



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1516th MEETING: 4 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1516)	1
Expression of thanks to the two preceding Presidents	1
Adoption of the agenda	4
Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513)	4

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 SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 4 December 1969, at 3.00 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1516)

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

Expression of thanks to the two preceding Presidents

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we take up the adoption of the agenda, allow me, on your behalf, and on my own behalf, to express my gratitude to my two predecessors who, as President of the Security Council, brought their experience, wisdom and eminent status to bear on this Council.
2. During the month of October we saw the Ambassador of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, with all his skill and leadership tackle important issues for the benefit of this Council.
3. As regards Ambassador Charles Yost of the United States, who was President of the Security Council for the month of November, although he very carefully and successfully avoided any meetings during his tenure of office, we cannot fail to recognize the exalted qualities he possesses and the skilful consultations he conducted behind the scenes on the composition of the sanctions Committee. I am truly indebted to him for his efforts.
4. Having paid a tribute to my distinguished colleagues, I should like in all humility and seriousness to make an appeal to all of you, and to all those not represented at this table. As we enter into the Christmas festivities many of us are reminded that this is the period when the call for peace on earth and goodwill towards men becomes more urgent and more demanding. Without prejudice to all that each one of us may consider sacred and at stake, let us, nevertheless, extend the spirit of Christmas to all our endeavours. Let us be resolved here and now to give mankind a surprising Christmas gift: the cessation of all hostilities with a determination to return to peace and

justice. The journey may be long, but a start could be made and the time is now.

5. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I should like simply to congratulate you upon your accession to the Presidency of this Council and to express my appreciation for the very kind words that you addressed on my behalf. I am afraid it is too much to hope that you will have the same good fortune I did in having so quiet a month in the Council, but I am sure that any problems that come before us you will deal with with your customary skill, wisdom and good humour. I particularly appreciated the Christmas plea which you so appropriately addressed to the nations of the world and I trust that it will be heeded.

6. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to add my congratulations to those of Ambassador Yost. We are so delighted to see you presiding over our deliberations that we promise you that we shall make the maximum use of the Council during the month of December. I should like also to convey my apologies for not being here at the opening of the Council. I happened at that particular moment to be speaking in the General Assembly; no other excuse would have been adequate for my absence. I hope to make up for that absence by our subsequent efforts in the Council. I thank you warmly for the reports which I have already received in the Assembly of your kind words about myself.

7. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to express my satisfaction that you are occupying the Chair this month, and to point out that we are personally all grateful to your predecessor, Mr. Yost, that he did not call on us at all during his month of Presidency, when there was no meeting of the Security Council. That was indeed convenient to us, both personally and from the official point of view, as we were all busy in the General Assembly and the various Committees and were thus taken up by Assembly business. That does not, however, mean that all was quiet and peaceful in the world during Mr. Yost's month of Presidency.

8. Bearing in mind the item before us today, there were at least four places in the world where wars and conflicts were taking place. We should, therefore, do better to hope for a greater number of meetings of the Security Council and fewer armed conflicts, clashes or wars, or perhaps hope that there were none at all. That might be a better wish.

9. Therefore, Mr. President, I welcome with all my heart your statement upon assuming the Presidency, and may I

express the strong hope that what you have said will come true and that we shall have more Security Council meetings and fewer armed confrontations and conflicts. May I wish you every success in your important post.

10. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the kind words he has addressed to the Chair.

11. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, before making my statement I wish to express to you the fraternal congratulations of my delegation on the occasion of your accession to the Presidency of the Council for the month of December, which is the last month of our term of office.

12. We have had the honour of knowing you in the United Nations and elsewhere for many years, at conferences of States as well as at peoples' conferences, and have appreciated your qualities and your determination to defend the principles of the United Nations Charter and those of the Organization of African Unity. You can rely entirely on the co-operation of my delegation for the duration of your term of office. My delegation would also like to pay tribute to your predecessors, Lord Caradon and Ambassador Yost. Speaking personally of your two predecessors, I would say that Lord Caradon has welcomed me in this Council in terms that I have had reproduced, framed and sent to my son. Ambassador Yost holds a very special place in our hearts in Arab North Africa, an area in which he had occasion to serve during times that were difficult for our peoples, when we were able to appreciate his human qualities and his far-sightedness in regard to the future of North Africa.

13. Mr. President, I would add my voice to your appeal; we are on the threshold of great celebrations traditional for Jews, Christians and Moslems. I hope that during this month of December, during which there will be Jewish, Christian and Moslem celebrations, we will do everything within our power to serve the ideals of peace, justice and security laid down in the sacred books of these three religions, the Torah, the Bible and the Koran.

14. My statement concerns the working conditions of missions accredited to the United Nations. As you know, some time ago the General Assembly elected Syria to the Security Council and Syria will shortly be seated here in the Council. You have all learned that yesterday, on 3 December, the delegation of Syria was occupied by a commando of the so-called "Ad hoc Committee for Jewish Defence", a commando which we think—and we say so outright—is manipulated by the representatives of the Tel Aviv interests in this country. The Syrian mission which has been occupied for the second time—the first time was on 4 October 1966—did not have adequate protection and when it asked for protection against any future attempts at occupation, particularly after the new threats of occupation today, following on the demonstrations scheduled for 4 p.m. today outside the mission, it received the reply that it had better close for the day.

15. We raise this point because we believe that our Organization and our Council have a duty to act to ensure

undisturbed working conditions and adequate protection and security to all missions to the United Nations. The Arab countries have taken steps to this effect after the incident that occurred yesterday, and we should like the President of our Council to act to guarantee adequate conditions of safety for delegations accredited to the United Nations.

16. I would add that the problem does not arise in terms of bilateral relationships between certain countries and the United States of America, but in terms of relationships between the United Nations of which we are members and the host country. It is not for us to intervene in the internal affairs of the United States of America, but it is our duty to express our astonishment before the matter takes on a legal character and is brought before the Supreme Court, though we have no intention of discussing this in legal terms. We are astonished because the occupation of private premises is, it seems, a violation under United States law and when it comes to missions that have diplomatic immunity the breach of the law is more serious, and we are still waiting to hear that the individuals who occupied missions, as was the case yesterday with the Syrian mission, have been prosecuted or condemned.

17. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for the brotherly compliments addressed to the Chair.

18. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I should like to assure the representative of Algeria and the other members of the Council that we are very keenly aware of our responsibilities, as host Government, to provide the fullest protection to missions and representatives of Member States. In this particular case we have expressed our regret to Ambassador Tomeh for the incident which, I may say, happened unexpectedly and had not been anticipated.

19. As soon as it occurred, the New York City police moved with rapidity and dispatch to deal with it. We, of course, as do most other members of the Council, have the right of free assembly and free protest; but within those constitutional limits the necessary action was taken promptly. All due precautions have been taken today to see to it that the demonstration which has been announced for this afternoon is also held within proper bounds. I should like to assure all members that we remain, as does the Police Department of the City of New York, constantly at their disposition, to provide protection normally and on special occasions, and they have only to inform us in case emergencies arise and we will immediately do everything that we can to see that the situation is kept under control.

20. I believe we need not anticipate any serious consequences, and I am sure that if the Syrian mission has any further requests to make in this connexion the fullest consideration will be given to them by all of our federal and city authorities.

21. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The question raised at this meeting by the representative of Algeria is indeed a serious one and affects all permanent missions accredited to the United Nations. All missions should enjoy normal con-

ditions of work and their safety in the country which is host to the United Nations should be guaranteed.

22. The events in the Syrian mission were like a bolt out of the blue and startled the permanent missions to the United Nations. Though these events are indeed surprising, there have been other cases in the past. I remember when I was President of the Security Council, the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroody, raised the question when he received a whole series of threats from Zionist organizations. The matter took a very serious turn and he felt bound to draw the attention of the Security Council to it, while I, as President of the Security Council, had to contact the representative of the United States about it, requesting him to inform the appropriate United States authorities to take measures to protect and guarantee the safety of the representative of Saudi Arabia.

23. The present and more striking case of this kind, in which a hostile and disorderly crowd broke into the premises of the mission and threatened the permanent representative of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, is unprecedented. The members of the Security Council and the United Nations should therefore undoubtedly devote serious attention to this matter, the more so as under the existing agreement between the United Nations and the United States, the latter has assumed all the necessary obligations relating to such cases. Such deplorable events are fraught with very serious dangers. Why should we hide the facts? Many delegations do not feel safe in New York. This gives rise to all kinds of strong feeling, and serious assumptions may be made or conclusions drawn. It is therefore understandable that each one of us ask the representative of the United States to take the necessary precautionary measures to enlighten those people who may not like this or that delegation or representative. There are other ways of expressing views. There are embassies. But we here are accredited to the United Nations, and for local organizations to express such hostile feelings and attitudes against the missions is unacceptable not only from the point of view of international law but from the point of view of the elementary courtesy due to foreign representatives.

24. I must recall here the memorable words of L. N. Tolstoy, the great classical writer, "I cannot keep silent." In the case of such an exceptional occurrence one cannot keep silent and must draw the attention of the representative of the United States and of the local authorities to it so that all necessary measures should be taken by the United States Government to avoid any repetition of such events in the future, since, as I have said, they can lead to the most serious consequences.

25. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your assumption of the Presidency of this most important organ of the United Nations, and to wish you every success in the discharge of your duties, in which you can always count on the support and co-operation of my delegation.

26. At the same time, I should like to congratulate the outgoing Presidents on their discharge of this lofty office,

namely, the representative of the United Kingdom and my distinguished friend, Lord Caradon, and the representative of the United States, Mr. Yost, both of whom have maintained the high standards of this organ, and, as the representative of the Soviet Union has already stated, they have done so though the Council held no meetings, not because they failed to work behind the scenes, as it were, but because the work of other important United Nations organs have kept us busy. I should like to express our gratitude to both of them for their efficiency and skill in the discharge of their duties.

27. My delegation listened with concern—and it had occasion to hear it yesterday in the Special Political Committee—to the complaint [S/9532] addressed to the Secretary-General and to the United States mission regarding the sudden irruption of a group of persons into the Syrian mission. These events have already been described by the representative of Algeria. My delegation endorses everything he has said and is grateful for the explanatory statement made by the representative of the United States to this organ in which he assured us that such events would not be repeated.

28. We are grateful for this explanation and we hope that, in fact, we shall in future be permitted to discharge our responsibilities as members of this Organization in an atmosphere of calm and efficiency required by our functions.

29. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Spain for his kind and complimentary sentiments addressed to the Chair.

30. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Mr. President, first of all permit me to join you in congratulating the outgoing Presidents, Lord Caradon and Ambassador Charles Yost, for the excellent, efficient and elegant manner in which they have displayed their competence as Presidents of the Security Council in the months of October and November respectively.

31. At the same time, on behalf of the Hungarian delegation, may I welcome you, Mr. President, to the Chair. We all know your high qualities as an outstanding diplomat of the African continent, who is able to mediate among opposing parties and to resolve the outstanding problems. Your equanimity, tact and perspicacity are guarantees that under such tense conditions as prevail during the concluding period of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and of the year 1969, the Security Council will successfully accomplish its tasks. I offer you my delegation's full co-operation in carrying out your difficult tasks.

32. We have listened with great apprehension to the statements that have just been made, in view of the fact that the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, has to deal with problems of international peace and security. To ensure that we do not fail in carrying out our tasks, we must, of course, have adequate conditions that are guaranteed to the permanent representatives of the various countries of the world in order to comply with their important mandate.

33. We ourselves have experienced considerable inconvenience, and now that we have learned of this most recent

outrageous incident of the illegal occupation of the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic, our feelings of insecurity grow deeper. We feel deep sympathy for our Syrian colleagues. The Hungarian delegation joins most energetically in the protest expressed here by the representative of Algeria, and expects the authorities of the host country to take the appropriate measures necessary for the protection of representatives accredited to the United Nations, and of their missions.

34. The argument we have heard from Ambassador Yost—that the democratic right of free assembly and protest within proper bounds is guaranteed in the United States—in principle, is correct, but in this instance its practice is inadmissible, since the occupation of a diplomatic mission for several hours by unauthorized persons, preventing its proper and effective functioning, is contrary to international law and practice.

35. Therefore, my delegation considers that proper guarantees should be given—as called for by the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations¹—to all diplomats and diplomatic missions, so that they may discharge the difficult tasks of the world Organization.

36. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Hungary for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I sincerely hope that I shall live up to his optimistic expectations.

37. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): Sir, my delegation will be happy to have another occasion at a later stage to convey to you its congratulations on your elevation to the Presidency of this Council, and also to express its appreciation and gratitude to your two distinguished predecessors.

38. The purpose of my asking to speak at this stage of our deliberations is limited. We have been gravely concerned to hear of the serious and outrageous incident that took place today—the occupation of the Syrian mission by Zionist sympathizers. We entirely agree with the representative of Algeria and support whole-heartedly the considerations that he has submitted to this Council. The security of one's premises is the most elementary requirement of effective participation in the work of the United Nations, to which we are all accredited, and we expect that this will be guaranteed by the host Government. In this connexion, we have taken note of the statement made by the representative of the United States.

39. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Algeria has raised a subject which is of grave concern to all of us—the protection of diplomats, their property and their chanceries. In view of the assurances given by Ambassador Charles Yost on behalf of the United States, it is the hope of the President that the city, state and federal authorities will do everything possible in New York City to ensure that there is no recurrence of such unpleasant incidents.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 11 (1947), No. 147, p. 11.

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

40. The PRESIDENT: Requests to be allowed to participate in the Council's discussion of the item before it today have been received from Portugal and Guinea. The request in the telegram dated 2 December 1969 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal is contained in document S/9519; and that in the letter of 3 December 1969 from the representative of Guinea is contained in document S/9525. In accordance with the usual practice of the Council and with the provisional rules of procedure, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of those countries to take places at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote.

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

41. The PRESIDENT: I have just received a letter from the Permanent Representative of Morocco [S/9529] who also requests to participate in the discussion of the question before the Council. If there is no objection, I propose to invite the representative of Morocco, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council, to take a place at the Council table in order to participate in our discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) took a place at the Council table.

42. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the complaint submitted by Senegal in its letter dated 27 November 1969, which was circulated in document S/9513.

43. In this connexion, I should like to draw attention to the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council on 2 December 1969 by the representatives of 35 African States [S/9524] as well as to the letter of the same date from the representative of Guinea [S/9525].

44. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should first like to congratulate you warmly, on behalf of my delegation, on your accession to the Presidency of the Council for the month of December. We have been working together for almost a year in the Council and have been able to appreciate your courtesy and your considerable knowledge of international matters and, more particularly, of African questions. My delegation would like to assure you of its loyal and sincere co-operation so that you can fulfill your difficult task.

45. My delegation would also like to express its appreciation to your eminent predecessors, the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, and the representative of the United States, Mr. Yost. Both of them have discreetly, yet skilfully and efficiently, directed the work of the Council in the months of October and November.

46. I should also like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and through you, to all the members of the

Council, for having agreed to hold this meeting, at which the Government of Senegal will submit to the Council extremely serious facts that require it to take a firm decision.

47. If my Government asked for this meeting of the Council, it was, as you may guess for very serious reasons, for all of you seated around this table, whose countries have had fruitful relations, based 'on friendship and co-operation, with Senegal, know the man who leads my country and his political thinking. In view of the grave events with which his country is faced as a result of the deliberate provocations carried out by regular Portuguese forces based in Guinea (Bissau), he is turning to you today to ask you to set aside whatever feeling of affection you may have for Portugal and judge calmly, without hatred, fear or culpable weakness, the acts we shall bring to your attention, and the authorities that ordered them. My Government believes that these acts are sufficiently grave to constitute a threat to international peace and security.

48. As I have stated in my letter dated 27 November 1969 [*S/9513*], on 25 November 1969, between 11.30 a.m. and 12.35 p.m., the regular Portuguese army, based at Bégène in Guinea (Bissau), deliberately fired 20 shells on the Senegalese village of Samine, leaving one person dead and eight seriously wounded. A building of the Senegalese gendarmerie of Samine, a village of about 1,000 inhabitants situated 15 kilometres from the frontier, was hit, and two houses were completely destroyed. The victims were as follows: Dead: Bineta Mendy, 26 years of age, a married woman with one child. Wounded: Aramba Sonkou Konaté, a girl 14 years of age, single; Foulé Danfa, 25 years of age, a married woman with two children; Bouraima Bodian, 70 years of age; Kadidatou Bâ, 26 years of age, a married woman with no children; Alfous Seynou Touré, one year of age; Gnima Seydi, 40 years of age; Moussa Signaté, 11 years of age, a student; Gnanguéry Camara, 40 years of age. As you can well imagine, several villagers were obliged to leave their homes following the shelling.

49. This is not the first time that the regular Portuguese army has attacked Senegalese citizens and deliberately violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal.

50. As far back as 8 April 1963, four Portuguese aircraft flew over the village of Bougnack, in the Senegalese region of Casamance, and dropped grenades. Following that event, the Security Council, in its resolution 178 (1963) of 24 April 1963, had, while "taking note of the declared intention of the Portuguese Government scrupulously to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal", deplored "any incursion by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory" and requested "the Government of Portugal, in accordance with its declared intentions, to take whatever action may be necessary to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and integrity".

51. Despite this decision—and, I would add, perhaps because of this timid decision—a Portuguese patrol violated the frontier between Senegal and Portuguese Guinea on 8 July 1963, less than three months after the Security Council adopted the resolution.

52. On 4 April, 10 April, 14 June and 5 July 1964, there were a series of violations of the Senegalese frontier and air

space, while several villages were fired on by Portuguese troops.

53. On 14 August 1964, a young soldier, 23 years of age, named José Fernandez Varela, of the 594th Company of the 15th Battalion of the regular Portuguese army, stationed in Mansaba, was arrested on Senegalese territory. He declared that he did not wish to serve any longer in the Portuguese army but wanted to join his mother in Tuy, Spain.

54. On 29 September 1964, a young divisional guard, aged twenty-four, named José Carlos Soares, of Portuguese nationality and origin, went to the prefecture of Vélingara, in Senegal, where he declared that he did not wish to return to Portuguese Guinea.

55. In 1965, several incidents occurred in the *départements* of Kolda on 6, 7 and 8 January 1965, and in Sedhiou on 23 January and 15 February 1965. These were cases of overflight and burning of villages by the regular Portuguese army. Villagers had to leave their homes and hide in the bush in fear.

56. On the night of 11/12 April 1965, a group of about 100 Portuguese soldiers attacked the little village of Bambado-N'Ding with guns and grenades. After firing for several minutes, the aggressors entered the village and set fire to several houses.

57. On 14 April 1965, a large group of Portuguese soldiers armed with rifles and machine-guns invaded the Senegalese village of Sambalcounda in Djirbang and, after forcing the inhabitants to leave by firing several times, they engaged in acts of brigandage, robbing several houses and stores.

58. On 18, 19 and 20 April 1965, armed Portuguese troops crossed the frontier and went to the Senegalese village of Bambado, which they subsequently left with 24 unarmed refugees from Guinea (Bissau).

59. This matter was again brought before the Security Council, and in its resolution 204 (1965) of 19 May 1965 it deeply deplored "any incursions by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory" and once again requested "the Government of Portugal to take all effective and necessary action to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity".

60. The Government of Portugal was no doubt satisfied and probably happy with the Security Council's decision, the regrettably mild language of which, when dealing with such serious events, must have encouraged it to commit further acts of provocation in 1967, 1968 and 1969.

61. I shall limit myself to pointing out that on 12 July 1967, Portuguese soldiers committed acts of banditry and penetrated into Senegalese territory as far as the village of Boussolomou where they fired on our nationals, killing a young man aged twenty and kidnapping a Senegalese couple. On 7 October 1967, Portuguese aircraft violated Senegalese airspace by flying over the district of M'Pack. On the night of 5/6 November 1967, Portuguese elements crossed the frontier and threw two grenades on the village

of Salikeme, wounding several among the civilian population. On 5 November 1967, Portuguese soldiers crossed the frontier in the area of Tanaff and kidnapped an unarmed refugee in the village of Bissassou, struck a woman and stole some money. On 5 August 1967, Portuguese units supported by heavy artillery, penetrated into the Santiaba Manjack Forest and stayed for several hours on Senegalese soil where they committed acts of destruction and looting. On 1 September 1967, Portuguese elements on the frontier near Santiaba Manjack opened fire, using automatic weapons and mortars on Senegalese territory. On 16 September Portuguese elements infiltrated the area of Santiaba Manjack.

62. In 1969 during every month from January to November, the regular Portuguese army violated Senegalese airspace or fired shells onto Senegalese villages. You will thus note that the incidents have become more frequent and more serious. So as not to tire you I shall refer to only a few of the incidents of 1969. In January of that year the Senegalese village of Djirbang was shelled from the Portuguese base of Begene. In February 1969, several shells were fired by the Portuguese from Guinea (Bissau) soil and fell in the immediate outskirts of the frontier village of Bafata. One of the villagers, a man called Ibrahim Camara, aged 22 years, was wounded on 14 February 1969 by the explosion of a mine while he was gathering straw. A very serious case occurred on 15 February 1969 when a shell exploded in the market place of the Senegalese village of Mangaroungou in the district of Diatta-Counda. Four persons were killed and five wounded. Another extremely serious event occurred on 18 March 1969 when a very heavy shell exploded in the same village of Mangaroungou killing four and seriously wounding eight other persons. On 15 May 1969 shell fragments hit the customs post and the building of the police in M'Pack in the *département* of Ziguinchor. On 18 May 1969 the Portuguese authorities kidnapped eight girls aged from 6 to 15 years. On 29 May 1969 two 120 mm shells exploded in the village of Linkiring and a woman was wounded. On 29 May 1969 one shell was fired from the Begene base and exploded in the market place of Mangaroungou. Two other shells fell on the same day in the extreme north-eastern part of the Yarang village and in the Mangaroungou village. On 12 June 1969 the frontier villages of Mangaroungou and Yarang were abandoned by their entire population, which wanted to be out of reach of the heavy artillery of the Portuguese bases of Guibadji and Begene. On 17 June 1969 two jet planes of the Portuguese army that were bombing Fakima flew over Sare-Kobe. On 6 August 1969 shells fired from the Begene base fell near the Senegalese villages of Sanou and Samine. On the night of 22/23 September 1969, a man called Moctarou Diallo, aged 52, living in the Senegalese village of Bassane, was wounded by grenade fragments while trying to resist an attempt by three men who had come from Guinea (Bissau) to steal cattle.

63. On the night of 2/3 October 1969, five shells were fired from the Begene base and fell in the fields in the immediate vicinity of the village of Touba-Couta. On 3 October 1969, about 3 p.m., a Portuguese helicopter flew at low altitude over the southern national highway from Mango-Roygou to Diatta-Counda. On 7 October 1969 a detachment of the regular Portuguese army invaded the

Senegalese village of Babonda. The Portuguese soldiers fired on the villagers killing one person and wounding another slightly, set fire to four houses and took away with them clothing and equipment. On 22 and 23 October 1969 Portuguese units fired several shells against the villages of Medina-Balante, Yarang, Adiouty, and Baylang. On 25 October 1969 Portuguese jet planes coming from Guinea (Bissau) violated Senegalese airspace and flew over the guard posts of Sare-N'Diaye, Sare-Cogno, M'Pack, Kenia and Tobacouta. On 2 November 1969 at about 4 p.m., five shells were fired from the Portuguese base of N'Gore and exploded in the fields of Bafata No. 2 and in the frontier post area of Bafata No. 1. On 4 November 1969 at 4 p.m., twelve shells were fired from the N'Gore base and fell near the frontier post of Bafata. During the night, between 8 p.m. and midnight several shells fell in national territory.

64. In view of this list of outrageously provocative acts, it will be easily understood why Senegal has decided today to ask for the meeting of the Security Council. If Portugal persists in its policy of systematic provocation against the independent States of Africa, if Portugal deliberately violates the territorial integrity of African countries it must be admitted that it is because it is sure of its impunity and of the support it receives from its allies who allow it to use the arms of a military alliance designed for Europe.

65. I who am speaking here today, I, who have devoted these last few years to a struggle for the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms, would like to call upon those who support Portugal in its colonial adventure to advise that country firmly to use its resources for the improvement of the standard of life of its nationals. For the Portuguese authorities should remember that their country is an under-developed one that cannot face a colonial war. We know that weight in gold which Portugal receives from the Government of South Africa in exchange for the freedom fighters which it supplies to South Africa to do forced labour in the gold mines. Portugal must realize that it is futile for it to want to keep under its yoke people who wish to live freely and independently.

66. I should like to state here that Senegal possesses one of the best trained armies of Africa, which embodies the best military qualities. If the people of Senegal stands united behind its President, a statesman respected by everyone and an ardent defender of human values, if the people of Senegal has shown moderation, despite repeated provocations by Portugal, it is because it is conscious of its role as a builder of international peace and security. Senegal has wanted to preserve peace by refusing to answer the provocations of Portugal. But you will understand that our patience is not unlimited. If Portugal, despite everything, were to continue its provocations, then Senegal would have no other choice than to resort to force in order to impose the respect of its territorial sovereignty and integrity.

67. However, we are convinced that this time the Security Council, in which again we express our trust and respect, will not cause Senegal to have recourse to force. We are convinced that the Security Council will be able to eliminate the weak language it has used in the past and will set aside such words as "deplores" and "censures" to find in the text of the Charter the appropriate words to

condemn severely, and without the possibility of appeal, the Portuguese authorities and the acts of aggression they have committed against my country.

68. We continue to believe that international life is a life based on morality and that relations between States are not settled on the basis of brute force but by principles of justice, equality and dignity. These principles are ignored by the Government of Lisbon, despite its declaration of intent; it acts as an international bandit as a wounded animal, striking wild blows at the independent countries adjacent to the territories under its domination.

69. I apologize for having spoken at length and tried your patience but I think you will understand my indignation in view of the acts committed by anachronistic Portuguese colonialism. You will also understand better the attachment to peace which small countries like mine cherish so much. And you will understand the call of an entire people that asks that the Security Council should eliminate once and for all from the path that leads it to happiness and prosperity all threats to international peace and security that may hover over it.

70. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The African delegations have addressed a letter to our Council dated 2 December 1969 [S/9524]. In this letter the African States on behalf of their Governments have supported the request for a Security Council meeting made by Senegal after the deliberate attacks on its sovereignty and territorial integrity by Portugal. The Portuguese aggressions against African States have frequently led us to debate this problem in the Security Council. This is not the first time that Senegal has been attacked. Guinea has often been attacked and it has just been attacked again. So has the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Republic of Zambia and the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville) have suffered similar acts of aggression. I should also mention the United Republic of Tanzania which has been the victim of attacks by Portugal against its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

71. The position of the African States, as stated in the document before us, is based on the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, which enjoins us all to strengthen African unity and solidarity and to eliminate all forms of colonialism in Africa.

72. In the case before us today, Africans know that Senegal has been attacked simply because it has complied with the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Charter and because, like all African States, it has implemented the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and of the United Nations which condemn Portugal for its persistent refusal to recognize the right to self-determination of many African States which still suffer from its domination and which have quite rightly chosen the only valid and only just course, that of armed conflict.

73. Colonialism is by its very nature a permanent aggressor. Portuguese colonialism, which still persists in various parts of our African continent, is continually engaging in aggression against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and

Guinea (Bissau). States Members of our Organization, such as—and I am mentioning the most recent cases of aggression—Guinea and Senegal, are constantly victims of the colonialist aggressor and this is a state of affairs which we are sure will not end until the Portuguese presence in Africa is eliminated.

74. We have listened to the statement made by our friend Mr. Ibrahima Boye, the representative of Senegal, a country that has been the victim of further Portuguese aggression and which has requested this meeting of the Security Council. In our preliminary statement we should like to emphasize the soundness of his arguments and the responsible character of his assessment of the situation created by the repeated aggressions of Portugal. Algeria completely endorses the conclusions of that statement, and we are sure that this is the attitude of all States members of the Organization of African Unity.

75. The shelling of the Senegalese village of Saminé by regular Portuguese forces on 25 November 1969 was a deliberate act of aggression, resulting in one person dead and eight seriously wounded. Among these Senegalese victims were women, children and one old man.

76. The series of Portuguese aggressions against Senegal is indeed a long one. The representative of Senegal has given us a long list and we would point out that for the year 1969 alone this is the nineteenth act of aggression and of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal. We are convinced that it is quite probable that the number will increase before the end of the year, for colonialism has no regard for the lessons of the Jewish, Christian and Moslem religions which, as I have said, will celebrate their great traditional religious feasts before the end of the year.

77. Portugal persists in its policy of aggression and provocation because it knows that it has the support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which provides weapons and all the necessary logistical and technical support to its expeditionary force which is operating against the people of Guinea (Bissau), and does not hesitate to attack its African neighbours, as is frequently the case in Guinea and Senegal. Africa, which as a whole is a victim of permanent Portuguese aggression, is aware of this fact and considers that the Security Council has not, so far, fulfilled its responsibilities in the maintenance of peace, justice and security on our continent.

78. Portugal's arsenals are constantly being renewed with modern weapons supplied by Western powers. The Security Council's arsenal of words on the subject has been outstripped since, so far, the Council has contented itself with words like "deplore" and "censure".

79. Algeria believes that, confronted with this new Portuguese aggression against Senegal, the Security Council must assume its responsibility and strongly condemn the Portuguese colonialist aggressor armed by Western Powers.

80. The Salisbury-Pretoria-Lisbon axis constitutes an ever-greater threat to international peace, justice and security. It is the ally of the aggressors in the Middle East and in

Viet-Nam and its aim is to extend and consolidate the last colonialist-racist areas, the last sores on African soil. By repeated aggression and provocation against African States, it believes that it can limit their support to African national liberation movements.

81. The colonialist aggressors are as always mistaken. The whole of Africa stands side by side with the peoples under Portuguese domination. Africa is determined to pursue this just policy of unconditional solidarity with colonized peoples. Attempts at intimidation simply strengthen its will to fight.

82. African countries are opposed to what has been called the "escalation" of conflicts, but they are not afraid of "escalation". It is for our Organization and the Security Council to take energetic, radical measures to prevent such "escalations" from being imposed on Africans.

83. We have heard the representative of Senegal state forcibly the determination of his people and his Government not to be content with coming to the United Nations and the Security Council to plead for justice. The expression of that determination of the Government and people of Senegal is no surprise to us. We all know this great people of Senegal and the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist determination of its Government. And I am sure they will welcome without any surprise whatever the fact that we have just stated, namely that Africa and Algeria will always be at their side in their struggle to impose justice in Africa, without which there can be neither peace nor security.

84. During this twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly we have had debates on the concept of justice as an essential condition for the maintenance of peace and security. In Africa there can be no justice without the elimination of colonialism, of which Portugal and those who support it are the main protagonists. Justice cannot exist so long as racist abscesses, such as those of Salisbury and Pretoria, remain; it cannot exist so long as the territorial integrity and sovereignty of African States are not guaranteed and preserved.

85. This Council, whose essential function is to preserve peace and security, has held numerous debates on this problem since the creation of our Organization. It should, when assessing a situation such as that created by aggressive Portuguese colonialism in Africa, bend its efforts to re-establishing justice in Africa and, as a first step to this end, should energetically and unequivocally condemn Portuguese aggression, such as that against Senegal, an aggression which, as the representative of Senegal has said, constitutes an act of international banditry.

86. We shall have an opportunity to speak on this again in the course of our debate, but as an African country, signatory of the letter of 2 December 1969, we wished to say, immediately after the representative of Senegal had spoken, that, by bombing a Senegalese village, Portugal has committed aggression not only against Senegal but against the whole of Africa, including my country.

87. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Portugal.

88. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): Mr. President, it is my pleasant duty to express to you and, through you, to your distinguished colleagues in the Council, my thanks for inviting me to participate in this debate as the representative of Portugal under the relevant rules of procedure.

89. The Security Council is seized of a complaint brought before it by the Government of Senegal. It concerns an incident described in the letter addressed by the representative of Senegal on 27 November 1969 to the President of the Security Council and issued as document S/9513 of the same date. The representative of Senegal has now stated the case for his Government. The Council will surely be interested in hearing the Portuguese side. I shall, with your permission, proceed to present it as briefly as possible. And, indeed, not much discussion would be needed if certain basic facts were clarified at the outset. With a view to ensuring both brevity and clarification, I should like, if I may, to ask the representative of Senegal three simple questions:

90. First, is it or is it not a fact that anti-Portuguese organizations avowedly dedicated to violence have been given bases in Senegal from which to carry out armed attacks across the frontier against Portuguese Guinea and return for shelter in Senegalese territory?

91. Second, is it or is it not a fact that Saminé is one of such bases?

92. Third, did the Government of Senegal contact the Portuguese Government on the subject of its present complaint before notifying the Security Council?

93. It will have been noticed that all of these three questions relate to matters of fact and I am sure that the representative of Senegal will have no difficulty in answering "yes" or "no" to each of them. I, therefore, request you, Sir, to be kind enough to ask the representative of Senegal, if he will oblige. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall pause for his answers before I proceed.

94. The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Senegal wish to reply?

95. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to note merely that this is the first time that the representative of Portugal has tried to avoid the question under discussion. I should like to note too, for the first time, that he is not answering the arguments I have put forward and that he has confined himself to asking three questions.

96. To these three questions I shall reply, first, that there are still 50,000 refugees at Casamance from Guinea (Bissau). These refugees are regularly listed by the High Commissioner for Refugees of the United Nations Office.

97. As to Saminé, the Portuguese representative is asking whether it is a base for subversive elements against Portugal. I shall merely refer him to the list of persons killed or wounded during the attacks. The representative of Portugal can see that a woman was killed and that among the wounded were schoolchildren and persons ranging from

seventy years to one year of age. He may draw the obvious conclusions as to whether they were or were not freedom fighters.

98. As for the question why the Government of Senegal has not contacted the Government of Portugal, the answer is that the Government of Senegal does not have to contact the Government of Portugal. The Senegalese Government has addressed itself to the Security Council, neither more nor less, and we are awaiting the Council's decision.

99. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Portugal has the floor again.

100. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): Mr. President, I thank you very much for your kindness and I also thank the representative of Senegal for the statement he made.

101. Unfortunately, he has not answered my questions and, I am sure, the Council will have taken note of his answer to my third question. The questions I put to the representative of Senegal related to matters of fact, not of opinion. And they related to facts which are at the basis of the issue before this Council. Indeed, this issue cannot be understood outside the context of those facts. It is indispensable to know the context in order to place the responsibility where it belongs. For it makes all the difference in the world to ascertain whether Portugal took the initiative to attack or was attacked and reacted in self-defence.

102. My delegation wishes to declare most categorically that the attacks came in every case from Senegal; Portugal has limited itself to actions strictly in conformity with the needs of self-defence.

103. It is common knowledge that anti-Portuguese organizations operate from Senegal and from the Republic of Guinea against Portuguese Guinea. For several years now those organizations have been carrying out armed attacks against the peaceful rural populations of the Portuguese territory on the other side of the frontier. This is, I repeat, common knowledge. In fact, even in reporting on the matter of the present complaint, an *Agence France-Presse* dispatch dated 28 November from Dakar said:

"Observers here said that the Portuguese action probably aimed at guerrillas of the PAIGC, the African party for the independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, who are fighting the Portuguese in Portuguese Guinea and who often enter Senegal for rest periods and to obtain supplies."

The same dispatch also said:

"The party has a permanent office in Dakar and several bases in Casamance Province, which includes the village of Saminé and borders on Portuguese Guinea."

104. Here, in a few words, a well-known press agency gives information which should be of great help to the Council. I quoted it because it is information that cannot be suspected of any Portuguese influence. It is information coming from Dakar.

105. As I was saying, for several years now such attacks have been directed against Portuguese Guinea from bases situated in Senegal. By now such attacks add up to several hundred and they have already taken a toll of hundreds of innocent lives in Portuguese Guinea and inflicted untold suffering on its people. That is an undeniable fact. Are those organized attacks on the peaceful people of Portuguese Guinea to be ignored or condoned? Is it in order to allow such attacks to be carried out across frontiers? If the answer to those questions were in the affirmative it would spell the end of the rule of law in international life and violence would be consecrated as a valid principle of international conduct.

106. The Portuguese Government cannot, under any circumstances, fail in its duty to protect the lives and property of its citizens and to help them defend themselves. That is an elementary duty of any Government worthy of the name.

107. Incidentally, it is a sad example of inverted phraseology to describe the people who are defending themselves as "mercenaries acting on Portuguese orders".

108. We know that for a certain school of thought the classification of rights is a monopoly reserved for its own adepts. Rights are held to be legitimate or illegitimate according as they apply to them or to those who do not agree with them. They of course claim all the rights for themselves, including the "right" to eliminate from this world those whom they consider as obstacles to the achievement of their own objectives. That twisted philosophy is surprisingly evident in the official communiqué issued in Dakar on 28 November, as reported by *Agence France-Presse* in a dispatch from the Senegalese capital on the same day.

109. My delegation would like particularly to invite the attention of the Council to an important aspect of attacks carried out by armed bands based in Senegal against Portuguese Guinea. Those armed bands make regular use of the most sophisticated war equipment—which could only come from the arsenals of the well-equipped armies of Powers outside the African continent, whose avowed policy is to incite and feed the fires of international strife. That fact has been admitted by one of the Powers involved even here in the United Nations. It must be conjugated with the other proven fact that high-ranking officers of the regular army of at least one of those Powers are officially commissioned to serve with the armed bands attacking Portuguese Guinea. I need not name the Power in question, but if the Security Council is interested, I am in a position to furnish further information. Meanwhile, I should like to draw the attention of the Security Council to this very serious matter. It places the entire pattern of those hostile acts directed against Portuguese Guinea in a new and sinister light, of which those genuinely concerned for the maintenance of international peace and security ought to take due notice. Examples are easy to follow, and before long we may see similar techniques employed elsewhere in the troubled regions of the world.

110. I now request the Council to consider some facts which my delegation views as indispensable for a correct assessment of the issue under discussion.

111. The populations living in the frontier areas of Portuguese Guinea are under constant harassment by attackers coming from Senegal. To enable the Council to have an approximate idea of that harassment, I must point out that since the beginning of this year alone there were thirty-seven attacks on Portuguese Guinea carried out with heavy artillery based in Senegal. There were 25 further attacks by armed raiders who came from and returned to Senegal. There were ten violations of the air space of Portuguese Guinea by helicopters based in Senegal and providing air-support to the infiltrating raiders. There were eight other violations of the air space of Portuguese Guinea by Senegalese planes apparently flying on reconnaissance missions. A Senegalese plane flew over the Ingoré-Guidage area in Portuguese Guinea for two hours on 24 November.

112. I will not trouble the Council with details of the flagrant and repeated violations of the territory of Portuguese Guinea, but I am prepared at any time to place the details before the Council. Once again, I should like to say that I am referring only to incidents which took place since the beginning of this year.

113. In addition to the incidents I have mentioned, there were this year again three actions in which Senegalese armed forces participated alongside raiders inside Portuguese Guinea. One of those actions took place on 6 June, when the second platoon of the 8th Senegalese Company of Kolda joined raiders in action against Portuguese security forces in the areas of Faquina and Cuntima, advancing and taking up positions 500 metres inside Portuguese territory.

114. On 14 June the infiltrating raiders who attacked the village of Cambaju in Portuguese Guinea were again joined by Senegalese troops who covered their retreat into Senegal.

115. On 14 August, after a raid on Cuntima in Portuguese Guinea, supported by heavy artillery based in Senegalese territory, Senegalese troops covered with intense fire the retreat of the infiltrating raiders, preventing the Portuguese security forces from pursuing them even while they were inside Portuguese territory.

116. Those are only a few of the many actions in which Senegalese troops have intervened inside Portuguese territory in support of the raiders coming from Senegal. My delegation formally draws the attention of the Council to this serious matter. The Senegalese armed forces have clearly participated in actions that have as their objective the violation of Portuguese territorial integrity and sovereignty.

117. I come now to more recent events. Between 26 October and 24 November 1969, there were not less than twelve attacks against Portuguese Guinea, all coming from Senegal. The weapons used by the attackers ranged from mortars and grenade-throwers to recoilless cannon. Here are some details: On 26 October the region of Sao Domingos was attacked with mortar fire for twelve minutes. Twenty-one enemy shell bursts were registered inside Portuguese territory. On 28 October the region of Cuntima was attacked with 82 mm and 62 mm mortars for forty-five minutes. The attack caused five dead and two injured

among the civilian population of Portuguese Guinea. Twenty-one tenements were destroyed. The attackers took away cattle and other belongings of the villagers. They retreated towards Panangar in Senegalese territory. On 31 October raiders coming from Senegal again attacked the region of Sao Domingos with mortars and other firearms for seventeen minutes. On 2 November the region of Ingoré was attacked with 82 mm mortars and other firearms for fifteen minutes. On 4 November the attack on Ingoré was repeated in the same manner. Also on 4 November raiders coming from Senegal attacked with 82 mm mortars and automatic weapons the region of Guidage for thirty minutes. They killed one person and injured five, two of them seriously. On 6 November, the region of Susana was attacked with 82 mm mortars. Nine enemy shellbursts were registered. On 18 November, the region of Bigene was attacked with 82 mm and 60 mm mortars and other firearms. On 24 November, the region of Guidage was attacked again for twenty minutes with 82 mm mortars and other firearms. Also on 24 November, the region of Sao Domingos was attacked with 82 mm mortars for two hours. As a result of another attack on the same day on Sao Domingos, five persons were injured in that region. The attackers used 82 mm and 60 mm mortars, recoilless cannon and other firearms. Again on 24 November, the region of Ingoré was attacked with 82 mm mortars for ten minutes.

118. It will have been noticed by the Council that on 24 November alone there were no less than four attacks coming from Senegal at various places in Portuguese Guinea situated along the frontier; they were in preparation for the attacks launched on 25 November. There was thus a clear intensification of hostile activity which continued from 24 November until 25 November. The raiders were supported by artillery fire coming from Senegalese territory. For the attacks on Ingoré and Guidage, the artillery fire came from Singuer and Sekouna, both places situated inside Senegal. Heavy artillery fire came from Saminé, in Senegal, and it was in the direction of Saminé that the raiders retreated when pursued by Portuguese security forces.

119. When Senegal has thus given the freedom of its territory for attacks against Portuguese Guinea, when our frontier areas are shelled from artillery bases set up in Senegalese territory, when the initiative of the attacks is taken invariably on the Senegalese side of the frontier, when Senegalese armed forces do not hesitate to join in these raids, the responsibility for the consequence must be placed where it obviously belongs. On our side, what can we do in the circumstances except defend ourselves? I am sure nobody will be so absurd as to ask us to resign ourselves to the prospect of being killed. Do not our people have as much right to live as anybody else? Or are there two standards to be adopted even on this question?

120. The representative of Senegal has mentioned several incidents; obviously, I am not in a position to comment on them. I have no elements of information. I am prepared to do so, if necessary, but in the opinion of my delegation it is hardly necessary to go into details.

121. No matter what are the theories invoked in this Organization or elsewhere, we have the right to defend ourselves.

122. No matter what are the motives of those who attack us, we have the right to defend ourselves.

123. No matter who supplies the arms, the military bases and the military leaders, to those who attack us—everybody knows who the suppliers are and what their motives are—we have the right to defend ourselves.

124. No matter from where the attacks are launched, we have the right to defend ourselves.

125. My delegation expects that nobody will contest our right of self-defence and that this right will be taken into due consideration in assessing the complaint before the Council.

126. At this stage I must emphasize that we exercise our right of self-defence within our own territory. Our security forces are under strict orders to respect the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of all countries bordering on our territories. We have no intention or desire to disrespect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country. But, when we are attacked from a neighbouring country, when we are fired upon from the other side of the frontier, what are we supposed to do? If we did not react—and here I must emphasize that we react inside our own territory—it would mean that a belt of our territory along the frontier could escape the jurisdiction of our authorities. We cannot be expected to allow this to happen. Nevertheless, we take all possible precautions to ensure that, in safeguarding our own security, we limit the exercise of our right of self-defence to the indispensable minimum. This is our declared policy stated at the highest level. Even last Monday, 1 December, it was reaffirmed by His Excellency the President of the Republic of Portugal, Admiral Americo Thomaz, in his opening address to the National Assembly:

“All the propaganda unleashed the world over against Portugal, on account of its decision not to abandon its overseas provinces, cannot deny this fact: it is only in the areas where there are frontiers with other countries favouring such situations that a state of subversion has been created and is being maintained. It is therefore amazing that complaints of violation of frontiers are made by some of the very countries in whose territory are situated camps for the training of terrorists, supply depots, barracks and bases for operations against Portuguese territories. We have always scrupulously respected the sovereignty of neighbouring countries and their territorial integrity. And it is only because the bands which our forces oppose and pursue come from there and take refuge there that an error may have accidentally occurred along extensive and poorly demarcated frontiers. But for each one of such involuntary incidents—which, when verified, have been at once admitted and indemnified—how many violations of our territory, how many acts of disrespect for the norms of international and good relations and neighbourliness, how many flagrant violations of international law have been committed against Portugal in Africa.”

These words of the President of Portugal sum up the entire situation and constitute a clear statement of Portugal's position on the matter.

127. In the concrete case now under consideration, our frontier area was continually subjected to intense artillery fire coming from the interior of Senegal and providing a cover for the infiltrating raiders who, being pursued by our forces, retreated across the frontier in the direction of Saminé. Given that this action took place near the frontier, it is possible that our return fire produced results such as those alleged in the complaint brought to the Council by Senegal. It is a possibility which my delegation does not wish to exclude *a priori*. Given the nature of the operation, it could have happened incidentally, but certainly not by design. If it did happen, the normal procedure would be to have the matter investigated by a mixed commission.

128. On the two previous occasions when Senegal brought similar complaints to the Security Council, my delegation formally proposed that such investigation be held; but Senegal did not want it. It was Senegal that did not want an investigation. Similarly, Senegal has come today to the Security Council without having made any attempt to contact the Portuguese Government on the subject of its complaint.

129. Yet, in terms of Article 33 of the Charter it was incumbent on Senegal to contact Portugal in an attempt to ensure that such an investigation of the occurrence would be held with a view to a settlement through conciliation. On our side, in proof of our continued goodwill towards Senegal and of our spirit of co-operation, we would be prepared to talk to Senegal over the concrete case mentioned in its complaint [S/9513] and, after a proper bilateral investigation, to compensate Senegal for any damage which might have been caused to Senegalese nationals as the result of our defensive action. We should particularly regret any loss of Senegalese life, or injury to Senegalese citizens, as the result of any action of our forces. But at the same time, we cannot help pointing out that there are dead and injured among our people, also, as the result of attacks launched against us from Senegal, in addition to damage to property. We cannot help pointing out that the lives and property of our people are not less sacred than the lives and property of anybody else. Aside from this, it is to be noted that all such incidents result from the fact that armed attacks against Portuguese Guinea are allowed to be carried out from Senegalese territory. This is the crux of the whole problem, and it is entirely in the hands of the Government of Senegal to remedy the situation.

130. Here I must add that we have good reason to think that the Senegalese people living in our vicinity are themselves anxious to see an end put to the attacks launched against Portuguese Guinea from their territory. In saying so, I do not of course pretend to speak for the Senegalese people in question. I am only referring here to something that is common knowledge in Casamance. I am referring to what the people of Casamance have expressly told us, and in no uncertain terms. In fact, only last week, on 29 November, when the Governor of Portuguese Guinea visited the frontier area of Biraba, he was welcomed by the people from Casamance who came across the frontier to greet him.

131. Does anyone honestly believe that Portugal has any interest in antagonizing Senegal, or for that matter any

other African country? Have we not ever so often assured African countries, particularly those having common frontiers with us, of our desire for co-operation with them and of our readiness to conclude non-aggression pacts with them? Is it not a fact that our offers have met with no response, and, instead, certain African countries have embarked on a course of aiding and encouraging violence against our territories? The philosophy behind this policy was reaffirmed only a short while ago in this Council by the representative of Algeria.

132. On the other hand, who can pretend to ignore the fact that some African countries, among them Senegal, are gratuitously and avowedly hostile to Portugal? Who can pretend to ignore that movements hostile to Portugal are organized, aided and allowed freely to use the territories of certain African countries, among them Senegal, for armed attacks against Portuguese territories? Under which Article of the Charter, which norm of international law, which principle of morality are such armed attacks across frontiers sought to be justified?

133. It is alleged that certain countries do not like our internal policy. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of our internal policy—and this is a matter which is discussed elsewhere in the United Nations—one thing is undeniable: our internal policy does not interfere with any other country. Other countries are free to like, or to dislike, our internal policy, as we consider ourselves free to like or dislike theirs. But dislike for the internal policy of another country does not justify the use of violence to force that country to change its policy. The Charter of the United Nations could not have been more explicit in condemning the use of violence, whatever may be the political differences. Violence, however, is exactly what certain countries are officially and avowedly aiding and encouraging, directly and indirectly, against Portuguese territories in Africa. This in turn creates incidents at the frontiers, since we are forced to exercise our right of self-defence. Then the very countries responsible for causing the incidents, or for allowing them to be caused, come to the Security Council with complaints against Portugal. This attempt to invert situations cannot be ignored by the Security Council for it would amount to ignoring something that the whole world knows.

134. From the time that Senegal became independent, Portugal has sought to maintain friendly relations with that country. We had diplomatic relations; Senegal took the initiative to break them off. We had consular relations; again it was Senegal that took the initiative to break them off. If these unfriendly actions on the part of Senegal are sought to be justified in the name of any resolutions, then so much the worse of those resolutions and for Senegal; for resolutions which recommend the rupture of normal international relations with a view to forcing a country to change its internal policy, are not politically constructive, nor justifiable from any other angle. Such actions are the usual prelude to violence in international relations, and this is the course which Senegal has in fact adopted in relation to Portugal, as I have abundantly shown in my foregoing remarks.

135. Nevertheless, Portugal has always scrupulously avoided offending Senegal. Although the Government of

Senegal has been acting in a hostile way, the Senegalese populations in the vicinity of Portuguese Guinea have never failed to receive from us the traditional benefits of good-neighbourly relations, particularly by way of medical assistance which we willingly extend to them. I do not mention this fact in order to enhance our merits, but only to show how much greater would be the advantage to the populations on both sides of the frontier if Senegal were to abandon the path of hostility—unjustifiable and gratuitous in any case—and open the door to friendly co-operation which Portugal, on its part, has always offered.

136. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Guinea.

137. Mr. CONDE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): We have a saying in our country that within a family there can be no thanks and that behind congratulations there can only be guile. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall refrain from addressing my congratulations to you on assuming the Presidency of the Security Council and shall say simply that the vitality, charm and intelligence which have characterized your every action within the United Nations can but confirm us in our conviction that you will discharge your duties with the utmost success.

138. We also congratulate your predecessors, who have fulfilled successfully the great task of President of the Security Council. We are also grateful to the Security Council for having invited us to participate, without the right to vote, in the present debate in the Council, convened at the request of our sister Republic of Senegal.

139. This afternoon I addressed to the President of the Security Council a letter [*S/9528*] which stated, *inter alia*:

“Further to our letter of 2 December 1969 [*S/9525*] concerning the aggression committed by Portugal against the Republic of Guinea and having regard to the explanations provided in the said letter and to the solidarity shown us by the African group, I have the honour to inform you that the Government of the Republic of Guinea has decided to request you to convene a meeting of the Security Council to consider the vile aggression recently committed by the Portuguese colonial army against the territorial integrity of the Republic of Guinea.

“Ambassador Abdoulaye Touré, the Permanent Representative, who is at present in the Republic of Guinea for consultations, will arrive in New York on 5 December with full information concerning this infamous act of Portuguese banditry.”

140. Accordingly we deemed it appropriate to wait until another time to speak in the debate on the item on the agenda which, in effect, together with the persistent aggression of Portuguese colonialism against my country, make up but one picture of the whole Portuguese policy.

141. Portugal is in fact the prototype of the most underdeveloped and obdurate colonialism. This is the moment to say that the complaint of the Republic of Guinea against Portugal before this Council is permanent. As long as Portugal, basing itself on a colonialist ideology

and supported by allies that enable it to perpetrate its fascist crimes—free of charge, of course—is not made to reconsider its policy, which is doomed from the outset, it will find that all independent countries that neighbour on territories still under Portuguese domination are enemies that will not tolerate it.

142. The representative of Portugal seated here knows, despite his arrogant utterances, that his army, though it has hidden support, cannot withstand an offensive by the Guinean people's army. Once again we are reasoning with Portugal. The Republic of Guinea will come once more to report to the international community on the vile crimes perpetrated by Portuguese fascism and to ascertain how the international Organization proposes to put an end to them. If our attempts are in vain, the Republic of Guinea will not hesitate for its part to respond to colonialist aggression with popular revolutionary and patriotic violence. Portugal will have enough time to learn to know us well.

143. The PRESIDENT: In regard to the requests which were submitted this afternoon by the Republic of Guinea for a meeting of the Security Council, I wish to say that I shall conduct consultations with the members of the Security Council to determine the date and time of the meeting.

144. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): When the representative of Portugal began his denunciation of subversive ideologies, I expected him to threaten our Organization with the fire of Portuguese artillery and aircraft, for, only just a week ago in the Fourth Committee and subsequently in the General Assembly, it adopted a resolution [2507 (XXIV)] on Territories under Portuguese administration, which recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under Portuguese domination and called upon the Member States to support and give material assistance to these people fighting for their freedom.

145. We feel that the text adopted by the United Nations would, if we base ourselves on the analysis of the representative of Portugal, turn out to be a subversive one. And I think Member States should take steps to protect our buildings from possible attacks by Portugal. The representative of Portugal, in trying to justify Portuguese aggression against Senegal, referred to the presence of refugees from Guinea (Bissau)—I should point out here that, as far as the United Nations is concerned, there is no such territory as Portuguese Guinea, only Guinea (Bissau), if we refer to the relevant documents—and of representatives from the national organizations, the PAIGC, at Dakar. The same applies to many other African countries, including my own, and I have met representatives of these organizations in New York. I cannot see why Senegal or any African country should be prevented from implementing resolutions of the General Assembly by supporting these peoples in their struggle or from granting the representatives of their national organizations the same facilities as those that are granted to them in most of the African countries or that are regularly granted to them during the General Assembly here in New York.

146. The representative of Portugal constantly referred in his statement to the duty of the Portuguese authorities to

defend themselves. In the case of relations between States the right of self-defence applies to the national territory. Neither Africa nor the United Nations recognize Guinea (Bissau) as part of Portugal, as being under Portuguese sovereignty, or as a Portuguese province. Those who are using the legitimate right of self-defence in Guinea (Bissau) are the freedom fighters of this part of Africa who are fighting the Portuguese colonialist expeditionary corps.

147. The representative of Portugal referred to my preliminary statement and spoke of my delegation's conception of the struggle for national liberation. We regard it as an honour and as our duty to repeat our conception of this struggle in the month of December—the last month of our membership of the Security Council; it is also an honour for us to speak under the Presidency of an African who embodies the principles of the struggle for national liberation and in the presence of our Secretary-General who represents the Bandung principles to whose definition he considerably contributed. Our philosophy, born of the Bandung Conference, and based on our experience of armed struggle, is clear: there is no possible path for the liberation of the African peoples under Portuguese domination other than that of armed struggle.

148. Our position is all the more justified since it was the populations of the Territories occupied by Portugal themselves that took the original decision, without any foreign interference, to take up arms. Since they have taken this free choice of an armed struggle they are assured of our total and unconditional support in that armed struggle, be it moral, political, diplomatic or material. Our only regret is that our means and technical possibilities are limited. We feel that our efforts to help these people fighting for their right to self-determination and for their independence should be even greater, and we hope to be able to do a little more each day to give the material assistance we owe them.

149. This philosophy may sometimes be expressed in other ways. A week ago, for instance, it was reflected in a resolution of the General Assembly. It can also be found in all the texts of the Organization of African Unity.

150. The Portuguese presence in Africa can no longer be tolerated; it jeopardizes the future of Africa, including that of the independent countries, and their prospects of economic and social development.

151. Algeria's position in this respect is well known. It is shared by a considerable number of other States. We are well able to explain that position clearly, precisely and frankly. Before us countries of Asia, like Indonesia, Burma, the Philippines and others, took up arms in order to free themselves of Japanese or Dutch occupation, and it is as a result of their struggle that they achieved their independence. In Africa we have had the same experience. In Europe the efforts of the nationalities to gain the right to an independent existence was marked by struggle, even though they may have had other features as well. The countries of Latin America have had the same problems. That is why in Algeria, where we honour all heroes of national independence and freedom in the world, some of our streets bear the names of heroes of the national liberation struggle in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe.

152. Our position in the Council and in the General Assembly is similar to that of two other African representatives that spoke before me this afternoon, the representatives of Senegal and of Guinea. They said, as we did, that either the United Nations must help us to put an end to colonialism, to Portuguese aggression and to imperialist injustice on our continent, or we would have to draw on our own military resources and, more particularly, avail ourselves of the spirit of sacrifice of our people.

153. In the Council, where we are attending our last meetings, we cannot repudiate what our national experience has taught us. Our experience has been a struggle which succeeded not only as a result of the action of our people, but also as a result of the material assistance in arms and money given by many countries of Asia, Latin America, Africa and Europe. These material contributions made it possible for us to be present here today as a respected member of the Security Council. Many countries have aided us and such aid was just, for it was given in order to preserve peace, justice and international security. If those States announce some day that they helped us—some may have done so already—the representative of Portugal will realize that the number of so-called subversive States in the United Nations is much greater than he imagines.

154. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): I should first like to apologize to my colleagues for having taken up their time, but all who are familiar with the political thinking of President Senghor will, with me, wholly reject the allegations of the representative of Portugal, according to which regular Senegalese forces have participated in attacks against the territory of Guinea (Bissau). Portugal feels so guilty that its Government endeavoured to prevent this meeting of the Security Council from taking place today by asking us to withdraw our complaint in exchange for payment of damages following an inquiry. Obviously we could not accede to this

request which was nothing but an attempt to escape condemnation by the Security Council.

155. I say again that Senegal has been patient long enough. The civilian population of Casamance, which can no longer pursue its work in the fields, demands that the Security Council, which is dealing with this matter for the third time, should see to it that justice is done. The Security Council must pronounce itself in a clear-cut, definite and vigorous manner against Portugal, unless it wants Senegal to take other measures to protect its frontiers.

156. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Portugal.

157. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): I shall be very brief. I have asked for the floor only to thank the representative of Algeria for explaining so clearly the origin of the violence against the Portuguese territories in Africa. He has confirmed that the violence has not been initiated by Portugal and that therefore responsibility cannot be laid at its door.

158. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Some dialogues are possible, like the one just resumed by the representative of Portugal. In this philosophical dialogue, my reply to his thanks will be brief. The origin of the violence in territories under Portuguese domination in Africa is the policy of a European colonial Power which has learned nothing and understood nothing.

159. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on my list. I shall therefore adjourn the meeting. In accordance with the views expressed in informal consultations, the next meeting of the Security Council on this item will be held tomorrow, 5 December 1969, promptly at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.