination of the area in question—and this the Portuguese side must admit—will clearly indicate that the Portuguese policy to remove forcibly all the inhabitants on the Mozambican side, at least seven miles away from the border, has left their side clear of any villages. Anyone found in the border area by the bloodthirsty Portuguese soldiers is shot on sight. It is incredible therefore that, while knowing that they have no villages in the border region on their side, they should shamelessly claim that the village they were bombing was Mozambican.

51. While in the past we had known the Portuguese to make hollow promises of peace and good-neighbourliness,

the occasion has not arisen for them to question on which side of the border the attacked villages were located. We would regard the matter as of very grave concern if by that reply the Portuguese were to suggest that Lote is on the Portuguese side of the border. But since this is not the only case of deliberate Portuguese aggression against Zambia, we can only interpret this attitude as being a prelude to open aggression and a departure from the policy of bilateral talks.

52. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter clearly states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

In the light of this shameful chain of acts of aggression, the Council may pause to consider whether Portugal, a Member of the United Nations, is observing that internationally accepted principle.

53. In various pronouncements and in several exchanges, my Government has reiterated its conviction concerning the policy of good-neighbourliness. Concerned over the deterioration of the situation in southern Africa, we have on occasion advised the Administration in Lisbon that it is foolish and ludicrous to blame their tragic failures in Angola and Mozambique on neighbours. We have told them that as long as the peoples of these colonies are not free they will continue to be encumbered with those problems. Why cannot Portugal learn from the excellent example of Brazil? It is that kind of relationship of co-operation in equality which is going to yield good results instead of murder, arson and oppression. But, of course, our counsel has fallen on deaf ears. While we have sought to advise our neighbours for the good of all, they have responded with cannon fire against us.

54. It is shameful that a country which led the world during the age of discovery, not so many centuries ago, should now be famous for providing rapists, callous murderers and robbers to Africa. One even wonders whether the teachings of the Catholic Church are making any impression on the Portuguese mind of today.

55. At this stage I should like to turn to our friends in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Will they sit back and let their allies sink so low? Indeed, will they continue to provide arms to Portugal so that it can use them to turn our innocent men, women and children into cannon fodder? When we come to this Council to tell Western countries that a real threat exists in southern Africa, instructions are rushed to our friends here not to support our call for collective effective preventive measures. Our arguments that their investments are protected better in a peaceful, democratic and independent southern Africa appear not to be heeded. When we ask them whether they at least care about the fate of their nationals in Africa north of the Zambezi, they bury their heads in the sand. Instead, our Western friends would rather believe the sordid propaganda that the Portuguese, the South Africans and the Rhodesians

are the champions of Christianity and Western civilization in southern Africa. What a shame. I wonder what they will say after hearing what their so-called champions are doing there. Will they continue to support militarily and economically a nation with as bad a record as the Portuguese? Do they derive any pleasure from all these murders, kidnappings, robberies and rapes? Is this what Western civilization stands for?

56. We in Zambia would like to build a colour-blind society where all men can have equal opportunity. We would like to devote our energies to peaceful economic development. We would like to live with our neighbours in peace and mutual co-operation. Unfortunately, the colonial policy of Portugal prevents us from reaching these goals. While we want to be faithful to the Charter of the United Nations, the Portuguese have not only trampled on it but, in doing so, they have made us victims of their inhuman colonial policies.

57. We would like to warn them, however, that in accordance with Chapter VII, Article 51, of the Charter, we reserve our inherent right of self-defence. If it is their intention to close the door to negotiations, if it is their intention to continue committing these acts of aggression, we shall not fail to make an appropriate response to their aggression. The fact that we have turned the other cheek so far should not be exploited any further. If what Portugal understands is barrel diplomacy, we shall have no choice, if attacked again, but to reply in the same language. We have a duty to defend our innocent peace-loving citizens, and our people are ready to defend their motherland. The supporters of Portugal in this mad policy will be well advised to prevail on it not to carry war into Zambia any more.

58. At this stage it may be necessary for me to indicate what we seek from the Council. We believe that any country worthy of membership in the United Nations should condemn, in the strongest terms, this continuous unprovoked and premeditated aggression committed by Portugal against our innocent, unarmed men, women and children. The Council should call on Portugal to stop all these cowardly murders, the destruction of property, shameful acts of rape, thievery, the planting of mines, and the violation of our territorial integrity. These acts must stop once and for all. As for what Portugal has already done, we shall demand that it hand back our nationals kidnapped by its barbaric soldiers in Angola and Mozambique. We demand that Portugal make amends for the destruction of our homes and property. We do not want our people to live in fear. The pain of this international pillory, although we do not cherish it, and the pain of having to recompense us for lost lives, should teach Portugal to live in peace with its neighbours. We are tired of people from other continents exporting their problems to us.

59. Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for bearing with me for so long.

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

61. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): Mr. President, I thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for

inviting me to participate in this debate on behalf of the Government of Portugal. I have listened with careful attention to the statement just made by the representative of Zambia. He began by saying that the hope had been expressed that the month of July would be devoted to bilateral rather than international diplomacy. If anything has been done to destroy that hope, the responsibility is obviously that of the Zambian Government. It is not Portugal which has called for a meeting of the Security Council. It is not Portugal which has abandoned the way of bilateral negotiations. As I shall have occasion to say later in this statement, the responsibility for coming to the Security Council, avoiding bilateral negotiations, is again that of the Zambian Government.

62. The Security Council has been convened at the request of the Government of the Republic of Zambia in order to discuss allegations of a specific nature made by that Government against Portugal. The request and the allegations are contained in document S/9331.

63. My delegation cannot help saying that this attitude of the Zambian Government is very strange indeed. It is very strange not only in view of the utter lack of substance in the allegations made against Portugal but also because the Zambian Government has thought fit to rush to the Security Council, bypassing the method of bilateral talks which have been adopted by agreement between the two Governments and which the Zambian Government itself has avowed to be very useful during all this time. What has made the Zambian Government leave those talks at loose ends this time and come rushing to the Security Council? My delegation cannot but wonder, as I am sure all of you, Mr. President and members of the Council, will also wonder. 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. According to press reports, a crisis has arisen between the executive and the judiciary in Zambia over the case under reference and serious riots have broken out in that country. I shall have more to say on this case subsequently. Meanwhile, I should like to emphasize that my delegation is at a loss to understand the strange conduct of the Zambian Government in calling upon the Council while bilateral talks were still going on.

64. In trying to justify its request for this meeting of the Security Council, the Zambian Government referred to its previous communications to the Council and to unspecified "recent Portuguese violations" of its territory. Concretely, the Zambian Government mentions a single incident alleged to have taken place on 30 June 1969 at Lote village in the Eastern Province of Zambia. Since this supposed incident has been talked about for the last two weeks, the Portuguese authorities have had sufficient time to check on it. I am in a position to inform the Council that the Zambian allegation is devoid of foundation. My delegation rejects it categorically.

65. In the statement he has just made, the representative of Zambia gave a long list of incidents alleged to have taken place since 1966. As I listened to him, I wondered whether he was trying to create an impression in the Council. To come now with a list of incidents which took place in 1966

is, to say the least, difficult to understand, but it is even more difficult when it is remembered that since then bilateral talks have taken place between the two Governments and as a result all the past incidents, whether they actually took place or not, have been considered as settled. Therefore, it was with no small amount of surprise that I listened to the list invoked here by the representative of Zambia.

66. In its letter to the Security Council the Zambian Government believes that it has found "proof of the bellicose intentions of the [Portuguese] Government" [S/9331]. What the Zambian Government has found is a mare's-nest created by its own unwarranted attitude towards Portugal. It is astounding that the Zambian Government should make such a sweeping allegation against Portugal, when all the facts point to the great lengths to which Portugal has gone in trying to maintain good relations with Zambia, in spite of the clearly unfriendly attitude which the Government of Lusaka has adopted towards Portugal. The Government of Lusaka is obviously trying to invert the truth in an effort to justify its own hostile intentions, seeking to camouflage its own lawless initiatives as self-defence. It is common knowledge that until 1966 there had been no incidents on the frontier between Zambia and the contiguous Portuguese territories. Since Northern Rhodesia became Zambia, Portugal has at all times tried to maintain friendly and co-operative relations with the new Republic.

67. As I said, until 1966 there had been no incidents. The Zambian attitude towards Portugal was correct and the Portuguese attitude towards Zambia was correct. Certainly there was no intention on the part of Portugal to provoke Zambia, just as there is today no intention on the part of the Portuguese Government to provoke Zambia, in spite of all that has happened since 1966.

68. Right now I wish to emphasize that at no time has Portugal shown any unfriendly, much less hostile, intentions towards Zambia. On the contrary, by words and acts Portugal has shown its sincere desire to live on good terms with Zambia. But the same cannot be said of the Zambian Government in relation to Portugal. It is significant that the representative of Zambia presented a list of incidents said to have taken place since 1966. What happened in 1966? It is not Portugal that changed its attitude towards Zambia. It is Zambia that changed its attitude towards Portugal, because in 1966 the Zambian Government decided to open its territory to hostile activities against Angola and Mozambique. The Zambian Government authorized the establishment of training and supply bases in its territory for armed attacks on the adjoining Portuguese territories. This is no secret and the Zambian Government has itself openly admitted it more than once. Indeed, in his peroration today, the representative of Zambia implicitly admitted Zambia's hostility towards Portugal.

69. It was therefore the Zambian Government that embarked, at a certain stage, on a policy of gratuitous hostility to Portugal. Its policy of permitting violence against Portugal gave rise to attacks carried out from Zambian territory against Portuguese territories. It is difficult to figure by what stretch of the imagination that can be

construed as self-defence on the part of Zambia. In fact, the offence comes from the Zambian side, and a situation has arisen in which the Portuguese frontier areas in Angola and Mozambique are constantly being violated by armed elements proceeding from Zambia. The Zambian Government cannot disclaim responsibility for this situation. It has the obligation not to permit its territory to be used as a springboard for hostile actions against foreign territories.

70. The representative of Zambia quoted Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. I wish he had quoted it to his own Government.

71. The Portuguese Government, faced with this situation, has, on the one hand, tried to reason with Zambia and, on the other hand, issued strict instructions to its own security forces to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Zambia. And the Portuguese Government sees to it that its instructions are obeyed by its security forces. But the Portuguese Government cannot, obviously, allow its security forces in the frontier area to be harassed and fired upon by hostile elements stationed across the border without those security forces reacting in self-defence.

72. The representative of Zambia has also quoted Article 51 of the Charter. If Article 51 is at all applicable, it is to this situation in which the Portuguese security forces, in their patrol duties along the frontier areas, are being harassed and fired upon by elements enjoying the protection of the Zambian Government.

73. If the Portuguese security forces did not react, it would amount to relinquishing control of a strip of Portuguese territory along the frontier which would thus come under the control of the attackers from the other territory. Portugal cannot allow such a situation to develop. In fact, no country can allow such a situation to develop along its frontiers. It is up to the Zambian Government to take measures to stop the firing across the border from its territory into Portuguese territory. This is the elementary duty of any Government. No amount of political quibbling can lessen the responsibility of a Government that fails in this duty as the Zambian Government is so failing. The Security Council could do worse than call upon the Zambian Government to fulfil its international obligation on this point. In fact, my delegation expects the Council to call upon the Government of Zambia to abide by the norms of international good conduct in this respect.

74. I repeat that the incidents are created by the hostile elements which the Government of Zambia authorizes to carry out unlawful violent activities against the Portuguese security forces engaged in their fully legitimate task of patrolling the frontier areas. Sometimes even the Zambian armed forces, including the Zambian air force, are involved. Now that the Zambian Government has come to the Security Council to accuse Portugal, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the frequent violations of Portuguese air space by the Zambian Air Force. The representative of Zambia has given a long list of details. I, too, have with me details regarding the violations of Portuguese territory by the Zambian Air Force. I am prepared to show this list to any member of the Council

who might wish to have a look at it, but I shall not waste the time of the Council by going into technical details. I do not wish to impress the Council in that way, but I too have with me a list of details of violations.

75. I wish also to draw the attention of the Council to another incident that took place recently, to which the representative of Zambia also alluded. Since armed raiders frequently cross from Zambia into the Portuguese territories, a certain area inside Portuguese territory was mined by our security forces. The representative of Zambia said that he has a map. Well, I too have a map which I am prepared to show to members of the Council. On 21 June, 27 armed men of the Zambian forces crossed into Portuguese territory and tried to remove the mines. When the Portuguese forces advanced with a view to arresting the intruders, they opened fire, which the Portuguese forces returned. The Zambian forces then fled back into their own territory. The incident was reported by the *Times of Zambia*. But it was denied by a Zambian Government spokesman, who naturally would have found it compromising to admit an incident in which the Zambian forces had obviously violated Portuguese territory. However, on the very next day after this denial, a Zambian Air Force plane violated Portuguese air space by flying low over the area for 15 minutes. Again, I shall not waste the time of the Council by giving the details of the description of the plane, and so on.

76. I could mention many more violations of Portuguese territory by Zambian forces. The Portuguese Government has tried to deal with all such frontier problems at the bilateral level and the Zambian Government, on its side, agreed to the adoption of that method for dealing with frontier problems. I repeat, the Zambian Government agreed to the adoption of bilateral talks for dealing with all frontier problems. In fact, we have documentary evidence to show that the Zambian Government not only agreed to that method but also found it to be very useful. This can only mean that the Zambian Government was satisfied with the honesty and reasonableness of the Portuguese Government and its desire to negotiate in good faith. Who or what has queered the pitch now? Certainly, nothing that the Portuguese Government has done or failed to do.

77. The Zambian representative mentioned vaguely an incident which is said to have taken place in the past few days. He did not give details; he has promised to do so. But one conclusion can already be drawn: that it was not that alleged incident which made the Zambian Government come to the Security Council, bypassing the talks that were being held on all the previous recent incidents, particularly the incident alleged to have taken place on 30 June 1969.

78. I must inform the Council that, as soon as the Zambian allegation concerning the incident said to have taken place on 30 June became known to the Portuguese Government, the Portuguese Government directed its Ambassador in London to contact the Zambian High Commissioner in that city, in accordance with the procedure adopted by the two Governments for bilateral talks, as I have already mentioned. The Portuguese Government gave its version of the incident, but the Zambian Government did not reply. It came to the Security Council, alleging

Portuguese bellicosity and making a number of other allegations which, to my Government, come as a surprise. My delegation asks whether this is a case of Portuguese bellicosity or of Zambian faithlessness.

79. The Zambian delegation says that Zambia broke off the talks because of Portuguese arrogance. I really fail to know what is meant by "Portuguese arrogance". Portugal approached the Zambian authorities, and the Zambian authorities did not even reply; they came to the Security Council. And yet they have the effrontery to allege Portuguese arrogance.

80. I must inform the Council that for over a year now the Portuguese and the Zambian Governments have maintained contacts and held bilateral talks, here in New York, in London, and in Zambia itself; high-level delegations of the two Governments have met on a number of occasions. The most recent of these meetings took place in Zambia about two months ago. A Luso-Zambian mixed commission exists to investigate, on the spot, all allegations made by either side.

81. As a result of the investigations made by the mixed Luso-Zambian commission, it was found that in the past many of the incidents alleged by the Zambian Government had been provoked from the Zambian side. When, in a case or two, it was found that the fault lay on the Portuguese side, the Portuguese Government immediately expressed regret and paid the amount of compensation demanded by Zambia. This has been acknowledged today by the representative of Zambia before the Security Council.

82. I ask: Is this an attitude of arrogance? Is this an attitude of bellicosity on the part of the Portuguese Government? Or is it proof that Portugal negotiates in good faith, in all honesty, prepared even to admit where its own fault lies, if there is any fault.

83. But there is more. As you all know, the Benguela Railway also serves the interests of the Republic of Zambia. Nevertheless, the Benguela Railway has been sabotaged by elements infiltrating from Zambia. There have been, between January and April of this year, no fewer than 110 acts of sabotage, some of them serious ones. Nevertheless, the Portuguese Government, knowing how vital that railway is for Zambian trade, has until now kept the line open for the transport of goods to and from Zambia, as it has kept open the line which Zambia uses for its access to the sea through Mozambique. Is this an attitude of bellicosity towards Zambia? After this, to attribute to Portugal bellicose intentions in relation to Zambia is to invert the truth and to display plain bad faith.

84. In these circumstances, the one who should be the accuser is Portugal, Portugal, which is the victim of the attacks which the Government of Zambia has authorized to take place from its territory. If the Lusaka Government finds that it cannot put a stop to such illicit activities against foreign territories initiated from Zambian territory, then the Lusaka Government has to assume full responsibility for the consequences.

85. Nevertheless, Portugal has patiently tried to come to an understanding with Zambia. Proof that Zambia does not

want that understanding, and indeed seems to fear the very goodwill shown by the Portuguese Government in spite of constant Zambian provocation, may be seen in the present attitude of the Zambian Government in bringing baseless charges against Portugal before the Security Council, bypassing the talks that were being held—I repeat: bypassing, not breaking them off—without saying a word to the Portuguese Government.

86. My delegation believes that it has made the Portuguese position quite clear. The specific charges brought by Zambia are utterly devoid of foundation. Portugal has at all times shown its willingness to smooth things out with Zambia in a spirit of friendship and co-operation. Portugal has given proof of this willingness not only by word but by action. And Portugal remains willing to continue with the bilateral talks, and formally proposes to the Zambian delegation that the Luso-Zambian mixed commission be asked to investigate also the allegation now brought before the Council. The Portuguese delegation to the Luso-Zambian talks has already suggested that the frontier line be clearly demarcated so that it can be easily recognized, even from planes. I repeat this—it is a very important point—because in some cases it appears that the Zambian authorities are not quite clear about the boundary line. It would help a good deal if the Luso-Zambian mixed commission were to proceed to a demarcation of the frontier line.

87. The Portuguese Government for its part has declared that it is willing to participate in the expenditure that may be incurred in this connexion. For reasons best known to it, this suggestion has not been followed by the Zambian Government. Are we to conclude that the Zambian Government wants to keep the frontier line undemarcated so as to be able to continue to allege Portuguese violations?

88. The Portuguese Government has shown its good faith and its sincere desire to avoid border incidents by making this constructive suggestion. It is a sad disillusionment for the Portuguese Government to find that the Zambian Government does not show equal good faith in dealing with Portugal. If proof were needed, we have it in the incident to which I have already alluded and to which I now wish to refer in detail. I refer to the incident of the two Portuguese military men who are being held in Zambia. The representative of Zambia mentioned this incident but gave a version which, I must say, does not fully correspond to the truth, because he has left out important details.

89. On 16 June 1969, at 1400 hours local time, a Portuguese military patrol comprising three elements and including a sublieutenant, went to Caripande, near the frontier between Angola and Zambia. The Portuguese military men were invited—and I emphasize the point that they were invited—to draw near the frontier by the Zambian authorities. The Portuguese military men were asked to leave their arms behind and approach for an exchange of views. The Portuguese sublieutenant and a lance-corporal accordingly gave their arms to a third companion and approached. At that stage a Zambian military vehicle appeared on the scene and arrested the Portuguese military men, taking them to Chavuma. Subsequent contacts which took place at the frontier between

the Portuguese and Zambian authorities indicated that the latter demanded the payment of a fine as a condition for the return of the Portuguese military men. The Portuguese authorities agreed to pay the fine—under protest, of course—in order to obtain the release of the prisoners. Nevertheless, the Portuguese military men continued to be held in Zambia. They were tried and sentenced by a lower court, but the High Court of Zambia, in a procedural review of the case, pronounced the two Portuguese military men innocent and ordered them to be released. The representative of Zambia said that the High Court had ordered the release for technical reasons. I understand from newspaper reports that the Zambian High Court has been accused of giving a political verdict. Be that as it may, the High Court of Zambia ordered the release of the two men; but then the Zambian Executive refused to carry out the verdict of its own High Court and criticized the judge who had given the verdict. The two Portuguese were ordered to be rearrested and are still being held in Zambia. According to press reports, the Chief Justice of Zambia, defending his colleague who had given the verdict, had this to say: "I myself cannot regard the actions of a man who divested himself of his arms and who steps within the borders of Zambia on the invitation of an immigration officer as constituting a threat to the security of the State." That is the opinion of the Chief Justice of Zambia, but the verdict of justice—of the High Court itself—obviously does not weigh with the Zambian Government. The latest reports are that the crisis between the Executive and the Judiciary in Zambia has triggered off riots, in the course of which, among other things, a foreign diplomat was manhandled. This is the state of affairs which probably explains why Zambia has thought it fit to come to the Security Council with a fictitious complaint against Portugal.

90. However, to revert to the case of the two Portuguese military persons, my delegation is sure that the case will be regarded as shocking by all those who have a sense of propriety and justice. To invite two foreigners and then to detain them amounts to perfidious conduct. To detain them even in the teeth of the clear findings of the country's own Judiciary amounts to a flagrant disregard of all values on which any ordered society rests. My delegation formally asks the Security Council to call upon the Government of Zambia to release forthwith and unconditionally the two Portuguese military men in question and place them back on the Portuguese frontier in Angola.

91. I have here with me certain correspondence exchanged between the authorities of the Governments of Portugal and Zambia at the highest level. A perusal of this correspondence would help clear many of the fundamental points relevant to this debate.

92. For our part we have given Zambia all assurances of our continued desire and our continued purpose of co-operation and good neighbourliness. Differences of political opinion do not justify the kind of conduct that Zambia permits itself in relation to Portugal; but Portugal likes to think that Zambia will still come to realize the advantages of mutual co-operation in furtherance of the well-being of the respective populations. This is the note on which my delegation wishes to conclude its reply to the unfounded Zambian allegations. The two parties can very well continue

their talks, which have proved their fruitfulness, to the satisfaction of both the Governments concerned. The Luso-Zambian mixed commission may still be an instrument of understanding and co-operation between Zambia and Portugal. This instrument should not be lightly set aside. Such a course would, besides, have the merit of being in conformity with Article 33 of the Charter.

93. For all those reasons my delegation expects the Security Council to reject the Zambian complaint.

94. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Before turning to the item on our agenda, I should like, on behalf of the Algerian delegation, to express to the delegation of the United States of America our congratulations on the flight of Apollo 11 to the moon. This scientific feat is, first and foremost, to the credit of man; it also shows that when man devotes all his energies to an enterprise worthy of his genius, he usually obtains the desired results.

95. Now, more than ever, is the time to raise the burning question of whether the progress we are witnessing in the material sphere is really being accompanied by progress in morality—particularly political morality—or whether in the latter field we have remained in prehistoric times.

96. More and more we see a new interpretation of international law tending to be based on force, as well as a systematic recourse to methods based on deliberate disdain for the law of nations and States in the settlement of international affairs. For example, a new category has been created in the law of war, a category which is by now becoming increasingly systematized, and is called the right of pursuit.

97. This accelerated deterioration of political morality, of which the situation in the Middle East provides a striking example, is also illustrated by the question before us today, the development of which the representative of Zambia has just described to us.

98. The unfortunate tendency of our Organization to place more emphasis on the main events of current political affairs, rather than on the struggle for liberation being waged for nearly ten years by the people of Angola and Mozambique in order to put an end to Portuguese colonial domination, makes us forget somewhat the daily nature of the bombings to which the neighbouring territory of Zambia is subjected by the colonial forces.

99. However, was it not our Organization which, in the framework of resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly, established a truth already well known in Africa—that is, that as long as a colonial situation continues, international peace and security will be in danger?

100. Is it not alarming that a State which formerly shone bright in the pages of world history, and which obviously retains some nostalgia for that splendour, does not hesitate for a single moment today to bomb innocent villages in order—so it claims, as have many others—to destroy resistance bases?

101. Is it not alarming that 60,000 Portuguese soldiers, aided by 44,000 auxiliary troops recruited locally, armed to the teeth thanks to their alliances with the Western world and NATO, are stubbornly persisting in fighting a people, or I might even say peoples, who are unarmed?

102. We know the logic of these situations, and how the colonial forces generally try to expand the zones of conflict. Unable to bring to its knees a people which intends to live, Portugal is now trying to expand the area and the nature of the conflict—to expand the area of the conflict by a “*fuite en avant*” policy which consists of bombing the alleged guerrilla bases in a neighbouring country, Zambia; and to enlarge the nature of that conflict, since only a few days ago Mr. Caetano launched the idea of a vast alliance uniting Brazil, Portugal and the latter’s overseas possessions for purposes you can well imagine.

103. It was to be expected that the representative of Portugal should try, as he has just done, to demonstrate that the bombings in question were confined to areas within the frontiers of Territories under Portuguese jurisdiction. We know what to think of such arguments, and we shall not get very far by saying that those responsible for these criminal surprise attacks are usually indifferent as to whether they are carried out on one or the other side of a frontier, since colonists of all sorts generally have as their common enemy only the populations of races different from their own.

104. If the Government of Portugal today feels authorized to persist in its misguided policy, it is obvious that it is being encouraged to do so by some of its friends in southern Africa, and that its battle is also theirs. In fact, geographically Zambia is at present the only independent country in this region, and also the only country which refuses to submit to the régime which advocates *apartheid*. It has now become a major obstacle in the rearguard action undertaken by the Salisbury-Pretoria-Lisbon alliance, and the hideous future which this trio has in store for southern Africa calls for the subjection of Zambia, if it were ever to be realized in practice.

105. It is now clear that any victory achieved by these enemies of freedom so far has been the result of the apathy of international public opinion, which has constituted a direct encouragement to continuation of such actions. The Organization of African Unity, which has endorsed the decisions of the United Nations, particularly General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), now expects our Organization to put an end to a passivity which is dangerous both to the future of Africa and to world peace.

106. Therefore, it is the duty of the Council to condemn vigorously both the repeated aggressions against an independent State—Zambia—and the entire colonialist policy being practised by Portugal. Furthermore, the Algerian delegation considers that it is time decisions were taken which would enable Zambia to defend the integrity of its territory and its political independence, which are the sole guarantees of its survival.

107. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Zambia in order that he may exercise his right of reply.

108. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): I apologize for taking the floor again. I do not know whether I should exercise my right of reply because, to judge from what the fascist representative of the Lisbon régime has had to say, he does not deserve even the mere courtesy of a reply. But I thought that I should make one or two points clear for the purpose of the record.

109. He wanted to know why we have bypassed what he called the *Zambian-Portuguese joint commission*. He makes this reference as though to imply that there is a permanent *Zambian-Portuguese commission* to deal with border incidents of this nature. I do not know how close he has been to this particular problem of border incidents, but for his information I wish to inform him that there is no permanent *Zambian-Portuguese joint commission* to look into border incidents. We have had committees meeting from time to time on an *ad hoc* basis.

110. Secondly, he wanted to know why we did not make use of that channel this time. The answer is that we did make use of that channel in the past; and no sooner had we signed an agreement than the Portuguese attacked another village. It is not possible for us to subject our innocent citizens to such barbarous and uncivilized attacks from the Portuguese.

111. I wish to read from one of the documents to which the fascist representative of Lisbon has referred. During one of the meetings which was held between the *Zambian and Portuguese delegations* for the purpose of settling an incident which had occurred, a joint declaration was made. It 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.”

112. If undertakings of that nature have occurred in the past, why are the Portuguese continuing to bomb our innocent civilians? The representative of Portugal has also complained about the activities of the *Angolan and Mozambican nationals* inside Mozambique or inside Angola. It is the duty of each and every Government to control the activities of its own citizens. The Government of Zambia cannot accept responsibility for the activities of the *Angolan people* in Angola and the activities of the *Mozambican people* in Mozambique, because that is the responsibility of the Lisbon régime.

113. He also made reference to what he calls a crisis which has arisen in Zambia as a result of the decision of the executive branch of government to demand an explanation from the High Court for having quashed the sentences of the two Portuguese soldiers who had violated *Zambian territory* and who had consequently been apprehended by the *Zambian authorities*. Unlike the case in Portugal, in Angola, or in Mozambique, there is freedom in Zambia. Our nationals have the right, enshrined in the Constitution, to demonstrate against anything they do not like, and I would be glad if the representative of the Lisbon régime could

state in this Council whether the peoples of Angola and Mozambique can do the same thing concerning the Lisbon régime, in their respective territories.

114. The arrogance that he has displayed before the Council this afternoon, which is obviously intended to mislead the Council, is characteristic of the contempt with which his country has treated the previous decisions of not only the Security Council but also the General Assembly. He is in a very unenviable position here. People would not envy me if I were in his position, because it is not an easy thing to defend such shameful acts. The representative of Portugal needs sympathy much more than anything else.

115. I shall take the opportunity at a later stage to reply in full to the baseless allegations which he has made against my Government.

116. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Portugal in order that he may exercise his right of reply.

117. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): The representative of Zambia has taken the initiative to refer to me in discourteous language. To insult a person who is on the other side of a debate is the final argument used by someone who does not have right on his side. The norms of social behaviour which I have learned do not permit me to descend to the same level. I shall, however, reply very briefly to the points which the Zambian representative made in his second intervention, if only to keep the record straight, lest there be confusion in the minds of the members of the Security Council.

118. The representative of Zambia said that there is no such thing as a permanent commission; a permanent Luso-Zambian mixed commission. In itself this point would be of little importance, but I must say that the Zambian Government itself signified to us its desire that the *ad hoc* committee—to use the terminology of the Zambian representative—should consist always of the same persons, so that the conclusions arrived at could be kept within a certain group of persons.

119. Secondly, the Zambian representative tried to give an explanation for why the talks were bypassed—again I use the word “bypassed” very deliberately—by the Zambian Government. He said that no sooner were the talks held than the Portuguese attacked another Zambian village. I have already made clear the responsibility for the occur-

rences along the frontier. The responsibility for all those occurrences rests squarely with the Zambian Government, which allows armed persons stationed in its territory to attack the Portuguese security forces on the Portuguese side. Nevertheless, I repeat that the Portuguese forces have strict instructions, which are being obeyed, not to cross into Zambian territory. And if even innocent Portuguese who are invited to Zambian territory can be treated in the way the two Portuguese military men have been treated, everyone here will understand how cautious the Portuguese security forces have to be about avoiding crossing into Zambian territory. But nothing takes away the right of the Portuguese security forces to defend themselves, from Portuguese territory.

120. The Zambian representative read out a passage from a document, a passage which referred to the payment of fair and reasonable compensation. He need not have taken the trouble to read out that passage; I referred to it myself in my statement, and I referred to it as proof of the good faith and honesty of the Portuguese Government in its dealings with the Zambian Government.

121. The Zambian representative also said that I had complained about the activities of people in Angola and in Mozambique. Certainly not. I complained about the activities of the armed men to whom Zambia gives asylum and protection to attack the Portuguese Territories of Angola and Mozambique. That is something very different from what the Zambian representative said.

122. The Zambian representative referred to the right of the Zambian people to demonstrate. My delegation is not concerned with this matter at all. If I mentioned it, it was simply to point out that the Zambian Government has not carried out a verdict of its own judiciary.

123. Finally, the Zambian representative offered his sympathy to me. I thank him very much, but I do not need it.

124. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no other speakers on my list, and if no other representative wishes to take the floor at the present stage of the discussion, I shall adjourn the meeting. As a result of consultations with the members of the Council, it has been agreed that the next meeting will take place on Tuesday, 22 July, at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5:30 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 нашем 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.
