



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda ( <i>continued</i> ) Seventh and eighth reports of the General Committee	1
Agenda item 107: Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	5

*President:* Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)\*

SEVENTH AND EIGHTH REPORTS OF THE  
GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/9200/ADD.6 AND 7)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): This afternoon we shall take up two reports of the General Committee on the adoption of the agenda and allocation of items.

2. We shall first consider the seventh report of the General Committee [A/9200/Add.6.]. In paragraph 2 of the report the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly that the reports submitted under agenda items 48, 49, 50 and 52 should be allocated to the Second Committee, except for those portions of the reports listed in subparagraphs 2 (a), (b), (c) and (d), relating to administrative and budgetary matters, which should be referred to the Fifth Committee. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the General Committee's recommendation.

*The recommendation was adopted.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Second Committee and the Fifth Committee will be informed of the decision just taken by the General Assembly.

4. I now invite members to turn their attention to the eighth report of the General Committee [A/9200/Add.7.]. In paragraph 2 of the report, the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force established pursuant to Security Council resolution 340 (1973):

report of the Secretary-General" should be included in the agenda and that it be allocated to the Fifth Committee.

5. Rule 23 of the rules of procedure states:

"Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of, and three against, the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

6. I have just been informed that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to introduce an amendment to the text recommended by the General Committee. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

7. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, the rule you have been kind enough to read out to us does not apply to what I am going to tell the Assembly for the simple reason that I am speaking neither in favour of nor against the decision of the General Committee. But I would be remiss in my duty were I not to warn the Assembly that it may be voting hastily on the inclusion of this item in the agenda without taking into account certain precedents which could create complications if we set them aside.

8. The financial document, if I may call it that, before us—namely, document A/9200/Add.7 of today's date—states that the General Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force established pursuant to the Security Council resolution 340 (1973): report of the Secretary-General".

9. We have no quarrel with the report of the Secretary-General. At the nineteenth session of the General Assembly no one highlighted Articles 24 and 49 of the Charter. The Article that created so much dissension was Article 19 of the Charter, which I shall now read out:

"A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may—"

10. I want my President and my Secretary-General to take note of what I am going to say. I hear noises behind my back. I am addressing both you, Mr. President, and the Secretary-General. You know what I have in mind.

11. I want to refresh the memory of the Secretary-General as well as that of my good friend the President of the

\* Resumed from the 2156th meeting.

Assembly, Ambassador Benites, about what happened at the nineteenth session of this same General Assembly. Our illustrious Secretary-General was then representative of Austria in this very hall, and, needless to say, Ambassador Benites has been with us for the last 12 years and is conversant with what happened during the nineteenth session.

12. The Assembly cannot adopt this item blindly. I am sure it will be adopted without any difficulty because the majority will vote for it, but I do not want it to do so blindly. We are not sheep here, following a shepherd. We have no shepherd. Each of us should be his own shepherd.

13. A permanent member of the Security Council has declared that it will not contribute to the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. It made it very clear that it will not pay. On the other hand, I have asked many representatives of Member States whether or not they are going to pay. Some of them have told me they may not pay a cent. In any event, most of us, including me, are still awaiting instructions on the statements we shall be making on this subject in the General Assembly. And, as I mentioned in the Security Council, it is the prerogative of the General Assembly, not the Security Council, to address itself to, and take decisions on, financial matters.

14. I have heard that Articles 24 and 49 of the Charter have been adduced privately and—I stand to be corrected on this—I believe also in the General Committee; it was touched upon there, if it was not dealt with at length. What does Article 24 say—on functions and powers, not on financing? It says:

“1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

“2. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII.

“3. The Security Council shall submit an annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.”

Article 49 states: “The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council”. At the nineteenth session, the word “mutual” bore many interpretations. “Mutual” could mean two parties on a bilateral basis. It could also mean the maximum number of States that can come to an agreement, and in regard to the financial implications it does not necessarily bind all the Members to contribute to meeting the cost of any operation—in this instance, the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. This Article was not bypassed during the nineteenth session. And in this instance, the measures related to the cost of the United Nations Emergency Force!

15. We were given a warning, a very clear-cut and unequivocal warning, by the representative of China in the

Security Council. In order to make sure that there could be no other interpretation of what he had said, and what he had done by not participating in the vote, I cleared with him what the intention of his Government was. I was given to understand that China would not contribute anything to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

16. Now, many of us may find ourselves in the same predicament—or in the same position, if it is not a predicament.

17. On the other hand, during the nineteenth session, because of the ambiguity of the word “mutual” in Article 49, the late Mr. Adlai Stevenson—may God rest his soul in peace—then representative of the United States in the United Nations, invoked Article 19, which I have already read out to the Assembly.

18. There was a crisis. Our colleague the late representative of Albania, Mr. Budo, did not intentionally precipitate a crisis, but he questioned the validity of certain contributions; and at that time he himself thought that there was a tacit understanding, to say the least—he called it “collusion”—between the United States and the Soviet Union.

19. Finally—and I am not going into the details of what happened then—I personally had to intervene in order to keep the United Nations together, and I found out that the President of that session of the General Assembly at that time, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, had concluded a private arrangement with the two major Powers, to which the smaller Powers were not a party. It was all sewn up. Mr. Budo—my memory is still vivid—was sitting in the third or fourth row of this hall. He raised his hand on a point of order during the afternoon meeting.<sup>1</sup> The President of the Assembly, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, seemed to ignore him. Then he stood up—and I can recall how he raised his hand—and said in French: “*Point d'ordre, Monsieur le Président*”. Mr. Quaison-Sackey had no option because of that tacit agreement made without us—when I say “without us”, I mean about 60 per cent of the Members, because the two major Powers had clients, you know. He said: “I adjourn the meeting”. And the meeting was adjourned unconstitutionally—bypassing a point of order by the representative of a Member State, who stood and raised his hand and shouted: “Point of order”—forgetting that the President is the servant of the Assembly. It is a great honour to be the servant of the Assembly. We have a saying in Arabic that the leader of a people is their servant. And he did not act faithfully to the honour of being President.

20. The next day the late representative of Albania had a prepared statement. He had consulted with me on the constitutionality, and I had said: “I am sorry”—because after all he was my President—“the President acted in an unconstitutional manner”.

21. I am going into some detail because it might have a bearing—if not immediately, then at some future date—on the matter that concerns us and I do not want it to be said, “Baroody did not warn us”.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1329th meeting.

22. The next day came. Mr. Budo asked for the floor, and as he began to read his prepared statement<sup>2</sup> he was again interrupted by the President. The President banged his gavel and said: "I have a statement to make". And that was again unconstitutional because Mr. Budo had put his name on the list of speakers, and unless there is an emergency and the President asks permission to speak of the representative whose turn it is to speak and gets such permission, he cannot prevent the representative of a State Member of the Assembly from speaking.

23. But what did the President do? He almost ruled the representative of Albania out of order. And worse than that, without making a ruling and without having a vote taken on the ruling, he cut off the microphone of the late Mr. Budo. And then I knew that there was some tacit agreement; I do not want to call it "collusion" or "conspiracy", because I try to speak objectively. But the late Mr. Budo was not easy to cope with. He continued to talk, but those who did not know French did not understand a word of his statement, and then there were catcalls from the Assembly: "Come down!"—you know I told you there are clients in the Assembly—as if it were a show on Broadway. Ironically, I was sitting in the same place where I am sitting today. I had to come and tell the President that he was wrong; I stood up for Mr. Budo. Mr. Budo was a Communist, and I was a monarchist, but I stood up for his rights. He said, "For heaven's sake, save the situation". When the President saw he was wrong, he wanted me to save the situation. I said, "All right, out of deference to you as our President, I will tell Mr. Budo, if you will accept, to speak after you—and this is a gracious favour that he will do for you". Mr. Budo did not know what I was saying to the President. I remember U Thant sitting where our illustrious Secretary-General is now, nodding his head. Mr. Budo was amenable to reason. I told him that the first speaker would be the President, out of deference to his position as President, but that he, Mr. Budo, would be given the floor afterwards. The President spoke, and then Mr. Budo began to speak and he was interrupted again by those who were planted in the aisles. A point of order was raised, and there was disorder. There were many points of order. Then I had to take the floor on a point of order, and I told them that there was disorder. Then they were making points of order against me, and I had to tell someone there in the aisles to shut up, and he shut up. Sometimes one has to use impolite terms to command attention.

24. Why all this explanation? Because we may come back to Article 19. If more than one or two—half a dozen or perhaps a dozen—representatives receive instructions from their Governments not to contribute a cent to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, there will be a problem—and I do not want our Secretary-General to be involved in that problem. The problem will come, not necessarily within six months, but later on. You, Sir, my good and illustrious friend, Mr. Benites, you may not be President then, because it may be six months from now, but out of consideration for the next President we should heed what we are voting on and make the position clear before anything unfortunate occurs. This is a secret I want to let you in on. Many of the representatives do not know it. Mr. Stevenson—who was sitting, I think, where our colleague

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1330th meeting.

from Mali is now sitting, or in the row behind—was in a quandary about what to do. He was an able gentleman, very articulate, and made a good case about Article 19 and then finally, after consultation with none other than our illustrious colleague and friend, Ambassador Pazhwak of Afghanistan, provided the formula, which may have been forgotten. After that formula had been scrutinized, it was thought the better part of justice not to spell it out. I am now spelling it out to you. What was the formula? It was to suspend the implementation of Article 19, and it has remained suspended up till now. The Soviet Union did not pay a cent for the Congo operation or for the United Nations emergency forces in the Middle East. France also refused to pay—not because it was insolvent, but because it thought that it should not pay, and it is its privilege to think what it wants. France was finally persuaded, not at that session but a few years later, to contribute \$3.25 million or \$3.5 million—I do not know what the amount was—but voluntarily, not for the purpose of covering the expenses of those United Nations operations in the Congo.

25. In other words, I want to put a direct question to the Secretary-General. I should like to ask him whether or not the countries which he consulted—and rightly so, because after all he has to find out how to prepare his report—adduced the fact that the implementation of Article 19 was still in suspension. We must tell our Governments—certainly I must do so, if my Government consults me. Sometimes it is the other way around. Some of our Governments consult their representatives. Others may be 6,000 or 7,000 miles away and issue instructions without knowing what those instructions are for. If I am consulted, I will say, "Don't pay a cent, like China". I do now know what instructions the Soviet delegation has received, to pay or not to pay. If it pays, will it be on account of the arrears for the Congo and the United Nations operations in the Middle East in 1956? If so, it is a selective contribution. Do we, the smaller countries, have the right to make selective contributions?

26. Do you see now why I took the floor? We want to avoid complications for anyone who sits in your chair, Mr. President, a year or two from now. Could it be that China or another country may in the future say, "I will pay selectively"? Please answer this question; Is the implementation of Article 19 still in suspension in the sense that a Member State will not be allowed to vote if it fails to contribute its share to some fund for United Nations operations in one part of the world or another? This is a technical point.

27. I promise you, Sir, that I will not touch on the political issue, because I should then be out of order. If you are silent out of consideration for me, my conscience will be touched, because then I will be going into the political issue. We have ample time and every opportunity to do that in other organs of the United Nations.

28. Before I get in touch with my Government about this, I must have an answer to the question whether Article 19 is still in suspension and/or whether contributions can be selective, and/or whether in Article 49 the word "mutual" is precise and has a definite interpretation. At the proper time I shall address myself amply to this question, after I have received an answer in the proper body, which is the Fifth Committee.

29. Then, what about the small States? When I say "small" I do not mean only those small in size but those whose economy cannot sustain contributions like this, year in, year out, in order to see whether or not the negotiations will bear fruit. Will the small nations be victimized if they do not contribute, and may they not be allowed to vote?

30. That was my last question, and I must thank you, Sir, for your indulgence in giving me sufficient time to bring to the attention of the Assembly the difficulties that are attendant upon adopting a financial resolution in this case without taking into account all the points I have made.

31. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express to Mr. Baroody, the representative of Saudi Arabia, my personal thanks for having given us such an important and graphic historical background to some of the events in which both he and I participated.

32. As I understand the procedural situation, it is as follows. Under rule 15 of the rules of procedure

"Additional items of an important and urgent character, proposed for inclusion in the agenda less than thirty days before the opening of a regular session . . . may be placed on the agenda if the General Assembly so decides by a majority of the members present and voting."

Upon the submission of a new item, the General Committee will, under rule 40 ". . . examine requests for the inclusion of additional items . . . and . . . make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly." The General Committee decided this morning to agree to the request for the inclusion of a new item and to recommend its inclusion to the General Assembly, as stated in document A/9200/Add.7.

33. At the present moment we are deciding, not on the substance of the matter, but on whether or not we should include in the agenda this matter, which was suggested to the General Committee by the Secretary-General and has now become a recommendation of the General Committee. This is no longer an item of the Secretary-General's but an item of the General Committee.

34. Since the representative of Saudi Arabia has not submitted any formal amendment but rather has pointed to inherent dangers, and I believe his remarks will prove most useful—if the General Assembly decides to accept the inclusion of the item—when the substance of the item is discussed. At this time we are merely discussing its inclusion in the agenda.

35. However, I shall call upon the representative of Albania, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

36. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to express warm thanks to the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroody, who was kind enough to recall my delegation's efforts, in particular those of the late Mr. Budo, at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

37. With regard to the eighth report of the General Committee [A/9200/Add.7] in which the Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item

entitled "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force established pursuant to Security Council resolution 340 (1973) . . .". My delegation would like to express its views very briefly.

38. The question before us is very important. We are well aware that it is the direct consequence of an armed aggression against two sovereign Member States of the United Nations. In the face of the serious situation created in the Middle East, instead of being asked to condemn the aggressor and defend the rights of the Arab peoples, the General Assembly is faced with a *fait accompli* by being asked to approve the inclusion in the agenda of this session of this item under whose terms all United Nations Member States would have to bear the expenses of maintaining the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

39. We know that on 6 October, following its other aggressions against the Arab peoples, Israel launched another large-scale armed aggression against Egypt and Syria. The new aggression of Israeli Zionism had been most carefully planned long in advance and was preceded by many systematic and serious provocations against Israel's Arab neighbours and against the Palestinian people. By this current aggression Israel has once again proved its immutable hostility towards the freedom-loving Arab peoples and has seriously defied all peace-loving Member States.

40. This attitude of the Israeli Zionists is no accident. It is the result of the political, military and financial support of the United States, which has transformed Israel into a base for aggression against the Arab peoples and is using it as an instrument for the defence of its imperialist and neo-colonialist interests in the Middle East.

41. All the representatives of Member States present in this Assembly know that the United Nations—especially the Security Council—when dealing with the present situation in the Middle East has not discharged the duties incumbent on it under the Charter. The United States and the Soviet Union have tried with all their might to force upon the Security Council their will, their plans and their decisions prepared in Moscow and Washington. They tried to conceal that conspiracy under the cloak of the Security Council. In so doing they have grossly violated the Charter and the rules of procedure of our Organization without showing any consideration for the other members of the Security Council, who were presented with a *fait accompli*. The work of the Security Council and the way in which it dealt with this problem and the scandalous situation created in the Council represent a black page in the annals of the United Nations. The full responsibility for this situation lies with the United States and the Soviet Union.

42. In the view of my delegation Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October and resolution 339 (1973) of 23 October were the result of collusion between the Soviet Union and the United States since these resolutions do not condemn the aggressor and they do not defend the legitimate interests of the Egyptian, Syrian and the Palestinian peoples in their struggle. They do not require the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. These resolutions do not show the procedures for their implementation and they do not open the way to a true

solution of the Middle East problem. The future will show that these resolutions are useless scraps of paper.

43. The Security Council decided to send a United Nations Emergency Force to the Middle East and now Member States who were never consulted are asked to meet the expenses of maintaining this force. We might well ask whether the role of the General Assembly and its 135 members should be reduced to that in the face of an aggression committed against Member States.

44. My delegation shares the legitimate concern of many representatives concerning the intolerable situation created within the United Nations when we are asked to assign only second-rate or third-rate problems to the General Assembly, when we are simply assigned the role of passive witnesses and asked to give our formal stamp of approval to decisions taken behind our backs by the two super-Powers, decisions directed against the national sovereignty of States, against the freedom and independence of peoples and against international peace and security.

45. My delegation rejects this practice. We are opposed to this situation. We are opposed to this attempt by the super-Powers to prevent the majority of Member States from considering these important issues.

46. The People's Republic of Albania has objected to the creation of United Nations forces. At past sessions of the General Assembly my delegation has on more than one occasion unequivocally stated our Government's position concerning the creation of such forces and the costs required to maintain them. We fully know the ignominious role played by United Nations forces that have so far been sent to various parts of the world. We have only to recall the aggression launched against the Korean people under the cloak of the United Nations and the continued occupation of South Korea by American troops under the United Nations flag for almost 25 years. United Nations forces are used to flout the rights of peoples and to serve the interests of the imperialist Powers. We know that United Nations forces and observers have been in the Middle East for many years. We know that these observers, instead of discharging their duties under the Charter, served as a cover for the Zionists when they were preparing their aggression of June 1967 against the Arab peoples.

47. In our view the United Nations forces which were sent and which are now being sent to the Middle East will be used to maintain a state of "no war, no peace" for a long period of time, to the prejudice of the sovereign rights of the Arab countries and the benefit of the Israeli aggressors and the imperialist aims of hegemony of the two super-Powers in that part of the world.

48. In view of the foregoing, my delegation considers as unjust the inclusion of this item on the agenda, and especially the sentence contained in paragraph 2 of the explanatory memorandum attached to document A/9198, according to which:

"The costs of the Force shall be considered as expenses of the Organization to be borne by the Members in accordance with Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter."

My delegation on many occasions, and particularly at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, has stated its clear opposition to such an erroneous interpretation of Article 17 of the Charter. Consequently my country will not share in any way in the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

49. The People's Republic of Albania bases its consistent position on the principle that the obligations of United Nations Member States can be based only on measures which serve the purposes and principles of the Charter and its fundamental provisions.

50. The most elementary principles of international law cannot allow the consequences of aggression to be imposed on those States which have condemned that aggression and have resolutely fought the aggressor.

51. My delegation feels that the consequences of this aggression should be borne by those who are directly responsible for the present situation in the Middle East. The item that is before the Assembly today for inclusion in the agenda is not merely a procedural or financial problem; it is in a sense a very important political act. The main purpose of the two super-Powers is to have the General Assembly adopt a decision according to which they will try to conceal and legalize their present and future activities in the Middle East under the United Nations flag in accordance with the policy of hegemony which they are pursuing in that region.

52. In expressing our position concerning the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, we should like to emphasize that our people and our Government are on the side of the Arab people and we will support without any reservation their just struggle against the Zionist aggressors and their protectors for the liberation of the occupied territories and the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people and the maintenance of their sovereignty and national independence.

53. For all these reasons my delegation will not participate in the vote on document A/9200/Add.7.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since there has been no objection raised, may I take it that the Secretary-General adopts the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 2 of document A/9200/Add.7 that the item be included in the agenda and allocated to the Fifth Committee. The views that have been expressed will be included in the records and the decision of the General Assembly will be communicated to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

*The recommendation was adopted.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 107

**Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic (*continued*)**

55. Mr. PATRÍCIO (Portugal): On 22 October, speaking before this Assembly [*2156th meeting*], I tried to develop

grounds militating against the placing of this item on the agenda. Unfortunately, the majority of Members, following a set pattern of action, voted for its inclusion. Today I shall seek to analyse any new points that may have been raised by its sponsors.

56. Even before the debate began on 26 October, a draft resolution was circulated in document A/L.702, dated 22 October 1973, setting forth the course of action which the Assembly is required to adopt. The debate thus appears to be a mere formality. The sequence of events in this respect is pertinent because it proves once again what my delegation has always maintained; it does not matter what views are expressed by the various Members here, or the course the debate may take. The final outcome of the deliberations has been long since determined and agreed upon. In other words, there is no objectivity and no attempt is made to discover the real facts. I venture to add that in all probability the draft resolution was not even written within the United Nations building. It was projected and set down way back in Addis-Ababa and endorsed in Algiers. The General Assembly is once again being asked to act as rubber stamp in order to validate the decision of the Organization of African Unity [OAU].

57. Issues and queries posed by the Portuguese delegation, in the course of its recent interventions, as also the invitations to visit Portuguese African provinces addressed by Portugal to the diverse organs of the United Nations, have not merited a response from that majority of Members which is responsible for the way the deliberations of the Assembly are carried on and decisions taken. This leads us to conclude that, first, there are no valid answers that can be provided to these queries and issues, and second, that if any were attempted, these would go to prove the emptiness of the claim that there is a new "Republic of Guinea-Bissau" as is alleged to have been proclaimed on 24 September 1973.

58. The advice to "ignore the Portuguese representative's intervention" given on several occasions by the chairman of the African group of States to his colleagues who might be tempted to respond to my delegation's questions must be seen from the same viewpoint.

59. Thus, from all that has been said and repeated in the course of the debate—of course, after discarding the customary verbiage of insults and vilification of which some speakers appear to have a monopoly—not much of substance is left to comment upon.

60. In the meantime, my delegation is thankful to the representative of Senegal. His contention [2157th meeting] that the requirements of classical international law for the accordance of recognition to new States do not apply to the so-called Republic of Guinea-Bissau, and that the case should be dealt with under the rules emanating from the United Nations Charter and from United Nations resolutions, helps to clarify the matter. We have thus an implied admission that these requirements of classical international law cannot be fulfilled in the case of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

61. That it is impossible to substantiate juridically that there exists in reality the so-called Republic of Guinea-

Bissau is shown by the scant, inadequate arguments invoked for the purpose by the representative of Ghana, in particular, in his statement at the 2157th meeting.

62. As justification for the recognition accorded to that ghost State, the argument is used here that France recognized the independence of the United States in 1778, and the United States recognized the independence of Panama in 1903, before the independence of each of those States had become a consummated fact. Historians may question the factual nature of these instances of recognition, and whether they were or were not premature. What cannot be disputed is that these would have been cases of illicit acts of recognition, had they taken place before the respective countries had consolidated their independence. On this point, my delegation will limit itself to cite only one view, coming from an author of undisputed authority, namely H. Lauterpacht. In his work *Recognition in International Law*, after enumerating the two above-mentioned cases, as well as others, whose character is disputed, the author states unequivocally:

"All these incidents have occupied writers from the point of view of premature recognition. It is generally agreed that premature recognition is more than an unfriendly act; it is an act of intervention and an international delinquency."<sup>3</sup>

63. We have also heard here cited, as justifying the recognition accorded to the so-called State of Guinea-Bissau, the recognition granted by the United States in 1918 to the Czechoslovak National Council. But the recognition of the Czechoslovak National Council—and likewise, of the Polish National Council—by several Allied Powers in 1918, constitutes a classical example to be found in the textbooks of international law of recognition, for limited purposes, of entities that are far from being States. Precisely because at the time the prerequisites for the Czech and the Polish States had not been completed, recourse was made to grant this limited recognition to the said Councils as entities that had not yet reached the threshold of Statehood. In this respect, it may be useful to compare what is said by Lauterpacht in the work already cited, in note No. 1 to page 164, and in note No. 3 to page 334. The same is the view expressed by Louis Cavaré, another well-known authority, in his treatise *Le droit international positif*.<sup>4</sup>

64. Lastly, mention is made of the recognition of the Barbary States by Great Britain in 1801. Barring some obscure association of ideas between the Barbary States and PAIGC,<sup>5</sup> there is no basis for comparison between the conditions of the existence of these States and the *de facto* situation prevailing in Portuguese Guinea. Thus the example quoted in this case cannot serve as a precedent.

65. In any event, in all the cases that have been cited by way of precedents, a political organization existed having at its disposal a defined territory and a population, circumstances that do not appear in the case of PAIGC. Therefore, there is no basis for any parallel between this movement and the States mentioned in those cases.

<sup>3</sup> H. Lauterpacht, *Recognition in International Law* (Cambridge, University Press, 1947), p.8.

<sup>4</sup> L. Cavaré, *Le droit international positif* (Paris, Pedone, 1967), vol. 1, p. 365.

<sup>5</sup> Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.

66. As regards the jurisprudence originating in the United Nations, it is well not to forget that the Charter is a multilateral treaty among sovereign and equal States. In fact, the principle of the sovereign equality of Member States is expressly laid down as being basic to the Charter by Article 2, paragraph 1. Member States are bound by the provisions of the Charter only to the extent of its expressed terms, for these set out the limits within which they surrendered a portion of their sovereignty when signing that treaty.

67. As for the resolutions of the General Assembly, it is accepted doctrine that these are recommendations not binding upon any Member State that has not accepted them by an affirmative vote at the time of their adoption. Security Council resolutions, however, stand on another footing. Article 25 states that:

“The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.”

I underline the words: “in accordance with the present Charter”.

68. In 1966 and 1967 the Portuguese Government addressed to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General of this Organization several letters requesting clarifications regarding a number of very pertinent points of a procedural nature, designed to assist in determining whether given decisions of the Security Council were in accordance with the Charter and fulfilled a precise requirement. Much to our regret, we would like to place on record that none of these points was clarified, and no legal opinion was obtained from the International Court of Justice or from the Legal Counsel, even though this was also suggested.

69. In any case neither the resolution of the General Assembly nor those of the Security Council can be invoked to justify the recognition of a non-existent State.

70. To sum up, we have before us the following: on one side, the side of fact and reality, we have the ghost Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which is admitted to have neither a capital nor any edifice to function from, nor any territory or population to control, and thus is unable to meet the requirements laid down in classical international law for international recognition; on the other hand, we have the side of theory and fiction, flowing chiefly from past resolutions approved by majority vote in the General Assembly, many of them asserting as fact what was merely fiction. Therefore there is an embarrassing situation for some who, in order to get out of their predicament, have hastily recognized this ghost Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which exists only on paper and in the realm of wishful thinking.

71. Let us examine the facts a little more closely. If we are to believe the statements of the sponsors of this item, the reports from news agencies, and the issue of *Jeune Afrique* dated 6 October 1973, which published photographs of the so-called proclamation of independence, this proclamation took place in the open air, and under some trees in an African forest, which may or may not have been in the Boé region. If it indeed did take place, then this becomes strange and curious in the face of the oft-repeated claims made on behalf of PAIGC, and heard over several years, that the

movement controls two thirds or three fourths of the Portuguese province of Guinea. The movement is also said to have set up in the area under its control many magnificent schools, hospitals and other political, administrative, social and cultural institutions.

72. Why, then, had PAIGC to proclaim the independence of Guinea-Bissau under the trees, in a forest? Could its leaders not make use of any one of the many splendid buildings that house these institutions?

73. Then again, why was this alleged proclamation of independence, an event purported to be of great historical significance, performed secretly and without the presence of witnesses? It would have been natural to invite representatives of Governments that have contributed so generously to PAIGC to attend. In this regard, attention may be called to the fact that several organs of the international press mentioned that Senegalese journalists were not authorized by their Government to witness the act because they did not receive adequate guarantees for their security.

74. Lastly, how can one account for the fact that news of such an extraordinary event was only given to the world two days after its supposed occurrence, on 24 September? In this context, it is interesting to note that *Jeune Afrique*, in its issue dated 6 October, writes:

“Some days before the proclamation in Boé, there were rumours in Dakar, that this very important act had been postponed because of the break of diplomatic relations between Senegal and Guinea, because the means of telephone communication between those two countries, which are the means used by PAIGC had been interrupted. We know now that this news was disseminated for reasons of security, in order to avoid a Portuguese attack.”<sup>6</sup>

And *Jeune Afrique* concludes:

“That is why the news was given out 48 hours later, so as to allow all those who had met in Boé time to leave before the Portuguese aircraft could attack those freedom fighters in their effrontery.”<sup>6</sup>

75. But then, if reasons of security prompted this delay of two days, as revealed by the *Jeune Afrique* article, how can it be said that the area where the proclamation was made is a liberated area of Portuguese Guinea, controlled by PAIGC?

76. Addressing the Portuguese nation on 26 October, Prime Minister Marcello Caetano said:

“PAIGC was counting on the great emotion which their declaration of ‘independence’ would provoke. But there was no emotion across the world. The comedy had been in preparation for a long time; the only thing was that it was not expected to be staged on the date on which its première took place. Straight away African, Asian and Communist States fell upon one another in their eagerness to recognize the phantom State. But the nations within which respect for common sense and for international law prevails reduced the farce to its proper dimensions. Among the Portuguese people, in particu-

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

lar, the event did not provoke anything beyond a few smiles. Thousands of people have passed through Portuguese Guinea. They know that the province is wedged between two Territories, at one time French: in the north, the Republic of Senegal and in the south, the former French Guinea—today the Republic of Guinea—known as Guinea/Conakry, to distinguish from out Guinea. It is in Guinea/Conakry that the anti-Portuguese terrorist movement has its political and military headquarters.

“This movement, better known by its initials—PAIGC—claims that it controls two thirds or even three fourths of the territory of Portuguese Guinea; but despite so vast a domain said to be in its possession and upon which it now seeks to found the independence of this State of wishful dreams which it has proclaimed, it has no specific town for its capital; and when, some months ago, Amílcar Cabral its leader, was assassinated by his own party members, it was in Conakry, in foreign territory, that he met his death, there that his funeral rites took place, there that a burial place was chosen for him . . .”

And the Prime Minister concluded:

“And now the terrorists claim that they convened in the depths of the forest their so-called National Assembly in order to approve a constitution and to form a government. But if indeed they came to the Portuguese part of Boé, they returned post-haste to Conakry, for it was from that foreign city that, once more, they dispatched their communications to the United Nations and to the States friendly to them. The proclamation of this independence without territory, without capital, without effective control of any population, without anything that could characterize a State, is not a mere manoeuvre of propaganda. What the terrorists and their friends seek is a juridical pretext, in order that they may openly have diplomatic and military support, as if they were a country at war. And by means of one of those pirouettes executed in our present day world by madmen who, in order to achieve their ends, twist all truths and distort all realities, intoxicating the opinion of the simple-minded with myths and falsehoods, it is now being said in the United Nations that the new republic of Guinea-Bissau—without Bissau and without Guinea—is the legitimate sovereign of all that territory, and that the Portuguese populations, together with the troops that defend them, are in illegal occupation of the places where they are in this manner giving stature to the ghost State that lays claims to them.

“In other words, as if by a stroke of magic we have passed from being victims of aggression to being the aggressors, from the situation of being defenders of a Territory that has for centuries been Portuguese to that of being aggressors against this government which exists only in the imagination of its members and of some of their friends and supporters.”

77. We may now ask, What sort of liberated areas are these which are said to be controlled by PAIGC in Portuguese Guinea but which cannot provide even a burial place for its leader after his death, or an edifice for the proclamation of the independence of the new Republic? And why are

all the communications addressed to the government of this phantom State sent in care of Conakry?

78. The truth is that no part of Portuguese Guinea is liberated or under the control of PAIGC. Its terrorist bands do indeed infiltrate from across the frontiers in order to commit acts of violence and murder, and during those moments of terror they may be said to exercise such control over the populations of the victimized villages; this is comparable to the control exercised by the hijackers of planes over the crew and passengers before they are overpowered, or by robbers assaulting a bank or some other institution before the agents of law and order arrive to re-establish authority.

79. However, a majority of the membership of this Assembly, it seems, is disposed, despite all the evidence to the contrary, to believe that such liberated areas as claimed by PAIGC exist, that its control in those areas is effective and sufficient to justify the proclamation of a Republic to which many of them have eagerly extended recognition in defiance of the norms of classical international law.

80. The fact is that PAIGC, having failed dismally in the political as well as in the military fields inside Portuguese Guinea, is nevertheless encouraged by its apparent victories in the United Nations, where an automatic majority commands the votes necessary to enable it to create legality for its purposes, its fictions. Thus, taking advantage of the climate of hostility created by the repeated allegations against Portugal, PAIGC has taken yet one more step designed to shore up the declining morale of its elements, which are faced with the firm determination of the populations of Portuguese Guinea, engaged in ever increasing numbers in the task of building their self-chosen futures and defending their homes, their lives and their property against the ferocity and the depredations of foreign-based terrorists.

81. With this so-called declaration of independence of Guinea-Bissau, PAIGC aims at keeping alive the flame of an anti-Portuguese crusade, inspired by well-known foreign interests and, for the benefit of its mentors and patrons, taking advantage of the climax of anti-Portuguese sentiment thereby generated. It will nevertheless be inescapable to objective students of this situation that PAIGC is really incapable of achieving its objective.

82. In conclusion, there is no new Republic of Guinea-Bissau except in the wishful imagination of the authors of that phenomenon, namely, the leaders of PAIGC and their mentors, the social imperialists and their disciples and friends among the so-called non-aligned State.

83. We now come to the so-called People's National Assembly, which is said to have made the proclamation of independence, and to its composition. It is curious that during the Oslo Conference<sup>7</sup> early this year there was circulated a communication in this respect, dated 8 January 1973, said to have been drawn up by Amílcar Cabral before his death. That publication stated that elections to

<sup>7</sup> International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo from 9 to 14 April 1973.

the Assembly had taken place between the end of August and 14 October 1972. It gave the numbers of ballots distributed and of the votes cast. On the other hand, referring to the same event the publication entitled *Guerrilheiro*, which purports to be a bulletin of the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola and Guiné, inserted in its issue number 14 for February-March 1973 an article by Basil Davidson under the caption "The People of Guiné Decide". Mr. Davidson, who is said to have visited Portuguese Guinea for the purpose of witnessing the election process, states that that election took place in April to June 1972 and not from August to October as stated in the publication circulated in Oslo. What is more curious, he says that the number of voters registered in the PAIGC-controlled part of Portuguese Guinea was smaller than that presented in the Oslo document. It is also to be noted that the statements of Mr. Davidson regarding the manner in which the elections are said to have been held and the number of the regional advisers and their representatives elected to the People's National Assembly differ widely from the information and figures provided in the document of Mr. Cabral. The question is thus posed, Who was telling the truth?

84. How do all these unsupported and dubious claims made by PAIGC and its friends stand beside the realities of Portuguese Guinea? And herein will be found the true reasons for not wishing to face those realities through acceptance of the repeated invitations of the Portuguese Government to send a representative to visit that Portuguese province. There, contrary to all that is stated on behalf of PAIGC, Portugal effectively maintains a whole complex of services extending practically from one end of the Territory to the other. These are the posts of civil administration, the schools and other educational establishments, the posts of health and sanitary services scattered across the countryside, where assistance is readily administered to all, as is so well known to the residents of the frontier villages both in Senegal and in the Republic of Guinea, for they also have easy recourse to these facilities in times of need. They include the network of roads and other communications, constantly being expanded, and the multifarious commercial establishments and industrial enterprises, both those that existed before and the new ones constantly appearing in various regions.

85. Thus Mr. Jacques Barmgartner, writing after a visit to Portuguese Guinea in the *Berner Tagblatt* of 17 January 1973, said:

"While in Western Europe appeals are addressed to people to give financial assistance for the installation of hospitals expensively built by the liberators of PAIGC, the visitor to the territory can certify how all along the frontiers with Senegal and with Guinea (Conakry) the natives of these countries hasten to the health posts of the Portuguese in order to secure treatment for themselves."

86. In Portuguese Guinea there were 207 primary schools in 1961, 379 in 1969 and 414 in 1972. The number of teachers increased from 228 to 628 between 1961 and 1973. The number of students grew in the same period from 13,539 to 36,126 and the index of enrolment rose from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. This last figure can be compared with those of other African countries: the Republic of Guinea, 25 per cent; Niger, 11 per cent; the United Republic

of Tanzania, 29 per cent; and Nigeria, 32 per cent. Similarly, the level of secondary education increased notably during that same period. The portion of the budget of the Province of Guinea that was allocated to education in 1971 amounted to \$868,000, in addition to the \$147,000 that was provided for by the second development plan, which yielded a sum of more than \$1 million. The remaining figures, besides, are augmented during the year in order to fulfil growing needs. To this effect, the Norwegian journalist Miss Inggerd Galtung, who also toured Portuguese Guinea extensively early this year, wrote the following in *Morgenbladet* of Oslo on 1 March 1973:

"I am particularly interested in schools and hospitals, but in this article I shall only concentrate on schools. We are passing one village after another. Everywhere the school children are busily occupied, in good school buildings, and in the classes they are sitting at their small desks. All the teachers are Africans."

87. In other words, as opposed to the imaginary organizations claimed by PAIGC, Portugal is able to show the world openly and without camouflage an array of well-organized services, with qualified personnel manning them and installed in their own edifices, where activities are carried out for the benefit of all the elements of the population in the province and even of some of the citizens from the neighbouring countries.

88. In March this year, elections to the Legislative Assembly, enlarged by the recent constitutional amendments, were held throughout the province of Portuguese Guinea. These elections were also held with absolute normalcy in the various regions which PAIGC claims to have liberated from Portugal's sovereignty, and 89.5 per cent of the registered voters exercised the vote. Unlike the so-called PAIGC elections, they took place publicly, without the need for secrecy. The results showed that all the seats in the Legislative Assembly were won by Portuguese Africans of indigenous Guinean ancestry, who will now enthusiastically shoulder greater responsibilities in an ever-growing climate of autonomy. The dominant traits of Portuguese policy are the granting of progressive self-rule to the province and the increasing participation by Portuguese Africans in public administration and in the conduct of affairs with wide access to the structures of economic and social development. Thus, the control of the province's political, social and economic life is in the hands of the population of the Territory.

89. In like fashion, popular assemblies have been established in the province under the designation of "Congresses of the People", for the purpose of discussing their pressing needs and suggesting solutions. The last such Congress of the People of Portuguese Guinea was held from 18 to 24 April 1973, in Bissau. In that Assembly, which can be called truly representative, delegates sat from all regions, including the regions claimed to be within the so-called areas liberated by PAIGC.

90. Furthermore, the Portuguese presence is not, as is claimed by PAIGC and its friends, reduced to half a dozen urban centres, but extends even to the confines of neighbouring countries. In the same way, the presence of the

armed forces extends to the entirety of the province, not only through the existing garrison posts and barracks, but also through the regular patrols that visit all points of Portuguese Guinea.

91. In this context it is worth stressing that more than 60 per cent of the armed forces in Portuguese Guinea are composed of Africans, not to mention the fact that numerous villages scattered all over the province have organized their own militias, armed by the Government, for self-defence against the murderous raids of the violent bands dispatched against them from Conakry.

92. The world is thus witnessing a strange spectacle. An overwhelming majority of Portuguese Guineans, natives of the Territory, desirous of building their country's future prosperity and advancing along the path of true and authentic self-determination and actively helping to defend their lives and property, are accused of the illegal occupation of what is their homeland by a few outsiders who are in fact non-Guineans, who have their headquarters outside the country, and who operate under directives issued by an international group that has long made a special vocation of subversion, aggression and usurpation of the territories of others. Could there be anything more preposterous, more absurd, may I ask?

93. It is an incontestable fact that the populations of Portuguese Guinea bear the major share and effort in the war against the terrorism generated by PAIGC. Many of the traditional chiefs have also an increasing measure of responsibility entrusted to them in matters of defending their country.

94. On the other hand, the fact that PAIGC has a foreign orientation, is financed from abroad and receives foreign support in all respects, is openly conceded. Every month, the armed forces and the militants of Portuguese Guinea capture or destroy dozens upon dozens of weapons of the most varied calibres and makes, captured from the raiding bands sent by PAIGC. For example, during an operation of African commandos in May this year, large quantities of such weapons and munitions were destroyed, including even 122 mm. rocket launchers. However, despite all this, PAIGC has never found itself in want of fresh weapons and munitions, for these are rapidly and constantly being unloaded and piled up at Conakry after coming from Moscow, Prague, Havana and other sympathetic capitals.

95. This lavish provisioning in weapons is not, however, the only aspect of the military and other assistance which PAIGC has received from its friends and supporters. No less significant is the training that the militants of that movement receive in huge numbers in the capitals of eastern Europe, in Havana, Algiers, and other centres of subversion, where they are indoctrinated and taught how to manipulate the most sophisticated weapons and to master the techniques of guerrilla warfare. Indeed, all campaign plans and other activities of PAIGC are dictated by the global strategy of our well-known adversaries. They are laid out and dispatched from the same capitals from which the weapons, the munitions and the training emanate. Even recently, in February this year, the armed forces of Portuguese Guinea surprised a rubber boat in the Cacheu river

full of Cuban guerrillas who were accompanying elements of PAIGC. Is it any surprise that Portugal is obliged to provide the hospitality of its detention camps to other such emissaries coming from Havana, including the internationally known Captain Rodríguez Peralta?

96. Despite all the evidence to the contrary, despite undeniable facts and despite all logic and common sense, some representatives have repeated the vile calumny that Portugal was responsible for the assassination of Amílcar Cabral earlier this year in Conakry. My delegation has denied this vehemently in the past, the last time being on 11 October 1973 [2150th meeting]. On that occasion, we disclosed, and we repeat here today, how Mr. Laurent Gabriel Cissé, a member of the Police and Intelligence Services of the Republic of Guinea, now granted political asylum in Portuguese Guinea, gave the press after his arrival the details of the plan put into execution in Conakry on January 1973 for the assassination of Cabral, because he would not agree to the integration of a liberated Portuguese Guinea into a federated State with Guinea/Conakry. The orders for Cabral's execution came from Sekou Touré himself. Certain subsequent events lend greater credibility to these details. These are the election of Cabral's brother and friends to succeed him, for they evidently had no choice but to bow to Sekou Touré's desire for integration. This is evidenced by the fact that representatives of PAIGC have been sitting in this hall during these debates as members of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea. Nothing could therefore be clearer.

97. We are living in an age in which traditional institutions, accepted rules of law and order and morality, and in fact, all that the world has come to consider the basis and foundation of society are being challenged and destroyed, both on the domestic and on the international level. In effect, this is the order of the day. We are in an age in which violence, subversion, terrorism and undeclared war are defended as just and legitimate against the claims of innocent victims; the lawbreaker and the treacherous assailant, rather than his helpless victims, find more ardent supporters and defenders in a great number of peoples and States and find tacit submissiveness on the part of those whose lack of moral courage strikes them dumb when they should be defending their true convictions. All these are, in the eyes of our present day Solons, the harbingers of the dawn of happiness to a suffering mankind.

98. Those who vote for the proposal before this Assembly would do well to pause a while and ponder the matter and consider where the sponsors aim to take this Organization. In plain, unvarnished language, the United Nations, at the instigation of these representatives, is to place its seal of approval on intervention in what is in the last analysis an internal situation of a Member State. It would condone a guerrilla war that is imposed upon the peace-loving population of Portuguese Guinea by foreign-based and foreign-supported terrorists. In conclusion, the United Nations is asked to don the garb of patron of collective aggressions in defiance of the role for which it was created—namely, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". And those who act in this fashion, making use of the United Nations for political ends that have nothing in common with the Charter approved in San Francisco, are the ones

responsible for the crisis of confidence that exists throughout the world in relation to this Organization.

99. Portugal refuses to participate in this process of disintegration of international law and rejects forthwith and in all respects these attempts at the inversion of values regulating relations between countries that are conscious of the supremacy of right over the use of force.

*Mr. Ibingira (Uganda), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

100. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): As can be seen, Portugal persists in maintaining its pseudo-didactic commentaries to the effect that Guinea-Bissau is not a legitimate State. As you have heard, Portugal refuses to recognize reality, just as it remains deaf to the unhoped-for opportunity offered by this debate, which is its last hope for salvation and might help it awake from its dream. It is not by resorting to insults and vociferations and slander that the fascist colonialist Government of Lisbon can turn back the course of history. As everyone knows, history condemns all kinds of colonialism, old and new. The sweetest dreams often end in a very rude awakening, since, in the words of Romain Rolland, "to believe that what one desires is true is no doubt very agreeable, but it is tantamount to taking opium; it is not altogether living".

101. As for us, we are ready to leave Portugal to its illusions. Our duty today is to do something quite different, because I come to this rostrum not to justify our position but to hail the birth of a new African State. I come to this rostrum on behalf of my delegation to humbly express all my admiration for the sons and daughters of Guinea-Bissau who have said no to colonialism and who have taken the destinies of their people in their own hands. The sovereign State of Guinea-Bissau has been born. To remove any doubt about this, we have to discuss this item in full, and therefore, true to our anti-colonialist, anti-neo-colonialist anti-imperialist policies, my delegation has not hesitated to join with several other peace- and freedom-loving countries in order to sponsor the item entitled, "Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic".

102. It is my delegation's duty to thank all those who by their votes supported this proposal so that this debate can be held. We shall not be misled by the pseudo-judicial arguments, so dear to Portugal, which only reflect the confusion which that country claims to dispel. This need to be believed reflects the disarray of the forces of aggression of the Portuguese colonialists who, lacking real power, show a violent nostalgia for past grandeur. This violence will soon be shattered, for in truth the African peoples, with the support of their friends throughout the world, who are very numerous, will never again, after four centuries of slavery which have cost our continent more than 100 million men, after a particularly savage colonization, allow a country, however powerful, to continue to humiliate and exploit our peoples. A brief examination of this question will reveal the efforts of the patriots of Guinea-Bissau under the leadership of PAIGC, efforts which have now culminated in independence.

103. In January 1963, when several African countries achieved independence, PAIGC, in the face of the obstinate refusal of Portugal to grant independence and sovereignty to Guinea-Bissau, and realizing no conciliation was possible with the Portuguese colonialists, took up arms and began the struggle for national liberation. It was the beginning of an inexorable process which, despite the barbarity of the Portuguese occupation forces, which did not hesitate to use weapons condemned by our Organization—napalm and defoliants supplied to Portugal by its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]—would lead the people of Guinea-Bissau from victory to victory, to the liberation of the country. The violence of the fighting was such that the Portuguese Minister of War stated a year later in a secret report: "The south and central south are practically in the hands of the nationalists. We can no longer reach Bafata and the eastern area in the normal way. If the road to Farim is cut, all will be lost."

104. As early as 1966, just three years after the commencement of the struggle for liberation, PAIGC announced the liberation of more than half of the national territory from the Portuguese. The entire colonial occupation of Guinea-Bissau gradually dissolved. This merciless combat became more and more extreme and forced the Portuguese colonialists to fall back to the urban centres.

105. Beginning in 1970 two thirds of the national territory was in the hands of PAIGC, which then proceeded to set up in the liberated areas, on the ruins of colonialism, an administration devoted to the people, and carried out all governmental acts on behalf of the people. As for the Portuguese colonialists, they took refuge along the coast and in certain remote camps completely cut off from the population. This establishment by PAIGC of a new infrastructure meeting the essential needs of the masses in the fields of health, education, trade, etc.—with deference to the Portuguese delegation—was to lead Amílcar Cabral, in November 1972, to announce the advent of the popular powers with which this young African State was to be endowed.

106. On that occasion, it will be remembered, Amílcar Cabral the Secretary-General and founder of PAIGC, an intrepid fighter for freedom, made a statement which is still in our minds. Speaking about the Council of State, he said:

"The Council of State will not be a provisional government or a government in exile. No, it will be the central organ of a sovereign country, part of whose territory is under foreign occupation. So we ask our brother countries of Africa and all peace-loving and freedom-loving countries to recognize us. We ask to be admitted to the Organization of African Unity and to the United Nations; both these bodies have already recognized that we are the only true representatives of the people. Then the Portuguese presence in our country will be considered a permanent aggression against a sovereign country."

This is the message of Cabral.

107. We must bear in mind that, despite the unchallenged success of the liberation struggle, Amílcar Cabral never rejected a dialogue with Portugal. However, the Portuguese

Government remained obsessed by its own illusions and deaf to the voice of reason. It replied with the cowardly murder of this leader whom Africa mourns.

108. Thus history has revealed the nefarious plots of the Portuguese Government. However, the wind of national liberation is blowing over Africa and the proclamation of independence by the successors of Amílcar Cabral whose name will never be forgotten, is a normal and logical historical process. It is our duty to contribute to strengthening the independence of this young State regardless of the pressures of reactionary forces which are always ready to revive the flames of racism and colonialism.

109. Thus, we are today faced with two parties: on the one hand, Portugal which has propounded dangerous and erroneous theories, and on the other hand, the people of Guinea-Bissau which is awakening from the long darkness of colonialism. The meeting between these two peoples resulted in a collision the only result of which could be independence for the people of Guinea-Bissau. The abusive use by Portugal of inhuman means to maintain these people under its domination shows to what heights the colonialists have raised hatred among men.

110. Today, Portugal is beginning to pay the price of its irresponsible attitude. The people of Guinea-Bissau have been able to break the fetters of colonialism. The people of Guinea-Bissau wish to embark on a new life with the help of our Organization.

111. The great objective of the United Nations has from its very outset been to free man from all his chains, including those of rapacious colonialism and racism and to exalt and enrich the universal image of man. In reality, I wonder with some anguish whether universal man should continue to make possible the exclusive happiness of European man. We must bear in mind that colonization is a sin without remission. In the last analysis, the colonizer suffers much more than the colonized, who, because his cause is just, knows that victory will be his.

112. Many other speakers have gone into a legal analysis of the situation and have adduced irrefutable evidence, and all this has helped us to understand the purposes of the sponsors of the draft resolution before the General Assembly. I support the pertinent arguments they have presented.

113. In order to avoid lengthening this historic debate unnecessarily, I should like merely to stress one point which, in the view of my delegation, is of particular importance. As everyone knows, the legal structure of every international body is based on the international convention which created it—in other words, its charter. The Charter is, therefore, at the very basis of the legal system of the United Nations, a legal system which is developed both in the rules which the Organization is competent to lay down and in the practice which is gradually transformed into customary rules. In this particular case, the Charter of the United Nations, in setting forth the purposes of the Organization, includes the development of “friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples” (Article 1, para. 2, and Article 55). Furthermore, in the Declaration on the Grant-

ing of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the General Assembly declares that:

“All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence . . . .”

It also demands that: “Immediate steps shall be taken . . . to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations . . .”. This Declaration cannot be dissociated from international practice during the 28 years following the birth of the United Nations. This practice is in our eyes the essential element in the formation of the customary rule which unequivocally establishes an international right to independence of peoples. Moreover, this opinion corresponds to the definition of custom established by the Statute of the International Court of Justice, a practice generally accepted as being law.

114. This being so, how can we explain the crude denials of the Portuguese Government, which constantly defies the United Nations and such organs deserving of our respect as the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, whose contribution to the work of our Organization requires no commentary. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that Portugal has passed from being a colonizer to being today itself virtually a colonized country because it is under the influence of foreign capitalist monopolies.

115. The Ambassador of Guinea rightly referred [2158th meeting] to the Treaty of Methuen, which was signed in 1703 and according to which Portugal became a tool of another Power.

116. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that Portugal should have practised a parasitic form of slavery in its African colonies which, as we all know, is a perversion of the symbiotic form of slavery found in ancient societies. The master lives at the expense of his subjects and the colonized subject thus becomes a “chattel” to be exploited at will. When, in order to invoke the provisions of Article 2 of the Charter, Portugal clings to the fiction that the African countries which are, and will always remain, the independent State of Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique, are Portuguese provinces in Africa, this is the height of cynicism and presumption.

117. Without dwelling unduly on this point, I would point out that, although a Government may claim to be the effective Government, this does not mean that it is the legal Government in the eyes of international law if it does not respect the principle of the inalienable right of colonial countries and peoples to independence.

118. Mr. President, through you I should like to appeal to all those who still believe in the United Nations and who want to give substance to the United Nations. I appeal to them to help in eliminating the last vestiges of the colonialism exercised by Portugal over the African peoples. It is high time for the United Nations to remove all doubts by directing all its efforts to assisting the independent State of Guinea-Bissau and the peoples of Angola and Mozam-

bique. It is our moral and political duty to put an end to Portugal's aggression against Guinea-Bissau and to give this young African State the means of remaining secure within its frontiers. My own country has welcomed with joy the proclamation of independence of the new State of Guinea-Bissau, and Comrade Marien Ngouabi, the Chairman of the Central Committee of our National Party has reaffirmed the determination of the people of the Congo to maintain relations of fraternal co-operation with the newly independent country of Guinea-Bissau.

119. In conclusion, I should like to make an appeal to the friends of Portugal. To them I should like to say: "It is time to stop believing in the sweet voice which whispers in our ear that we shall never die and that tomorrow will be like today".

120. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic welcomed with gratification the emergence of the new African State declared by its People's National Assembly, that was constituted on the basis that power derives from the people and should serve the people. In its greetings sent to the leadership of PAIGC, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia welcomed and noted with satisfaction this significant event in the history of PAIGC and of the national liberation movement, which has been accomplished after a long and hard struggle against Portuguese colonialism. In connexion with the recognition of the new State, the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Svoboda, sent a telegram to the President of the Council of State of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which says *inter alia*:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, proceeding from its policy of consistent implementation of the principles of equality and self-determination of the peoples, declares that it recognizes the Republic of Guinea-Bissau as an independent and sovereign State and expresses its willingness to establish with the latter diplomatic relations on an embassy level."

121. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] expresses the deep conviction, proved by historic reality, that the process of national liberation is irresistible and irreversible and that, in order to avoid serious crises, an end must be put to all manifestations of colonialism and all the practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith. The United Nations has repeatedly called on the Government of Portugal, particularly in the course of the past 12 years, to arrive at proper conclusions from the logic of the national liberation movement in the so-called Portuguese Territories in Africa. The United Nations has affirmed the illegality of the Portuguese presence in those Territories. One of the recent steps taken in that respect was the adoption of Security Council resolution 322 (1972) in which the Security Council reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, and Mozambique to self-determination and independence, as recognized by the General Assembly in resolution 1514 (XV) and the legitimacy of the struggle by those peoples to achieve this right. At the same time, the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly adopted resolution 2918 (XXVII) recognizing PAIGC as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Guinea-Bissau.

122. However, in defiance of United Nations resolutions and the generally recognized rules of international law, Portugal continues to deprive these peoples of their right to decide their fate in accordance with their own freely expressed will and desire. Moreover, today, when the people of Guinea-Bissau, thanks to its heroic struggle supported by the progressive forces of the world, has implemented its determined will and desire, Portugal rejects the right of the people of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde Islands to an independent existence and free development. In its efforts to reverse these developments, Portugal maintains by colonial force some portions of the national territory of Guinea-Bissau and it has been committing new acts of aggression against this young and independent Republic.

123. The military and other support provided Lisbon by some of Portugal's allies in NATO enables Portugal and its allies in the colonial and racist alliance—South Africa and Southern Rhodesia—to continue their joint efforts to apply colonial pressure against the African peoples. This policy directly threatens neighbouring independent States in Africa and thus constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The responsibility for this development rests also with those States that do not respect the appeals of the world community and that intentionally support Portuguese colonialism in the interest of their own political, strategic and economic objectives.

124. The Republic of Guinea-Bissau is an independent and sovereign State recognized by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations. As such, it has the full right, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and with the generally valid rules of international law, to request assistance from the international community in order to expel the forces of aggression of Portuguese colonialism from that part of the territory of Guinea-Bissau that they still occupy.

125. Allow me to refer in this connexion to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*]. This document, adopted by the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations, affirms that, by virtue of the principle of equal rights, self-determination and independence, all peoples have the right to determine freely, without external interference, their political status as well as to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, and that every State has the duty to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

126. The Declaration states, further, that

"Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples referred to in the elaboration of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence.

"...

"In their actions against, and resistance to, such forcible action in pursuit of the exercise of their right to self-determination, such peoples are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter."

127. The Portuguese colonialists long ago ceased to be the real masters of Guinea-Bissau. Portugal now maintains its strongholds only in military fortresses in some portions of the Territory. The presence of Portuguese forces on the territory of the independent Republic of Guinea-Bissau is in sharp contradiction to the will of its people and, as such, constitutes a gross violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter. It is left to the United Nations to compel Portugal to respect the right and the will of the people of Guinea-Bissau to independent and free development.

128. In this connexion the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully supports the proposal that the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, should in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Charter, devote its proper attention to the critical situation resulting from the illegal presence of Portugal in Guinea-Bissau and to the urgent need for taking, as a matter of priority, all effective steps to restore the territorial integrity of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau [A/L.702].

129. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was one of the sponsors of the request for the inclusion of this important item on the agenda of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly [A/9196 and Add.2]. The Czechoslovak delegation has actively supported this request in the General Committee and in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and has become also one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/L.702.

130. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always lent its support to the people of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands in its struggle for the implementation of the right to self-determination and independence. Proceeding from the policy of principle of the socialist States, Czechoslovakia will continue to provide the people of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau in future with political and diplomatic, as well as material and moral, support in the struggle for the complete liberation of the country from the Portuguese colonialists, and for the advancement of a sovereign, democratic, anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist State.

131. Mrs. BROOKS-RANDOLPH (Liberia): It has been my pleasant duty to sit and watch President Benites conduct the deliberations of this Assembly with efficiency, tact and dignity. As this is characteristic of his good self, it comes as no surprise to me. Allow me, Sir, even at this late hour in our deliberations, to extend to him my own personal congratulations on his election as President of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. His personal qualifications are well known, as can be seen from the contributions he has made during his term as Permanent Representative of Equador to the United Nations. I extend to him best wishes for a fruitful session, expressing the hope that when his term as President comes to an end he will find himself still enjoying nature's greatest gift, the gift of good health.

132. Although more than 100 million people have become independent since the founding of the United Nations and have taken their place among the sovereign nations of the world, there still remains a hard core of resistance to the recognition of the rights of 30 million Africans in southern Africa, as well as those in Guinea-Bissau in West Africa.

133. The telegram read to the Assembly by the representative of Guinea, Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé, on Monday, 28 October [2158th meeting], regarding the continuing atrocities being perpetrated by Portugal against Guinea-Bissau and its people, in spite of the fact that Guinea-Bissau proclaimed its sovereignty on 24 September 1973 and that that independence has been recognized by a large number of States of the family of nations, must be viewed by the Assembly with grave concern. According to reports, even those who in the Portuguese National Assembly tried to bring about a change by advocating an end to the 12-year-old fighting in the African Territories had to withdraw their candidacy from the election process because of the harassment and the limitations imposed on their freedom, particularly in the debate on what is termed "overseas fighting".

134. As against Portugal's denial regarding the achievements of PAIGC or the heroic people of Guinea-Bissau in liberating two thirds of their territory, it took the United Nations Special Mission of April 1972 to bring into focus Portugal's defeat in the area and turn the spotlight on the atrocities committed by Portugal in Guinea-Bissau.

135. If I may quote from Mr. Löfgren, the Swedish member of that United Nations Mission, giving an eye witness account, he stated:

"... it is my unhappy duty to tell you about the Mission's shocking experience of Portuguese repression. Using United Nations terminology we speak of the administering Power, but all that that Power administers in the Liberated Areas is terror and terror alone, especially bombing from the air, helicopter-borne detachments burning and destroying, bombardments from their isolated fortresses in the Liberated Areas and mine-laying."<sup>8</sup>

136. For Portugal, which stoops at nothing in its repression of the Africans in the Territories it continues to occupy, even to the extent of burying Africans up to the shoulders alive and taking their heads from their bodies by bulldozers or, sometimes, poisoning vegetation and crops in areas where they fight the Africans, this comes as no surprise.

137. Regardless of these atrocities, however, Portugal was unable to suppress the human spirit of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau. That was recognized by Mr. Löfgren when he mentioned also that he was moved by the indomitable and noble ambition of the people of Guinea-Bissau—describing it as "a combination of boundless energy and humanism" in the contemporary world, deserving "general recognition and support"<sup>9</sup>—heroic in their military struggle while at the same time determined to build a new and just society.

138. In the absence of any opportunity to negotiate the steps to self-determination and independence, all the Territories under Portuguese domination have taken up arms against Portugal, for it is true that, when a people is constantly denied its basic and legitimate rights and is bereft of

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/8723/Rev.1)*, chap. X, annex I, appendix II, section B.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

all hopes of change by an imperious and inflexible ruling class, reasonable men who desire nothing but peace and progress are apt to seize the frightful alternatives offered by constant frustration and loss of hope, and in such circumstances they are attracted to the painful alternatives of force and conflict.

139. Portugal flouts with impunity the provisions of the Charter regarding the Territories which it controls; it flouts the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council; it wages war by modern means against the people of the Territories it occupies—yet it is allowed to sit piously in this Assembly and support its actions by words, while my brothers who fight to liberate themselves from their oppression are frequently referred to as rebels. Who is the rebel? Is it he who seeks to free himself from hideous oppression, or he who oppresses?

140. To Portugal let me say that it is also true that where there is resistance to change and efforts to turn back the clock the result will be disaster. That disaster in the end will befall Portugal, not the Africans whom it hideously oppresses today.

141. While the great nationalist leader Amílcar Cabral fell victim to colonialist manoeuvres and his body lies silent today in the tomb, the cause for which he died was noble and just. We must therefore hail PAIGC for the heroic deed of proclaiming its independence, which came as no surprise to the African States and all people of goodwill. It was a surprise, however, to Portugal, the Rip Van Winkle of our day and time, for while the concept of empire and grandeur has faded from our world Portugal continues to toddle along completely blind to the new realities of today. This is, of course, understandable for Portugal continues to live in the seventeenth century. The statement delivered this afternoon by the representative of Portugal bears out what I am now saying. At this stage in which the peoples of the world are universally voicing their aspirations for dignity, freedom and greater social justice, the last remnants of colonialism, no matter where they exist, are bound to be of concern to the international community because they create friction, unrest and eventually result in a clash of arms.

142. It was hoped that the pressure of international public opinion would have persuaded Portugal to attune its thinking to the events that are part of our world today. Unfortunately, Portugal has not only preferred to remain in the fading ranks but has become the repository of the wrongs and shames of all that colonialism entails.

143. The inclusion in the agenda of the item, "Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic", at the request of 58 States Members of the United Nations, including my own [*A/9196 and Add.2*], is, to say the least, symptomatic of the vast extent of solicitude which the present situation in Guinea-Bissau has raised in a very large sector of the international community. The inclusion of this item reflects the unanimous expression of alarm and anxiety about the situation in Guinea-Bissau that is felt not only by the peoples of Africa but equally by the peoples of other parts of the world. The United Nations cannot sit by silently nor can its Members be idle witnesses to the atrocities that

Portugal continues to inflict upon a people which has the same right as others to the blessings of life, foremost among which is the right to liberty and independence.

144. This situation is a threat to the hard-won independence of the new State of Guinea-Bissau, which must be left alone so that it can consolidate its efforts to build a new nation—considering the circumstances under which it emerged as a sovereign nation.

145. The situation as it exists represents a threat to the States on the African continent as a whole. Indeed, it is a threat to international peace and security.

146. It is time, it is past high time, that the United Nations translated its high principles into living realities and assumed its proper role in taking those measures that will assure to the people of Guinea-Bissau freedom from this menace which unwarrantedly harrasses it and threatens it as a sovereign people. My delegation believes that the Security Council should act with haste to bring relief to the Government and distressed people of Guinea-Bissau. To Portugal, the people of Africa vigorously assert that the Cape Verde Islands—and for that matter, Mozambique and Angola—located as they are on the continent of Africa, can no more be a part of Portugal than can Portugal be a part of Africa.

147. The declaration of independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is an irreversible fact of life and Portugal has no other choice but to reconcile itself to it; otherwise Portugal will find itself imitating the proverbial ostrich with its head buried in the sand.

148. As Africans we do not accept that any individual or group has any right to govern any other group of sane adults without their consent, and we continue to affirm that only the people of a society acting together as equals can determine what is for them a good society and a good social, economic or political organization. I am sure Portugal understands where this is taken from. If not, it is from the Lusaka Manifesto.<sup>10</sup>

149. Like Portugal, Guinea-Bissau is now a sovereign nation. Like Portugal, it is an under-developed nation. If Guinea-Bissau is more under-developed, Portugal can best explain that its policy of sapping its African Territories has made it so. Whether or not Portugal likes it, Guinea-Bissau is a sovereign State and this fact is irreversible. God bless the people of Guinea-Bissau and save that State.

150. I would now recommend that the draft resolution in document A/L.702 should be supported by the overwhelming majority of this Assembly.

151. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Liberia, a former President of this Assembly for her statement and I will convey her tribute to the President.

152. Mr. ADJIBADE (Dahomey) (*interpretation from French*): When at its fifteenth session this Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV) it recognized the right to self-

<sup>10</sup> Manifesto on Southern Africa. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

determination and independence of the peoples under colonial domination. Likewise, Members of the Assembly committed themselves to doing everything possible to attain this objective. Resolution 1514 (XV), which was adopted by the majority of the Assembly, offered new opportunities to countries under foreign occupation by giving them hope for liberation, provided that reason and common sense triumphed over the rule of force and that the rule of law prevailed.

153. Most of the colonies of that time which had placed their hopes in that important and historic resolution were not disappointed because reason did indeed quickly prevail and certain colonial Powers—and not the smallest amongst them—taking note of this trend preferred to anticipate events and to grant their ex-colonies internal autonomy and independence. Today the nature of relations between these colonial Powers and their former colonies proves quite clearly that they were right in so doing, and it shows that they have thus contributed to strengthening peace.

154. But what is the situation with regard to Portugal, this under-developed State, this “insignificant and wretched country” to quote the words of my Foreign Minister, Major Michel Alladaye, in a statement delivered on 8 October 1973 before this Assembly [2144th meeting, para. 86]. Rather than going along with this trend, that poor country preferred to disregard the various resolutions of our Organization, and in spite of general reprobation, its Government persists in maintaining a medieval situation, persists in believing that the Tagus River rises in some distant part of Africa, and that the indigenous people whose territories it occupies by force in order to plunder them must continue to live in a situation of domination based on a social and political philosophy that is deceitfully referred to as being that of a multiracial society.

155. Everyone in this room knows—and I can never repeat this enough—that this poor little country owes its existence as a State to the resources that it extracts from the Territories under its domination and to the unreserved support given to it by its NATO allies. Everyone is aware that without NATO support this country would never have the courage to defy the international community and to wage vigorously several colonial wars whose disastrous influence hardly needs to be proven. We all know that in the face of the recurrent failures of its army at the hands of the valiant freedom fighters of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, the fascist, reactionary régime of Caetano has had to resort to massacring innocent people and to perpetrating acts of terrorism and barbarity against the peaceful population of these colonies.

156. The various statements of trustworthy persons and the relevant documents of our Organization provide a wealth of information on this point. In any case, the international community has noted for years that the Lisbon régime has been losing ground in the face of the stubborn opposition and unshakeable determination of the liberation movements to win their international sovereignty and independence using all available means.

157. Consequently, our delegation categorically rejects the lying declarations which the Portuguese Foreign Minis-

ter has not had the humility and common sense to spare our Assembly. My delegation will not attach any importance whatsoever to the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Portugal, which is as absurd as the dreamland in which his country wishes to live.

158. Suffice it to say that in recommending to the General Assembly the discussion of an item on the illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the General Committee is merely noting an actual fact, namely, the irrevocability of resolution 1514 (XV) that must be implemented whether or not the colonial Power wishes it.

159. The population of Guinea-Bissau freely and democratically elected its own Assembly and decided to proclaim its independence. The Republic of Guinea-Bissau has been born. This is a fact and it represents a revolution.

160. In accepting the recommendations of the General Committee the General Assembly is merely confirming its own logic, a logic that has guided its position in the face of the many resolutions on the Territories under Portuguese domination.

161. As I mentioned a moment ago, the victory of PAIGC in the field was beyond all doubt. Despite that favourable situation, the late Secretary-General of PAIGC, Amílcar Cabral who was so cowardly murdered, did not wish to boast about this or to promise a total victory for his people. Quite the contrary: that great statesman, acting as a responsible and courageous leader, made a statement before the Fourth Committee last year<sup>11</sup> in which he offered to the reactionary Fascist Government of Caetano, an honourable peace.

162. Indeed, did he not state that his party and its people were ready to begin negotiations with Lisbon in order to obtain independence for the people of Guinea-Bissau, and that they were ready to give consideration, together with the authorities of Lisbon, to the interests of Portugal in Guinea-Bissau? What better offer could be made by him, a man who was on the threshold of victory? Instead of replying to that appeal motivated by the voice of reason, the Portuguese Government preferred to persist in its refusal to negotiate with the so-called “rebels” and the inevitable happened.

163. The date of 24 September marked a new page in the heroic history of colonial Africa. PAIGC had no other possibility. Its freely elected Assembly proclaimed the independence of Guinea-Bissau and its entry into the international scene as a full-fledged sovereign State.

164. My country, like many other African countries, hailed this proclamation with enthusiasm and recognized the existence of the new State. In the face of the new situation, Dahomey had no other choice since, as was stated by its leader, Colonel Mathieu Kerekou, in the policy speech he made on behalf of the Revolutionary Military Government on 30 November 1972: “The fundamental characteristic and the primary cause of the backwardness of our countries lies in foreign domination”. The total elimina-

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the Secretary-General, Twenty-seventh Session, Fourth Committee, 1986th meeting.*

tion of this domination is therefore a prerequisite to the promotion of our peoples.

165. For this reason my Government supports the sister Republic of Guinea-Bissau without any reservation whatsoever. It is significant that within our Organization more than 70 Member States, that is more than half of the membership, have recognized Guinea-Bissau as an independent sovereign State. There is no doubt that this example will be widely followed.

166. Other countries particularly those countries that support Portugal in its futile endeavours, invoke legalistic arguments and try to ignore the birth of a new State. Their attitude certainly is not surprising. In fact it would surprise only those who are not familiar with the deceit that has always characterized their position with regard to this question. How else can one understand that those same countries that hastened to grant independence to the Territories under their domination were reluctant to apply pressure to Portugal in order to bring it to reason.

167. Can it be that there are Africans capable of being emancipated and other Africans who must owe their salvation only to being kept under the colonial yoke? As far as my delegation is concerned we cannot share that viewpoint and we do not subscribe to this dichotomy. For this reason we state categorically that a refusal to recognize the existence of this new and young State would be tantamount to challenging Africa as a whole.

168. In any event, the reality in Guinea-Bissau is that there is a people which has wrested its territory from the control of the colonialist and imperialist invader, a people which has organized a political power that is exercised under the enlightened leadership of PAIGC. That reality is a living, unshakeable, ineffaceable, stubborn reality.

169. Our Organization cannot quibble, for in proclaiming its independence Guinea-Bissau is merely implementing that right which the General Assembly, the most competent organ of our Organization, has recognized to it. Furthermore, in stating that the new State will accept the obligations laid down by the Charter, the leaders of Guinea-Bissau have fulfilled one of the fundamental obligations imposed on a State by Article 4 of our Charter.

170. You will agree that the presence of Portuguese troops in certain sectors of the territory of Guinea-Bissau represents a flagrant violation of the relevant provisions of our Charter and that consequently our Organization has the duty to consider radical measures to put an end to this illegal situation and to halt the acts of aggression committed by Portuguese troops against the population of Guinea-Bissau, which seeks only peace—peace, I say—in order to devote itself to the primary tasks of its own development.

171. In order to enable this Assembly to assume its responsibilities, some 60 delegations, including my own, have submitted draft resolution A/L. 702 dated 22 October 1973. This draft resolution, both in its preamble and in its operative part, merely recalls those principles which have generally been accepted by our Organization and the provisions of our Charter, for the purpose of applying them to

the situation which has prevailed in Guinea-Bissau since 24 September 1973. Thus, no delegation need hesitate to vote for this draft resolution except perhaps those among us who refuse to recognize or accept reality.

172. I should like to address an urgent appeal to those among us who are still hesitating. I should like to ask them to recognize the facts and to give their support to a draft resolution now sponsored by more than 60 countries, a draft resolution which we hope to see adopted by an overwhelming majority. For indeed the time has come for our Organization no longer to tolerate a situation in which Portugal can continue to defy the international community with impunity. The General Assembly, by adopting this draft resolution, must recommend that the Security Council take urgent, effective measures to guarantee the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of this new State.

173. Finally, my delegation hopes that Portugal and its allies will learn the appropriate lessons from the situation in Guinea-Bissau and will promptly embark on the road to negotiations before it is too late.

*Mr. Benites (Ecuador) resumed the Chair.*

174. Mr. Kewal SINGH (India): One more nation of Africa has won its freedom from colonial rule after a long, arduous and heroic struggle. Only a year ago the late Mr. Amilcar Cabral spoke at the United Nations of the determination of his people to bring the liberation struggle to a speedy end. "There is no force," he said, "capable of preventing the complete liberation of my people and attainment of national independence by my country".

175. Those words are ringing in our ears today when Guinea-Bissau has emerged as a sovereign nation and has been recognized by nearly 70 countries from all parts of the world, including my own. The Foreign Minister of India, speaking in the general debate earlier this month [2136th meeting], welcomed the proclamation of the independent State of Guinea-Bissau.

176. With the liberation of Guinea-Bissau, the colonial occupation and repression of yesterday has now taken the form of even more ruthless military aggression and violence, and impermissible use of force against a sovereign, independent State. The Portuguese Government has refused to move with the times and is still clinging desperately to outmoded and decadent colonialism.

177. Two decades back, Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister of India, speaking of Portuguese possessions in India, said:

"Moved by the fear characteristic of those whose strength is based on force [the Portuguese] have sought to amass their military strength on their possessions in India to terrorize the people. They are well aware that they constitute no terror for us."

178. As we see today, what Mr. Nehru said applies equally to Portuguese colonies in Africa. Today the brave people of Africa are fighting for their freedom, and they cannot be terrorized by the military might of Portugal. The Portuguese have failed to learn the lessons of history and still

show no understanding of the fundamental changes that have taken place in the world situation.

179. Twenty years ago I was in Lisbon. I recall many occasions when, under the instructions of my Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, we offered to start negotiations with the Government of Portugal to bring about the peaceful withdrawal of their authority from India. Curiously enough, the reply I used to get from the leaders of Portugal was that the Portuguese enclaves in India were not colonies but a part of their metropolitan territory. Situated 6,000 miles away, with no Portuguese population in those territories excepting their military force and colonial administrators, they had the audacity to call those Indian territories Portuguese metropolitan areas. It was at this stage, when the Portuguese refused to negotiate, that Mr. Nehru said:

“When it comes to dealing with the Portuguese, it is impossible for the twentieth century to speak to the seventeenth century. The Portuguese are still living three centuries behind the times.”

I regret to say that is true even today. We were thus left with no option but to break our relations with Portugal, ultimately leading to the overthrow of the Portuguese domination of the enclaves in India.

180. We therefore share the joy of the people of Guinea-Bissau with a special feeling of warmth and understanding, having ourselves suffered at the hands of Portuguese imperialism. Our hearts go out to the newly-independent State of Guinea-Bissau and its valiant people at the suffering which they are still undergoing as a result of the widespread and indiscriminate destruction of life and property by the Portuguese in a last-ditch effort to resist the death-blow being given to their colonial occupation of Guinea-Bissau.

181. A number of speakers who have preceded me have given graphic descriptions of the horror still being perpetrated by the Portuguese. We have been told of resort by them to saturation bombing, as a result of which 40 villages are in complete ruins. Large planes and helicopters are engaged in wholesale destruction of human life. Even on the eve of their final expulsion, the Portuguese are bent upon committing genocide. We are confident that, despite the all-out war waged against the people of Guinea-Bissau by Portuguese armed forces, the new Government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which already controls two-thirds of the territory, will soon be able to achieve the objective of complete liberation from colonialism and, to quote article 3 of the Constitution of the new Republic, achieve “their unification into one State in accordance with the will of the people and the building of a society that shall create the political, economic and cultural conditions needed to eliminate the exploitation of man by man and all forms of subordination of the human being to degrading interests for the benefit of any individual, group or class” [see A/9196 and Add.2, annex II].

182. In this noble cause of defending, completing and consolidating their independence, the people of Guinea-Bissau have the support of the world community.

183. Even before the proclamation of Guinea-Bissau as an independent Republic we had proposed that the United

Nations should declare Portugal an aggressor in all its African Territories and should deal with it accordingly. Since 24 September, the day the new Republic of Guinea-Bissau was proclaimed, there can be no shadow of doubt that Portugal has no legal *locus standi* in Guinea-Bissau and its aggressive, barbaric acts are in our view clearly a threat under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

184. It is very sad to see that Portugal, in its arrogance and intransigence, refused to accept the proposal which the late Mr. Cabral made to Portugal in October last year during the debate in the Fourth Committee. He had then suggested a negotiated withdrawal by Portugal from Guinea-Bissau. The offer was spurned by Portugal in the same way as Portugal had spurned 20 years back the offer made by India to negotiate the peaceful liberation of Portuguese enclaves in India.

185. Mr. Cabral brought to bear on the liberation struggle a constructive and positive approach. His fight against colonialism was not through slogans but through hard struggle and sacrifices and through progress and the construction achieved in the liberated territory. He tried till the last minute to avoid bloodshed, but his life was sacrificed in his struggle. The reply of the Portuguese to the peaceful overtures of Cabral was intensified terror and oppression. This showed once more how Portugal, in its desire to retain colonial domination, has always missed the opportunities for peaceful negotiation.

186. Amílcar Cabral often said that he was only an anonymous soldier in the cause of the United Nations. That most befitting epitaph to his life-long service to the cause of freedom is, in his own words:

“When a fighter has succumbed in his country to police torture or has been murdered, imprisoned or burned alive or machine-gunned by the Portuguese troops, for what causes has he given his life? He has given his life for the liberation of his people from the colonial yoke and hence for the cause of the United Nations. In fighting and dying for the country’s liberation, he has given his life in a context of international legality for the ideals set forth in the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations.”

187. On this occasion, therefore, I once again pay a warm tribute to the memory of this great man who worked unceasingly for the cause of his country’s independence from colonial rule as well as for the cause of restoring human dignity and freedom. Were he alive today, he would be glad to see that his country is independent and has been recognized by more than half of the total membership of the United Nations.

188. India is privileged to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.702, dated 22 October 1973. We are confident that the result of the current debate on the illegal occupation and aggression by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of Guinea-Bissau will constitute a resounding vindication of the just struggle of the Government and the people of Guinea-Bissau to throw off the last vestiges of the colonial rule of the Portuguese.

189. Mr. ELEIH ELLE (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): The proclamation of indepen-

dence of Guinea-Bissau falls squarely into the irreversible course of history that only the retrograde and those nostalgically longing for a dead past still refuse to recognize.

190. Portugal and the minority of its false friends have not yet realized that the era of the iniquitous Treaty of Berlin is over, and I could not forgive myself were I from this high rostrum to burden their bad conscience—if they still have a conscience—with an account of all the forms of exploitation and dehumanization, one more revolting than the other, to which colonialism has subjected the Africans. Thank God that at the end of the Second World War in 1945 the United Nations was created and endowed with the Charter which brought renewed hope to the colonized peoples. Those peoples engaged in a struggle on all fronts to have their right to freedom and independence respected. Some victories were won here and there until the great changes of the 1960s.

191. Consistent with the principles of its Charter, the United Nations adopted, on 14 December 1960, its famous resolution 1514 (XV), which, taking note of the irreversibility of the liberation movement of the colonial countries and peoples, established their inalienable and imprescriptible right to self-determination and independence.

192. Not without sorrow, the major colonial Powers understood that the wheel of history had turned, but Portugal, whose social and economic under-development is equalled only by its intellectual and cultural under-development, could neither understand nor obviously accept that turning-point in history. It obstinately persists in remaining in Africa in what it calls the "Overseas Provinces". It imagines, through megalomania or, more accurately, through ignorance, that Portugal is a great multi-racial State extending from the Iberian Peninsula to the borders of the Indian Ocean. What a childish fiction!

193. It was high time for someone to bring Portugal back to reason by making it understand that the Mozambicans are Mozambican; the Angolans, Angolan; the Guineans, Guinean; and that none of them is any more Portuguese than the Portuguese are American or British. These are African peoples with their own identity, peoples who are determined to recover their international sovereignty and to safeguard their national identity at any price.

194. This is what the proud and courageous people of Guinea-Bissau has done. From this high rostrum I am happy to hail this new State which my country, the United Republic of Cameroon, recognized immediately. We would hope that others, all the others, up to and including Portugal, will quickly come down to earth and understand that Guinea-Bissau is well and truly established. That new State, that baby born after a painful Caesarean operation, is still fragile and tottering, but it is far from being a stillborn child. It needs our assistance to consolidate itself and to face up to the serious problems of reconstruction and development inherent in every new nation, particularly in one which, in order to assume the full responsibility of its fate, has lived through more than 10 years of hard and implacable fighting.

195. In its colonial wars Portugal practises a scorched-earth policy. It destroys in its path not only men, women

and children, but also homes, infrastructures and cultures. Thus, it was an almost completely ravaged country that became independent on 24 September last. All the Member States, the specialized agencies and other bodies in the United Nations system must therefore render it all the necessary assistance for its reconstruction and development. Rather than a political act, it would be more, we believe, a humanitarian imperative dictated by the solidarity of the human race. But it goes without saying that, while the authorities of the new State devote their efforts to this difficult task of reconstruction, they cannot divert any part of their time, energy or meagre resources to the task of facing up to the diabolical acts of aggression directed against their country by the foreign occupiers.

196. That is why the General Assembly must vigorously condemn the illegal occupation of certain parts of the national territory of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, as well as the repeated acts of aggression committed by the Portuguese armed forces against the peaceful people of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, and demand that the Portuguese Government immediately stop violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guinea-Bissau and committing its acts of aggression against the people of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde by withdrawing forthwith its armed forces from those Territories.

197. As a supplementary measure, we believe that the Security Council, which has the principal role for the maintenance of peace and security, must urgently take all the effective measures that might be required upon the refusal of Portugal to abide by the injunctions of the General Assembly.

198. That is the least that our Organization must do by virtue of the principles of its Charter and in the name of justice and the most elementary humanitarian principles in order to take account of this new development in the history of peoples, which falls squarely within the logic of that détente of which so much has been spoken.

199. The eyes of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau are on New York. Even the dead watch us and will judge us. Among them we have a friend, Mr. Amílcar Cabral, who believed in our Organization. Cowardly murdered by the colonialists, Cabral continues to exhort us to assume our responsibilities.

200. We are all convinced that over and above the short-sighted selfish interests, over and above the smoke-screen of a narrow and tendentious legality, common sense is the best distributed thing in the world, and that common sense speaks to our conscience—it tells us where our duty lies and it traces the path we should follow. That duty and that path, are contained in the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly which we unreservedly support as a minimum programme, and in favour of which we ask the Assembly to pronounce itself without delay.

201. It has sometimes been said that the State of Guinea-Bissau does not exist, that it is a simple fiction used for purposes of propaganda and pressure. First of all, I believe that a fiction that is recognized as a reality by more than 70 independent and sovereign States Members of our Organization can no longer be considered to be a simple fiction. Moreover, what does the new State of Guinea-Bissau lack

for it to be considered a reality? A territory? The territory of Guinea-Bissau exists. More than 80 per cent of it is controlled by the authorities established there by PAIGC and the People's National Assembly. A people? The people of Guinea-Bissau exists, and with its new authorities it has unquestionable ties of allegiance. Institutions? Guinea-Bissau is endowed with institutions established by the people through the most democratic means, and we hope that even the United States, which made its position known on the doctrine of legitimacy in vogue in Europe after 1815 will not contradict us. The United States, in fact, declared to the French authorities during the French Revolution that it recognized a government as legitimate if it was formed by the effectively declared will of the nation. Since this is in fact the case in Guinea-Bissau, the United States, without contradicting itself, should not refuse to recognize the new régime in Guinea-Bissau. Neither could the United Kingdom refuse to do so.

202. The new State of Guinea-Bissau, strongly backed by the people, ensures order, security, public tranquillity and development in those sectors of the country from which the foreign occupier has been dislodged. It is true that this is not a fundamental constituent element of a State as defined in international law, but it confirms, if confirmation were still needed, the reality of the State of Guinea-Bissau. The Special Mission sent by the Special Committee in April 1972 to the liberated areas of Guinea-Bissau submitted a most eloquent report on the subject which needs no comment.<sup>12</sup> American, Soviet, French, Cuban, Italian, Swedish, and Finnish journalists and others who visited Guinea-Bissau in these past years have arrived at the same conclusions, namely, that more than 200 schools have been opened for more than 20,000 young Guineans, with native teachers; 495 young Guineans are studying abroad; 6 field hospitals, 220 first aid posts and dispensaries, 23 mobile medical units, 1 main hospital with modern surgical equipment with a capacity of 200 beds, constitute the health infrastructure. People's shops sell staple foods to the population.

203. What remains? A very small part of the territory occupied by the Portuguese aggressor, with the support of its NATO allies, which takes advantage of the naïveté of an unaware or opportunistic indigenous minority. Yes, I say "opportunistic" because I know that those Guineans who are still collaborating with the Portuguese authorities know in their hearts that they are Guineans and that when the time comes they will abandon, as they must, the camp of colonialism and, crying their guilt, will join the large majority of the struggling population devoted to the task of national reconstruction. We are happy to know that those opportunistic Guineans exploit the naïveté and bad conscience of the Portuguese aggressors. But now that the hour has struck when they must make their choice, it is time for them to return to their adventure. Their people will no doubt be sufficiently magnanimous to forgive them and take them back like prodigal sons. These remarks are, of course, addressed first and foremost to those marionettes whom we find in the Portuguese delegation speaking out in the debates in the Third Committee and who we hope will understand what we are saying.

204. Portugal, which is no longer affected by ridicule, maintains that it controls the greater part of Guinea-Bissau.

But what does that change? Did not the United States proclaim its independence on 4 July 1776—that is, only one year after the outbreak of a war of independence that was to end only in 1783? But neither the state of war nor the occupation of one part of the territory by the former colonial Power prevented France from immediately recognizing the new State and sending General Lafayette with armed forces to assist the new Republic. Similarly, neither the obstinate fight nor the physical presence of Portuguese colonialism prevented the independence of Brazil.

205. We understand that certain countries may not be ready to recognize the new State of Guinea-Bissau. That is an act of domestic policy and at most an attribute of their sovereignty. But it is worth while recalling that their recognition or non-recognition neither adds anything to nor subtracts anything from the reality of the existence of the new Republic.

206. In fact, there is a principle of international law, recognized and confirmed by the Institute of International Law in its resolution of 23 April 1936, which states that the existence of a new State with all the juridical consequences arising therefrom is not affected by the refusal of one or several States to recognize it.<sup>13</sup>

207. Similarly, according to Oppenheim, an unquestionable authority on the subject, international law does not say that a State does not exist so long as it has not been recognized; rather, it does not take it into account so long as it has not been recognized.

208. Now, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau has been recognized by more than 70 independent and sovereign States. Furthermore, even those which have not formally recognized it cannot juridically question its existence; nor can they support the presence of Portugal in that new State without being in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 312 (1972), which calls upon Portugal:

"(a) To recognize immediately the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"(b) To cease immediately the colonial wars and all acts of repression against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau);

"(c) To withdraw all its armed forces as presently employed for the purpose of the repression of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau);

"(d) To promulgate an unconditional political amnesty and the restoration of democratic political rights;

"(e) To transfer power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)."

209. No one is more deaf than he who does not wish to hear; no one is more blind than he who refuses to see. We have heard the cause of Guinea-Bissau. We have seen the reality of that new State. It is for that reason that, as one of

<sup>13</sup> See Institut de droit international. *Tableau général des résolutions (1873-1956)* (Basel, Hans Wehberg, 1956), p. 11.

the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.702 and Add.1-6 proposed by more than 60 delegations, my delegation pleads earnestly in favour of the sacred rights of that new State. History will judge the others—those who have elected obstinately to block their ears, to cover their eyes and to swim against the tide. Who would dare to take the risk of siding with Portugal and its reactionary, retrograde cohorts?

210. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would recall that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly at its 2123rd meeting, statements in exercise of the right of reply are to be made at the end of meetings and are to be limited to 10 minutes.

211. I now call on the representative of Senegal, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

212. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): During the meeting of the Assembly of 22 October [2156th meeting], I told the representative of Portugal that he was not at the right meeting, because during a procedural meeting dealing with the inclusion on the agenda of the item we are discussing today, he presented his well-known arguments concerning the illegal occupation by his country of the territory of Guinea-Bissau. Unfortunately, he paid no attention to me. He was quite wrong in so doing, because today he has merely repeated what he said at the meeting of 22 October.

213. In his statement the representative of Portugal mentioned my criticism of certain arguments put forward by European countries which serve as a pretext for those countries not to recognize the Government of Guinea-Bissau. What I said was that the problem should not be confined to the conventional rules of international law governing the recognition of relations among States and that in this particular case we were dealing with a phenomenon characterized by a struggle for colonial liberation. We therefore stated that the rules relevant to this particular case are those of the United Nations as enshrined in its Charter and its resolutions. I preferred to set forth that thesis because the conventional theses of international law concerning the recognition of States are very often subject to controversy.

214. I therefore wished to base my arguments on irrefutable theses—those of the United Nations, which no Member of the United Nations could refute. But even in invoking the rules of conventional law we are by so doing providing additional arguments to support our position, because, indeed, those who refuse to recognize the existence of Guinea-Bissau base their position on three points. They say that that State has no territory. We have proved that the territory does indeed exist. We have mentioned its borders and its areas so that argument cannot be upheld. The second argument is that of government; a State must have a government which rules over the territory. And here again we have shown that this State has a Government, elected by a parliament which, in turn, was democratically elected by direct universal suffrage held by secret ballot. The third point was that that Government should agree to apply the relevant rules of law governing inter-State relations. Here also the Government of Guinea-Bissau has indeed stated that it agrees to abide by the rules of international law, as well as by the rules and recommendations of the United Nations Charter.

215. As regards the rules of the United Nations, I shall not go into all of them because I have only 10 minutes' time and I know that, despite the understanding and kindness of the President, he will not allow me to take up too much of the Assembly's time. However, I should like to comment on Article 4 of the Charter, which states:

“Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.”

Consequently, Article 4 imposes an obligation on Portugal to observe the provisions of the Charter and to apply them. Article 1 of the Charter states that the purposes of the United Nations are: “To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples . . .”. Consequently, if Portugal is to implement the provisions of the Charter and is to be a Member of this Organization, it must respect the right of self-determination of the peoples of the territory which it occupies.

216. Article 25 of the Charter deals with the Security Council and states the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council are compulsory. The Members of our Organization must therefore accept them and carry them out. Accordingly, Portugal, which was not a member of the Security Council and, thus cannot state that it had reservations on this point, is compelled to carry out the decision of the Security Council; and this decision prescribes certain obligations on the part of Portugal. There are five of them; a preceding speaker mentioned them. However, I shall refer to two of the most essential among them.

217. Security Council resolution 312 (1972), which was adopted in Addis Ababa on 4 February 1972, calls upon Portugal:

“a) To recognize immediately the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)”.

That resolution also calls upon Portugal: “(e) To transfer power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples . . .”.

218. Therefore, if there is a party here which is violating the rules of law that govern us, it is indeed Portugal, and not Guinea-Bissau nor the 70 States which have recognized that Government.

219. The representative of Portugal spoke of morality and law and civilization a few moments ago. I was rather disturbed on hearing such words uttered by the representative of that country which has made of murder and oppression a national institution. The representative of Portugal has his own interpretation of the terms “morality”, “civilization”, “law”. For him, morality, civilization and law mean the murder of Amílcar Cabral and the perpetration of genocide in Mozambique. They represent the invasion of territories neighbouring on the territory which Portugal occupies illegally. This is what Portugal calls civilization, law and morality.

220. He also spoke of journalists from Senegal who did not attend the proclamation of independence of Guinea-Bissau. Since I always speak sincerely, I cannot supply a relevant reply to this comment because I am not informed on that matter. I do know that the Senegalese press reported the event. Whether Senegalese journalists were there, or whether they were informed of the event indirectly, I do not know. But what I do know is that in Senegal press representatives do not ask the Government for authorization to travel to a certain place to report events. In Senegal, journalists are free; they can travel where they wish. Consequently, when we are told that Senegalese journalists did not attend the independence ceremonies in Guinea-Bissau because the Government of Senegal prohibited them from going, I must refute such an assertion categorically. My Government has never refused journalists the right to go and perform their duties where they wish and when they wish.

221. Naturally the representative of Portugal can speak in this way, because matters do not stand this way in Portugal. We know how Portugal deals with its opposition. We know what Portugal does to those who do not share the views of the ruling party in Portugal.

222. I read in the newspaper today the reports of the elections that were held last week in Portugal, and in the newspaper it states that the opposition boycotted the elections, because for 50 years not a single member of the opposition has been elected in Portugal at any of the elections that were held in that country. For that reason the opposition boycotted the elections in Portugal on this occasion also. So you will understand that, even though the opposition does not have great influence on the population, if it is active in opposition for 50 years and if affairs proceed normally members of the opposition might be elected to a municipal council at least somewhere, but this is not the case.

223. In conclusion, we say that the presence of Portugal in Guinea-Bissau is illegal. It is an act of aggression committed against the people of that country. Therefore our Assembly should issue an urgent invitation to the Security Council to utilize all the means available to it under the Charter in order to force these backward colonialists to heed the voice of reason, these colonialists who are still dreaming a dream that has long since become a thing of the past.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*