

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

FEB 22 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION  
**SECURITY COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1525<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 19 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1525) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
Complaint by Guinea: Letter dated 4 December 1969 from the Chargé d'affaires <i>ad interim</i> of Guinea addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9528) . . . . .	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 TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 19 December 1969, at 3 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/1525)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Complaint by Guinea:

Letter dated 4 December 1969 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of Guinea addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9528).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Complaint by Guinea

**Letter dated 4 December 1969 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of Guinea addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9528)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with previous decisions, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Guinea and Portugal to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of Mali, Syria, Congo (Brazzaville), Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Lesotho, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Yemen and India to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, on the usual understanding that those with places at the side of the chamber will be invited to take a seat at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Touré (Guinea) and Mr. F. B. de Miranda (Portugal) took places at the Council table, and Mr. S. Traore (Mali), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria), Mr. J. Mombouli (Congo (Brazzaville)), Mr. L. H. Diggs (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. F. B. Savage (Sierra Leone), Mr. A. M'Sadek (Tunisia), Mr. M. T. Mashologu (Lesotho), Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya), Mr. M. S. Alattar (Yemen) and Mr. S. Sen (India) took the places reserved for them.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received letters from the

permanent representatives of Mauritius and Bulgaria requesting to be invited to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion on the question now before the Council [S/9572, S/9573]. In accordance with the Council's usual practice I propose, accordingly, if I hear no objection from any member of the Council, to invite the representatives of Mauritius and Bulgaria to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to sit at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. K. Ramphul (Mauritius) and Mr. M. Tarabanov (Bulgaria) took the places reserved for them.*

3. The PRESIDENT: Before we turn to the item on the agenda, I should like to inform the members, with deep sorrow, that I have just learned of the shooting of the President of the Republic of Uganda, Milton Obote, this evening. The fate of the President is unknown, and I shall undertake, on behalf of the Security Council, to send a message to the Government and people of Uganda expressing our sympathies.

4. The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the complaint submitted to it by Guinea on 4 December 1969 in document S/9528. I call now on the representative of Nepal who wishes to introduce a draft resolution.

5. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): Mr. President, I associate myself with the sentiments that you have just expressed with respect to the reports of the tragic happening that has befallen the President of Uganda.

6. For the third time since July of this year the Security Council has been called upon to consider a situation brought about by the violations of territorial integrity of African States by Portugal in pursuance of its colonial policy. The Government of Guinea has sought redress for the wrongs it has suffered at the hands of the Portuguese authorities. The complaint by Guinea has the full support of all African States represented in the Organization of African Unity, as we can see from the letter dated 5 December [S/9549] from the representatives of 40 African States addressed to the President of the Security Council. My delegation fully shares the concern felt by those States at the threat posed by the colonial policy of the Government of Portugal to peace and security in Africa, a concern which has been reflected time and again in a number of resolutions adopted by competent organs of the

United Nations. May I say that, by those resolutions, the United Nations has rejected the claim of the Government of Portugal concerning the legitimacy of its colonial presence in various parts of Africa.

7. It has become evident to all of us that the Government of Portugal, in a bid to perpetuate its domination over its colonial possessions in Africa, a bid which is foredoomed to failure, is bent on carrying out a sustained policy of active hostility against each of the African States whose territories adjoin those of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique. Those colonial Territories have been recognized as ones to which Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration<sup>1</sup> on decolonization apply. The several violations of the territorial integrity of Guinea, the subject-matter of the present complaint, fall into the general pattern of the colonial policy of Portugal. My delegation has no doubt whatever that so long as Portugal persists in its present policy it is bound to give rise to further such justifiable complaints in the future, because Portugal's colonial policy is a source of constant friction in the political life of the African continent.

8. As a progressive institution in the United Nations system, the Security Council, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of world peace and security, cannot lose sight of that basic factor in the over-all situation in Africa. Each individual complaint, such as the one which the Security Council is considering, should be viewed in that context. Furthermore, the Council should take account of the commitment of the African States to the ideal and goal of a peaceful change in Africa, as evidenced by the Lusaka Manifesto.<sup>2</sup> The Security Council should pronounce itself unequivocally in favour of freedom, independence and the self-determination of peoples under colonial domination everywhere.

9. With those considerations uppermost in our minds, the delegation of Nepal has joined with those of Algeria, Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia in sponsoring a draft resolution, which it is now my honour to submit to the Security Council in the name of the five delegations. The draft resolution reads as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having noted the contents of the letters of the representative of Guinea in documents S/9525,<sup>3</sup> S/9528<sup>3</sup> and S/9554,<sup>3</sup>*

*"Observing that incidents of this nature jeopardize international peace and security.*

*"Mindful that no State should act in any manner inconsistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations,*

*"Gravely concerned with any and all such attacks by Portugal directed against independent African States,*

*"Grieved at the extensive damage caused by the Portuguese shelling of Guinean villages from positions in the Territory of Guinea (Bissau),*

*"1. Deeply deplores the loss of life and heavy damage to several Guinean villages inflicted by the Portuguese military authorities operating from bases in Guinea (Bissau);*

*"2. Calls upon Portugal to desist forthwith from violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Guinea;*

*"3. Calls upon the Portuguese authorities in Guinea (Bissau) to release immediately the Guinean civilian plane which was captured on 26 March 1969 together with the pilots thereon;*

*"4. Further calls upon the Portuguese authorities in Guinea (Bissau) to release immediately the Guinean motor barge, Patrice Lumumba, which was captured on 27 August 1969 together with the passengers thereon;*

*"5. Solemnly warns Portugal that if such acts were to be repeated in future, the Council would have to consider seriously further steps to give effect to this decision."*

10. I shall refrain from explaining the provisions of the draft resolution, because they are self-explanatory. Let me point out, however, that the draft resolution has been conceived in a spirit of moderation and formulated with a great degree of restraint, and that it seeks, in a limited way, to redress the wrongs suffered by Guinea and to discourage Portugal from taking upon itself the task of chastising the African States one after the other, in pursuance of its colonial policy and in contravention of its solemn obligations under the Charter.

11. This disturbing situation in Africa, for which the colonial policy of Portugal is responsible, is the fundamental factor that should be taken into account by the Security Council in the discussion of this question. It is this situation that the sponsors of the draft resolution are concerned about most.

12. Members of the Council will recall that on 28 July 1969, and on as recent a date as 9 December, the Security Council, quite rightly, adopted two resolutions—268 (1969) and 273 (1969)—with regard to similar matters brought before the Council by Zambia and Senegal.

13. In a spirit of consistency, the Security Council will no doubt view the present text with that measure of positive consideration which characterized its attitude to the two aforementioned resolutions. It is the firm belief of the sponsors that this draft resolution will receive the widest possible support in the Council.

14. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that arrangements will be made to have the text of the draft resolution which has been read out distributed as an official document of the Council.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) dated 14 December 1960.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969.*

<sup>4</sup> Subsequently submitted as document S/9574.

15. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): On behalf of the Hungarian delegation I wish to join you, Mr. President, in expressing deep sympathy to the delegation and Government of Uganda on the tragic event which has befallen His Excellency President Milton Obote.

16. It is most regrettable that the Security Council for the second time in three weeks has to deal with the oppressive colonialist policy of Portugal, which has resulted recently in armed acts of aggression against sovereign African States, this time the Republic of Guinea.

17. From the letter submitted to the Council by the representative of Guinea [S/9528], it has become quite clear, even to those who might have had some doubts before, that the incidents enumerated, which are various types and intensity but always destructive to foreign land, life and property—acts of hijacking of airplanes, boats and so on—are by no means isolated incidents. In less than six months, these violent actions have been perpetrated by Portugal against Zambia, Senegal and now Guinea; but there were many more at earlier times against other African countries.

18. During the 1522nd meeting of the Council on 15 December, the representative of Portugal took the liberty of saying, among other things, that it was not the policy of Portugal that was under discussion here. But what do these facts prove, if not a policy? The sequence of such acts of aggression constitutes an inherent part of the deliberate colonialist policy of Portugal, a policy, and practice, of terror and piracy, which occur repeatedly wherever Portuguese domination exists in Africa.

19. The representative of Portugal may be right in saying that it is not the internal affairs of that country on the Iberian Peninsula with which we should deal here. But he is definitely and deeply wrong in suggesting that the policy of colonial domination—the policy of aggression against the territorial integrity of African nations, the policy of terror against Africans fighting for their freedom, independence and self-determination—is not before the Council. He has been reminded many times—the demand has been made repeatedly in United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council—that Portugal must abandon its colonialist policy, that it must adopt immediate measures in order to grant independence to Territories under its domination and to ensure observance of the right to self-determination of the peoples living in those Territories.

20. Moreover, the General Assembly, in its resolution 2507 (XXIV), adopted at the 1816th plenary meeting on 21 November 1969—that is, at a time when armed acts of aggression were being committed by Portugal against African countries—stated, among other things:

*“The General Assembly,*

*“... ”*

*“Recommends that the Security Council, with a view to the immediate implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) in the Territories under Portuguese domination, should take effective steps in conformity with the relevant*

*provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and in view of the determination of the international community to put an end to colonialism and racial discrimination in Africa.”*

21. Portugal's answer to that resolution, as well as to a number of earlier ones, was nothing but the shelling of villages and the killing and wounding of the civilian population—not only a violation of human rights, but also a danger to international peace and security. In such circumstances can anyone question the right—and not only the right but also the most important duty—of the Security Council to examine Portugal's policy of colonialism and aggression?

22. The representative of Portugal ventured to state the other day that the comments of his delegation do not receive due attention in the Security Council. As a matter of fact, those comments, including such distorted ideas as “Portuguese overseas provinces” and “pluri-continental State”, and such other hypocritical assertions as that Portugal was “acting in self-defence” or was “the victim of constant attacks”, have always been given due attention; the result of that consideration by the Security Council, as well as by the General Assembly, has been a long row of resolutions condemning Portugal for its colonialist policy.

23. Thus, contrary to the accusations of the representative of Portugal, the fact is that Portugal does not pay the slightest attention to international public opinion; it is Portugal which disregards and completely defies the United Nations and the Security Council.

24. Needless to say, it is not the United Nations or the Security Council which need to be governed by the colonialist ideas and oppressive policy of Portugal; rather, it is the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of this body that must be honoured and implemented by Portugal. Any formal hope the aggressor may entertain of possibly rejecting and dismissing those instruments could never justify its cause and its actions.

25. Representatives of African States and peoples, including those at present under Portuguese colonial oppression, have stated in strong terms on several occasions that Portugal has got nothing to do with Africa. Portugal, as a country situated on the Iberian Peninsula in Europe, is nothing but an intruder on the African continent and as such it has no right at all to characterize its aggression against African peoples as “self-defence”. In fact, the opposite is the case. The peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and other African countries have every reason to exercise their right to self-defence against the intruder State of Portugal.

26. In this context, my delegation does not and cannot accept any approach such as that made by the representative of Portugal, earlier in this debate, when he said that the Security Council should arrive at an equitable decision concerning Portugal's acts of aggression and continued violations of the United Nations Charter. It is the firm opinion of my delegation that there can never be an equitable decision that would suit the aggressor or confer any right or justification on the colonialists in the mainte-

nance of their oppressive policy. To paraphrase the words of the representative of Portugal: The world at large knows very well who launches violence against whom, who takes the offensive and who is obliged to defend himself. The present case, as well as many previous ones, shows clearly that Portuguese armed forces violate African territories, Portuguese soldiers kill African peoples and Portuguese artillery shells and destroys African villages.

27. The Security Council has once again the task of stopping these cruel and inhuman acts and of condemning the every-day practice, as well as the general idea and the reality, of this remnant of the colonial age in Africa. Owing to the seriousness of the continued armed aggression by Portugal against African States, the Council is obliged to consider these acts with adequate seriousness, in view of the provisions contained in Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations.

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

29. Mr. ALATTAR (Yemen) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I wish to associate myself and my delegation with your expressions of regret at the tragic event which has just taken place in Uganda.

30. I should like to thank you for being kind enough to let me speak on the subject of the complaint lodged by a brother country, Guinea. Once again I wish to express to the members of the Council our indignation at the acts of aggression committed by the Portuguese colonial authorities against countries and peoples of Africa.

31. Hardly ten days ago, on 8 December, my delegation was one of those that expressed their concern at the resumption of attacks by the Portuguese authorities. Now Mr. Touré, the representative of Guinea, has brought before the Security Council a complaint justified by grave events, by warlike acts committed by the Portuguese authorities against the sovereignty of the Republic of Guinea.

32. Those who know the conscientiousness with which the leaders of Guinea, in particular President Sékou Touré, deal with political problems and international relations can have no doubt that the crimes made known here were indeed committed by Portugal. There are, on the one hand, the facts reported by the representative of Guinea and, on the other, the subterfuges of the Portuguese representative intended to distract our attention from the real problem, the problem of colonial domination. I shall not repeat what I tried to demonstrate in my last statement regarding the economic aspects of Portuguese colonialism and the crucial importance of those aspects for the political life of Portugal, a traditional colonial Power. The facts and figures are there. I should merely like to draw attention to the remarkable report of 28 November 1969 of Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.<sup>5</sup>

33. The new Government of Portugal, that of Mr. Caetano, we are told, is giving the economic development problems of Portugal and its overseas territories greater attention than they received hitherto. This means purely and simply still greater and more merciless exploitation of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, for the very heavy military expenditures, which absorb half the revenues, have to be made good. Officially—and we know what is meant by that—the figures for the various items of a budget come under specific headings, but there are other figures besides which should be added to those official figures. We all know the solid support given by international capitalism to colonialist Portugal. Annexes II A and II B of appendix II of the report of Sub-Committee I on the activities of foreign economic interests in Portuguese colonies show up clearly the close ties between traditional colonialism and modern neo-colonialism. I need not stress here the economic, social and political consequences of such foreign capital reinforcements in the Portuguese colonies; but we must not lose sight of this aspect of the problem, which will enable us to understand how desperately anxious the Portuguese authorities are to preserve their colonial privileges at all costs.

34. Neither modern history, which has seen peoples free themselves from colonial domination by heroic struggle, nor the lessons drawn from this experience by other great colonial Powers, nor the principles of the United Nations Charter have modified the policies of the Portuguese authorities, which still believe that they are living in the days of colonial epics and conquered territories.

35. The murderous warfare being waged by Portugal on the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola, and its provocations against sovereign African countries constitute a challenge to the international community and an affront to our Organization. However, the liberation movements are sure of their victory. Let us listen to one of the leaders who symbolizes the decisive liberation struggle in Guinea (Bissau); he said:

"Today, we no longer fear the forests; we have conquered the forests; we have mobilized and organized men's minds for the struggle and transformed their weakness into strength. Such is the struggle.

"...

"We do not like war, but this armed struggle has its advantages: by means of this struggle we are forging a strong nation, aware of itself. We have freed more than two thirds of our territory. No matter what the present political circumstances may be in Portugal, the situation will only progress towards the total liberation of our people with"—and I would emphasize this—"with or without the prior assent of the Portuguese Government."

36. The representative of Portugal may say this is bravado or exaggeration, but he is free to think what he wishes. Those who believe in the liberation movements, whether in Africa, Asia or the Middle East, are convinced that the aims the liberation movements have set themselves will be achieved.

37. Guinea, for its part, has never concealed its view on the liberation movements, views which are in perfect

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 23A*, annex.

agreement with the principles of the Charter and the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Hence the shellings and provocations, and the threats made by the Portuguese authorities against Guinea. Nevertheless, Guinea is not alone. It has secured not only the support of all the 39 members of the Organization of African Unity, but also that of many countries on other continents.

38. As far as the delegation of Yemen is concerned, we should like to assure the delegation of Guinea of our total solidarity, and we should like to assure the liberation movements in Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola, and also the other liberation movements struggling for self-determination, liberation and independence, that we admire them and have absolute confidence in their ultimate victory. Furthermore, my delegation hopes that the Security Council will take adequate steps to put an end to the aggression and to apply to recalcitrant countries like Portugal the sanctions provided for in the Charter, so as to make possible the achievement of one of the fundamental principles of our Organization, that of self-determination.

39. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): My delegation joins the other delegations in expressing deep concern and sorrow on hearing the sad news of the tragedy that has befallen the President of the Republic of Uganda. We extend our deep sympathy to the Government and people of Uganda.

40. For the third time this year, the Security Council is seized of a complaint brought against Portugal by an independent African State. This time the complainant is the Republic of Guinea. A little more than a week ago the Security Council adopted a resolution strongly condemning the Portuguese authorities for the shelling of a Senegalese village, causing loss of life and damage to property [*resolution 273 (1969)*]. Earlier, on 28 July, the Security Council strongly censured the Portuguese attack on a village in the territory of Zambia—your country, Mr. President—resulting in similar loss of life and property [*resolution 268 (1969)*].

41. It is therefore clear that what we have before us is a much wider question than that of specific complaints. This wider question is that of confrontation between the independent African States and Portuguese colonialism in the west and south of Africa. The fact that 40 African States have again, in their letter of 5 December 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council [*S/9549*], ranged themselves on the side of the Republic of Guinea, as they did on the side of Senegal and Zambia on the earlier occasions to which I have referred, and also the fact that so many African States not members of the Security Council always participate in the debates on complaints against Portugal, confirms that what the Council has to consider is not so much the particular instances of provocations and aggressive acts by Portugal, but the potential threat to peace and security in Africa by the refusal of Portugal to end its colonial rule over Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique.

42. My delegation, at the 1519th meeting of the Security Council, stated the case of the international community against Portugal, basing it on the provisions of the

resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, namely, General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 1542 (XV) of 15 December 1960 and 1807 (XVII) of 14 December 1962, and Security Council resolutions 180 (1963) of 31 July 1963, 218 (1965) of 23 November 1965 and 253 (1968), paragraph 13, of 29 May 1968. I do not wish to repeat the statement of the case that I submitted to the Council on that occasion.

43. I also dealt at that meeting with the defence of Portugal as put forward by the representative of Portugal. I do not wish to repeat either what I then said in this connexion. However, at the 1524th meeting of the Council, held yesterday, the following contention was advanced by the representative of Portugal:

“Throughout that period”—that is, nearly 500 years—“Portugal’s sovereignty in Africa has been internationally recognized. It was on that basis that Portugal was admitted to the United Nations. It is beyond the competence of the United Nations to question the territorial composition of the Portuguese State or its sovereignty in any part of its territory.” [*1524th meeting, para. 76.*]

44. The representative of Portugal seems to maintain that the United Nations is not competent to question Portuguese sovereignty in Africa. May we not in our turn ask whether Portugal is competent to question the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, which sets forth the declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. Is not Portugal bound to comply with the obligations set forth in that declaration? As recently as the just-concluded twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Assembly, in its resolution 2507 (XXIV) of 21 November 1969, condemned the continued refusal of the Government of Portugal to transmit information under Article 73 c of the Charter with regard to the colonial Territories under its domination. The resolution went on to state that this refusal stemmed from Portugal despite numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly concerning those Territories. What has Portugal to say about this violation of a Charter obligation? Is it tenable to invoke the Charter against the international community and at the same time to flout a provision which obligates Portugal to develop self-government and to transmit information, including that of a constitutional and political nature, as to how it is developing political institutions and taking into account the political aspirations of the peoples of its colonies?

45. My delegation would like to submit that it is the bounden duty of all the members of the Security Council to keep in mind Portugal’s breach of the law of the United Nations in weighing the contention of Portugal in regard to the right of self-defence and so-called reprisal. The right of self-defence does not belong under the generally accepted rules of international law when the party claiming it is acting in contravention of the law. That basic rule must govern our entire approach to the defence put forward on behalf of Portugal on the present complaint, as well as on any others that may be brought against Portugal in the Security Council from time to time.

46. I should like in this context to repeat what I said at the 1519th meeting of the Security Council on the plea by Portugal of the right of self-defence:

"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." [1519th meeting, para. 17.]

47. Finally, the African States are accused by Portugal of giving aid and comfort to persons involved in what Portugal calls "terrorist activities". The Republic of Guinea has been so charged in the present debate. In this connexion the Security Council will no doubt bear in mind that Guinea, like the other African States concerned, has been doing no more than acting in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations. As the Lusaka Manifesto puts it:

"If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible, or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movements to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the timing of change. But while peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those at present in power in the States of southern Africa, we have no choice but to give the peoples of those territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against their oppressors."<sup>6</sup>

48. Those then are the considerations which, in our opinion, constitute the perspective for the Council's action. It is clear that the succession of provocative attacks and incidents, including the latest shelling of Guinean territory, is creating a highly-charged atmosphere. The resultant tension is fraught with serious consequences to peace in Africa. The Council must therefore focus attention on the preventive aspects of its decision. In our view, it is the duty of this Council to endeavour to take such steps, as it did in the case of the complaint by Senegal, as would reassure the Government of Guinea and other African States that the Council cannot remain indifferent to the series of incursions by the Portuguese colonial authorities against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States which adjoin its colonial possessions.

49. The choice before the Council is clear: it lies between the retention of the confidence of African States in the Council's willingness to pronounce unequivocally against Portugal, and the loss of that confidence should it fail to do so. It is our hope that the Council will make the right choice.

50. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

51. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate you on being President of the Council. We are most gratified that an African has been called upon to preside

over discussions in the Security Council on questions concerning Africa.

52. I wish to express to you the thanks of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and, through you, may I thank the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to explain, during the deliberations in the Council on the complaint by the Republic of Guinea against the acts of aggression by Portugal—and this in fact is a complaint by Africa as a whole—the views of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

53. We have decided to participate in this debate because it concerns not only Guinea, a friendly country with which we are linked by long-standing ties that were established at the time of its declaration of independence, but also because it concerns all of Africa. Indeed, the aggressive acts perpetrated against Guinea by Portugal are the expression of a policy of continuous war not only against that country but against the whole African continent.

54. In a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of all the African countries [S/9549]—with the exception of the Republic of South Africa, which cannot in its present form be considered as anything but alien to Africa—it is stated:

"The African States' request for the convening of the Security Council is based on the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, which requires all member States to 'promote the unity and solidarity of the African States' and 'eradicate all forms of colonialism from Africa'."

55. These aggressive acts against Guinea, which are one link in a long series of acts of aggression against African countries, are very revealingly set forth in the letter from the 40 African countries, so that I need not mention them again. They constitute, when taken together, a threat to international peace and security.

56. It is true that the representative of Portugal tried to minimize the significance of those aggressive acts by describing them as border incidents and by trying to present the matter as if it was Portugal that had been attacked by Guinea, and not the reverse. Although in many cases he tried to extricate himself from the situation in which he found himself by saying for example that the acts of aggression reported by Guinea were non-existent, he did in effect recognize their existence in his statement of 18 December when he stated:

"But we also emphasize our right of self-defence against attacks launched on Portuguese Guinea; since the attacks come from the Republic of Guinea, we hold the Republic of Guinea wholly responsible for the consequences."

"The Republic of Guinea, which aids and encourages violence against us, has no right to complain of consequences, whatever they may be, arising from its own illegal offensive actions." [1524th meeting, paras. 73 and 74.]

These are open avowals of Portugal's responsibility and guilt in connexion with the acts of aggression committed against the Republic of Guinea.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754, para. 12 of the Manifesto.



57. The representative of Portugal made much of the fact that the border incidents which he referred to were old incidents and that the matter was brought belatedly before the Security Council. That is but one additional admission on the part of the representative of Portugal that the acts of aggression were real and were indeed committed by his country. At the same time, he would have us believe that Portugal was the victim of attacks from the Republic of Guinea, and he mentioned a number of facts that had been alleged. However, the fact remains that it was the Republic of Guinea that lodged the complaint against Portugal concerning the attacks, whereas Portugal did not dare lodge a complaint against Guinea in the Security Council. This shows that Portugal cannot, will not and dare not shed any light on the situation which has arisen as a result of its own acts of aggression. All it does is equivocate in the Security Council in the face of a situation which is all too clear in Africa.

58. The list of offences of Portuguese colonialists is so long that the representative of Portugal was himself compelled to say that he could not remember the facts mentioned and would need some additional time to secure information from his Government.

59. In this situation, so threatening for peace and security in Africa, a very relevant question has been put on a number of occasions by many representatives in the United Nations, namely, how it was possible for a small country like Portugal to maintain in its African colonies an army of 150,000 men, the largest army in all Africa. How could the Portuguese Government afford to spend every year \$320 million, 43 per cent of its national budget, just to wage a colonial war against the oppressed peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). It is a secret to no one, least of all to the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), that these members are the main suppliers of weapons, and that they provide the military and economic assistance thanks to which Portugal can afford to wage that colonial war, can repress the struggle for freedom of the African peoples, and can engage in repeated attacks against the independent States of Africa. That is an act which is a violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of many United Nations resolutions. The General Assembly, in paragraph 13 of its resolution 2507 (XXIV), which it adopted on 21 November 1969:

*"Urges all States, and particularly the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to withhold or desist from giving further military and other assistance to Portugal which enables it to pursue the colonial war in the Territories under its domination."*

60. What is really responsible for the non-compliance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is international imperialism. The aggressive policy in southern Africa is being applied by a new colonial and racist bloc made up of South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, acting with the complete support and with the complicity even of certain NATO powers. Their primary aim is to create in southern Africa a strong military and economic bastion in order to defend at any price the Territories which are still under colonial

domination and to embark on the reconquest of the African continent.

61. It is with this in mind that Portugal, largely on the basis of the assistance from its allies, tries to blackmail the independent States of Africa in order to make them give up the struggle for the complete independence of Africa and to prevent them from supplying the assistance which United Nations resolutions require that they should provide to the liberation movements of the still subjugated African peoples.

62. In the light of these repeated acts of Portugal against the independent States of Africa, the Security Council should regard it as its duty to take vigorous action in order to put an end to this constant threat which weighs heavily over peace and security in Africa. Portugal should be compelled to stop its armed attacks in Africa and to comply with the resolution of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

63. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, the Soviet delegation fully associates itself with the sympathy expressed by you in connexion with the monstrous terrorist act committed by the assailant of the President of Uganda, Mr. Milton Obote. I am personally horrified at the news and wish to express my deepest regret because I knew President Obote personally very well. I accompanied him in the Soviet Union when he came on an official visit and we visited numerous towns and regions. I met him in the capital of Uganda, Kampala, and he impressed me as a fervent patriot of his own country and all of Africa, as a passionate champion of the liberation of Africa, as an active fighter against oppression, colonialism and imperialism, and as a wise statesman distinguished by the breadth of his political views and by his great experience of the revolutionary struggle for the freedom of his own country and of Africa.

64. The assailant's hand raised against so distinguished a leader of Africa was undoubtedly not the only one, but behind it the forces of vicious reaction, colonialism and imperialism. It is this aggression on the part of colonial Powers, which we are discussing today in the Security Council, that creates an atmosphere of hatred and malice in the continent of Africa against those who are selflessly waging a struggle for African freedom and for the strengthening of the sovereignty and independence of African countries and peoples.

65. But, as members know, terror is the weapon of those that are doomed. The fact that reaction, colonialism and imperialism are doomed is what impels these men to commit such monstrous crimes. But we know that the peoples of Africa will respond to such acts by closing their ranks, strengthening their unity and intensifying the struggle to cleanse the African continent of the last vestiges of colonialism and to eradicate racism from that continent. In that connexion we can assure the African peoples and the African States that the socialist countries and the Soviet Union will extend to them support, understanding and all possible assistance.

66. Turning now to the question under discussion in the Security Council, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement. Only recently the Council completed its consideration of the question of aggressive acts by the Portuguese colonialists against Senegal. The Council condemned the Portuguese authorities for those acts of aggression and demanded that an end should be put to violations of the sovereignty and integrity of Senegal.

67. Now the Security Council is once again obliged to discuss the question of aggressive acts by Portugal against another African country, Guinea. The representative of Guinea adduced in his statement numerous irrefutable facts demonstrating that the armed provocation and violations of the territorial integrity of Guinea by the Portuguese colonialists from the Territory of Guinea (Bissau), which is illegally occupied by them, are of a permanent and systematic nature. The mere enumeration of those acts of aggression perpetrated by the Portuguese colonialists against the Republic of Guinea sounds like a most serious indictment: the artillery and mortar bombardment of peaceful settlements in Guinea and the bombing of its territory from the air, the piratical seizure by Portuguese military patrol boats of a civilian vessel with passengers, in Guinean territorial waters, the illegal detention by Portugal of a Guinean civilian aircraft and the abduction of dozens of peaceful Guinean citizens and their illegal detention. As a result of all these acts, peaceful inhabitants of the Republic of Guinea are dying and serious material damage has been caused. The delegation of Portugal has been unable to refute these facts.

68. The Soviet delegation, in considering Senegal's appeal to the Security Council arising out of Portugal's acts of aggression, has already had an opportunity to express its views on the acts of aggression of the Portuguese colonialists against African countries and the colonial-imperialist motives of those acts of aggression and of those forces in whose interests they are perpetrated. That assessment by the Soviet delegation is fully applicable to the aggressive acts of Portugal against Guinea now under discussion.

69. The Security Council and the General Assembly have in recent years repeatedly demanded a halt to armed subversion by the Portuguese colonialists against independent African countries and the cessation of violations by Portuguese troops of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of those countries.

70. The General Assembly, in paragraph 4 of its resolution 2507 (XXIV) recently adopted at its twenty-fourth session, condemned Portugal's policy of using the Territories under its colonial rule "for violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States, as in the recent case in the Republic of Guinea".

71. However, as recent events have shown, Portugal is going further and further in its policy of ignoring these legitimate demands of the United Nations. It is defying the stern determination and the unshakable will of the African peoples to achieve the liberation of the remnants of colonial slavery in Africa and to defend their independence and sovereignty against all encroachments by the forces of colonialism and imperialism.

72. Portuguese colonialists in Africa are comporting themselves like doomed men, recklessly and provocatively. Their reckless acts are a threat to the security of African countries and to peace in Africa. But no political trickery, no acts of aggression and violence against African peoples can impede the liberation of those African peoples that are still under the foreign yoke. The hour has struck for colonial rule on African soil. Next year both the United Nations and the world will commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. No efforts on the part of the Portuguese colonialists can save them from the legitimate and righteous wrath of the African peoples that they have oppressed.

73. Portugal has no future in Africa. The hour is near when African soil will be cleaned of the Portuguese colonial oppressors and they will be expelled from Africa. There can be doubt about that.

74. It is now obvious to the Security Council that the armed provocations of the Portuguese colonialists committed against independent African countries are not isolated incidents and not the result of irresponsible acts by the Portuguese military. This is in fact essentially a new stage in the permanent colonial war of Portugal against the African peoples that are oppressed by the colonialists and racists and against the sovereign States of Africa.

75. We have here a perfectly definite political course on the part of Portugal, which for many years has been waging war against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), and is now expanding the scope and the sphere of that war by perpetrating systematic armed attacks on independent African States. That is the essence of the matter. Portugal's war against the fighting peoples of the Portuguese colonies to maintain its rule over those peoples is at the same time becoming a war against free Africa. Using modern weapons and modern military technology, the Portuguese colonialists, for many years now, have been carrying on a large-scale and bloody war to maintain their colonial oppression over 5 million Africans in Angola, 6 million Africans in Mozambique, and 500,000 Africans in Guinea (Bissau). Now the Portuguese colonialists are also laying hands on the freedom and sovereignty of the peoples of independent African States: Guinea, Senegal, Zambia and Tanzania.

76. Portugal is in effect waging war in various parts of the African continent against the freedom of Africa and against all African peoples. Portugal's colonial war in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and its aggressive acts against a number of independent African States are links in a single chain of aggressive colonial actions by Portugal in Africa.

77. Portugal's war against the peoples of the Portuguese colonies fighting for their freedom and against a number of independent African States in various parts of Africa is a flagrant flouting of the most important principles of the United Nations Charter and a violation of the decisions of the General Assembly. In resorting to the methods of international brigandage to perpetuate its colonial rule on African soil, Portugal is in fact committing aggression

against all Africa and its peoples. The reply to this strengthens the unity and solidarity of the African States, as demonstrated both in the discussion of Senegal's appeal to the Security Council and, now, in the discussion of the appeal made by the Republic of Guinea. In the first stance, 36 African States, and in the second, 40, appealed to the Security Council, expressing their solidarity with and support for the victims of Portuguese aggression. That is a striking illustration of the solidarity of the African continent in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism; and those who are trying to preserve colonial rule in Africa must draw the most serious political conclusions from it.

78. The aggressive activity of Portugal must inevitably be a matter of concern to all peace-loving States—States that have the cause of the freedom of the peoples and the preservation of peace and strengthening of international security at heart.

79. The question naturally arises why such a small, economically backward country as Portugal is behaving so aggressively and provocatively in Africa. Why does it dare to defy the United Nations, to ignore the historic decisions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to all colonial peoples, and to encroach upon the independence and sovereignty of many African countries, notwithstanding the demands and warnings of the Security Council? The reasons for that are to be found, in the first instance, in the assistance, support and patronage which Portugal receives from some of its more powerful military and political allies in NATO.

80. We fully share the views and statements of those representatives of African States who have rightly pointed out in the Council that the aggressive acts of Portugal against those countries and the expansion of its war and intensification of terror against the peoples of the Portuguese colonies have become and are possible only because Portugal, as a member of the NATO military bloc, is able to obtain military and financial support, as well as political and moral support, from its allies. Everybody knows that, and it is really the case.

81. In the statements made by the representatives of a number of African countries, convincing information has been adduced showing that Portugal, with its economic and military potential, and even utilizing the resources of the African peoples it oppresses, could not, without such assistance from outside, expand its military activities against the fighting peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) on such a large scale, could not strengthen its army and increase the number of police and security troops, could not extend the apparatus of terrorist oppression in the colonies, and at the same time throw down a military challenge to the countries bordering on its colonial possessions and thereby expand its aggressive acts against those countries in Africa.

82. The provocative acts and the incessant armed provocations against independent African States carried out by Portugal are possible also because the Portuguese colonialists can rely on their military-political alliance with the racist-Fascist régimes of the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, condemned by the United Nations.

That bloc of colonialists and racists will not stop at any crimes against Africans in order to keep southern, and some parts of western, Africa under colonial racist rule as a bastion and bridgehead of military imperialism on African soil. Portuguese troops, shedding the blood of African peoples, are actually doing the dirty work of their more powerful, wealthy and influential allies, they are acting as an advance punitive detachment of imperialism, whose task is to prevent the liberation of oppressed African peoples and terrorize free Africa, to oppose the strengthening of independence and to impede the economic development and social progress of the independent countries of Africa.

83. The Soviet delegation has already drawn attention to the fact that attempts by the Lisbon delegation here to justify Portugal's aggressive acts against independent African countries by references to an alleged "right to self-defence" cannot mislead anyone. Not a single African country is threatening Portugal's security. On the contrary, the Portuguese colonialists, acting illegally and violating United Nations decisions in maintaining their rule over millions of Africans living thousands of miles from Portugal, are putting down the freedom of African peoples and threatening the security of the sovereign States of that continent.

84. The General Assembly has recognized that it is not only a right, but a duty, of African States, and indeed of all States, to afford moral and material assistance to the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese rule in their sacred and just struggle for their freedom and national independence. That decision was adopted by an overwhelming majority of Member States. The General Assembly called upon all States to render such assistance, and at its twenty-fourth session once again affirmed that appeal, calling upon all States to increase their assistance to the peoples of the Portuguese colonies in their just struggle for freedom. Those appeals are not going unheeded: the fighting peoples of the Portuguese colonies are receiving, and will continue to receive—right up to the time of their full liberation from colonial rule—material and moral assistance and support. Right and justice are on their side.

85. In the light of this reality, the Lisbon representative's utterances about some so-called interference in the domestic affairs of Portugal are entirely unfounded. This is a typical example of the attempts made to distort the true concept of "internal affairs". African States, in affording assistance and support to the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), have a lawful right to do so, a lawful right confirmed and approved by the United Nations. They are doing their fraternal and international duty. The peoples of those colonies are carrying on an armed struggle against the illegal interference in their internal affairs, against Portuguese colonial brigandage, against foreign enslavers that are trying to deprive them of their inalienable right to self-determination and freedom.

86. The arguments of the representative of Lisbon about the right of the Portuguese authorities to take "retaliatory measures" are also completely devoid of foundation. Everyone knows that modern international law and the United Nations Charter forbid States to have recourse to military reprisals. The aggressive acts of Portugal against

African States, carried out under the pretext of being so-called retaliatory measures, are in flagrant contradiction with the obligations Portugal assumed under the United Nations Charter.

87. It is well known that the Security Council has repeatedly and officially emphasized in its resolutions, for example, when dealing with the aggressive acts of Israel against Arab States, that the practice of so-called military reprisals is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Israel has been condemned by the Council for such reprisals.

88. The Security Council must take the severest measures to halt the aggressive acts of Portugal against independent African States and to prevent a recurrence of such acts in the future.

89. The Soviet Union fully supports the just and legitimate demands of Guinea that the Security Council should condemn Portugal for its aggressive acts against that country and that armed attacks and other violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guinea should cease immediately.

90. We fully support the demands for the immediate release and return of nationals of the Republic of Guinea that were forcibly seized and detained by Portugal, for the urgent restitution of all property of the Republic of Guinea and for compensation for material damage.

91. The Security Council must warn Portugal that in the event of a recurrence of such acts of aggression it will take further necessary effective steps in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

92. The Soviet delegation also supports the demand put forward by a number of representatives here that the Security Council should condemn Portugal for its failure to carry out the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the case of the countries under its colonial rule, namely, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau).

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

94. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Mr. President, my delegation is shocked and grieved at the sad news from Uganda regarding the shooting of President Milton Obote, a Commonwealth and African brother. We extend our deep sympathy to the delegation of Uganda. We pray that peace will continue to prevail in Uganda.

95. Mr. President, I should like to extend to you the warmest congratulations of my delegation and to say how pleased and proud we are to see a distinguished young son of a young African sovereign State President of the Security Council. Your devotion and your sense of understanding and justice are obviously helping you to carry out your duties as successfully and with as much dignity as your three very distinguished predecessors, Mr. Yost of the United States, Lord Caradon of the United Kingdom and Mr. Malik of the Soviet Union.

96. I should like also to thank you and the members of the Security Council for allowing me to participate in this debate on the serious matter before the Council. As leader of the delegation of Mauritius, which is a proud member of the Organization of African Unity, I joined all our other brother representatives of the Organization of African Unity in signing the letter addressed to the President of the Council [S/9549] in support of the request for the convening of a meeting of the Council following the violations by Portugal of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Guinea.

97. For quite some time now, acts of aggression by Portugal have been constantly committed against our brother States. The victims so far have been our brother States of Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal and the Republic of Guinea. We are gravely concerned at the persistent harassment of our brothers by Portugal. The world should know by now that there can never be continued peace and security in Africa as long as the last vestiges of colonial rule have not been removed and oppressive racist policies not eradicated.

98. Portugal today is behaving like a naughty child, throwing stones at its neighbours and hiding behind the skirts of its strongest friends. This is a dangerous pastime. We can only appeal to the more powerful friends and allies of Portugal to exert their influence upon it and advise it to put an end to the suppression of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and withdraw itself peacefully from Africa before it is too late. The patience of the African States is running short. The arrogance of Portugal cannot be tolerated for ever.

99. Today Portugal is indeed in a pathetic situation. Yet it has so much to gain by following the good example set by the United Kingdom in giving up its colonial domination. The continued presence of colonial Powers by force and against the wishes of the people of a territory is in itself a form of aggression. That such an aggressor should come here and talk of self-defence is ironical and farcical. Not long ago a wise and noble man, for whom my delegation and my country as a whole have the greatest admiration and respect, told me, in the language of Shakespeare, that it is a good thing to have the strength of a lion but not a good thing to use it like a lion. Portugal and its allies should heed this good and sound advice. It should not provoke the African lion to wake up from its long and deep slumber and sharpen its claws.

100. Yesterday we heard Mr. Miranda of Portugal make what he called "an important declaration". I do not know who was impressed by the antics of Mr. Miranda in withdrawing from the Council chamber when the representative of India, Ambassador Sen, took the floor, but it did provoke laughter. It would be a sad state of affairs if all the member States of the Organization of African Unity were to leave the hall every time Portugal took the floor. India was not the aggressor in the case of Goa. She was the liberator, and her intervention was the wish of the people of Goa. The long-enslaved people of Goa celebrated the liberation with the same jubilation and enthusiasm as the people of France when they were liberated from nazism.

101. We hope that in the not too distant future the people of Mozambique, Angola and other colonial Territories will celebrate their independence with the same gusto. I congratulate Ambassador Sen for having taken the opportunity to commemorate this noble and historical event. According to the *Bhagavad-Gita*, when injustice is being perpetrated, when all the avenues for peaceful negotiation have been explored in vain, then—and only as a last resort—it is not only the right of man but also his duty to use force, if necessary, to remedy the wrong. Mahatma Ghandi, of non-violence fame, believed in the *Bhagavad-Gita*.

102. We hope that Africans will never have to resort to force to liberate their brothers, but we are aware that the States of the Organization of African Unity are not alone and are thankful for the moral support of India and other well-wishers. The delegation of Mauritius expresses here its own very firm solidarity, in the present situation, with the Government and people of Guinea.

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

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

105. Mr. SAVAGE (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, my delegation would very much like to join with you and other delegations in expressing regret at the grave event which has befallen the President of Uganda, Mr. Milton Obote.

106. Mr. President, my delegation once again wishes to thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing us to participate in the present debate on the question of which the Council is seized. If we refrain from complimenting you, it is not because we are unaware of the great skill and dedication you have so ably demonstrated, but rather because we have had the opportunity in an earlier debate to do so, and in the interest of brevity would prefer not to repeat ourselves.

107. My delegation participated without reservation last July in the discussion of the question of Portuguese aggression against Zambia's territorial integrity. On the fifth of the current month my delegation again intervened to protest against Portugal's molestation and wanton shelling of villages and townships in Senegal resulting in loss of life and property. In that instance the Council seriously censured Portugal for its aggression and decided to remain seized of the Senegalese complaint.

108. Now the Council is faced with another complaint, this time from the Republic of Guinea, whose representative has, in document S/9554 of 12 December 1969, presented the Council with a catalogue of atrocities perpetrated by Portugal against innocent Guinean nationals during the past eight months. It would therefore seem to my delegation that Portuguese attacks on the territories of neighbouring States is a deliberate policy that transgresses all acceptable norms of international conduct. More specifically, such attacks are seen as a conscious pattern of Portugal's behaviour, in spite of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter.

109. In the above-mentioned document we note that in the month of April no less than four instances of shellings of Guinean villages took place. That of the 14th resulted in the death of three persons: one woman and two children. In May, two such occurrences were reported as well. In August, the attack on the *Patrice Lumumba*, a motor barge used for peaceful purposes, resulted in the loss of one life, with three wounded, and twenty-one Guineans forcibly taken into Portuguese custody. These attacks have become a regular pattern of harassing civilians of a country not even at war with Portugal.

110. We were only yesterday reminded of the Indian experience with that country over the enclave of Goa. After ten years of futile attempts at negotiation with the Portuguese Government with regard to the future of that Territory, the Indians became disgusted with the matter and handled the situation in a totally different manner. They ousted Portuguese forces stationed in Goa and literally pushed those forces out of their sub-continent. As complaints against Portuguese aggression follow each other from sovereign States in Africa, notwithstanding the repeated censures meted out by the Security Council, which remain unheeded by that country, one might perhaps begin to wonder whether the Indian method is not by far the most effective—the more so as the combined forces of Guinea and Senegal would appear to be militarily superior to the armies of this arch colonial Power stationed in Guinea (Bissau).

111. If those two States have refrained from such a line of action, it is largely out of respect for the world community and their belief in peaceful settlement of disputes. It would be impossible to conjecture how much longer they will continue to restrain themselves. We can well understand it if their patience is fast running out. Instead of listening to reason, instead of harking to the universal conscience of mankind, the Portuguese authorities are heading towards a situation of crisis which undoubtedly constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security and should, as in the case of Senegal, be condemned in no uncertain terms by the Council.

112. In spite of Security Council resolution 180 (1963), in which the Council refuted Portugal's contention that the African Territories are an integral part of metropolitan Portugal and declared that such a concept was contrary to the Charter, we are still treated to discourses from the representative of that State to the effect that Portugal is an African State and has been so for more than 500 years. He further stated that his country's sovereignty in Africa is unquestionable and that his Government is prepared to defend it—I presume at all costs. No matter what the Government of that country may be inclined to think, members of this body know only too well that that type of view is at best decadent. Other colonial Powers in the past had to some extent propounded such a concept. But discretion finally prevailed and in time such policies were reversed, and to a great extent those erstwhile colonial Powers are all the better for the steps they took. The relationship which has now developed between them and their former colonies is one of mutual respect. If Portugal comes before the Council to hammer away on this outmoded colonialist view, it is a sad commentary on its

backwardness and a reflection of the sterility of its colonial policies.

113. The attack on the Guinean motor boat, the provocative bombardment of Guinean villages, the seizure of a Guinean aircraft and the unwarranted detention of its two airmen, as well as the unnecessary loss of Guinean life and destruction of other property, should not go uncondemned. These causes of continued friction should be eliminated and sterner measures taken to bring an end to this kind of situation.

114. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I had asked to speak shortly this evening rather than later in order to add my voice to that of others in the expression of our shock and dismay at the news we have received while we have been sitting in this Council, the news of the attack on the President of Uganda. The subsequent news which we have heard as we have been sitting here leads us to hope that the President will recover and that his injuries are slight. But that we cannot know until we receive further reports. In any event, I believe that all of us would wish that you, Sir—and there can be no more suitable person to do so—would be good enough to send on behalf of us all an immediate message to the President expressing our deep concern at the news which has reached us and our prayer that he will rapidly recover.

115. Many of us in this Council know President Obote personally and have done so for many years. We have seen him grow in confidence and authority as he has exercised his exacting duties. We greatly hope that he will be spared to serve for many years the great Commonwealth country of which he is the head.

116. On 9 December I voted in favour of Security Council resolution 273 (1969). That resolution dealt with complaints brought to us by the Government of Senegal. I said then that what we had to do was to form a judgement on the basis of the reports put before us. The reports then represented to us were not denied. They were detailed and categorical and we were consequently satisfied that the complaints were justified. I go on to say that I have no need to repeat what I said in explanation of our vote on that occasion when I spoke on general questions of Portuguese policies in Africa and about the right of African peoples to self-determination and also about the dangers and evils of violence and retaliation.

117. I have often had opportunities of expressing our strong feelings on those subjects. In this debate a number of matters have been raised and allegations and counter-allegations made. It has been impossible, partly for reasons of time and distance, fully to establish the facts—all the facts. Consequently, we do not feel that it is possible to form a conclusive judgement on all the matters raised, and it is for that reason that we shall abstain in voting on the draft resolution which has been put to us.

118. There is another question which I think deserves our special attention. It is the possibility of an impartial investigation. Whenever facts are disputed and the evidence is incomplete or is challenged, we would naturally wish to have an unbiased investigation. Such an inquiry has been

offered by the representative of Portugal. It may be said that this is not the right moment to pursue that proposal. But it should certainly be remembered. It would no doubt be salutary to all concerned to realize that if such complaints are made in the future the Council may well call for an investigation on the spot. Surely our main concern must be to stop such incursions, such bloodshed, such damage in future.

119. Our debate here may yet serve a valuable purpose: the purpose of putting a stop to these acts of violence in the future. That should be our purpose, the outcome, the result, the benefit of our debate and our decision when we take it today or on a subsequent occasion.

120. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further speakers on my list who wish to take part in this general debate, I should like to make a statement in my capacity as the representative of ZAMBIA.

121. Today the Security Council looks like a courtroom in which, after the accused has pleaded guilty to some very heinous and barbarous crimes, the judge, instead of severely punishing the criminal, turns round to him and says "The jury is hoping to see you again soon". It has not taken Portugal more than two weeks to return to the stand. Its representative even appears to have become a permanent member of the Security Council. He is answering the same charges of banditry, looting and violation of territorial integrity of independent sovereign States of mother Africa.

122. The fact is that Portugal no longer respects the pronouncements of the Security Council and the General Assembly. As if wanting to chide the Ambassador of Guinea, Mr. Touré, the representative of Portugal in his usual arrogant fashion stated:

"It appears that the Republic of Guinea has taken upon itself the task of enforcing resolutions of the General Assembly. But it should not be forgotten that resolutions of the General Assembly are only recommendations which Member States may accept or reject." [1522nd meeting, para. 51.]

This type of attitude by a Member State certainly cuts across the very spirit of the United Nations Charter. It reduces the United Nations to impotence, and impotence makes this place a mere debating chamber. Being a member of an organization, as I had the opportunity of stating earlier, calls for more responsibility than has so far been demonstrated by the old-fashioned reactionary régime based in Lisbon. It is the peace-loving nations of the world that will adhere to the resolutions of the Security Council; it is the peace-loving nations of the world, which have respect for mankind, that will respond positively to the call of the General Assembly and strongly condemn any kind of Portuguese cynicism by which the representative of the Lisbon régime wishes to besmear the commendable aspects of moral and material assistance that the independent States of Africa—and the sister Republic of Guinea stands prominently among them—give to the heroic freedom fighters of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique.

123. When my delegation salutes the achievements of our brothers in their just struggle against Portuguese colonial-



ism, we do so not much because we read from war communiqués that so many Portuguese soldiers have been killed, but because we begin to see a ray of hope—a hope for regaining a personality that has for many years been destroyed and brutalized by foreign exploiters. It is also a reaffirmation of our knowledge that, under whatever circumstances, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) are an integral part of Africa and not parts of the Iberian Peninsula or Europe. The Government and people of Zambia will be among the first to extend a fraternal hand to Portugal as soon as it has granted the right of self-determination to its colonial peoples in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. That is the first step Portugal must take, for it will lead to the cessation of wars of attrition, massacres and hostilities. Colonialism cannot coexist with freedom, and our claim for a free Africa is incomplete if parts of the continent are still tormented and exploited.

124. On the other hand, the patience of the African continent is not unlimited and if the authorities in Lisbon cannot come out of their deep slumber and reconcile themselves to the facts of modern change and development, the people of Africa will have no alternative but to intensify the struggle until the entire continent has rid itself of foreign domination. That may produce consequences which may make it difficult, if not impossible, for different races to live and work together as people of one God.

125. I know that there are Members of the United Nations which have continued to support Portugal in its criminal wars against the independent States of Africa, and we know they will do so again. The support which Portugal enjoys from some of the members of the Western Powers—and the Western Powers deserve special mention in this respect—will undoubtedly encourage it further to violate and attack peace-loving African States with impunity. The twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly witnessed one of the most important political developments of this century which will go down in history; I refer here to the revolt of the small nations against big-Power bureaucracy, which has dominated them for so long. We, the small States, have suddenly rediscovered ourselves; we have emerged determined to make use of the enormous power—and I mean moral power—that we possess for the benefit of mankind as a whole. That is a trend which we are proud of, which we

hope will continue with even greater intensity and in which we shall always be honoured to participate actively.

126. Many countries, including my own, are worried about the impotence of the Security Council as an instrument for peace, justice and progress. They are worried because of the indifference and insensitivity of some of us in the Council to African and in general small-Power problems. We have the power but we are too selfish to use it for the benefit of mankind; we have the power but we do not have the will to use it for just causes, and our refusal to do so will continue to undermine world public confidence in our activities. If we continue to care only about our micro-national interests, the Council will soon and very soon sink into an abyss of disgrace.

127. My country, which continues to climb the long stairway to peace for all mankind, will as always draw a sharp distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. That approach is as important to us as light is to darkness. In this particular complaint before the Council we are convinced beyond any reasonable shade of doubt that Portugal is the aggressor and we are equally convinced that the Republic of Guinea is the victim of aggression. For that reason Zambia fully endorses the just and legitimate complaint of the Republic of Guinea against the Portuguese colonialist oppressors. It is my hope and that of my Government that the Security Council, while reiterating its severe condemnation of the barbaric and inhuman activities of Portugal directed against independent African States, will meet its obligations and responsibilities. The demands made by the Republic of Guinea are modest and reasonable in every sense of the word; they are that justice must be done and that it must be seen to be done. Unless that is done, it is my humble but rather staggering submission that the conscience of the Security Council will stand condemned in the eyes of the world.

128. Speaking as PRESIDENT, I would say that there are no further speakers on my list and on the basis of informal consultations, the next meeting of the Security Council will be held on Monday at 10.30 a.m., at which time it is hoped that the Council will take a decision on the draft resolution which has been formally presented by Nepal on behalf of five member States [S/9574].

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

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

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

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

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Получите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или напишите 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.

---