

UNITED NATIONS

IN L. 2427

PLS 3183

UN/SA/CONF/104



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1519th

MEETING: 8 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1519)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaints by Senegal:	
(a) Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513);	
(b) Letter dated 7 December 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9541)	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 NINETEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 8 December 1969, at 3.00 p.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/1519)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaints by Senegal:
 - (a) Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513);
 - (b) Letter dated 7 December 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9541).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaints by Senegal:

- (a) Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513);
- (b) Letter dated 7 December 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9541)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at our 1516th meeting 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. A. Touré (Guinea) and Mr. J. Charkaoui (Morocco) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the further decisions taken at the 1517th and 1518th meetings I propose next, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Mali, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria, the United Arab Republic and Mauritania to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the under-

standing that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. H. Diggs (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. A. M'Sadek (Tunisia), Mr. G. Sow (Mali), Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. A. S. Alattar (Yemen), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) and Mr. A. Ould Daddah (Mauritania) took the places reserved for them.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Pakistan, Ambassador Shahi, who will introduce the draft resolution contained in document S/9542.

4. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, before I address myself to the item on our agenda, I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for this month. Zambia is in the front rank of the struggle of the peoples of Africa against colonialism and *apartheid* in the southern half of that continent. It has borne the brunt of this struggle with a dignity and a fortitude that have evoked admiration in Pakistan. We are confident that under your outstanding leadership the Security Council will be able to act in accordance with the expectations of all States Members of the United Nations on the matter before us and on the other questions which the Council may be called upon to deliberate this month.

5. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Lord Caradon for the superb manner in which he discharged the duties of President of the Security Council for the month of October. Since the Council held only one closed meeting in that month, we did not have the opportunity of giving expression to the high esteem in which we hold him not only because he is an outstanding representative of the senior Commonwealth country but also because of his great qualities of statesmanship. To Ambassador Yost, who was president of the Council last month, I cannot fail to pay a tribute. November was one of those infrequent but welcome months when the Security Council managed to conduct its business under the confident and skilful leadership of the representative of the United States, without any formal meeting.

6. Turning now to the question before us, namely, the complaint of Senegal against Portugal [S/9513], I should like to begin by pointing out that only four months ago the Security Council, in its resolution 268 (1969), strongly censured Portuguese attacks on Zambian territory and

declared that if Portugal did not desist from violating the territorial integrity of Zambia the Council would meet to consider further measures. The present complaint against Portugal by Senegal cannot be viewed in isolation from the Zambian complaint or other similar grievances of the African countries which have engaged the Council's attention during the past few years. Portugal has been repeatedly charged with premeditated acts of provocation and armed attacks against the African neighbours of its so-called overseas provinces. It is therefore necessary that Senegal's present complaint be viewed in the wider context of the confrontation between the Governments and peoples of free Africa on the one side and Portuguese colonialism on the other.

7. The representative of Senegal has placed before the Council certain facts which show that of late, Portuguese incursions have become more frequent and serious. To compound the seriousness of the facts cited by the representative of Senegal in his first letter [S/9513], the aerial bombardment of the same village, Samine, on 7 December has been brought to the attention of the Security Council by Senegal in document S/9541. In this attack of yesterday the number of dead has mounted. Twice in the past—in 1963 and 1965—Senegal was obliged to approach the Security Council for redress against the Portuguese colonial authorities. The Security Council took the necessary action in resolutions 178 (1963) and 204 (1965) respectively, deploring the Portuguese military incursions against Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity and requesting the Portuguese authorities to cease and desist from any such violations in the future. Nevertheless, I regret to say, the Portuguese armed attacks continued.

8. I said earlier that Senegal's present complaint must be viewed in a wider context—namely, that of the confrontation between Portuguese colonialism and free Africa. In their letter of 2 December [S/9524 and Add.1], 36 independent African States Members of the United Nations have demonstrated their solidarity with Senegal, the victim of acts of aggression by Portugal and have expressed their concern at the constant threat posed by the Portuguese colonial army in its "war of reconquest in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)" to the neighbouring States, besides Senegal, of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia, Guinea, Congo (Brazzaville) and Tanzania. In addition, a complaint from Guinea is awaiting consideration by the Council. Furthermore, it was only a little more than four months ago that the Security Council, in its resolution 268 (1969), strongly censured Portuguese armed attacks on Zambian territory.

9. The case of the international community against Portugal was stated by my delegation, along with several others, in this Council on the Zambian complaint. This case was based on the various resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council pertaining to colonialism and racialism in southern Africa. I should like briefly to recapitulate the indictment of Portugal by the General Assembly and the Security Council in some of the salient resolutions adopted by these two principal organs in the past.

10. First, the international community has rejected the contention of Portugal that the African Territories under its domination are an integral part of Portugal and constitute its "overseas provinces". These so-called provinces, according to General Assembly resolutions 1542 (XV) and 1514 (XV), are Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and, as such, entitled to self-government and independence.

11. Second, in resolution 180 (1963) the Security Council affirmed that this contention of Portugal—that is, that the African Territories are an integral part of Portugal and constitute its overseas provinces—was contrary to the Charter and also determined that the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration was seriously disturbing peace and security in Africa. The General Assembly also declared, in resolution 1807 (XVII), that the colonial war being carried on by the Government of Portugal "constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security".

12. Third, in view of Portugal's continued refusal to recognize the right of the peoples of its colonial territories to self-government and independence, the General Assembly, in the same resolution, requested all States Members of the United Nations to deny Portugal any support or assistance which might be used by it for the suppression of these peoples.

13. Fourth, by its resolution 2105 (XX), the Assembly, while recognizing the legitimacy of the struggle by the peoples under colonial rule to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, invited all States to provide moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements in colonial territories. This appeal has been repeated in several subsequent resolutions, notably in paragraph 13 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) relating to Southern Rhodesia.

14. It may be asked, what is Portugal's defence against this indictment? In his statement at the 1516th meeting of the Security Council, the representative of Portugal advanced certain arguments: First, Senegal he said was attempting to "invent" situations by causing incidents or allowing them to be caused against Portugal and coming to the Security Council to complain against Portugal. But, we may ask, what has the representative of Portugal to say against the invitation by the General Assembly, in its resolution 2105 (XX) and other resolutions that I have mentioned, to Senegal, among other States, to provide moral and material assistance to national liberation movements in colonial territories—which movements the General Assembly considers to be legitimate?

15. Second, the Portuguese representative alleged a series of violent incidents against Guinea (Bissau) from Senegal, contending that Portugal had the right to react. Since Portugal has foreclosed all means of peaceful resolution of the conflict between the right of self-determination and its own colonialism in Africa, is it expected of the people of Guinea (Bissau) that they should not struggle for their freedom? Is such a struggle contrary to the purposes, principles and obligations set forth in the Charter of the United Nations?

16. Third, the representative of Portugal sought to justify the shelling of Samine in the exercise of what he called the right of self-defence. The council is only too familiar with this pretext advanced in the Council on previous occasions as well, notably in regard to the so-called right of reprisal. While expressing the views of my delegation at the meeting of the Security Council concerning the complaint brought by your country, Mr. President, against Portugal on 23 July 1969, I said:

"Pakistan does not and cannot subscribe to the notion that the spontaneous help and sympathy rendered to a resistance movement should expose the country that accords it to the penalty of reprisals. This notion is advanced not only by colonial Powers but also by all those who seek to efface a distinct people's individuality and to suppress its demand for self-determination. But it is a notion which has been exploded by the international law that is progressively developing in the post-colonial age. It is this law which refuses to recognize the so-called right of pursuit. The Council cannot but refuse to countenance the claim to such a right, whether it is involved in southern Africa, in the Middle East or elsewhere. We regret that much of the case which the representative of Portugal sought to make out, if analysed, rests ultimately on nothing but the assertion of this right of pursuit under the guise of self-defence." /1488th meeting, para. 78./

17. The right of self-defence invoked by Portugal is clearly untenable. Neither the African community of States nor the United Nations recognizes the Portuguese colonial possessions in Africa as integral parts of Portugal's metropolitan territory, no matter what the municipal law of Portugal may decree. The right of the colonial peoples to self-determination cannot be legislated away by domestic legislation which violates the rules of international law and the obligations of Member States under the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, to talk of flouting by Senegal or, for that matter, by any independent African State of "norms of international conduct" and "flagrant violations of international law committed against Portugal in Africa" is to harp on the rules of international law which were developed in the colonial age and which have since been profoundly modified by the law of the United Nations.

18. Portugal has also been contending that such incidents as may occur should be settled on the basis of bilateral negotiations. It is true, of course, that a large number of these incidents have, in fact, been so settled. The question is, why do the aggrieved African countries sometimes prefer, as Senegal has now done, to come to the Security Council to complain against armed attacks by Portuguese colonial authorities? The statement of the representative of Senegal provided the answer. The fact is that the basic issue in question is not bilateral in nature. Even if it can be said that the individual frontier incidents between Portugal's colonial Territories and their African neighbours are amenable to bilateral settlement, the root cause of the tension and conflict involves an issue which concerns the entire international community and the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of peace in Africa, as elsewhere.

19. The suppression by Portugal of freedom movements in its colonial Territories has given rise to a refugee problem

and to a growing exodus of the population of those Territories to those of neighbouring States. The High Commissioner for Refugees has estimated the present strength of such refugees to be in the region of half a million. Is it not natural that uprooted men, women and children should struggle to regain their homelands? Who can say that their struggle for human rights is illegitimate or outlawed by the Charter, or that those States and Governments which extend to them asylum and assistance are guilty of violating the principles of law and justice?

20. There is another claim that Portugal advances in justification of its repressive policies in its so-called overseas provinces, namely, that the popular struggle in those Territories is not rooted in widespread nationalist movements but is due to ideological forces operating from without their borders. That argument has found little credence except perhaps in Portugal itself. The statement issued by the Heads of State and Government of East and Central Africa in Lusaka has clearly brought that into focus, and I quote from that historic Manifesto, which was endorsed by the General Assembly on 20 November 1969:

"The present Manifesto must, therefore, lay bare the fact that the inhuman commitment of Portugal in Africa and her ruthless subjugation of the people of Mozambique, Angola and so-called Portuguese Guinea are not only irrelevant to the ideological conflict of power-politics, but . . . to the politics, the philosophies and the doctrines practised by her Allies in the conduct of their own affairs at home. The peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Portuguese Guinea are not interested in communism or capitalism; they are interested in their freedom. They are demanding an acceptance of the principles of independence on the basis of majority rule."¹

That is a quotation from the Lusaka Manifesto in answer to Portugal's contention that the nationalist movements in its colonial Territories are inspired by ideological forces from outside their borders.

21. The situation in Portuguese colonial Territories will, we fear, continue to remain a potential danger to peace so long as Portugal does not fulfil its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to lead them to self-government and independence. But, to our infinite regret, the Government of Portugal seems as determined now as in the past to flout those obligations. Premier Marcello Caetano stated as recently as 7 October 1969:

"Portugal cannot yield, cannot compromise, cannot capitulate in the struggle being waged in the overseas provinces. We must be ready to do all that can peacefully be done to further the natural development of the great African provinces. But we must be intransigent as to a withdrawal which would imperil for many years all that has been accomplished in centuries."

It appears from that quotation from the Portuguese Prime Minister's statement that Portugal is irrevocably committed to wage a protracted and cruel war against the peoples of its

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754, para. 14 of the Manifesto.

colonial Territories. It also follows that that war will continue to spill over into the territories of those countries which aid and comfort those peoples in conformity with United Nations resolutions.

22. If the Security Council wishes to ease the tensions in Africa, it is its duty to extend at this stage the fullest moral and political support to Senegal in the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. All that Senegal has done is to attempt to carry out the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations which have repeatedly condemned the persistent refusal of the Government of Portugal to implement resolution 1514 (XV) and all other relevant resolutions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, and Portugal's policy of using the Territories under its domination for violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States.

23. It is in the light of these considerations that I have the honour now to introduce formally, on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Nepal, Zambia and my own delegation, the draft resolution that has been circulated in document S/9542.

24. The contents of this draft resolution cannot but have been clearly anticipated by the members of this Council in view of similar and repeated complaints in the past and the actions taken on them by the General Assembly. It is especially important to bear in mind resolution 180 (1963) and resolution 218 (1965) of the Security Council, by which the Council made the determination that the situation in the Portuguese colonies was seriously disturbing peace and security in Africa.

25. To those members of the Council who may find it difficult to support this draft resolution unreservedly, I can reiterate the assurance that it is not animus against Portugal but grave concern at not only the situation existing on the Senegal-Portuguese (Bissau) front but also the potential danger along the entire frontier between free Africa and Portuguese colonialism that has inspired this draft resolution.

26. It is with a sense of sad duty that we view the rejection by Portugal of the call to reason that is contained in the United Nations Charter, in the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and most recently in the now overwhelmingly endorsed Manifesto on Southern Africa—the Lusaka Manifesto, initiated and signed by all the Heads of Government and States of Central and East Africa.

27. It is tragic that Portugal—a country that has made such great contributions in the march of civilization, a country that has been untainted by accusations of racial discrimination and colour prejudice—should act in concert with Pretoria and Salisbury to perpetuate colonialism, *apartheid* and illegal racist minority rule in Southern Africa.

28. In introducing this draft resolution in document S/9542 we once again appeal to Portugal to abandon its colonial wars and, in the spirit of the Lusaka Manifesto, to recognize the right of the peoples of Mozambique, Angola

and Guinea (Bissau) to freedom and independence in order that a true partnership based on a commitment to human equality and dignity may supersede the present relationship of subjugation and domination between Africa and Portugal.

29. I commend the draft resolution to the Security Council, with the following revisions which the four sponsors, namely, Algeria, Nepal, Pakistan and Zambia, have agreed to make in its text as a result of consultations. Those revisions are as follows. In document S/9542, which is the draft resolution I have referred to, the second preambular paragraph, which reads "Having heard the statements by the parties" should be deleted. In the first line of paragraph 1 the words "Government of Portugal for ordering" should be replaced by "Strongly condemns the Portuguese colonial authorities for", which would then be followed by the remainder of the paragraph: "the shelling of the village of Samine," and so on, as in the present text. I hope I have made myself clear.²

30. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan, Ambassador Shahi, for the kind words he has addressed to the chair.

31. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Mr. President, I am happy to have this opportunity to extend to you the best wishes of my delegation on your accession to the Presidency. It has been a great pleasure to work with you during the past year and I am looking forward to another year of friendly co-operation with you and your delegation in the Security Council. I also wish to join in paying tribute to the Presidents of the Council in October and November, Lord Caradon and Ambassador Yost.

32. As we are considering the complaint brought before the Security Council by the Government of Senegal, we are conscious of the fact that it comes from a State which desires nothing but to live in peace and to promote peace and which, under the leadership of President Senghor, plays a constructive role in the work of the Security Council and in international co-operation in general. The complaint of Senegal thus merits our most serious attention.

33. The facts about the incident which have led to the convening of this meeting of the Security Council do not seem to be in dispute. The representative of Senegal told us on 4 December that Portuguese armed forces based in Guinea (Bissau) had once again violated the territorial integrity of his country by shelling the village of Samine, causing casualties and material damage. He pointed out that this was not the first time that the territorial integrity of Senegal had been violated by Portuguese forces. Similar incidents have in fact occurred intermittently ever since 1963 and they have become more frequent and more systematic each year. Decisions by the Security Council in 1963 and 1965 requesting Portugal, in accordance with its declared intentions, to take whatever action might be necessary to prevent any violations of Senegalese sovereignty and territorial integrity have not led to any lasting improvement in the situation.

² The text of the revised draft resolution was subsequently issued as document S/9542/Rev.1.

34. This morning the representative of Senegal informed the Council of a new attack made yesterday by Portuguese forces on the village of Samine, killing five persons and seriously wounding one. This new serious incident serves to underline the urgency of the complaint brought by the Government of Senegal. The representative of Portugal has not disclaimed responsibility for the incident of 25 November. He has expressed regret over the loss of life and material damage that may have resulted. He maintains, however, that the Senegalese Government allows its territory to be used by armed elements infiltrating into Guinea (Bissau) and that this takes place with the knowledge of the Senegalese authorities and with the support of Senegal's armed forces. He insists therefore that the Portuguese forces have acted in legitimate self-defence.

35. According to the Charter, in disputes of this kind a solution should be sought in the first place through the means envisaged in Article 33. My Government has consistently emphasized the primary duty of parties to a dispute to seek solutions by negotiation and conciliation. We are aware, however, that such a procedure presupposes the existence of the minimum measure of mutual confidence between the parties. In the present case this prerequisite does not seem to exist. In these circumstances it is the duty of the Security Council to investigate the complaint and to seek an effective remedy to the situation within the terms of Chapter VI of the Charter.

36. The complaint which the Council is now examining must be seen in a larger context. As recently as last July the Council considered incidents which had taken place on the frontiers between Zambia and adjoining African Territories under Portuguese administration, and a few days ago we were informed that the representative of Guinea had submitted to the Council yet another complaint against Portugal [S/9528]. Thus repeated incidents along the borders between African Territories under Portuguese administration and neighbouring independent African States form a pattern of tension and violence. The underlying cause for that situation is Portugal's disregard for the aspirations of the peoples in Territories under its administration, its persistent refusal to make any advance towards granting them the self-determination and independence to which they have an inalienable right under Chapter XI of the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In fact, no lasting improvement in this situation can be expected so long as the Government of Portugal continues to pursue in Africa a policy which cannot be reconciled either with the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples living under Portuguese rule or with the deepest convictions of the independent African States.

37. It is in the light of those considerations that my delegation will determine its position with regard to the draft resolution which has just been introduced in the Council by the representative of Pakistan.

38. The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Jakobson for the remarks he made about me. They were much too complimentary.

39. The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Syria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

40. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Allow me first, Sir, to present to you our sincerest congratulations on your accession to the Presidency of the Security Council for this month. You symbolize, in a word, the spirit of Africa's liberation from the yoke of colonialism, the spirit of determination to free the Territories that are still non-self-governing, and the spirit of peace, justice and progress. They all go together.

41. May I also express our grateful thanks to you, Sir, and to the members of the Security Council for granting the request of the delegation of Syria to participate. We are deeply concerned over the matter being considered at the request of our brother delegation from Senegal. The problems arising from the obstinate non-compliance of Portugal with United Nations resolutions calling on the administering Power to implement forthwith the provisions of the resolution concerning independence—namely General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)—must indeed be the concern of all Member States, even of humanity at large. You cannot have a United Nations Organization and colonialism at one and the same time. The principles and objectives of the United Nations are in total contradiction to those inspiring colonialism. If colonialism is not defeated, those principles and objectives will be—and that will mean the defeat of the Organization. There is a polarization between the two; the one completely negates the other.

42. The matter raised by the representative of Senegal presents one aspect of the stubbornly surviving remnants of colonialism, actually one of the most serious aspects. With the denial to the African masses under colonial rule of their right to self-determination and with the repeated encroachments on the security and territorial integrity of sovereign and independent States of Africa, the threat to international peace and security is made twofold and must engage in earnest the prompt attention of the Council, as it is engaging it now. In this connexion, that conclusion is only strengthened by the complaint our brother delegation of Guinea is going to raise before the Council—and for the same reason, namely, Portuguese aggressive acts against Guinea.

43. In essence, the régime in Lisbon, like a few other reactionary colonial régimes, aims at deflecting the trend towards liberation which has characterized the second half, in particular, of the twentieth century and at keeping the African masses in Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola under the colonial yoke in defiance of all United Nations resolutions. If such defiance is allowed to continue with impunity, the United Nations will be indeed in a serious crisis. Its principles will be in jeopardy and it will be unable to fulfil its role in the establishment of international peace and justice. We are all, therefore, indebted to the Government and the delegation of Senegal for reporting to this highest organ of the United Nations in order to expose this threat not only to their country, not only to their brethren, but to the whole fabric of the United Nations, thus facing the Security Council with its responsibilities.

44. The arguments of the delegation of Portugal, even in detail, are untenable. The representative of Senegal has put

at the disposal of the Council specific data on the assaults committed by the colonial Portuguese army against the citizens and the territory of Senegal. The delegation of Portugal could not deny the facts; they are too evident to permit of denial. Instead, the delegation of Portugal puts the blame on Senegal for not resorting to bilateral contacts and dialogue.

45. Appearing in garments of innocence and peacefulness, that call for contacts and dialogue, is most misleading. The real dialogue was offered long ago; it is still refused by the very régime which purports to be asking for it. That régime has undermined from the start the very premises of any fruitful dialogue by claiming that the African Territories under its domination have no right to self-determination, have no African personality of their own, and are mere Portuguese provinces. That ludicrous and arbitrary disposition of peoples and territory by decree by a colonial régime is the most glaring example of tyranny. What dialogue is possible when such absurd claims are advanced? Does the Lisbon régime expect the sovereign countries of Africa to acquiesce in the suppression of their brothers' right to self-determination and in the suffocation of their brothers' distinct African personality? Does the Portuguese régime expect the countries of Africa to turn the refugees from Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola over to the oppressor?

46. Can we forget that since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) no fewer than 30 resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee of Twenty-Four on decolonization³ regarding the same problem that we are discussing now? It is the United Nations resolutions themselves—the latest of which is General Assembly resolution 2395 (XXIII) of 29 November 1968—which affirm the inalienable right of the African people under Portuguese domination to self-determination, freedom and independence, and the legitimacy of their struggle to achieve that right; which condemn the persistent refusal of the Government of Portugal to implement resolution 1514 (XV); which denounce the situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination as aggravating explosive conditions in all of southern Africa; and which appeal to all States to help the Africans in their struggle against Portuguese domination and to withhold assistance for the prosecution of the colonial war against those Africans. Indeed, resolution 2395 (XXIII) condemns Portugal's violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States and it also condemns the collaboration between Portugal and the racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

47. Those United Nations resolutions provide the authoritative answer to the arguments and claims of the Portuguese delegation. The régime of Lisbon has tried to distort the picture; it projects on to others its own crimes and arrogates to itself rights due to others. It launches wanton attacks on the territory of Senegal, kills innocent citizens—including women and children—and then claims that it was the victim rather than the aggressor. It speaks of self-defence. But, who is to judge whom? Is it the party that

sets itself above the law, or is it the party that is defending the law? Who is entitled to self-defence—an army whose presence is illegitimate or the African masses and peoples who are mercilessly subjected to illegal rule? Is Portugal the objective of Senegal's bombardment, or is Senegalese territory subjected to Portuguese attacks? Are the women and children of the Senegalese village of Samine posing a threat to the security of Portugal, or is the colonial Portuguese presence engulfing the whole of Africa and putting the peace of the world in the deadliest danger?

48. The delegation of Portugal comes before the Council to plead against violence. What violence is worse than the forceful occupation of vast portions of the African continent, the force mobilized for illegitimate consolidation of colonial rule and denial of natural rights to millions of Africans? The régime of Lisbon turns its wrath against the countries that supply the liberation movements with weapons. Who is to be condemned—those who extend moral and material support to a legitimate struggle for self-determination and independence in full observance of United Nations resolutions, or those who supply the Portuguese colonialists with the means of force required to consolidate its colonialism and silence African aspirations?

49. A serious attack by colonial Portuguese forces was made on Samine village in Senegal. It made innocent human victims—among them women, children and the aged. Not only have the attacking forces violated sovereignty, international law and morality, but such brigand assaults on territory and innocent people run counter to every norm of civilized conduct, and, as if the Lisbon régime wants to give an exhibition of more power, it bombards populated localities of Senegal while its first aggression is being debated here within the Council.

50. In the last analysis it is the presence of Portugal in Africa by force of arms which is unwanted and illegitimate. Those who supply the colonialists with arms are known. The marks of the manufacture of their planes and destructive weapons are also too obvious to permit denial. The flow of weapons is too deliberate to permit any excuse. The principles of the Charter, the resolutions of the United Nations, are all against this illegitimate occupation and the support which the Portuguese receive from their allies. With the escalation of this colonial war so as to involve sovereign African countries as well, they have trampled on peace in Africa and menaced the peace of the world. It is, therefore, for the Security Council to take up the gauntlet, to enforce the rule of law, to accelerate the access of subject peoples to the exercise of self-determination, to silence with effective measures the guns of the aggressor and to remove the threat to Africa and international peace and security once and for all. Meanwhile, it is the duty of every country to come to the support of the subjected people and demonstrate solidarity with the independent countries of Africa in their noble stand of resisting aggression. This is not only an elementary rule but it is a stand of principle and not a stand of expediency. If it is not fulfilled, the independence and integrity of every small State will be in peril.

51. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Syria for the kind words he has addressed to me.

³ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

52. Mr. MORALES-SUAREZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, I would ask you to accept the sincere congratulations of my delegation that someone of your ability, competence and equanimity now presides over the deliberations of the Security Council. I wish also to congratulate your predecessors, Lord Caradon and Mr. Yost, on the way in which they discharged their duties.

53. In regard to the item before the Council, my delegation wishes to express its feelings of shock at the events which have been denounced and its deep regret at the loss of innocent human lives. I wish to convey these feelings to the representative of Senegal.

54. As regards our theoretical position, that is to say our position on the principles that have been invoked in the consideration of the item, it should first of all be noted that we are against the survival of all colonial régimes and that we have, as it were, an inborn anti-colonialist attitude, so that the self-determination of peoples is one of the essential tenets of our thinking in international relations. Fortunately, history has proved that colonialism is essentially short-lived. Peoples aspire to freedom and that is a vital tendency which overcomes any attempt to suppress or condition it. On the other hand, my delegation does not hesitate to condemn any arbitrary qualification of self-defence and any justification for reprisals or punitive acts. For if we are against the colonialist system, that does not make us the enemy of a nation. We maintain old bonds of friendship with Portugal, and even though that does not incline us in its favour against evidence and justice, it does prevent us from taking a decision without having Portugal's version of the facts. I think we can ask no less in cases such as the present one, and that circumstances can hardly be overlooked by the delegation of Colombia.

55. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

56. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): I apologize for intervening once again in this painful debate, but I do so on a point of order. The Council will doubtless recall that this morning I asked it to meet without interruption and to adopt a decision today. However, certain friendly delegations have asked me to agree to deferring the vote until tomorrow morning. Naturally, I can only agree to that request, and I should be grateful to you, Mr. President, if you would agree to postponing the vote until tomorrow morning.

57. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for his intervention on a point of order to inform members of the Council that he does not wish to insist on his original proposal that the Council should vote on this item today. I call on the representative of Portugal on a point of order.

58. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): I merely wish to state that my delegation reserves its right to intervene tomorrow morning or at the next meeting of the Security Council, if the President will permit me to do so.

59. The PRESIDENT: I shall permit the representative of Portugal to make a statement before the vote tomorrow

morning. I now call on the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

60. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I apologize for speaking once again, but I should like to make it clear that while I agreed, as I said, that the draft resolution should not be put to the vote today, I did specify that the vote should take place tomorrow morning.

61. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for the statement he has made on a point of order. It is my understanding, as I stated earlier, that the vote will take place tomorrow morning.

62. Since there are no representatives who wish to take part in the general debate, with the permission of the Council, I should like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of ZAMBIA.

63. When Zambia sent a letter of complaint to the President of the Security Council on 15 July 1969 [*S/9331*], requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council, we stated that the regular armed forces of Portugal had violated the territorial integrity of the Republic of Zambia by bombing the village of Lote, thereby causing considerable harm to life and property. When that meeting was convened [*1486th meeting*] we listed 60 specific acts of aggression against Zambia by Portugal. Out of those 60 incidents the representative of Portugal stated that only about two were real acts of aggression or violation of Zambia's territorial integrity. We argued, however, that whatever the number it did not alter the fact that Portugal had deliberately violated the Charter of the United Nations.

64. In the same debate my colleague, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, reminded the Council that on no fewer than three occasions the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had appealed to the Security Council to condemn forcefully the aggressive acts of Portugal. Mr. Boye of Senegal also spoke and told the Council of the unrest that is being caused by Portugal in Senegal. Many eminent friends from Africa spoke of their experiences in their own countries, which share the fate of being neighbours of African territories still suffering inhuman oppression from the last bastion of the colonial epoch. At that first meeting and the ones that followed later my delegation was told by the allies of Portugal in this chamber that Zambia had failed to establish a *prima facie* case and that they could not support a resolution that condemned acts of banditry committed by Portugal. Obviously, Portugal must have felt comforted and assured of continued support when it repeated similar acts.

65. On 4 December 1969, this Council met to hear the representative of Senegal, Mr. Boye, in his most judicious manner, give precise information on more than 20 flagrant violations of which his country had been the target this year alone. He mentioned places, dates, and names of persons who had been killed or captured; he even mentioned the villages which had been burnt. To all those complaints and all that information given by the representative of Senegal, the Lisbon Government was content to make an over-all, cynical denial.

66. It is the hope of my delegation that those who supported the Lisbon administration in the course of the last debate and told them that the complaint of Zambia was not clear will not in this debate repeat the same story. Portugal's acts must be severely condemned, for facts cannot be better told than they were by the learned representative of Senegal or in a language clearer than that employed by him.

67. We have always pointed out that the Lisbon Government would not have to be harassed here at the United Nations, at the Organization of African Unity or at any meeting of people who long to see the world at peace, if only Portugal did one thing: leave Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea (Bissau) and grant the right of self-determination to the indigenous people. Portugal knows that as far as Africa and the United Nations are concerned Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) are not Portuguese provinces whatsoever. We repeat that those Territories are merely Non-Self-Governing Territories, whose peoples are still deprived of the right to self-determination and independence. They are African Territories still being exploited by Portugal and its allies; they are parts of Africa, or Territories to which the United Nations resolution 1514 (XV) is applicable. That resolution represented a turning point in the history of imperialism and colonialism in Africa and elsewhere in the world and provided a basis for change.

68. But Portugal, instead of responding affirmatively and giving effect to the aspirations of the United Nations Charter, has defied that resolution. It is needless for me to reiterate the numerous other resolutions that Portugal has defied. There are many other resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, all of which I cannot mention, but the following are pertinent: General Assembly resolutions 1807 (XVII), 1819 (XVII), 1913 (XVIII), and Security Council resolutions 163 (1961) and 183 (1963). As I said there are many more, and not even a single one has been heeded or respected by the Lisbon régime.

69. Yet Portugal is a Member of the United Nations. It is the impunity with which Portugal defies those resolutions and the comfort it receives from its imperialist NATO allies which enhances its obduracy. Surely being a Member of the Organization and freely adhering to the Charter of the Organization does not mean that one simply has the right to sit behind a placard marked "Portugal" in the General Assembly, its Committees, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations. Membership demands of a Member State that it live up to its obligations. Portugal has not lived up to them.

70. Every time the representative of Portugal has been called upon by this Council to answer charges of aggression brought against his country, he has unashamedly tried to confuse the course of debate: for instance, by wanting to give the impression that Portugal is at war with the independent African States that border the Non-Self-Governing Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). We have never declared war against Portugal; for, had we done so, the position would clearly have been different. Portugal is fighting a war of oppression; it is in the armed conflict with heroic men who are determined to

free themselves by whatever means and at whatever cost. The only crime that Zambia, Senegal, Guinea, Tanzania, and Congo (Kinshasa) and other countries have committed is to respond affirmatively to the appeal of the Organization of African Unity and the General Assembly addressed to all States. Paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2107 (XX) is pertinent. It calls upon all Member States: "in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, to render the people of the Territories under Portuguese administrations the moral and material support necessary for the restoration of their inalienable rights".

71. It is that assistance which we openly give to the oppressed people that the Lisbon régime terms "acts of aggression" and would like the Security Council to condemn. We in my own country have thousands of refugees from Angola and Mozambique. They are men and women who have run away involuntarily from their own soil to seek shelter in a foreign country. Mr. Boye eloquently pointed out that there are well over 50,000 refugees in Senegal alone being looked after by his Government in collaboration with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. My delegation must point out that the Government and people of Zambia regard the presence of Portugal in Africa as a rotten sore requiring immediate surgery. It is intolerable and unacceptable, and the pride of Africa is extremely hurt by the Portuguese presence in Africa. Consequently, we regard it as an act of good faith and an obligation to give any possible assistance to all those who are prepared to sacrifice everything, including their lives, in order to rout the oppressor. Furthermore, our act is only a positive response to the call of the world, and we would be letting down the world Organization were we to respond otherwise. That is why we feel all the more encouraged and in duty bound to act in this way.

72. Only last month the African people, in their tireless efforts to work together with the United Nations, presented to the General Assembly the Manifesto on Southern Africa, a lucid and clear document acclaimed by peace-loving nations of the world as memorable, eloquent and fair. The document provides a working framework for the oppressor and the oppressed. It insists that the African people want a peaceful settlement of all problems of colonialism and racial "superiority". But it is also emphatic on the point that, should those colonialists refuse to negotiate, then the people of Africa would never abdicate their responsibility and abandon those who are still under the colonial yoke.

73. It is only a matter of time before all of Africa shall become free. We believe ardently in historic determinism, and we believe that no single nation, however strong, however well armed it may be, will crush the spirit of nationalism. That is a fact which has been proved in Europe, in Asia, in Latin America and in Africa. If Portugal's presence and domination can survive my generation, it certainly cannot survive the generation that will come after mine. Here is the advice that the allies of Portugal should give it: that Portugal is fighting a lost war; that it is foolishly wasting all the financial help that they give it. Is it not Portugal which is the most under-developed country in Europe? Lisbon is spending about \$400 million a year—or 45 per cent of its national budget—on defence and security alone. Defence and security in Lisbon mean

wars in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea (Bissau). That is a lot of money for a country with such a low standard of living. At times we wonder whether Portugal has any friends in Europe at all. They must try to disillusion it by telling it that military and colonial adventurism in this second half of the twentieth century is a notion as fantastic as the dream of an opium smoker. Portugal has such poor provinces as Alentejo within its territory to develop, and would save millions of dollars if it got out of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Leave the people of those Territories to shape their own destiny, we say. The obligations of Portugal are in Europe, and not in Africa.

74. In this debate Portugal and its allies will hear the voice of agony from Africa. It is the voice of a continent still bleeding from wounds inflicted by a foreign oppressor; yet in it they will hear the rhythm of optimism, for if the

peoples of Africa have a monopoly of anything it is of optimism that we shall conquer and that Africa shall be free and shall regain its usurped rights.

75. We shall have another occasion to continue this vigorous denunciation of these irresponsible acts of terrorism and banditry by Portugal.

76. Speaking now as PRESIDENT, I would say that, as I indicated earlier, there are no further speakers on my list for the general debate. In accordance with the views expressed during informal consultations that have been held during the course of the meeting, the next meeting of the Security Council, which will concentrate specifically on the matter of voting, will take place tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Напишите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
