

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

1561st

MEETING: 7 DECEMBER 1970

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1561)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Guinea:	
(a) Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);	
(b) Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1)	1

188.

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 SIXTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 7 December 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1561)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Guinea:
 - (a) Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);
 - (b) Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Guinea:

- (a) **Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);**
- (b) **Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): May I remind the Council that at its last three meetings, during its consideration of the item under discussion, it decided to invite the representatives of Guinea, Senegal, Mali, Saudi Arabia, Mauritania, Algeria, Liberia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Yugoslavia, Mauritius, the Sudan, the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Southern Yemen and Cuba to participate in the debate on this question without the right to vote. I also wish to inform the members of the Security Council that a letter has been received today from the representative of Uganda [S/10023] requesting that, in accordance with the established procedure, his delegation should be invited to participate in the Council's consideration of the com-

plaint by Guinea without the right to vote. I suggest that the representative of Uganda should be invited to participate in the debate on the item under discussion without the right to vote.

2. In view of the limited number of seats at the Council table, I shall invite the representative of Guinea, in accordance with the practice followed by the Council in the past, to take a seat at the Council table and the other representatives to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that each will be invited to the Council table when it is his turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Touré (Guinea) took a place at the Council table; and Mr. I. Boye (Senegal), Mr. G. Sow (Mali), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. S. Ould Taya (Mauritania), Mr. M. Yazid (Algeria), Mr. N. Barnes (Liberia), Mr. S. A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. N. Mondjo (People's Republic of the Congo), Mr. A. Psoncak (Yugoslavia), Mr. R. K. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. M. Khalid (Sudan), Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (United Arab Republic), Mr. T. Gebre Igzy (Ethiopia), Mr. R. M. Ismail (Southern Yemen), Mr. R. Alarcón (Cuba) and Mr. P. Ofwono (Uganda) took the places reserved for them.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council will now continue its discussion of the item indicated in document S/Agenda/1561.

4. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Mr. President, allow me to perform the exceedingly pleasant duty of congratulating you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this crucial month of December. The bonds of friendship between our two countries and peoples are long-standing, dating as they do as far back as the period when the people of Zambia were heroically struggling to rid themselves of the oppressive yoke of British colonialism and imperialist rule. We shall always remember and cherish the moral and material support that your great country and the Soviet people rendered us during that dark period.

5. Needless to say, knowing as I do that you are a man with unique qualities and abilities, a skilful master of diplomacy, with a wealth of experience, I have no doubt in my own mind concerning the Council's privilege in having you to direct its important deliberations for this month to the satisfaction of all concerned. I assure you of my delegation's full co-operation.

6. Furthermore, I should like to pay an unstinting tribute to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Syria, Professor George Tomeh, for the skilful manner in which he got the deliberations of the Council under way last month—an eventful month when the world witnessed one of the ugliest instances of naked aggression by a Member State—the fascist State of Portugal—against another, contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Declaration on Friendly Relations among States.¹ The speed and thoroughness with which he and the Secretary-General, in consultation with Council members, successfully dispatched the Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea², let alone the manner in which he had earlier directed the Council's consideration of the grave situation itself, is one of the living testimonies of his eminent qualities of skill, ability, patience and understanding. We are deeply grateful to him.

7. The Council, having before it a report by its Special Mission contained in document S/10009 and Add.1 of 3 December 1970, has now reached the crucial stage in its consideration of Portugal's criminal act of aggression against the peace-loving Government and people of the Republic of Guinea and against Africa as a whole. As a member of the Special Mission, my delegation would like first to express its sincere appreciation of and satisfaction at the able manner in which the Mission's Chairman, the Ambassador of Nepal, General Khatri, presented the report to the Council last Friday, 4 December [1559th meeting]. My delegation fully supports the Chairman's presentation. I would, in fact, be failing in my duty if I did not express my delegation's gratitude and appreciation to Ambassador Khatri and, indeed, congratulate him on the excellent leadership which he gave to the Special Mission.

8. My gratitude also goes to the other members of the Special Mission, Ambassadors Kufaga, Jakobson and Espinosa for the serious and business-like manner in which they performed the task entrusted to them by the Security Council. I feel honoured to have been associated with all these great men and I am gratified to have benefited from their wealth of experience. The Secretariat staff who accompanied the Special Mission deserve our commendation, and I would request the Secretary-General to convey our deep appreciation for the excellent job they performed, sometimes under the most trying circumstances.

9. The grave events of 22, 23 and also 27 and 28 November 1970, involving Portuguese aggression against the Republic of Guinea, are elements of the total question of western colonialism and imperialism in Africa. As has already been indicated by many previous speakers, several independent African countries—Senegal, the People's Republic of the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United

Republic of Tanzania and, indeed, my own country, Zambia—have been and still are constant objects of Portugal's acts of aggression. These States border on the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), which are under the fascist régime of Portugal. And in the view of this fascist régime and of certain Western circles, these free and independent African countries constitute a challenge to their interests. Consequently, Portugal, in connivance and collusion with its NATO allies, conducts criminal aggression against progressive and democratically constituted Governments with the intention of replacing them with puppet régimes.

10. From the report and conclusions submitted by the Security Council's Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea, Portugal's responsibility for the premeditated armed aggression against the Republic of Guinea is unquestionable and irrefutable. That is evidenced by many factors, including the evidence of Lieutenant Lopes, a captured Portuguese prisoner who maintained that the Portuguese Governor-General of Guinea (Bissau) was on board the invading ships before they departed for Conakry; and the Portuguese chargé d'affaires to the United Nations has communicated with the Security Council only through an unconvincing letter [S/10014] and a hastily called press conference instead of appearing personally to account for his country's criminal acts of aggression.

11. At a press conference on 4 December 1970, the Portuguese chargé d'affaires not only alleged that the Special Mission consisted of what he called "an Afro-Asian and communist majority" but also indicated that the report of the Special Mission should be viewed in that context. I leave it to the members of the Council to draw their own conclusions. For my part, I can best describe Portugal's statements on this matter as unworthy of serious consideration.

12. Portugal's crimes against independent Africa are also NATO's crimes against Africa. There are no two ways about that. It is with NATO arms and material assistance that an impoverished Portugal is waging its colonial wars and committing acts of aggression against independent African States. Writing in a publication entitled *Portugal and NATO*, the Dutch professor Dr. S. J. Bosgra in no uncertain terms states as follows:

"That Portugal has been able to continue her colonial wars in Africa for years is due to the fact that she is supported by her NATO partners . . . They take advantage of the fact that Portugal is a NATO member and they supply substantial quantities of war material under the pretext that Portugal has to be assisted so as to meet her NATO commitments. A great part of this armament is used in the colonial wars of Africa. At the same time Portugal's NATO partners accept that Portugal has withdrawn almost all her units from the NATO force, so as to use them in her colonies."

Professor Bosgra goes on to say:

"NATO as an organization has never protested against the fact that advantage is taken of Portugal's

¹ Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)).

² Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970).

membership to carry out criminal arms sales. NATO as an organization has never protested against the fact that NATO troops and armament are withdrawn from the NATO area to be used elsewhere. . . Also NATO as an organization is an accessory to the injustice which is rampant in the Portuguese colonies in Africa."

Referring to the attitude of the leadership itself within NATO, he confirms that:

"General Lemnitzer spoke in 1963 of his admiration for the Portuguese troops in the 'overseas territories', saying also that not only did the Portuguese fight for principles, but also for the indispensable raw materials and bases, which are not only of great importance for Europe, but for the entire West."

13. Addressing the commemorative session of the United Nations General Assembly; President Kaunda, speaking at the 1872nd plenary meeting as the current Chairman of the Organization for African Unity and of the non-aligned countries, said, *inter alia*,

"It is clear, however, that the strength of freedom fighters, far from decreasing, will increase both in intensity and magnitude, and Portugal is bound to lose the war. One of the stumbling blocks remains the the Western countries—the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in particular.

"In the Treaty, the parties reaffirmed:

"... their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

"Article 2 of the Treaty provides that:

"The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being."

"The Portuguese colonial system constitutes a violation of these principles."

14. In its dispatch from Brussels of 4 December 1970, the Associated Press, reporting on the NATO Ministerial Council meeting said:

"There was a last minute fuss over whether to stage the next meeting of the Foreign Ministers, 3 and 4 June, in Lisbon. Canada, Denmark and Norway expressed strong views about the wisdom of meeting in a country accused of involvement in the invasion of Guinea. But the United States and Britain strongly backed Lisbon in a closed meeting and the decision stood."

15. It is revealing and disturbing that while this Council is considering Portugal's aggression and, therefore, possible punitive measures, the NATO countries could decide to hold their next meeting in Lisbon. What does that mean, in fact?

16. Besides NATO's sinister role in Portugal's criminal activities, there is also the equally sinister role of Western economic, financial and other vested interests in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). In an article entitled "US trade with Angola and Mozambique" in the publication *Africa Today* of July-August 1970, the following is stated:

"It is clear that US economic connexions with Angola, Mozambique, and Portugal itself are rapidly becoming more tense and complex. When this happens the colonial power is strengthened immediately. It gains not only new finances to fight its wars, but also the increasing assurance that once American economic interests are at stake, the United States will stand firmly on the side of stability and the government in power against the growing attacks of the liberation movements. New Viet-Nams are being built in Africa today."

17. In its general declaration, the International Conference in support of the Peoples of the Portuguese Colonies, held in Rome, stressed, *inter alia*, that the colonial fascists of Lisbon were, in order to oppose the struggle of the people of the territories under their colonial yoke for freedom and independence,

"... facilitating penetration of powerful economic interests of imperialist powers to ensure that these interests should consider their fate as linked to that of Portuguese domination. They become defenders of the cause of Portugal's colonialism, expressing themselves through the policies of their Governments, and thus create conditions for an increasing internationalization of the confrontation."

18. Is not that the crux of the matter with regard to the devilish role of foreign economic, financial and strategic interests in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)—let alone in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa? It is against that background that we unreservedly condemn, for instance, the Cabora Bassa project in Mozambique. In this connexion, the Council will wish to know that the United States Gulf Oil monopoly in Angola contributed over \$11 million to Portugal's colonial war effort. It is also common knowledge that most of the exports from Angola and Mozambique, such as coffee, go to the United States, West Germany and other Western countries.

19. In the final analysis, the Western political, military, economic and financial complex is the worst enemy of Africa. It is also against this background that we view and condemn Britain's intention to resume arms sales to South Africa. There is no question about those arms being used in the so-called defence of the Cape route. South Africa is heavily involved in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. It is there in independent Africa that the British arms sent to South Africa will be used.

20. Portugal must be severely punished for its crimes against Africa and, most immediately, for its wanton aggression against the Republic of Guinea. The Council should decide to call upon Portugal to pay compensation for the loss of lives and the extensive damage inflicted on the Republic of Guinea; the Council should decide to apply fully the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against Portugal; if the international criminal does not respond it should be expelled from the United Nations. Finally, Portugal should be forced to relinquish without delay its colonial domination over the Territories under its yoke, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

21. Let those—particularly those in the Western countries—who loudly preach the high ideals and principles of freedom, democracy, justice and the rule of law, fully stand up to the test of realities. Portugal is an international criminal against humanity. Are they going to accept that fact and therefore do everything possible to isolate Portugal? Are they going to accept in practice the legitimacy of the struggle for freedom, justice and independence now being heroically waged by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa?

22. I should like to emphasize two important factors. First, it is evident from the foregoing that colonialism is a threat to international peace and security, as was shown by Portugal's aggressive invasion of the Republic of Guinea. It is therefore the hope of my delegation that this twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, in its resolution on international peace and security, which I hope will be finalized today, will in no uncertain terms denounce the existence of colonialism and the oppression of people under foreign domination, and call for its immediate elimination. Secondly, events in Guinea have demonstrated once again the impotence and ineffectiveness of the Security Council in times of crisis. As my Head of State, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, pointed out when he spoke at the commemorative session of the General Assembly at the 1872nd plenary meeting on 19 October 1970, the United Nations becomes wise only after the event. What would the United Nations have done if the people of Guinea had not repulsed the armed aggression? There would be no Guinea today, and that would only have served to confirm the suspicion of many people who believe that in their search for compromise Members of the United Nations compromise even the basic principles of the Charter.

23. The pride, honour and dignity of the African continent has been hurt and insulted by this act of international banditry committed by the fascist régime in Lisbon against the Republic of Guinea. The Security Council cannot remain indifferent to this major crime against a Member State.

24. As long as a single square foot of Africa remains under foreign domination, the world will know no peace. I believe that we have now reached a stage where the possession of colonies is becoming incompatible with membership in the United Nations. The

inhumanity of the Portuguese colonial wars in Africa surpasses even the brutality of the Nazis against the Jews. The people of the great continent of the future Africa await with impatience and anxiety the outcome of this debate. Nations represented around this table will be judged by the positions they take on this important question, and it is my hope that faced with such a naked act of aggression the members of the Security Council who stand for justice and right will vindicate the good conscience of the international community. Thereafter, it will be up to Africa to learn the necessary lessons and draw the appropriate conclusions.

25. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I wish to thank the representative of Zambia for his kind words about me and my country and also for his kind offer of co-operation.

26. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

27. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and, through you, to the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to participate in the debate called for by the delegation of Guinea to denounce the recent aggression against his country.

28. May I be permitted, too, to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Tomeh, the representative of Syria, for the very effective manner in which he conducted the Council debates during last month.

29. Likewise, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and to congratulate the Council for having you as President during the month of December. My delegation trusts that, under your wise guidance, the Council will take just action in view of the complaint of Guinea. It is fortunate that this serious problem is being examined under the presidency of someone who, like Ambassador Malik, has fought so many battles in this Council in defence of the rights of peoples and for the full implementation of the principles of the Charter.

30. My delegation has requested to participate in this debate so as to place on record our condemnation of the aggression committed against the Republic of Guinea, with whose Government and people my own country has bonds of the closest solidarity.

31. The report submitted by the Special Mission of this Council, and its addendum, leave no room for doubt whatsoever regarding the nature, origin and significance of the events which occurred in November this year.

32. It has been fully proved that Guinea was a victim of an attack that was organized and directed from abroad, and that responsibility for the aggression falls squarely on the Government of Portugal, which acted through the colonial authorities of Bissau. The military aggression had as its purpose to try to overthrow the Government of Guinea and, at the same time, to deal

a serious blow to the national liberation movement of so-called Portuguese Guinea. From the report, one even deduces that the plans of the mercenaries included the murder of the President, Ahmed Sekou Touré himself and the Secretary-General of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde, Amilcar Cabral.

33. This aggression constitutes a gross violation of the San Francisco Charter and once again proves that the persistence of the colonialist régime in Africa is not only a negation of the sacred right to independence of peoples who are subject to the colonial yoke, but, furthermore, it is a direct threat to the independence and security of the young African States, and therefore places international peace and security in jeopardy. This is not the first aggression of which the Republic of Guinea has been a victim, nor has Guinea been the only country which has had to suffer armed attacks promoted and encouraged by the colonialists. The People's Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and other African States have had to face similar situations in the past.

34. The colonized Territories of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Kabinda are used by the colonialists as means of aggression, of provocation and pressure against the neighbouring independent States. In these activities they count on the obvious support of the racist régimes of Rhodesia and South Africa, and on the co-operation and material and military support of certain Western Powers, particularly the group organized in NATO. For that reason this aggression against Guinea, as has already been pointed out in the debate, constitutes an aggression against all African peoples. For that reason also it forms part of the series of aggressions which the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America suffer at the hands of imperialists—aggressions which today have reached their climax in the criminal war being waged against the people of Indo-China.

35. That is why, in coming here to express our solidarity with the people and Government of Guinea, we do so not only because that Government has been the victim of a direct aggression, but because we are aware of the significance for all the peoples of the Third World of the struggle of the Guinean people to consolidate their independence and to achieve social progress. Since the last century, Guinea and its people have been like a defence shield of African independence.

36. Since the last century the resistance struggle of the people of Guinea to European colonialism, which reached legendary heights in the resistance of Almamy, Samory and Touré, has placed that country in the vanguard of the peoples of the Third World. All of us, the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, owe a debt and have a commitment of solidarity to the people of Guinea, which my delegation wished to place on record at this meeting.

37. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Cuba for his kind words to the Security Council and I am gratified by the

remarks he addressed to me as President of the Security Council.

38. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): May I first of all address my warmest and sincerest thanks to the representatives of France, Southern Yemen, the United Arab Republic, Senegal, Zambia and Cuba for the kind words they were good enough to address to my humble self.

39. The Security Council is examining the question of a flagrant violation of the Charter, the gravity of which exceeds even that of a deliberate well-planned armed aggression against a sovereign State. The revolutionary and progressive Republic of Guinea, people and Government, have bravely withstood the colonial onslaught; but it remains the imperative duty of the Council to ponder over the far-reaching implications of this aggression, particularly since the aggressor adopts no attitude other than outright rejection of the charges brought and proved against him.

40. What are these implications which must prompt the Council to act adequately?

41. First, that the reactionary forces which still hold colonialism as a creed and basic policy are now passing over to the offensive in order to impose their will. Not content with repressing the masses under their yoke, they now attempt to eliminate one by one the progressive and freedom-loving régimes which oppose the colonial domination hanging over their brothers. The attack on the Republic of Guinea is intended to demonstrate to the international community that the colonialists have the ability not only to subject with impunity the colonies under their domination to strict control, but also to extend their ravages further around them and to threaten in their very existence the sovereign States opposed to their policies. By this they seek to impose on the whole world the surrender of its cherished principles of self-determination and equality of peoples on which the Charter of the United Nations is fundamentally based. Thus the aggression against the Republic of Guinea represents an open threat to every sovereign country that dares, by deeds or by words, to condemn the rule of conquest, the philosophy of racial discrimination, and the policy of imperialist exploitation. But more than this, there is its ominous substance as defiance of the international will to put an end to colonial rule.

42. Secondly, the aggression against Guinea gives an actual demonstration of the real use the colonialists make of the arms supplied to them by their allies for the alleged purpose of self-defence. These arms are not used for self-defence. They are used to suppress innocent people and to commit aggression against sovereign countries. They are used for a three-fold purpose: the consolidation of colonial acquisition, the steady expansion of the domain of conquest, and hegemony over entire continents through the supremacy of the rule of force and the law of the jungle. If these purposes are allowed to take their course, the United Nations principles and the Organization itself will be reduced to a myth.

43. Thirdly, the aggression on the Republic of Guinea proves the existence of the colonialist trend of preventing sovereign States, hardly emancipated from colonial rule, from developing their resources and restoring to their peoples their long-usurped rights. In a word, this aggression is a symptom of the deliberate policies of obstructing the renaissance of the African, the renaissance of the Asian, and the emancipation of man from his colonial status and from imperialist domination.

44. Consequently, as peace is indivisible, colonialism, under no matter what guise, whether it takes the form of the attack on Guinea or the form it has taken in the Middle East, or the form it is now taking in Viet-Nam and the whole of Indo-China, is also indivisible.

45. Undoubtedly, the Security Council had such grave threats in mind when it unanimously decided to dispatch a Special Mission of its own members to the Republic of Guinea and requested an immediate report on its findings. Our highest appreciation goes to the Chairman of the Special Mission, Ambassador Khatri of Nepal, and to its members, Ambassador Espinosa of Colombia, Ambassador Jakobson of Finland, Ambassador Kuzaga of Poland, and Ambassador Mwaanga of Zambia; and to the Secretary-General for his most valuable help, as well as to the Under-Secretary-General, who, together with members of the Secretariat, rendered possible the arrangements for a diligent and successful mission.

46. The report of the mission, document S/10009 and its addendum, is outstanding in its precision, objectivity, procedure, and sound legal judgement based on the substantiation of conclusions by concrete and irrefutable evidence.

47. One main conclusion emerges from the report: an external force has committed aggression against Guinea; the attackers were foreigners, and the testimony, particularly of one eye-witness—none other than the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany—spells it out loudly and concisely; regular military troops and mercenaries participated in the attack.

48. What is the identity of the planners and perpetrators of the attack? The Mission gives the straightforward reply: Portuguese. The report states:

“After a thorough analysis of all the material it has gathered concerning the external armed attack launched from the sea against the Republic of Guinea, the Special Mission has reached the considered opinion that:

“(a) The ships used to transfer the invading force to Guinean waters were manned by predominantly white Portuguese troops and commanded by white Portuguese officers;

“(b) The force consisted of units of Portuguese armed forces, mainly African troops from Guinea (Bissau) under the command of the regular white Portuguese officers, as well as of a contingent com-

posed of dissident Guineans trained and armed on the territory of Guinea (Bissau).

“In the best judgement of the Special Mission, the invading force was assembled in Guinea (Bissau). The invasion of the territory of the Republic of Guinea on 22 and 23 November was carried out by naval and military units of the Portuguese armed forces, acting in conjunction with Guinean dissident elements from outside the Republic of Guinea.” [S/10009, paras. 40 and 41.]

49. What was the purpose? To silence forever the voice of truth of the progressive Republic of Guinea, by murdering its great leader, President Ahmed Sekou Touré, toppling its revolutionary régime, massacring the leaders of the liberation movement of Guinea (Bissau) and installing a subservient Government which would acquiesce in the crimes of Portuguese colonialism against Guineans, Mozambiquans and Angolans and in the denial of their right to self-determination.

50. The Council, faced with this overwhelming evidence, ought now to proceed with the same speed as it did when it dispatched the Mission: by condemning the aggressor, invoking Chapter VII of the Charter, requiring compensation and redress for the extensive damage to Guinean life and property, imposing the appropriate sanctions and, last but not least, enjoining the aggressor to put an end to its colonial rule in Africa.

51. The Council would be remiss in its duties if it did not deplore the material and military assistance extended to Portugal by its allies and if it did not require that this assistance should cease forthwith.

52. It would befit those who supply the aggressors with military weapons to explain before the Council the purposes they serve and the plans they wish to fulfil, and to clarify what other aim is served by those arms supplies, apart from the suffocation of the rights of peoples and the series of aggressions against sovereign States. Otherwise, the condemnation of the Portuguese aggression is, in reality, a condemnation of their own policies.

53. The Afro-Asian community should not fail to draw the appropriate conclusions; and their condemnation of aggression, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination should be one and indivisible.

54. Mr. KUZAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is a special pleasure for me to extend to you my sincerest congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to transmit my most cordial wishes to you personally, Comrade Ambassador, as an eminent statesman who is universally known and respected, and one with whom I am very happy to be on the best and most comradely terms; and to the delegation of the Soviet Union, with whom we have the closest ties of brotherhood, friendship and co-operation. I also wish to express my gratitude to your

predecessor, the President of the Security Council for the month of November, His Excellency the Ambassador of Syria, Mr. Tomeh. His contribution to the work of the Council was particularly important. His presidency was marked by a unanimous decision of the Council regarding the dispatch of a Special Mission to Guinea—a landmark decision in the history of the Security Council. As a member of that Special Mission I wish to express to him and to our Secretary-General and to his representatives, my gratitude for the aid and assistance they gave us in discharging our mandate. May I also be permitted to say how very much I appreciated the co-operation and team spirit which characterized the work of our Mission, under the Chairmanship of His Excellency, Ambassador Khatri. That co-operation with such eminent diplomats as Ambassadors Khatri, Mwaanga, Espinosa and Jakobson was for me personally a most valuable experience which I shall never forget. It also enabled us to submit the report which is now before members of the Council.

55. The report contains a summary of the work of the Special Mission, as well as the conclusions reached by the Mission as a result of a very careful study of all the material submitted to it. Addendum 1 contains the complete record of the statements made before the Mission.

56. As a member of the Mission, I, of course, fully subscribe to the conclusions appearing in section III of the report, so that my statement is not intended to add to the conclusions, nor to interpret them. On the contrary, my statement is intended to submit some more general considerations which, in the view of the delegation of Poland, are rendered necessary by the events which the Council is now considering.

57. In the view of my delegation, there is no doubt that the events which occurred in Guinea on 22 November and thereafter were basically a determined and implacable attempt at imperialist and neo-colonialist reconquest of a proud and valiant people—a champion of decolonization and of the sovereign and independent development of the African peoples; that is, an imperialist reconquest of the Republic of Guinea.

58. From that observation, which for us has the value of objective truth, flows a series of essential questions for the United Nations: first of all, the need for a detailed analysis of all the elements of this attempted imperialist reconquest to which we were witness; secondly, the need to draw the necessary conclusions without ambiguity or subterfuge. First, as regards the analysis, an element that deserves particular emphasis is the care, the expertise and the accuracy with which the armed invasion by Portugal against the Republic of Guinea was prepared. Troops were specially trained and specially camouflaged, to attack by groups assigned to specific targets, in an over-all plan in which the key elements were surprise and speed. The objectives were the physical elimination of the President of the Republic of Guinea, the elimination of the leader of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde and the destruction of the headquarters of that organization, and the overthrow of the legal

Government of Guinea. The attainment of those objectives were to have ensured the success of the undertaking.

59. Such is the typically narrow colonialist reasoning, I would say, which ignores the fundamental element of the situation: namely, the attitude of the people of Guinea—of the population of Conakry—its will and strength to resist. The seizure of Radio Conakry and the attainment of other targets might have sown confusion in the world at large. They could not break the will and strength to resist, of the people of Guinea.

60. Neither can we ignore the machinery of that act of aggression against the Republic of Guinea. I have already spoken about the accuracy—holding good up to a certain point—of that machinery. Another important element was the care the aggressors took to conceal their origins—to eliminate, in so far as possible, all traces of their aggression. Thus there were—ships whose names it was impossible to detect—and this has been confirmed, in particular, by the ambassadors of Yugoslavia, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. Uniforms and weapons had been exchanged shortly before the invasion; and, above all, there was the characteristic detail of the make-up of the white officers and soldiers who participated in the invasion of the territory of the Republic of Guinea. Finally, there was the most dangerous element—the fact that the world was presented with a fait accompli in circumstances in which it would have been impossible to establish the chain of events or to determine with certainty the external responsibility for the act.

61. In the opinion of my delegation, we have witnessed and imperialist act of neo-colonialist reconquest, psychologically, politically and militarily adjusted to present circumstances. We have seen an illustration of a sophisticated technique aimed at implementing imperialist strategy in Africa. That is an extremely important observation for Africa and for the world.

62. The resistance of the Guinean people and its victory in the face of this aggression is thus not only a victory for the Guinean people; it is also their contribution to the cause of the struggle against attempts at recolonizing Africa. It is also the Guinean people's contribution, at the price of the blood and lives of some of its best sons; which has made it possible to unmask the most recent and very dangerous forms of imperialist and neo-colonialist activity.

63. The imperialist strategy for the reconquest of Africa intends to use the subjugated Africans, who are enrolled by force in the colonialist troops, to try to halt the struggle of the former colonized peoples, and to try to undermine the independence and dignity of the African States. It also uses mercenaries who are recruited, trained and armed by the enemies of Africa. This strategy is not new. We have observed it and we continue to observe it elsewhere in Africa as well as on other continents, in Asia in particular. But what seems to be characteristic, nevertheless, and most important, is the resistance of those Africans

which colonialism and neo-colonialism would, by force and deception, compel to serve their purposes. The decision of Lieutenant Lopes and his group not to carry out the order to destroy the Conakry airport because this would mean destruction of the work of the fraternal Guinean people—and here I am referring to the statement made by Prisoner Lopes at the eighth meeting of the Special Mission, held on 27 November 1970, contained in document S/10009/Add.1, is one of the most positive illustrations of this evolution.

64. For many years we have been discussing in the Security Council and in the General Assembly the question of colonialism as a threat to international peace and security. Poland has always maintained that colonialism, by its very existence, represents a constant threat to international peace and security.

65. As a condemned historical phenomenon colonialism cannot remain passive. To remain where it is for colonialism and imminent death sentence. It cannot maintain the *status quo* other than by continued acts of aggression against the liberation movement of colonial peoples in the first place, against the independent and anti-colonialist African states as a corollary. The recent Portuguese invasion against the Republic of Guinea is an absolute illustration of that truth. If we accept that truth which I consider to have been objectively established, it is no longer possible for anyone to claim that colonialism does not constitute a constant threat to international peace and security. Now it is no longer possible to play with words, to invent formulas that speak of situations which, quoting from one of the Security Council's resolutions, "might endanger international peace and security". In the opinion of my delegation we have to put an end to this casuistry. It is incumbent upon us to qualify each situation as it deserves and to take the necessary action when such a situation arises.

66. Portugal is one of the "strike-forces" of the strategy of the imperialist reconquest of Africa. However, it would be mistaken and perhaps even dangerous to see only Portugal behind this strategy, or even Portugal as the main element.

67. Portugal and its ramifications in Africa are part of a well-defined military, strategic and ideological system. Portugal is a member of NATO. NATO gives it the material and military means which it uses to implement its colonialist policy which, as I said, constitutes a constant threat to the peace and security of Africa. On the other hand NATO protects it from any condemnation or effective action by the United Nations, so it could be said that NATO supplies Portugal with the sword it uses against Africa and at the same time, with the shield to protect it from the fury of the African peoples.

68. The aggression of Portugal against the Republic of Guinea and the context and the ramifications of that aggression require that the Security Council take a clear-cut and firm position. Might I mention those elements which, in the opinion of my delegation, should be at the basis of such a position.

69. First, an unequivocal condemnation of Portugal for the aggression it committed against the Republic of Guinea, as well as the application of the arsenal of sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. One of the forms of action which the Council is duty bound to recommend is an appeal for the immediate cessation of all military and political assistance to the aggressor, Portugal. The response to this appeal will enable the Security Council to assess the sincerity and the true value of the anti-colonialist protestations of faith of the allies of Portugal.

70. Secondly, an assurance to be given to the Republic of Guinea that the repetition of such an act of aggression could never take place. A decision of the Council to adopt, if need be, all the measures provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, it seems to us, would meet such a need.

71. Thirdly, reparation for the losses suffered by the Republic of Guinea. We are aware that only the material losses can be compensated for, that we shall not return to life all those, both military and civilians, who died while resisting Portuguese aggression; for them, we can but pay tribute to their memory, which we do from the bottom of our hearts.

72. Fourthly, the Security Council must take note of the fact that the maintenance of Portuguese colonialism in Africa and the continuation of the colonial wars it wages against the peoples of Africa in themselves contain the constant danger of acts of aggression against the independent countries of Africa, which is contrary to the most fundamental principles of the Charter.

73. It is the duty of the Council to note that only the final liquidation of Portuguese colonialism, only the immediate granting of independence to the peoples under Portuguese domination will make it possible to remove the constant threat weighing on peace and security in Africa.

74. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to emphasize the positive elements of this heinous act of aggression against Guinea, the reaction of the Guinean people, the spontaneous reaction of all the anti-colonialist forces in the world, and more particularly in Africa, their determination to adopt measures which would not only assist the Republic of Guinea in these very difficult hours, but would also mobilize the efforts of all the forces which are for the achievement of the final goal: the complete elimination of colonialism.

75. I wish to assure the Republic of Guinea and the members of the Security Council that the People's Republic of Poland, faithful to the consistent attitude which it has adopted in this connexion, supports and will continue actively to support all their efforts.

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank you, Comrade Ambassador, for the kind words you have spoken about me and the good wishes you have extended to me as President of the Security Council.

77. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Uganda, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table.

78. Mr. OFWONO (Uganda): The delegation of Uganda wishes to express its appreciation for the opportunity afforded it to discuss the question of Portuguese aggression against the peace-loving Republic of Guinea. My delegation is also extremely happy, Mr. President, to see you assume the presidency this month when this important issue is before the Council and we give you our hearty congratulations.

79. The recent Portuguese aggression against the Republic of Guinea is not a new thing. It is, in fact, part of the colonialist and neo-colonialist manoeuvres to which the whole of Africa is being subjected by Powers that would like to see the peoples of Africa remain hewers of wood and drawers of water while they themselves benefit from our natural resources. As the report of the Security Council Special Mission states, the aim of the Portuguese invasion of the Republic of Guinea was to kill President Sekou Touré and replace him with a puppet Government which could be coerced and which would agree to selling the people of Guinea back into slavery as in former days.

80. When one looks at the continent of Africa today, one clearly sees outside forces of aggression coming from all directions. That continent of peace-loving young nations is being attacked directly or indirectly by régimes or organized forces commonly called mercenaries. Those so-called soldiers of fortune who have the backing of imperialist Powers have been operating only in Africa and are, of course, primarily intended to serve the interests of colonial Powers in small countries which the imperialists are ashamed of invading directly for fear of losing face. The mercenaries have a definite role to play. They serve as a camouflage for the imperialist forces as in the recent case of Portuguese aggression, the intention being to mislead the world and divert attention from the actual aggressors. If this were not true, would it be by sheer coincidence that those so-called mercenaries have hitherto operated only in Africa? Jean Schramme's residence in Portugal and the hospitality and honour he enjoys there and in other Western countries explains his usefulness for the defence of imperialism in Africa.

81. It is a well-known fact that certain great Powers, in order to prove that the indigenous populations cannot rule themselves, would like to see their leaders who are properly elected and who work for the good of their peoples disgraced and overthrown so that puppet régimes can be placed in their stead. We have seen this done in several countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. That is why Portugal is being used by NATO Powers to invade the Republic of Guinea.

82. The report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970), has confirmed that a naval force consisting of two troop-carrying ships described as being of the type known as LST, as well as three or four patrol boats, invaded the Republic of Guinea. The ships

and the boats belonged to Portugal and were manned by Portuguese sailors and troops. Those members of the Security Council which doubted the truth of President Sekou Touré's complaint now have before them indisputable findings of the Special Mission to the effect that Portugal was the aggressor. President Sekou Touré has never failed to identify the colonialists and the neo-colonialists.

83. In 1958, when the people of the Republic of Guinea won their struggle for independence and decided to be their own masters under the leadership of President Sekou Touré, the former colonial Power became embittered, and to quote William Attwood, former Ambassador of the United States to Guinea:

"... angrily decided to make an example of Guinea as a warning to the other French African leaders not to follow suit. He ordered all French administrators, teachers, doctors and technicians out of Guinea. Before leaving they destroyed documents, ripped out telephones, smashed light bulbs and stripped the police of their uniforms and weapons. Touré's Guinea had been condemned to death."

84. However, the enlightened people of Guinea did not succumb to that act of humiliation and barbarism. They have been steadfast in their struggle to remain free and to free the whole of Africa from colonial domination. In their determination they have several times defended their sovereignty against Portuguese aggression.

85. The Lisbon régime has denied that the invading forces were Portuguese although they were caught red-handed. Of course, it is not usual for aggressors to plead guilty. We have witnessed this in many countries where acts of aggression were committed and then the victims of aggression were accused of being the aggressors.

86. My delegation and several others have repeatedly stated in this Council and in the various committees of the General Assembly that Portugal alone could not effectively subdue the liberation movements in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique. It is the support that the NATO Powers give Portugal that makes that poor country proud and impervious to reason. It is because of NATO support that Portugal undertook an invasion of the Republic of Guinea. It is because of NATO support that Portugal ignores all the resolutions that have been adopted by this Council and the General Assembly.

87. The Security Council is meeting again to discuss the same old problem in a new setting. This is not the first time that Portugal has committed aggression against an African country. It has done so against Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia and the Congos. Indeed it is time that the Security Council showed some firmness in executing its role as a peace-keeping organ of the United Nations. If the United Nations is to be worthy of its name, the big Powers which helped Portugal to commit aggression should be brought to see

reason, otherwise they will realize too late when a point of no return has been reached.

88. When President Sekou Touré asked for United Nations forces to ward off Portuguese aggression, the Security Council failed to respond to his request and was even reluctant to send a special mission. Many of us who believe in justice, peace and security, were disappointed at the indifference shown by the Security Council. However, the Council has been fortunate in being presented with a very comprehensive and objective report by the Special Mission. My delegation will therefore expect the Council to take appropriate action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

89. Portugal should also be made to pay for the damage it inflicted on the Republic of Guinea. My delegation will be shocked if the Council only finds it fitting to adopt a resolution condemning Portugal, for mere condemnation will not repair the extensive damages and losses inflicted on the Republic of Guinea. Condemnation will only give encouragement to the defiant attitude of the Portuguese colonialists and their collaborators.

90. Recently there was a group of demonstrators outside United Nations Headquarters and one of the placards they carried read: "United Nations is a place where big countries sell small countries." Let the Security Council prove the demonstrators wrong in the matter before it now.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Uganda for the good wishes and congratulations he has expressed to me as President of the Security Council.

92. The next speaker on my list is the representative of the Sudan and I invite him to take a place at the Council table. Before giving him the floor, I wish to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of India requesting that his delegation should be invited to participate in the Security Council's discussion of this item, without the right to vote [S/10025]. If there are no objections, I shall invite the representative of India to take part in the Council's deliberations in accordance with rule 37 of the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure.

93. I invite the representative of India to take the seat reserved for him in the Council Chamber, it being understood that he will be invited to take a seat at the Council table as soon as it is his turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. Sen (India) took the place reserved for him.

94. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I now call on the representative of the Sudan.

95. Mr. KHALID (Sudan): Mr. President, I wish at the outset to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate for making known the views of the Democratic Republic

of the Sudan on one of the most critical questions facing our continent.

96. More than two weeks have elapsed since the President and the Government of Guinea addressed a moving appeal to this Organization for immediate intervention to meet a premeditated act of aggression against the Republic, its territory and its institutions. The appeal was made while the culprit was still running amuck red-handed at the scene of the crime. However, for the past two weeks the supreme organ of the United Nations responsible for maintaining peace and security has been procrastinating here in this slate-roofed palace in order to gather proof and evidence of the culpability of Portugal, the most notorious international felon that the United Nations books have ever known, together with the other unmentionable governments in the southern part of our continent. The Security Council was procrastinating while Portuguese legions of terror and treachery inflicted on the Republic of Guinea a first, second and third attack.

97. Aggression against Guinea has a particular significance to Africans. If the whole of our continent stood up as one man on 22 November in the face of this dastardly and ill-bred assault, it did so because Portugal and its allies by proxy have touched us where it hurts most. Guinea is not merely another State. Sekou Touré is not merely another leader. The attack on Guinea in the eyes of every forward-looking African is an attack on the African pilot socialist State. The attack on Sekou Touré is an attack on the oracle of African revolution. Africa knows that Portugal and its allies are aiming neither at the country nor at its leader. They are aiming at the Guinean revolution and its ideas: its efforts for the eradication of colonialism in all its malignant forms in Africa, the liquidation of capitalist monopolies, the edification of socialism. However, imperialism never learns its lessons. Africa is scarred with the tokens of colonial and liberation wars, and every added scar reinforces our determination to continue the struggle to achieve the dignity of the African man.

98. Imperialism, using the United Nations, murdered Patrice Lumumba. What did they gain out of it other than fanning the spark of African revolution into a blaze in central Africa? Imperialism is now engaged, aided by the temporization of the United Nations, in a campaign to eliminate Sekou Touré through the gaunt and bloody hands of Portugal. But what have they gained out of it other than uniting the whole of Africa behind the man who will always be remembered, dead or alive, as the foremost champion of African freedom? Governments come and go, but Africa endures. Leaders come and go, but the African revolution abides.

99. Within this context, Africa stands as one man behind Guinea. The African people stand as one man behind Sekou Touré. That is the essence of the message sent by my President, General Gaafar Mohamed Nimeiri, to President Sekou Touré on the morrow of the infamous attack on his country. That is the reason for the action taken by my Government, in concert

with the sister States of the United Arab Republic and Libya and in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to make available to Guinea all assistance within our means to meet its defence needs. Action to this end was promptly and appropriately taken.

100. The question, now that the facts are assembled and the verdict has been given in the expeditious and objective work of the fact-finding mission of this Council, is not whether we should enunciate a condemnatory sentence against Portugal. Portugal, as one of the last remaining heirs of ancient thefts in Africa, stands condemned in the eyes of the whole civilized world. Resolutions in this sense have been adopted for the last ten years at all instances of the United Nations organs. But Lisbon is determined much more than ever not to lend an ear to the urgings of the world. That was confirmed only yesterday while the whole world was still expressing its shock at the Portuguese aggression against Guinea. It was confirmed by the Prime Minister, of Portugal, Marcello Caetano, when he told Parliament, in the course of the elaboration of a deceptive home rule policy for the African colonies, that Portugal will never give up its African Territories. Premier Caetano's statement means in plain words "to hell with the United Nations and its resolutions".

101. What is requested, therefore, is that this Council should take the appropriate sanctions to make that international felon abide by the laws of nations. If the Charter has any meaning at all it will have to be displayed in such an action, an action very long overdue.

102. The irony of it all is that Portugal, the country with the lowest *per capita* income in Europe, is able to scoff at the resolutions of the United Nations and continue to wage the longest colonial war in contemporary history. But if that is possible, it is only possible through the generous military and economic aid furnished to Portugal by its NATO allies, many of which stand condemned for complicity. These are no rash words. Those who speak for NATO do not themselves hide the fact that in both tactics and strategy Portugal in their sense also encompasses Portuguese Territories in Africa. Should I refer those interested to the statements made at the NATO General Assembly meeting, at Lisbon, of all places, in October 1968? Or should I refer them to the host of articles and comments in the military and strategic journals of the West? For a sample of this evidence you may wish to lend me your ears. I cite the following from the French Publication *Revue militaire générale*, of 8 November 1963:

"Owing to the presence of the Portuguese and as long as the Portuguese remain there, the Portuguese positions in Africa are safe and as such they are of great significance to the West. It is therefore obvious that the West serves its own cause if it supports Portugal's efforts in Africa."

103. I quote the following from *NATO's Fifteen Nations*, October-November 1968:

"Portuguese Guinea is the last territory in West Africa possessed by a NATO Power and should be considered in relation to the vital Cape route and the strategy of western resistance to tricontinental subversion."

104. I quote the following from *Foreign Affairs* of January 1953, an article entitled "Portugal's Strategic Territories": "Angola and Guinea, with 1,816 kilometres of coastline on the Atlantic, may be regarded as an integral part of Atlantic defence. They also offer a vital outlet to the inland territories of Africa."

105. The evidence is too overwhelming to be hidden behind a haze of mystifying declarations and window-dressing statements that we hear time and again from NATO Powers. Our brothers in Africa are being killed, maimed and dragged into bloody servitude by British Lockheeds, American B-26 bombers, German Fouga Magister jets, French frigates and Panhard armoured cars. And while we are meeting here to consider Portuguese aggression against an African country, three 1,400-ton warships destined for Portuguese colonies are being built at the West German shipyards of Blohm and Voss, possibly to transport more mercenaries and armies of invasion into other African harbours. Yesterday it was the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Senegal. Today it is Guinea. The whole of Africa is asking whose turn it will be tomorrow.

106. The allies of Portugal are now faced with a difficult moral choice. They have united with Portugal in the name of a so-called free world, gathering together in face of a so-called totalitarian threat. That is the lesson we have been taught by our anointed educators of the West. Subjugating whole nations to save their souls from the communist threat; muzzling the mouths and intelligence of millions of people in the metropolitan country and colony alike to safeguard the liberty of the "free world". Portugal, the "free world". How ridiculous can one be? Let us define the meaning of the words. To that end over 2,000 years ago Aristotle wrote a treatise entitled "Logic". If Portugal stands for anything, it stands as a monument to Western hypocrisy. We have nothing against the people of Portugal, which also has its victims and martyrs, but if the Portuguese Government is being used by its allies, it is being used for what it is. A scoundrel may be of use to us just because he is a scoundrel. But for what end is this Iberian scoundrel being used by the free world in Africa? If Africa means anything to the NATO Powers—and many of them count friends in Africa—they should try to come to terms with what the United Nations Charter, international morality and good conscience dictate.

107. Africa, which is now following the deliberations of this Council, is looking forward neither to more of our supine utterances nor to more of our tired condemnations. Africa is looking forward to our action to bring an end to the most malignant form of colonialism in our continent—Portuguese colonialism. It is waiting for us to take the appropriate punitive measures

against the wanton transgression of the Charter, to indemnify the victim of aggression for its losses, and to make available to it all the economic and technical help necessary.

108. The attack on Guinea has awakened many a slumbering African to the reality that the war of independence is not yet completely won. It has awakened us to the reality that our continent is still rampant with treacherous quislings, whose ultimate fate will be neither better or worse than that of their Norwegian counterpart. It has awakened us to the reality that colonialism, which is condemned by history to political sterility, will not hesitate to resort to the most dastardly acts to survive in our midst. It has awakened us to the reality that African swords must not yet sleep in our hands, not until we have completely erased this colonial infamy from our soil. History knows no pause in progress and nobody can forbid Africa the future.

109. To conclude, let me hope for this Council that its decisions will measure up to the necessities of the situation. By so doing the Council will save the soul of the United Nations and shore up its eroding prestige in the eyes of African men and women. And for you personally, Mr. President, let me hope that you will never find yourself in the impossible situation where you will be made to react in the way Maxim Litvinov reacted three decades ago when he said, "international diplomacy has never done anything which Hitler disliked".

110. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Thank you for your kind words to the Security Council and to its President.

111. Before I invite the next speaker to the Council table, I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Somalia [S/10026], requesting that his delegation should be invited to participate in the consideration of the item under discussion by the Security Council, without the right to vote. If there are no objections, I shall invite the representative of Somalia to participate in our deliberations in accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

112. I invite the representative of Somalia to take the seat reserved for him in the Security Council Chamber, it being understood that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia) took the place reserved for him.

113. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Ethiopia, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

114. Mr. GEBRE IGZY (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me to thank you and the Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in this debate to express

the concern of my Government and its position on the aggression of Portugal against a sister African State; the Republic of Guinea.

115. When the news of the invasion of the sovereign State of Guinea by the armed forces of Portugal was first reported to my Government the reaction was not one of doubt or surprise but of utter indignation. This incident was not the first and only testimony of violations by the Government of Portugal of the cardinal principles of the Charter of the United Nations governing inter-State relations. Portugal has repeatedly violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of many African States in its futile pursuit of the perpetuation of its colonial rule in Africa. The latest act of unprovoked aggression committed by Portugal against the Republic of Guinea differed greatly both in magnitude and overtness. It was the most audacious act of aggression by Portugal, having the clear intention of overthrowing the lawfully constituted Government of an African State and of destroying the institutions of a liberation movement. That act of banditry by the Portuguese Government sets a new record in a series of acts arising from the impervious disregard manifested by Portugal for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

116. The conclusive report contained in document S/10009 and Add.1, submitted to the Security Council by the Special Mission established under its resolution 289 (1970), confirms beyond any doubt the fact that the Government of Portugal conceived, planned and executed the invasion launched against the people of Guinea in the early hours of 22 November 1970. Portugal has been caught in the act. We are satisfied that this recent aggression by Portugal is corroborated by the report of the impartial mission sent by the Security Council.

117. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing to the Chairman and members of the Special Mission the appreciation of the Ethiopian Government for their exhaustive and clear report, which I believe will make the Council's task easier.

118. Too often, both inside and outside the United Nations, charges of armed aggression brought against Portugal by African States have, in order to thwart effective action by the United Nations, been cast aside as nothing more than mere allegations. Now that its own investigating Mission has incontrovertibly indicated the charge of the Government of Guinea, what action will the Security Council take? Will it, as in the past, content itself with adopting one more resolution of mere condemnation and thus in effect reward Portugal by letting it go unpunished for its flagrant act of aggression against a State Member of this Organization? A proven act of armed aggression in clear contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations has been committed by one Member State against another. The aggrieved party has asked for effective measures to be taken against the aggressor. Are we to witness continued helplessness on the part of the United Nations, unable to act even when the proven lawlessness and impunity of

an offending State clearly warrants the taking of measures in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter?

119. We must be alert to the fact that failure to meet the challenge posed by this aggression against a peaceful people can have dire consequences for the Organization. I believe that this latest Portuguese act of aggression against the people of Guinea clearly merits the taking of effective measures forthwith if the call for action submitted to this Organization by the Government of the Republic of Guinea is to have any meaning at all. The present case is not one of "innocent until proved guilty". Portugal has been found guilty, and whatever it may now fabricate to claim innocence must be understood as one more link in the chain of manoeuvres and falsifications it uses in its attempt to prevent any effective action being taken against it. In this regard, the letter of the chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations, contained in document S/10014, is very instructive. That letter does not deny that Portugal has committed an act of aggression; it merely pleads that Portugal has not authorized or consented to its being launched. The Council should not be diverted from holding Portugal responsible, for an operation of this magnitude and audacity cannot be undertaken without the active engagement of all State organs.

120. The question under consideration has yet another aspect of the greatest importance for the peace and security of the African continent. The Council is certainly aware that the States of Africa have been pleading with the Powers concerned to desist from extending military assistance to Portugal because such assistance is inevitably used to suppress the freedom of peoples under Portuguese administration.

121. In the light of this recent Portuguese aggression against the Republic of Guinea, I trust that the Powers concerned will be persuaded to discontinue both the sale of arms to South Africa and assistance to Portugal as detrimental not only to freedom, peace and security in Africa but actually to their own interests. I do not wish to labour the point but I must simply point out the fact that military assistance and the sale of arms to the avowed enemies of Africa is decidedly harmful to the continued sound and harmonious relations between Africa and the patrons of its adversaries.

122. Portugal must be severely condemned for its armed aggression against the valiant people of Guinea. But that is not enough by itself, for Portugal has, over the years, amply demonstrated its capacity to ignore without compunction the moral weight of the United Nations. Portugal must be compelled to pay compensation for the considerable damage done to property as a result of its armed aggression against the Republic of Guinea. Furthermore, this Council must agree to impose sanctions against Portugal, for no one can now seriously claim that Portuguese policy in Africa is no threat to international peace and security. Portugal has for too long been allowed to flout the decisions of this Organization. Unless enforcement action is taken against it by the Council, the Government of Portugal

will undoubtedly persist in its impudent defiance of the authority of the United Nations.

123. The ceaseless aggression being perpetrated by Portugal against independent sovereign African States demonstrates beyond any doubt the danger which Portuguese colonialism poses to international peace and security. Had the political will of the United Nations been actively mobilized to compel Portugal to give up its colonies, this Organization would have removed one major source of the danger to peace and tranquillity in the African continent. Today Guinea is the victim of overt Portuguese aggression and, as long as Portuguese colonialism is permitted to continue, tomorrow it will be some other African country which opposes Portuguese colonial oppression and exploitation of the peoples of the Territories under its administration.

124. In the light of the foregoing, permit me to suggest to the Council that it should take the following measures: first, the Council must, in our view, adopt the report of the Special Mission; secondly, the Council must condemn Portugal for the act of unprovoked aggression committed against the Republic of Guinea; thirdly, the Council must compel Portugal to compensate the Republic of Guinea for the loss of life and damage to property; and, finally, the Council must seize this opportunity to remove once and for all one of the major reasons for the threat to peace and security in Africa by eliminating Portuguese colonialism.

125. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Thank you for your statement.

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

127. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Mr. President, I should like to thank you, and, through you, the members of the Security Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate on the complaint of Guinea, so that the attitude of my Government on some of the issues involved can be clearly expressed.

128. The report of the Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea should have dispelled any doubts that may have existed in the minds of members of the Security Council as to whether an act of armed aggression had indeed been committed against the people and territory of Guinea on 22 and 23 November 1970.

129. As stated by President Sekou Touré when he requested military assistance from the United Nations, the evidence is clear that armed aggression by an external Power did take place and that that Power was Portugal. The report indicates three possible motives for the attack: to overthrow the Government and replace it with dissident elements; to strike at the leadership and headquarters of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC), and to free Portuguese prisoners. Those are the motives that have been cited by the Government of Guinea, and all the evidence that has been collected by the Special Mission clearly supports this view.

130. Now that the facts have been established, Africa and, indeed, the world is waiting to see what action the Security Council will take in order to discharge its responsibilities and its duties under the Charter. In referring the matter promptly to the United Nations, the Government of Guinea quite properly acted in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter and was entitled to a positive and immediate response. My delegation can fully understand the deep sense of disappointment felt by the Government of Guinea at the inability of the United Nations to provide assistance at a time when that Government was engaged in driving from its territory a wave of enemy troops, and when there was a distinct possibility that other attacks were in the offing.

131. It was fortunate that the Guinean armed forces were able to contain the invaders and drive them back to the sea. But what would the position have been had Portugal followed up its reckless adventure by committing further troops to the battle? There would have developed a situation of grave dimensions and of incalculable consequences.

132. If there should be doubt in anyone's mind on this score, let them study the intense reaction to the situation throughout Africa. Many States, including my own, have offered the people and Government of Guinea military assistance should this still be required. Several thousand Somalis have registered themselves for service in Guinea should a volunteer force be recruited. Today, the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity will assemble in Lagos to discuss the Guinean situation.

133. For five years, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has been debating the question of the provision of adequate peace-keeping machinery for the United Nations. Year after year in the General Assembly, Members express their regret that no progress has been made by the Committee. The events we are now considering show clearly the failure of the United Nations in this respect, a failure that was highlighted by the words of the Guinean Minister of Finance, Mr. Ismael Touré, in his evidence given to the Special Mission at its first meeting [S/10009/Add.1]. Referring to the fundamental aim of the United Nations to bring about international solidarity in situations of this nature he said:

"We believe, therefore, that the United Nations, in not acting with the speed requested by the Republic of Guinea, and in not sending it any military aid, has not fulfilled that aim of the Charter."

134. Guinea's experience will certainly have a radical effect on the manner in which African States will deal with their own security problems. It had been hoped that Africa would be spared the necessity of having to provide for this form of defence; but it is obvious that if the United Nations cannot devise machinery to enable it to respond effectively and immediately to situations involving acts of aggression, then its Members will turn away from the Organization and devise means for their own individual or collective security.

This would entail the diversion of scarce funds from development to military forces, but if that is the price that African States have to pay to maintain their independence and national sovereignty, they are willing to pay that price.

135. The Security Council can do much to restore the confidence of smaller States in the integrity and usefulness of this Organization in matters relating to international peace and security, by taking immediate measures on the substance of the Guinean complaint and instituting others so as to prevent a recurrence. When the complaint has been remedied, the Security Council should then discuss ways and means by which its peace-keeping and peace-making machinery can be geared to deal quickly and effectively with situations of the kind that confront Guinea.

136. In dealing with the substance of the complaint, my delegation would expect the Security Council to take into account, among other matters, the questions of indemnification for Guinea, the application of punitive measures against Portugal, the effects of Portuguese colonialism and the threat it poses to international peace and security, the role of NATO arms in feeding the Portuguese colonial war machine, and the activities of mercenaries in Africa.

137. It stands to reason that the first step the Council should take is to require Portugal to pay for its acts of lawlessness. My delegation believes that appropriate action should be taken under Chapter VII of the Charter. In addition to the payment of indemnification, Portugal, as the aggressor State, should be subjected to enforcement action in order to demonstrate international disapproval of its lawless conduct, to serve as a deterrent to further acts of aggression and to persuade it to terminate its colonial wars and bring its colonial policies into line with the requirements of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

138. Ever since the question of the Portuguese-administered Territories in Africa was brought to the attention of the Security Council in 1961, Portugal has repeatedly violated the land and air space of African States bordering on its Territories, inflicting casualties in human lives, destroying property and conducting terror raids. This kind of conduct, unless checked, will certainly lead to a breakdown in international law and order.

139. There is no need for me to dwell on the unhappy nature and extent of Portuguese colonialism in Africa, nor on the intolerable attitude which the Portuguese continue to hold on the question of self-determination for the indigenous inhabitants of those Territories, since these are matters well-known to members of the Security Council. What I should like to emphasize, however, is that in this situation there are two diametrically opposed forces at work. In one direction, there is the stubborn Portuguese insistence on keeping the people of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique under colonial rule, and imposing on Africans an identity, a culture and a way of life alien to their character, detrimental to their interests and at variance with their

national aspirations. At work in the opposite direction are the national liberation movements, united, strong, determined, with the objective of regaining control of their political destiny, restoring the dignity of their peoples, and uplifting the moral, social and economic fabric of their societies.

140. The United Nations cannot claim ignorance of the wars of attrition that are currently being fought in those Territories. If the valiant African freedom fighters have suffered great casualties, it is not because of their fighting qualities, but because the Portuguese colonial forces are equipped with superior armaments of all kinds, including naval ships and aircraft, all supplied by NATO. It was those same weapons and naval ships that were used to carry out the aggressive act against Guinea two weeks ago. The least that NATO members can do in this situation is to withhold their military supplies to Portugal as long as Portugal's colonial wars in Africa continue. Unless they do so, they cannot escape responsibility for the untold suffering that is being inflicted on the African peoples, nor can they hope to retain the friendship of Africa.

141. The other day it was announced that the Portuguese Government had proposed basic reforms for its overseas Territories, under which they would have wider autonomy and parliamentary representation. The situation in those Territories has gone too far to allow a leisurely, unrealistic and limited approach to the political needs and demands of the people. In Guinea (Bissau), in Angola and in Mozambique, the forces of liberations are themselves in a position now to dictate the pace of political development. The people refuse foreign domination. That is why the Portuguese are desperate; that is why they savagely turn on neighbouring States from time to time in an effort to alter the course of events.

142. Guinea has always been a source of inspiration to freedom-loving peoples in Africa. The resolute stand which the Guinean people have taken against colonialist and imperialist exploitation, and the unqualified support they have given to national liberation movements, have earned them a special place among the peoples of Africa.

143. It is quite obvious that the Portuguese armed aggression against Guinea was aimed at neutralizing their position, effecting a change of leadership to one more sympathetic to Portuguese aspirations and at destroying the PAIGC leadership based in Conakry.

144. The plan has failed; the people of Guinea are even more determined to resist colonialism wherever it may appear, and Africa has been alerted to the danger that is ever present while bastions of colonialism remain on the continent.

145. But it is the duty of the Security Council to consider ways and means by which Portuguese colonialism can be speedily brought to an end. In the view of my Government, the continued refusal of Portugal to give African peoples under its domination their right to self-

determination, coupled with the resulting civil strife in those Territories, has created situations in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique which are a threat to international peace and security.

146. As far back as 1961, the attention of the Security Council was drawn to the situation in those Territories, but no action has been taken because of a conspiracy of indifference. Persistent refusal by the Council to recognize the gravity of that situation would, in the view of my delegation, continue to create potential areas of conflict between Portugal and African States bordering on those Territories.

147. Another matter for international concern is the fact that in their incursions into the territory of sovereign African States, the Portuguese employ the services of mercenaries, those ruthless adventurers who have no compunction at serving as hired assassins for the highest bidder. According to *The New York Times* of 5 December 1970, it is an open secret that mercenaries have been operating together with Portuguese forces in the cross-frontier hostilities along the borders of Guinea (Bissau). This evil phenomenon, which is the result of recent colonial wars and of the international market in arms, will continue until we can establish effective international preventive machinery to serve as a deterrent. Those mercenaries exploited and aggravated the situation in the Congo, in Nigeria during the civil war and in other parts of Africa. They have now reappeared in Guinea (Bissau). It is time that the United Nations took forceful action to rid Africa of their presence.

148. There is one other field of action which should receive serious consideration by this Council: that is the question of bringing to justice those responsible for this outrage in Guinea. In another organ of the United Nations, a study is already under way for the creation of an international crimes tribunal in which those who are directly responsible for crimes against humanity can be brought to justice. In this particular incident, many people including women and children, have been killed or maimed for life. From the evidence received by the Special Mission, it should be possible to identify some of the leaders of the aggression. Efforts should be continued in that direction so that a salutary example can be made of them.

149. We Africans do not seek violence; we seek peace and social benefit. We do not want war, except war against disease, poverty and illiteracy. We cannot afford to waste our limited resources when we need all that we have to promote our national development, so that our peoples can have a better standard of living. But all these become secondary considerations when circumstances arise which present a threat to our dearly won independence. Having struggled to regain that independence we will not allow it to be wrested from us without a struggle. And while we jealously guard our independence, we do not consider it complete until the rest of our brothers on the African continent have also attained freedom from colonial bondage. This is the spirit that moves Africa; this is the reason for the creation of the Organization of African Unity; this is

the spirit that animates the courageous people of Guinea; this is the spirit that moves the peoples of Africa to respond as one to the situation created by the latest Portuguese adventure.

150. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The list of speakers for this meeting is now exhausted. In accordance with consultations held with members

of the Security Council, the next meeting, at which the Council will continue its discussion of this item, will be held at 3 o'clock this afternoon. I have three speakers on the list for that meeting and I request those representatives who intend to participate in the discussion of the question and to speak at the afternoon meeting to inscribe their names on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 1.5 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 вашем 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.
