



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1517**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 5 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1517) .....	1
Statement by the President .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513) .....	1

## NOTE

*Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.*

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 5 December 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. V. J. MWAANGA (Zambia).

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1517)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513).

### Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed with the adoption of the agenda and before we resume our consideration of the question on our agenda, I wish to inform members that our schedule of meetings for this month so far does not promise to be an easy one and I appeal to members who wish to make statements and to take part in the present debate to inscribe their names with the Secretariat with a minimum of delay. This will enable us to speed up our work and I am sure you all want to spend the forthcoming Christmas holidays with your families.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513)**

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the usual practice of the Council and with the provisional rules of procedure, and with the decision taken at the 1516th meeting yesterday afternoon, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Portugal, Guinea and Morocco to take seats at the Council table in order to participate in our discussion, without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. F. B. de Miranda (Portugal), Mr. M. L. Condé (Guinea) and Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) took places at the Council table.*

3. The PRESIDENT: Last evening I received a letter from the Permanent Representatives of Liberia, Madagascar,

Sierra Leone and Tunisia, which has been circulated today in document S/9531. Those four representatives have expressed a desire to be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion on the question before it. If I hear no objection, I propose to invite them, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in our discussion, without the right to vote.

4. Since I see or hear no objections, I take it the Council agrees to the invitations. Owing to the lack of space at the Council table I shall invite the four representatives to take seats at the side of the Council chamber, it being understood that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it comes their turn to take the floor.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. H. Diggs (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. D. Nicol (Sierra Leone) and Mr. A. M'Sadek (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them.*

5. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, may I just say that Senegal challenges the representative of Portugal to prove that Senegal's troops supported the attacks of the PAIGC (*Partido Africano de Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*). The truth is contrary to the affirmation made by Mr. Miranda.

6. The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Portugal wish to answer the question just posed by the representative of Senegal?

7. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): I shall certainly reply to the statement just made by the representative of Senegal, but I will ask for the floor at a later stage, if you will permit.

8. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to add my warmest congratulations to those you have addressed to your two predecessors as Presidents. The rare qualities of both have been known and appreciated for many years in the United Nations. You, Mr. President, belong to a younger generation, but the often quoted lines of the French poet, "*La valeur n'attend pas le nombre des années*", could never have been applied more aptly. Since you have been working with us in the United Nations, and more particularly in the Security Council, each one of us has acquired full and friendly confidence in the manner in which you conduct our meetings.

9. On several occasions already the Security Council has had before it complaints made by African States after the

violation of their territorial integrity by elements of the Portuguese armed forces. Senegal, a long-time friend of ours, which since its independence has made a constant contribution to the development of cordial relations between States and which since 1961 has evinced a long-suffering and praiseworthy patience when subjected to continuous pressures on its frontiers, has unfortunately not been spared. On two occasions already, in April 1963 and May 1965, Portuguese military forays on its territory have compelled Senegal to bring highly regrettable incidents before the Council which, in its resolutions 178 (1963) and 204 (1965), has deplored these violations of sovereignty and requested the Lisbon Government to take all necessary action to avoid any repetition thereof.

10. My delegation is bound to note that such action as may have been taken by the Portuguese Government has not been as effective as the Council would have wished, since once again the Council is called upon to consider a complaint by Senegal in connexion with an incident which caused one death and eight wounded, mostly women and children. The complaint states, in fact, that the shelling, apparently from 105 mm guns, caused only civilian victims. My delegation had taken note with satisfaction of the declared intention of the Portuguese Government, mentioned in resolution 178 (1963), scrupulously to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal. My delegation regrets all the more this commitment could not be kept, even though, as the representative of Portugal maintains, the action of the armed forces of his country is to be considered as a reply to the provocation of armed bands, probably not Senegalese, but which found refuge in the territory of Senegal.

11. Throughout the centuries France and Portugal, which are almost neighbour countries, both on the European seaboard of the Atlantic, have had relations marked by mutual esteem and cordiality. However, my delegation feels today it is in duty bound to pronounce itself clearly. It cannot, whatever the reasons advanced by Portugal, approve of actions that are contrary to Article 2 of the Charter, which calls upon Members of the Organization to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means", and to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

12. Bearing these principles in mind my delegation would have wished that, rather than having recourse to military action, Portugal would have sought by way of bilateral negotiations a solution to the difficulties for which Senegal does not appear to be in any way responsible. My delegation recalls furthermore that the delegation of Portugal, in particular at the 1486th meeting of the Security Council on 18 July 1969 on the complaint of Zambia, had stated it was in favour of such negotiations.

13. For these reasons my delegation requests that the Council should adopt a resolution which may be deemed satisfactory by Senegal and which will help to bring a lasting solution to the problems Senegal had laid before us.

14. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France, Mr. Bérard, for the over-generous compliments

which he has addressed to me, and particularly his recognition of the fact that I belong to the younger generation. My presence in this important chamber is proof of the determination of the United Nations to bridge the generation gap.

15. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Sierra Leone, Mr. Nicol, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

16. Mr. NICOL (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to congratulate you on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council. We are certain that your wisdom and objectivity will ensure for the Council a satisfactory period this month. We also wish to congratulate Lord Caradon of the United Kingdom and Mr. Yost of the United States on the successful completion of their terms of office in the Chair.

17. During the current twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Manifesto on Southern Africa<sup>1</sup> of the Organization of African Unity received the overwhelming support of Member States. It is a declaration championing freedom, the elimination of racism and the maintenance of the territorial integrity of independent African States. We have now received, in document S/9513 of 27 November 1969, less than a month later, news of a savage attack by Portugal on an independent African State, Senegal, during which there was at least one death, and several were wounded. In his contribution to the debate on the Manifesto, the representative of Portugal, in concluding his speech, said that his country wished to extend the hand of friendship to African countries. By this latest act of aggression, it is obvious that his country is bent on extending, not a hand of friendship but one of wanton destruction and brutal attack. My delegation has joined other States in asking for the convening of the Security Council to consider this matter [*S/9524 and Add.1*].

18. Guinea (Bissau) borders, in the north, on the Casamance region of the free and independent Republic of Senegal and, in the south, on the northern portion of the Republic of Guinea. In 1951, to preclude the surveillance of the United Nations, Portugal declared Mozambique, Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and its other colonial territories overseas provinces of Portugal, with the intention of leaving the impression that they constituted an integral part of Portugal. Ten years later, in 1961, legislation was passed to grant the inhabitants of these territories citizenship and representation in Lisbon. So far as Africans are concerned, however, these acts have proved to be untruthful and dishonest, and millions of Africans are still being governed by dictatorial Portuguese administrators and still suffer from iniquitous identification procedures which are tantamount to pass laws and which virtually classify them as second-class citizens. The franchise has been arranged in such a way that in some territories less than 2 per cent of the Africans are qualified voters.

19. The statement, often quoted, that racism is absent in Portuguese Territories is equally dishonest in fact since this

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

touches only a fragment, certainly less than 5 per cent of the population, and most *assimilados*, that is Africans thought worthy to be given Portuguese citizenship, mulattos and Goans are condemned to a status where they can seldom reach the highest position in their country in matters of social, economic and political power.

20. Against such a dictatorship of forced labour and arbitrary cruelty and murder, it is not surprising that in all these so-called overseas provinces of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) Africans have been forced to fight and struggle for their freedom. Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique are not provinces of Portugal, as that colonial country would like to have us believe. They are, rather, Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter. This fact is amply substantiated by General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV) of 15 December 1960, as well as by other resolutions of that body.

21. Portugal has armed itself well for its oppression of Africans and the suppression of their inalienable rights of liberty and freedom. The budget for its military expenditure for this purpose has reached over \$200 million a year. It continues to receive support from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries under the guise that it is a strong link in the defence pattern of that organization, an argument that is becoming increasingly irrelevant with agreements being reached towards disarmament and a *détente* being sought between the super-Powers. It is an argument made even more irrelevant when one considers the evident and manifest ability of African countries like Zambia, Senegal and Guinea neighbouring the oppressed Portuguese colonies, countries which are able to conduct their affairs with skill and all evidence of stability.

22. Africans in Guinea (Bissau) are virtually in control of large areas of the interior of the country and have paralysed the Portuguese Administration on the clear evidence of such distinguished commentators as Basil Davidson who have visited the country.

23. Portugal, obviously disconcerted by its reverses at the hands of freedom fighters, has now embarked upon dangerous acts of aggression against neighbouring Senegal, whose President, Léopold Senghor, was in fact once reported to have sought, by persuasion, to bring about a peaceful end to Portuguese colonialism.

24. This Portuguese attack on Senegal which we are now discussing is by no means new. Resolutions 178 (1963) and 204 (1965) of the Security Council attest to the stand the Council took on earlier occasions when it rebuked the Portuguese Government and forbade it to make incursions into that country.

25. We have also recently heard, in the last two days, that Portugal has attacked another neighbouring country, the Republic of Guinea, thus doubling its act of aggression [see S/9525]. The restraint of these two African countries has been great, since together they could easily crush the Portuguese in Guinea (Bissau). These acts of provocation and aggression without any doubt constitute a grave threat

to international peace and security and, in the view of my delegation, should be condemned strongly by the Council.

26. It appears to us to be a shocking violation of human rights and an insensitive, if not brutal, response to a modern progressive outlook that, on the eve of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Portugal, armed and supported by wealthy allies, should have continued to carry out attacks on three independent African countries.

27. My delegation is unable to support the concept of reprisals in so-called self-defence which the representative of Portugal has given as the reason for the action of his Government's forces. We disagree completely with any notion, expressed or implied, that countries which aid liberation movements in furthering their natural rights and aspirations—the ultimate attainment of independence for colonial countries and peoples—are committing a crime. Such an interpretation would in essence conflict with existing resolutions of this Organization.

28. The representative of Portugal has quoted Article 33 of the Charter, which reads:

“1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

“2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.”

It is the view of my delegation that the present complaint falls well within the provisions of that Article.

29. The whole argument of the representative of Portugal and his air of sweet reasonableness are based on the false premise that the overseas provinces of Portugal are Portuguese. This, as my delegation has pointed out, is not so. The inhabitants of these Territories do not appear to agree with this. The presence of 50,000 refugees in Senegal from Guinea (Bissau) is not the response of people to a well-loved régime.

30. The truth of the matter is that the continued persecution of Africans in these areas, the wholesale burning of villages, the bombing of innocent women and children, have driven thousands of Africans across the borders into free and independent African countries for refuge. The Portuguese army has pursued them across the frontiers and has killed those who have given them shelter. If the representative of Portugal was so definite about dates of casualties caused by attacks of Senegalese forces, why did he not give details of those killed and wounded, as was done by the representative of Senegal, who plainly showed that women, children and old people had been wounded and killed.

31. The oppression of millions of Africans constitutes the hallmark of Portuguese colonialism. The vicious backward-

ness of their outlook in the twentieth century is a reflection of the backwardness of the metropolitan country of Portugal and the bankruptcy of its colonial and domestic policies.

32. The specific complaints before us are an overflow of the internal suppression of Africans in Portuguese-dominated territories and must be dealt with firmly.

33. It is clear to my delegation that the time has arrived for radical steps to be taken in this deteriorating situation.

34. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Liberia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

35. Mr. DIGGS (Liberia): Mr. President and members of the Security Council, it is with a great amount of justifiable pride and identification that I congratulate you on your accession to the Presidency of this august body for this month. My delegation and the Government of Liberia are grateful to you for granting our request to be allowed to take part in this debate on the serious and grave issue of Portuguese aggression now before the Council.

36. This is not the first time that the Liberian delegation has come before this Council on the matter of Portuguese aggression in Africa. As a matter of fact, it was only a few months ago that my delegation made a statement before this Council requesting action against Portugal for the systematic manner in which the Lisbon-based Government of Portugal has brought terror and destruction to the African continent. The complaint by Senegal concerning the shelling of the Senegalese village by Portuguese forces, as outlined in the Security Council document S/5913, is too detailed an account for me to make any further elaboration. The representative of Senegal, Mr. Ibrahima Boye, has given us a true picture in his account only yesterday of the continued Portuguese aggression against his country and it is my duty to state, here and now, that the representative of the Lisbon-based Portuguese Government has asked some completely extraneous questions and tried to evoke dissimulation, which has only had the effect of stretching our imaginations to the breaking point.

37. The horror of war has been brought to a peaceful Senegalese village with the killing and wounding of innocent people. It is, therefore, with a deep sense of bitterness and feeling that my delegation seeks, once more, to call attention to these acts of aggression by a foreign European Power on the African continent.

38. The Lisbon-based Government of Portugal is a member of one of the strongest military alliances in the world today. It is a matter of deep concern to my delegation that Portugal receives active military aid from its NATO allies which is being used to suppress the rightful aspirations of the people of the African territories under Portuguese domination for self-determination and independence. These weapons are also a matter of deep concern to my delegation, because every member of this Council is aware that the limited resources of Portugal would preclude it from this policy of aggression, without the active support and participation of its NATO allies.

39. In this connexion, I should like to refer to an article which appeared in the 27 October 1969 issue of *Newsweek* magazine which describes Portugal as the poorest and most backward nation in Europe. Despite this fact, that country is able to maintain an army of more than 150,000 troops in the African territories under its domination. It is also a matter of common knowledge that Portugal, in return for renewing the lease for United States' military installations in the Azores, is requesting a weapons modernization programme costing more than \$200 million over the next five years.

40. Portuguese colonial hegemony in Africa is an affront to the entire world community and those countries here which are not willing to condemn and take positive steps to bring to an end these savage Portuguese acts of terrorism, are also making an unenviable record and reputation for themselves. The peoples of Africa are awake and aware of the deliberations here. The Portuguese military action, which has brought death and destruction to the friendly Republic of Senegal, will do nothing except to increase the will of the oppressed people of Guinea (Bissau) to free themselves from Portuguese domination, together with all the aid that we, as members of the Organization of African Unity, can give to them in their just struggle.

41. The Foreign Minister of Liberia, Mr. J. Rudolph Grimes, stated before the General Assembly in 1962:

"One can understand the reluctance of the non-African communities . . . to give up the special privileges which they now enjoy. One cannot understand their failure to realize that, in their own interest, this reluctance must be overcome. Have they read nothing of recent history? Can they not realize that of the long succession of colonialist wars fought since 1945, not one has ended with a victory for the moribund colonial cause? . . . Those non-Africans who still dream of clinging to power in Africa can hope for no more success. . . All they can hope to do is to prolong a battle which they are bound to lose and which will grow more and more bitter, more and more futile, as the months and years are allowed to pass and the last opportunities for conciliation are frittered away. We must pray that the leaders responsible for this vain effort to keep the book of history open forever . . . will be blessed with a change of heart and a clearing of vision before it is too late."<sup>3</sup>

42. We have stated time and time again that Portuguese aggression is not limited in its scope and seeks to bring war to Africa, despite the manifest intention of the African peoples to liberate themselves by peaceful means.

43. In that connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the Fifth Conference of East and Central African States held in April of this year at Lusaka, Zambia. From that Conference emerged one of the most far-sighted and comprehensive documents to come out of Africa—the Manifesto on Southern Africa, which is universally accepted as the African attitude towards the colonial racist policy on our continent and the white minority Governments.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Seventeenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1132nd meeting, para. 36.

44. Portugal must attune its policy to present-day realities by realizing that eventual independence of the African territories under its domination is an assured fact. Its suppression of the people of those territories will certainly become as ineffectual as the command of King Canute who ordered the waves of the ocean to recede.

45. I should like to conclude by reiterating that we consider the premeditated Portuguese military actions against African countries as a matter of the gravest concern. My delegation once more asks that a strong condemnation be made of those acts and that the Security Council take the necessary steps to put an end to those acts of war against the African people by a foreign European Power.

46. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Liberia for the statement he has just made, and particularly for the brotherly compliments addressed to the Chair. I call now on the representative of Morocco.

47. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): I should like to take this opportunity to express to you, Mr. President, and to the Council as a whole, our gratitude for enabling us to participate in the debate.

48. My delegation wishes to speak, first because we have a moral obligation in the United Nations to express our solidarity with a country which is the victim of an act of aggression such as the one now being considered by the Council. We are also speaking, and I wish to emphasize this, because of our strong spirit of solidarity with the Government and people of Senegal due to our centuries-old ties of special friendship with them and to the legal relationship between us as recently defined in a treaty of friendship, solidarity and co-operation concluded between us.

49. This question has already been brought before the Council several times. My delegation, when it had the privilege of being a member of the Council, made it a point already at that time to describe the dangers inherent in such aggression and the risk that such incidents might be multiplied. Together with the delegation of Ghana we endeavoured, in resolution 178 (1963) of April 1963, to render justice to Senegal and to express in the resolution, as forcibly as possible, the concern of the Council to find measures which would prevent the repetition of such incidents in the future. That concern was two-fold: to ensure that the interests of Senegal would be safeguarded in the future, and to avoid a situation where Portugal, which already has disputes with the peoples of the territory under its administration, would aggravate its case in the United Nations through the multiplication of crises and incidents in its relations with those that it still wants to call its African neighbours.

50. Unfortunately, in the last six years, it has become apparent that neither the resolution of the Council nor statements that have sometimes been most friendly towards Portugal have been able to prevent such incidents. The year 1969 has been particularly painful and costly for the people of Senegal. You yourself, Mr. President, as the Permanent Representative of Zambia, had occasion last summer to lodge a complaint against Portugal. We remember also the protests of the Government of the United Republic of

Tanzania. Today we have the complaint of Guinea. We know the protests of the Governments of the Congo (Kinshasa) and the Congo (Brazzaville). And we are confronted by a new dimension since Portugal continues to occupy African territories.

51. Yesterday afternoon, the Portuguese delegation as on previous occasions endeavoured to express surprise that Senegal, instead of appealing to the Security Council, should not first have resorted to traditional methods of bilateral or intermediary interventions. In incidents of this kind, we give priority to direct contacts to express apologies, to offer restitution, and to give assurance that there will be no repetition of such incidents. Portugal would have been justified in having recourse to such a procedure, had it not, since 1961, neglected such related practices as mutual respect among neighbours and respect for international law. Senegal cannot, like other African countries, be swayed by considerations of convention and procedure when a country occupying neighbouring territory extends its activity with almost complete impunity by committing aggression against the air space or territory of neighbouring countries.

52. I should like to emphasize Portugal's notion of neighbourliness in Africa. Portugal is not a neighbour of Senegal in Africa in the same way as it is a neighbour of Spain. Being a neighbour of a country does not merely imply having a common frontier with it. It also has ethical implications—the existence of excellent relations and mutual respect. This fundamental element in the status of a neighbour is not present in the case of Portugal in Africa, which brings up the question of geographical proximity only when there are incidents such as have occurred all over Africa, as we have seen in the Security Council several times in the last few years.

53. Senegal has lodged a complaint in the Council in which it has stated again that, having lost all patience and having taken all necessary precautions, it could not shirk its responsibilities as a neighbour to the true people of Guinea. In that respect Senegal has precise obligations. When populations flee from an occupied territory the first duty of a neighbour is to open its doors and offer succour to them.

54. Senegal does not have a direct conflict with Portugal, but its obligations as a neighbour to the people of Guinea and as a Member of the United Nations, which has voted on relevant resolutions concerning Portugal, impose on it a moral duty to support the action and the struggle of that people. It cannot become the victim of a country which rejects the principles of the Charter and which invokes the Charter only against African countries supporting the struggle of the colonized peoples, though these African countries respect the Charter.

55. If we open the door to this concept of the right of pursuit, we shall see throughout the world a certain number of countries which, being engaged in a conflict in a given region, might expand that conflict and spread it all over the world. Unfortunately, centres of armed conflict exist in practically every continent, and we see, here and there, that the aggressor or occupier exercises a "right of pursuit"

which he does not have, since no such right exists in law, and extends the conflict to neighbouring countries. I am referring to what is taking place in the Middle East and in the Far East, where countries are daily becoming victims of aggression merely because under the pressure of facts they opened their borders to exiles, or to people fleeing before the threat of overwhelming military power. Perhaps the impunity which some Powers have enjoyed in this respect in recent years has convinced Portugal that its case would benefit from the same indulgence or the same indifference here.

56. Beyond the present conflict involving Senegal, we believe that the Council must not lose sight of this practice which is becoming established in areas where there are conflicts whereby the occupier and aggressor is tacitly allowed to spread the conflict with impunity under the pretext of subduing resistance movements or controlling populations that are trying to free themselves from the régime that is being imposed on an oppressed people.

57. Concerning Portugal, I should like to say that it seems illogical to us to hope that its NATO allies, which bolster up Portugal's military potential, could support it within the alliance and condemn it here. And we would appeal to them to distinguish clearly between the defensive objectives of their alliance and the obligations of the Charter, so that their attitude reflects the essential difference between their responsibilities within the alliance and those within the United Nations. Politically this problem is of considerable importance since many speakers have reminded the Council of Portugal's resources and have wondered whether it could rely on them to wage a costly colonial war which must impose all kinds of hardships upon its people. They have pointed out that Portugal seems to be renewing its potential regularly so as to pursue the war indefinitely. There is a contradiction there on which the Council should one day throw some light.

58. I know that when a problem has been presented several times before the Council, most of its aspects have been dealt with and commented upon and for this reason I should, at this point, merely wish to express our total solidarity with Senegal which has asked the Council to consider the present incident not in the light of the victims and damage, which some might consider insignificant, but from the point of view of the principle, which has nothing to do with the number of victims or the amount of damage caused, since aggression is aggression, no matter what its consequences, and it should not be gauged solely by the number of dead and wounded, and the number of villages destroyed.

59. The PRESIDENT: At this stage I should like to inform the Council that letters have just been received from the chairman of the delegation of Mali [S/9533] to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and from the Permanent Representatives of Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Syria [S/9534, S/9535, S/9536] requesting that they be allowed to participate in the discussion of the question before the Council. In accordance with the usual practice and with the provisional rules of procedure, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of those countries to participate in our discussion, without the

right to vote. Accordingly I shall invite them to take places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, it being understood that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it comes their turn to take the floor.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. B. Kassé (Mali), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. M. S. Alattar (Yemen) took the places reserved for them.*

60. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): When we are taking up again in the Security Council the outrageous acts of Portuguese aggression, I cannot help but recall that on 20 November 1969 Mr. Miranda, the representative of Portugal, concluded his statement in the General Assembly with the following words:

“... Portugal has always been ready to co-operate with all African countries. Realism and political wisdom indicate that co-operation is in all events the most constructive attitude in international life. There is no substitute of equal value.

“We believe in co-operation. We want to co-operate. We hold out our hand in friendship to all the African countries and we sincerely hope that it will be grasped.”<sup>3</sup>

These were the words of the Portuguese representative on 20 November, and only five days later Portuguese army units shelled the village of Samine. The “peaceful” and “friendly” hands of Portugal killed again and seriously wounded “dangerous” African children, women and aged men in a small village in Senegal. This is only one of the last in a long series of criminal operations committed by Portugal.

61. Less than five months have passed since the Security Council had to repeatedly condemn, in its resolution 268 (1969), the armed acts of aggression of Portugal against another sovereign country, yours, Mr. President, which caused the loss of life of the innocent civilian population.

62. It is most tragic that ten years after the general collapse of the colonial system in Africa, one remnant of that anachronism still exists there, and every effort by the United Nations directed towards a peaceful solution of that problem seems to come to a dead end. In the statement that I referred to earlier, the representative of Portugal ventured to say: “The Portuguese system is not and never has been a colonial system in the modern sense of the term.”<sup>4</sup> He deliberately and repeatedly established the twisted philosophy of a so-called Portugal in Europe and overseas, decorating this idea with expressions such as “pluri-continental State”, “protracted historical process” and so on. But no reference to 500 years of history or to the early purpose of the expansion of Christianity can camouflage the pure and classical colonial nature of Portugal's presence in Africa. Not even an army of invented philosophical axioms can justify the imprisonment, torture

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1814th meeting, paras. 108-109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 77.

and execution of African freedom fighters in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), or the cruel attacks by the Portuguese army and air force against Zambia or the killing and wounding of innocent civilians in Senegal and Guinea.

63. These recent acts of aggression which we are facing now is only another example of that classical colonialist behaviour. We also know well that in pursuing that colonialist behaviour, Portugal enjoys the uninterrupted political, economic and military assistance of her former or present colonialist partners in Europe, as well as overseas. They share the responsibility for the atrocities and criminal acts committed by their allies. Without this moral and material assistance by its NATO partners, many of whom are its long-time comrades-in-arms in colonial domination, Portugal would be unable to maintain huge military forces in Africa, armed to the teeth, in order to preserve the so-called harmony in the so-called overseas provinces. Portugal claims that self-defence prompts such a huge military presence. This argument is well known; it is used by Israel when practising bloody repressive measures against the Arab civilian populations, and it is used hypocritically in Viet-Nam by the aggressors who are crossing the Pacific for this end.

64. We dare agree, however, with the representative of Portugal on one point. Indeed, there exists already in the United Nations an ocean of papers about the situation in Portuguese colonies on many different aspects. There exists a sea of resolutions also condemning Portugal for violations of various human rights, for maintaining colonial domination in foreign territories, for committing acts of aggression against other nations, for attacking, killing and wounding innocent civilians in foreign territories, and so on. All those resolutions were adopted in various United Nations bodies by an overwhelming majority, if not unanimously, and in most cases with only the single opposition of Portugal itself. This conduct by almost the whole membership of the United Nations, by almost every nation of the world states clearly that the colonial system, even in its Portuguese variation, if a variation may exist, has become outmoded, uncivilized, cruel and inhuman, and its maintenance is in the sharpest contradiction to contemporary human norms. Colonialism in itself constitutes a continuous aggression against the African people. This system is doomed to elimination, either by agreement or by force. Portuguese colonies are the remnants and a shame of the twentieth century, a crime against humanity. The Hungarian People's Republic has never hesitated and will never fail to condemn the colonialist policy and practice of Portugal, including its aggressive and bloody actions against sovereign African countries. We shall never fail to express our deep concern over the stubborn and impertinent refusal of Portugal with regard to the implementation of all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as to emphasize the responsibility of those States, members or not of the United Nations, which render continuous support to Portugal in its colonialist policy. We will also continue our assistance to the liberation movements by our modest means.

65. To sum up, Portugal appears before this world body as a recurrent criminal of the international community, having

been found guilty on several counts: violating the most basic of human rights; maintaining the colonial system—in spite of basic provisions of modern international law—in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau); preventing the exercise of the right to national self-determination; suppressing by military force, and in the most brutal manner, the lawful popular resistance to illegal domination; violating the borders of Senegal and other sovereign African countries, thus committing acts of aggression; murdering civilians in the area, and destroying their homes and belongings.

66. All those acts run counter to the Charter of the United Nations, violate the elementary rules of modern international law, contradict the basic principles of political conduct for civilized nations, and last, but not least, do considerable harm to the real interests of the Portuguese people itself.

67. In these circumstances, what is to be done? In the view of the Hungarian delegation, the Security Council cannot but condemn the wanton and premeditated act of aggression against Senegal; condemn Portugal for occupying territories and brutally oppressing peoples far from its own legal boundaries; and call upon all States which are giving such aid to withdraw from Portugal all their military and economic support, whether on a multilateral or bilateral basis. The Security Council should undertake the most resolute action against Portugal that is in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations. Finally, all States should render to the peoples suffering under Portuguese domination every assistance towards helping them to achieve their independence.

68. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia, our esteemed colleague, Ambassador Jamil Baroody, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

69. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, it is an honour for me to participate in the debate on the current item under your Presidency for the simple reason that you symbolize the best in modern Africa that has emerged on the world scene. But for a few enclaves that remain under the colonial yoke, the free sons of Africa have proved themselves as most worthy of our respect and admiration.

70. Regretfully, two colonial Powers are still entrenched on the African continent, none other than South Africa and Portugal. Today we are seized with Portuguese aggression against our sister State of Senegal. Our Portuguese colleague seems to rationalize the aggression of the Portuguese armed forces against Senegal on the grounds that Portugal has been provoked time and again, and had no alternative but to take punitive action. That is the thesis of our Portuguese brother—I call him brother, and you will know later why I call him brother.

71. I shall not address myself to specific cases of aggression, because were I to do that, as many of us sometimes do, I doubt if we should find the cause of the continued trouble in Africa. This course of action is like a child saying: He hit me and I hit him; then when I had another opportunity to hit him, I hit him and he hit me. Presenting the case strictly on what is happening will not solve our problem.

72. Suffice it for me to say that colonies are an anachronism in the era of the United Nations. Big Powers saw the light only after World War II, and were compelled to grant freedom to the people who lived under their yoke. Unfortunately, it took a second world war for them to see the light, and if Hitler and Mussolini had no virtue whatsoever, unwittingly they were instrumental in liberating many peoples in Africa and Asia. Of course, I still remember the aggression of Mussolini in Ethiopia, and I don't have to recall what aggression was perpetrated by Hitler on the European continent. However, had it not been for World War II, there would not have been an acceleration in the movements of liberation in Africa and Asia.

73. But why did the great Powers—the metropolitan Powers—liberate the peoples over whom they ruled? It was strictly because of economic factors. They still had armies, even after the war. They saw that they would become totally insolvent; were they to remain in their colonies, they would be bankrupt. And at a time when we shall soon celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, our friends here, the Portuguese, a small Power, do not seem to heed the lessons of history.

74. After the war, it took leadership amongst the British, the French and the Dutch to grant freedom, sometimes not always by compulsion but because of economic factors, and I believe Portugal, which, in my opinion, had a better background than the big Powers, does not seem to see the light as to what should be done. Even more so, it pains me to say, they do not see the light because even their neighbour, Spain, willingly granted freedom to certain parts of Africa, and we salute Spain for its political sagacity and wisdom that characterized their action.

75. Africa is not dormant; it is seething with unrest because of the ulcer in its stomach—its belly. If you look at the map you find the Portuguese possessions inside the African continent. I did not wish to use a figure of speech by saying “cancer” because, I must say, the Portuguese are different from some of the Nordic people who ruled certain parts of Africa. I should not say “Nordic”, because that might give an impression about Sweden, but rather “northern” people; Sweden, Denmark and Finland are composed of Nordic people.

76. Portugal is a Mediterranean country although most of it lies on the Atlantic. But it has been influenced a great deal by Spain which is a Mediterranean country and belongs to the Mediterranean culture. I would not put Portugal in the same boat as those countries that possessed great empires, starting from the British Isles across the Channel, from the Netherlands, or, for that matter, from France. The Mediterranean culture is humanistic, whether it be the eastern Mediterranean or the western Mediterranean. If we look at the countries surrounding it, we see how much humanity has benefited from the Mediterranean culture. We cannot forget Magellan, the great explorer; I am not going to enumerate the cartographers and others whom Portugal produced.

77. But, above all this, Portugal was never racial. We know that in their colonies—and I checked with those who came from those colonies and are against Portugal—there exists a

multiracial society. They identify themselves with the people like the Arabs do. You say, “Are you extolling the Arabs?” The Arabs have the gamut of all colours and ethnological origins. Our Sudanese brothers are Negroes, but they are Arabs. We occupied Spain for 800 years, and I am sure Spain and Portugal owe much to Arab culture and civilization. But the majority in the Iberian Peninsula, at a given date, did not want the Arabs to rule them, and the Arabs were chased out of Spain. Why? Because the people opted otherwise when Isabel and Ferdinand occupied Spain. If the people had opted for Arab rule, we would still be in the Iberian Peninsula. But we are not because the people did not want the Arabs to rule Spain any more. In contrast, we find now that the peoples of the Portuguese colonies do not want the rule of Portugal. Are you better than we were in Spain? We cleared out of the Iberian Peninsula. We have sympathy for you, but do not go too far, because I would feel sorry for you since you cannot afford the struggle that is being carried on by the peoples—I say “peoples” because tiny Portugal has several colonies in Africa.

78. I cannot improve on the statement that my brother, Mohamed Yazid, the representative of Algeria, made the other day about the liberation movements. He was not speaking from books. Mohamed Yazid is among those who struggled in order to liberate his homeland from a metropolitan Power which, at one time, considered—like my good friend from Portugal does now—Algeria a department of France, as if it were located across the Seine. It is on the continent of Africa. And I recall that, when I first met him in Paris, this gentleman, Mohamed Yazid, was 22 years old and a member of the Algerian delegation, who was pleading the cause of his own country without any rancour or hatred for the French. But he and others had no alternative but to fight. They tried to reason with the French, and the French are noted for their liberal ideas. After all, the French Revolution gave the European world freedom; before that, people were feudal. He and his colleagues argued the question.

79. Why do I talk about Algeria? Because in 1954 it fell to me to submit the item for consideration by the United Nations. It took a man of the stature of de Gaulle—may God prolong his life and may the French gain more wisdom from his action—to liberate and grant freedom to Algeria. He saw that in the end France would become bankrupt. How do I know this? Do not think I have dealt with the question of Algeria only here in the United Nations. I was making trips and talking with the French, even though we had cut off relations with the French. None other than my good friend Georges-Picot had several meetings with me—in his club because he did not want to be seen talking with me about this question; they would have asked him what he was doing with Baroudy, when his country had cut off relations. Once I asked him this simple question: “Do you think you can win the war with your 450,000?” He was a United Nations man; he served as Assistant Secretary for Social Affairs. We were talking shop, as they say. He said, “To be frank with you, we may not be able to win but we will not lose the war militarily.” Then I said to him, “Will you lose it economically?” He said, “Sure; we will.” “Who can solve this problem?” I asked him, and he answered, “Either Monsieur Pinay . . .”, and I said, “Why Monsieur

Pinay?" "Because he is an economist," he replied, "and he knows we will become bankrupt." "And who is the other of the two who may be able to help solve this problem?" I asked him. He said, "General de Gaulle." Here was a Frenchman who was honest, who was at war with the Algerians—a wise man; he was older than I am now; he was about 70 years old. And yet he admitted that it was a futile struggle.

80. That is why I want to tell you to heed the lessons of history, my brothers; nothing else. You are a good people. It is your Government that has been misguided enough to continue this struggle against the wishes of the people who live in the *départements* of Portugal—colonialist *départements*. There are a thousand miles between Portugal and its possessions.

81. Why is Baroody addressing himself to this question in general and not to the specific item submitted by our brother from Senegal? There could be many incidents before you are finally beaten, as many others, stronger and richer, have been beaten. We do not want to see innocent Portuguese and innocent Africans sacrificed in war.

82. It is a matter of time before not only the people inside your colonies rise against you but also the African peoples, and not only those who are contiguous with your colonies, but African peoples to the north and the south, except, of course, South Africa—and the east and the west. They are galvanized and will see to it that sooner or later you are expelled from the continent, just as other metropolitan Powers have been expelled from the African continent.

83. What shall we do? Shall we come to the Council again with another specific case of aggression? You say they provoked you, and you retaliated. Well, it is your privilege to say that on behalf of your Government. But the fact remains that this is a movement of liberation.

84. Now I shall give you another thought to ponder. It is not a thought; it actually happened. Again, I turn to our brother Mohamed Yazid, the representative of Algeria. He may have forgotten a question I posed for him because I was handling this Algerian question here, in Europe and in the Middle East—quietly, with no oratory; we talk too much here in this Council. I said to him, "Mohamed, how many armed troops do you have in Algeria? What is the number of your armed forces?" He replied, "Every Algerian is a soldier. We do not have a regular army." He has forgotten that, but I am reminding him. I said, "What is the number? How many are participating in the conflict?" And he told me at that time—I have forgotten when it was; it was 1957 or 1958—"It could be 15,000 or 18,000". I said, "Good Lord; what can you do against 450,000?" He replied, "We hit and run, and we choose our locale. We do not fight pitched battles against those armed forces"—today that is what we call guerrilla warfare, or liberation movements. Call it by whatever name you want. They hit and run. They do things that a regular army cannot handle.

85. We have seen what is happening in the Far East. The Viet-Cong, those maligned Viet-Cong, what are they? Do they come from Europe, or from the American continent? The might of the United States could not suppress them,

unless of course it used the atom bomb. And then the Chinese would join the war. God help us then, because you would see atom bombs exploding to the right and to the left and we should all be done for—you and I also, because of the fall-out. The Russians are clever enough not to be involved, but they might become involved, who knows? Of course, our friend Ambassador Malik is a humanitarian who would not want to see anybody die, but he is not a free agent. We should all be there. And why should it happen because of Portugal, a sympathetic country, a country whose people love songs and peace? It is those cliques in your country—there are cliques in the smaller countries too, to be fair to the big countries—and the industrialists in the big countries who are interested in war. They want to fill their pockets; their patriotism is in their pockets. It is so not just in your country but in every country that seems to pursue war. Those who sell arms are the ones who profit.

86. But why look as far as Viet-Nam? In my region, for 20 years the Palestinian refugees have had to live on four cents a day. The usurping State was created deceitfully by the United Nations, because of pressure, so that after 20 years those refugees would have forgotten their homeland and die. But the new generation of those self-same refugees thought otherwise. They are called terrorists by the usurping State, but we call them freedom fighters. It does not matter what we call them; a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. It is not the name that matters; it is the action. The Arab countries themselves do not dare to stop those Palestinian commandos, as they are sometimes called.

87. Does not Portugal have some lessons to draw from history? I have spoken about past history; now I speak of modern history. I mentioned the Arab and Viet-Cong guerrillas, or terrorists as they call them. We like Portugal and we do not want it to suffer. I hope that my words will not be taken in the wrong spirit because Portugal has proved itself to be a non-discriminating European country, it has no racial discrimination; we know that and that is to its honour. I can go on and speak at greater length but I guess everyone has the gist of my intervention. Is there a solution? We come and talk on these matters day in and day out, there are interminable incidents. Today Portugal is rebutting what our brothers from Senegal have said; tomorrow it will rebut what another African State that lodges a complaint against Portugal will say. There is a solution.

88. My colleagues and I know many of those who are fighting Portugal. They come here and some of them petition the General Assembly. I speak to them and they are reasonable men like the representative of Portugal here today is personally reasonable, but they have to take instructions from their Governments. There are many responsible people in Portugal. Why does Portugal not set the stage for a Commonwealth until one day when it could ask those people "Do you want us to stay? You can have a plebiscite". I can assure the representative of Portugal that his country will not become bankrupt but it will enrich itself more from those erstwhile possessions. Should we talk here in the strait jackets of instructions, that get nowhere? Here I have spoken to many of my colleagues in the Council. They agree with me sometimes on various issues

but they tell me they have instructions. Why are we here? We should enlighten our own Governments as Member States who are working for peace and there can be no peace when peoples are suppressed whether in Africa or elsewhere, in the Middle East or the Far East. Time is of the essence, because the longer you wait, the worse the situation will be and the more blood will be shed. I have a right at my age to say that I am really apprehensive that if, as Member States, we do not go by the rules of the Charter—it should be rules, not principles only—we will be lost and accomplish nothing.

89. The hour is late and I reserve my right to speak again should there be any resolution or should I see the need for taking the floor again, hoping in all sincerity—I am not a Minister like other Ministers and there are a few Ministers here in the United Nations—I am not preaching a sermon. I am speaking from my humble experience because in my early days I was a nationalist. I know what nationalism involves. No one can crush a people clamouring for their independence, and Portugal no doubt has illustrious men and it has a glorious history. It should see the light and not grope in the darkness for ways and means to keep the Africans under its rule suppressed. I apologize to you, Mr. President, and to my colleagues for having spoken in an unorthodox way but we cannot go on with stereotyped phrases all the time.

90. We have to approach problems in a novel way. As we say, attack the serpent of colonialism not by cutting off its tail but by scotching the head of the serpent of colonialism. You may cut the tail in debate but you cannot kill the serpent by cutting off the tail. This is a purely colonial

question and how lucky are the South Africans that they do not have a complaint against them today. Oh, what I would not say! I content myself with what I have said and thank you, Mr. President, for your graciousness and for the patience of my colleagues who have been kind enough to listen to me.

91. The PRESIDENT: I express to the representative of Saudi Arabia my gratitude for the complimentary words that he addressed to the Chair. May I also thank him from the bottom of my heart for having given us what he himself has described in the past as humorous relief to our deliberations.

92. I have just received from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic a letter [S/9538] expressing a desire to be invited to participate in the Council's discussion on the question before us. If I hear no objection, I shall invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to participate in our debates at an appropriate time without the right to vote.

*It was so decided.*

93. There are no further speakers on my list. Is there any representative who wishes to take the floor at this time? Since I have received no such request I shall adjourn the meeting. In accordance with the views expressed in informal consultations, the next meeting of the Security Council on this item will be held on Monday, 8 December 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*