

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

FEB 21 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1518th MEETING: 8 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1518)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaints by Senegal:	
(a) Letter dated 27 November 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9513);	
(b) Letter dated 7 December 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9541)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 8 December 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1518)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaints by Senegal

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with further decisions taken at the 1517th meeting and in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and of the provisional rules of procedure, I propose, if I hear no objection, to invite the

representatives of Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Mali, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria and the United Arab Republic to take part in our discussion without the right to vote. Owing to the lack of space at the Council table I shall invite those representatives to take seats at the side of the Council chamber, it being understood that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it comes their turn to take the floor.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. H. Diggs (Liberia), Mr. B. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. D. Nicol (Sierra Leone), Mr. S. El Goulli (Tunisia), Mr. G. Sow (Mali), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. M. S. Alattar (Yemen), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria) and Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (United Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them.

3. The PRESIDENT: Since our last meeting a letter has been received from the representative of Mauritania [S/9539] asking for permission to participate in the discussion on the question before the Council. If I hear no objection, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and of the provisional rules of procedure, I shall invite the representative of Mauritania to participate in our discussion, without the right to vote. Owing to the lack of space at the Council table I shall invite the representative of Mauritania to take his seat at the side of the Council chamber, it being understood that he will be invited to take a seat at the Council table when it comes his turn to take the floor.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Ould Daddah (Mauritania) took the place reserved for him.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that last night the representative of Senegal informed me that a new incident had occurred in his country. He has sent me a letter to this effect. The letter was received by the Secretariat and copies have been circulated to members of the Council on their arrival here. The letter will shortly be translated and circulated in document S/9541. It is my understanding that the representative of Senegal would like to take the floor first to explain his second complaint which will be considered together with the earlier complaint [S/9513] for which this meeting had been called. The Security Council will now continue its deliberations on the item before it.

5. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and my colleagues on the Council for agreeing to meet urgently to consider the new complaint which, because of extremely serious reasons, Senegal submitted last night against Portugal.

6. The situation is deteriorating further every day and Portuguese provocations are becoming more and more serious. We solemnly declare that Portugal wishes to create in Africa another hot-bed of dangerous tension similar to those already existing in Viet-Nam and the Middle East. Portugal appears to have chosen Senegal for this purpose, and to have done this undoubtedly after mature reflexion.

7. As I explained in the letter that I addressed last night to the Security Council [S/9541], the regular Portuguese forces on Sunday, 7 December 1969, shelled the small village of Samine from 11.10 to 11.30 a.m. A Portuguese helicopter flew over the village unceasingly directing the shelling. Shells fell in the centre of the village and on the building of the Gendarmerie.

8. The intense shelling handicapped rescue work and the search for victims. The known results of this new aggression so far are as follows: five persons killed and one seriously wounded, and one home and five shops burnt down.

9. The identities of those killed are as follows: Mrs. Gossa Dabo, aged 23, daughter of Arphan and Sirra N'Diaye, married, one child; Mr. Sounama Cissé, son of Malang and Gossa Dabo; Mrs. Aminata Sadio, aged 60, daughter of Abdou and Fatoumata Masaly; Mr. Sana Camara, aged 35, son of Malang and Khady Cissé; one body not yet identified. The seriously wounded person is Miss Rosa Diatta, aged 50, daughter of Abdoulaye and Aïssatou Mané.

10. The President and members of the Council will note—and will, I am sure, draw the appropriate conclusions—that at the moment when we are continuing the debate on the previous complaint of Senegal, Portugal is defying the Security Council and has committed a new and odious aggression against the population of Senegal. I should like to stress the fact that Portugal had announced, shortly before the attack on Samine, its intention of shelling Ziguinchor, a city of considerable size and the capital of the Casamance region in the southern part of Senegal. The entire population of this prosperous area of Senegal is living in a state of fear, and Portugal has deliberately chosen the time when, throughout the rural areas of Senegal, the marketing season for ground-nuts and food crops is beginning.

11. While certain people are searching in the corridors of the United Nations for ways of reaching an honourable solution for Portugal in the Security Council, Portugal is pursuing its cowardly policy of aggression and provocation against a peaceful people. Senegal, in this difficult moment of its life, thanks those delegations that have already expressed unequivocally their feelings of solidarity with it. A great country can be recognized by its strong sense of the responsibilities it must assume in grave circumstances. The true friendship of one country for another is recognized only when the latter country is going through a period of trial. In any case, in this matter Senegal will know where its true friends, on whom it may count in the future, are to be found. This new aggression is, of course, directed against Senegal, which in lives and property is affected, but it is also directed against the Security Council for which Portugal is openly showing its contempt.

12. It will be recalled that the President of the Republic of Senegal had publicly proposed the following peace plan for Guinea (Bissau): the two parties would proclaim a cease-fire; negotiations would begin immediately between the Government of Portugal on the one hand and all the nationalist movements on the other; Portugal would grant internal autonomy, which would last several years; after a period of autonomy, Guinea (Bissau) would accede to independence within a Lusitanian African community. But the only answer to this peace plan from the Portuguese Government has been the shelling of Senegalese villages.

13. In these circumstances we ask the Security Council, if it wishes to avoid a catastrophe in West Africa and a new Viet-Nam or a new Middle East, to adopt today, without any delay, a decision strongly condemning Portugal for its acts of aggression against the village of Samine on 25 November 1969, as a result of which one person was killed and eight were seriously wounded, and on 7 December 1969, when five persons were killed and one woman was seriously wounded.

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

15. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*translated from French*): On behalf of my delegation I would like to thank you and through you all the members of the Security Council for allowing us to participate in the consideration of the complaint of Senegal against Portugal, as contained in document S/9513 and the document just mentioned by the representative of Senegal. Several reasons have prompted my delegation to participate in this important debate. The first is our sincere and genuine friendship for Senegal with whom we share our past and which, since independence, has chosen the same course as ourselves, because we have common aspirations and similar approaches. This means that anything that affects the interests of Senegal as well as their legitimate defence cannot leave us indifferent. If I have right at the start mentioned the special relations we have with Senegal and other countries belonging to a common regional organization, that does not mean that we want to reject outright any objective or impartial consideration of the problem before us, but simply that we want to stress that since we know the Senegalese people and the philosophy which inspires its Government in the conduct of its international relations, we deem it an honour to be able to understand the motives which prompted Senegal to seize the Security Council of this problem.

16. The other reasons for our participation have been set out in the letter of 2 December 1969 [S/9524], signed by 35 African States, and in the letter of 4 December 1969 [S/9531], in which we recall the collective authorization given us since 1963 by the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity whereby, whenever a problem affecting African Territories under Portuguese administration is examined by the Council, the representatives of Liberia, Sierra Leone, Tunisia and Madagascar are to come to defend African interests.

17. My delegation was struck by the series of provocations and attacks of which Senegal has been a victim since 1963,

some of which have already been the subject of two Security Council resolutions [178 (1963), 204 (1965)], even as far back as 1963 and 1965. It is to be deeply deplored that a country such as Senegal, which wishes to devote all its efforts to the social and economic advancement of its people, should not be able to do so in the requisite atmosphere of security and serenity. We have been all the more struck because, since 1967, no less than 27 incidents occurred in the southern area of Senegal, and despite the number of victims, abductions, violations of air space and national territory, bombings and other acts, Senegal has so far evinced patience and moderation to such an extent that the international community seems to have forgotten that a situation of that kind cannot in the long run be endured without affecting international peace and security. The grave incidents at Samine—including that of 7 December, which is the most serious if only because it has occurred while the Security Council is still considering the previous complaint—are simply the culminating point in this long list, and the concise accounts made by the representative of Senegal show us, in their truth and poignancy, that any responsible State cannot in fact ignore the sufferings of its people and the repeated violations of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

18. It has been alleged here that all these acts were perpetrated in the exercise of the right of legitimate self-defence. In all logic we recognize that the Africans of Guinea (Bissau) have the right to live in security, but we do not think that they are the authors of these acts of so-called legitimate self-defence. Mention has also been made of the right of the administering Power to ensure the safety of the peoples for which it is responsible, but should this right be exercised to the detriment of the security and sovereignty of neighbouring States? If such a concept were to be accepted as part of the exercise of the right to legitimate self-defence, we would be trampling underfoot all standards governing relations among States. What is more, in the particular case being considered by the Security Council, no one can allege that Senegal has committed any act of aggression whatsoever.

19. I should like to revert for a minute to the rights of the administering Power. My delegation believes that if we are to recognize these rights we must needs also invoke the duties of that Power. We maintain that an administering Power has the imperative duty to lead the people for which it is responsible to independence by way of self-determination. We are convinced that the people of Guinea (Bissau) would be happier if they were accorded the right to self-determination at the same time as the right to security, even though it would seem normal that for a dependent people the former should be of more immediate importance than the latter.

20. Furthermore, among the principles that have been examined in this Organization and which bear on friendly relations and co-operation among States, there is one to which the countries of the third world are particularly devoted, namely the legitimacy of the struggle being waged by the movements of national liberation. The attitude of my delegation on this has been quite formal, and we have declared that it is difficult to admit that repression of such a struggle should be included among acts of legitimate self-defence.

21. We take note of the statement made by the representative of Portugal who told us: "We have no intention or desire to disrespect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country" [1516th meeting, para. 126]. In brief, this is a reaffirmation of the declared intention which is already referred to in resolution 178 (1963) of 24 April 1963, and if this intention had been followed by effective action, we should not now have before us the complaint from Senegal. On the contrary, everything seems to show that since this resolution was voted on, Senegal has constantly been the victim of deliberate acts of provocation.

22. In resolution 204 (1965) of 19 May 1965, the Security Council requested "once again the Government of Portugal to take all effective and necessary action to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity". We maintain that the 27 grave incidents which the representative of Senegal has mentioned before the Council last week, and those which have occurred since, prove that such action has not been taken, or, if by any chance it has been, then it has led to a paradoxical renewal of the acts which we condemned.

23. We hope that the Security Council will examine the complaint of Senegal and act on its just request in the light of the facts stated and of the implementation or non-implementation of the said resolutions and that a line of action will be decided on in accordance with the indications given by the representative of Senegal at the 1516th meeting of the Security Council, in which the Council was asked to pronounce itself clearly and unequivocally on the basis of the provisions of the Charter.

24. It remains for my delegation to clarify its position on the procedural question. It has been stated here that Senegal should have exhausted all the resources provided for under Article 33 of the Charter before approaching the Security Council. I believe I can affirm that, like Madagascar, Senegal is one of those countries which attaches most importance to the intrinsic values of negotiations and dialogue. For our part we in no way doubt the commitments of Senegal in this connexion on several occasions and at many international meetings. Thus I shall merely say what I said in the Security Council at its 1489th meeting, when we considered the complaint of Zambia against Portugal. Negotiations, the virtues of which were recognized in the Charter and in the practices of this Organization, are binding to the extent that all the parties so decide and on the condition that the situation to which the dispute has given rise lends itself to a settlement. This implies that, for reasons inherent in the defence of its interests and respect for its other commitments, one party may choose the procedure which seems to it to be most appropriate.

25. In view of the fact that the Security Council resolutions were not complied with and in view of the recurrence of events which seems to show that they were probably deliberate and premeditated, Senegal has, in our view, rightly turned to the Security Council. We cannot reproach it for its patience or its moderation and it is even less desirable to take such a pretext to lead it along a course which the present situation and facts prevent it from following.

26. The representative of Senegal in his preliminary statement emphasized, "if Portugal deliberately violates the territorial integrity of African countries it must be admitted that"—we must say it frankly—"it is because it is sure of its impunity and of the support it receives from its allies" [1516th meeting, para. 64].

27. We have already addressed an appeal to certain great Powers and drawn their attention to resolutions 180 (1963) of 31 July 1963 and 218 (1965) of 23 November 1965 regarding the assistance given to Portugal which enabled it to continue reprisals against populations on the territories administered by it. We renew these appeals today because it is obvious that all these reprehensible acts could not have occurred if in good faith certain Powers had agreed to carry out these resolutions. Generous sentiments are sometimes not enough. The will to help to put an end to situations based on obsolete concepts should be translated into deeds. It is easy enough to shut oneself up within the strict bounds of legality and to be concerned only about formal compliance with the law. But is it not true that such an attitude in political matters may lead those who adopt it onto the dangerous path of acceptance of flagrant violations of the very principles of our Charter?

28. The fact that a country like Senegal, with whose philosophy we are familiar, recognizes that there are limits to its patience and that it may have no choice but to resort to the use of force to impose respect for its sovereignty and territorial integrity, deserves our careful consideration.

29. We support Senegal in its confidence in and respect for the Security Council, and we are convinced that the time has come to ensure that the principles on which normal relations between States are based will be strictly respected and that in the present case the conditions essential to the existence of such relations should be established.

30. The representative of Portugal, in his statement at the 1814th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the Manifesto on Southern Africa of the Organization of African Unity, extended the hand of friendship to the African States. Without false shame, we can say that we have no prejudice against any State whatsoever, but we shall always oppose any manifestation of an obsolete form of colonialism. Let this gesture of friendship, then, not take the form of continued acts of aggression, and let this appeal echo our concern, particularly that of seeing our brothers under Portuguese administration enjoy the right of freedom, self-determination and independence.

31. Senegal requests that its sovereignty and territorial integrity should be preserved on the basis of the principles of justice, equality and dignity. Africa continues to ask that the security of the continent and the right of the still dependent peoples of Africa to self-determination should be recognized. Nothing in the Charter can prevent the Security Council from considering these requests, which are closely and inextricably inter-linked, in all equity. Nor is there anything in the Charter which does not authorize the great Powers to do everything in their power to persuade Portugal to reach more realistic and less doctrinaire attitudes, taking into account the evolution of problems dealing with relations among States and peoples.

32. Mr. President, I should like to end on a personal note and congratulate you on your accession to the Presidency of the Council. Our brotherly feelings go with you in your delicate task.

33. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Madagascar for his brotherly compliments addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Tunisia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

34. Mr. EL GOULLI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like first to express to you my thanks and my appreciation for kindly allowing me to speak at this stage of the debate on the complaint of Senegal. I wish to state the position of the Government of the Tunisian Republic on the tragic and painful situation caused by the military action of Portuguese forces on the territory of the Republic of Senegal.

35. I could give a number of reasons for our participation in the debate. The main purpose of our participation is to state clearly and unambiguously to this important organ of the United Nations and, through it, to the entire world, that what affects Senegal affects us, and that in these difficult moments when Senegal is struggling for its dignity as an independent and sovereign nation, Tunisia gives Senegal its full support and assures it of its entire sympathy and solidarity.

36. We could also mention the close and brotherly relations of our two countries in all fields of activity and the joint action which has encouraged us to co-operate on a sound basis for the promotion of our mutual interests and for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in Africa which, unfortunately, remains a prey to colonialist wars that are still rife in some of its areas. We could also give as a reason that we belong to a single organization that unites all the independent countries of Africa, and which last September in Addis Ababa, energetically and unequivocally condemned the actions of the colonialist diehards who have still not learned anything from the teachings of history. We could also say that we realize and feel convinced that this brotherly and peace-loving people wishes only to hasten its development on the basis of a highly humanistic philosophy which makes the advancement of man its main concern. The actions of President Léopold Senghor, who is highly esteemed by the President, Government and people of Tunisia, need no comment, because they are so well known, both in Africa and in the world. This great son of Africa has been able to direct first his struggle and then his constructive work along universal lines, for his actions are based essentially upon the love of peace, freedom and prosperity for all, in a world wherein co-operation, brotherhood and justice are not vain words.

37. But, in addition to all these considerations, we feel justified in speaking because of our conviction, as a Member of the United Nations respectful of its Charter and the obligations it imposes on us, that it is the duty of the United Nations and the Security Council, when events reach such a grave and dangerous point, to defend the interest of a small country and help it to do away finally with the vestiges of colonialism, which are one of the most

serious threats to peace and security in the world. Consequently, it is of the utmost urgency that the Security Council should shoulder its responsibilities and quickly put an end to this situation which threatens the security and integrity of one of the Members of this Organization and also threatens peace in an area of Africa which has been tried enough already.

38. The representative of Senegal has reviewed the history of this matter. He has very clearly shown how his Government made constant efforts over the past few years to prevent the situation from growing worse, bearing in mind the obligations of the people and the Government of Senegal with regard to the populations still living under the yoke of Portuguese colonialism. We have followed these peaceful efforts and I must say that we have been impressed by the patience, realism and sense of international responsibility of the Senegalese leaders in the action they have taken.

39. Unfortunately, these efforts have met with the incomprehension and intransigence which reflect a colonialist mentality, at a moment when the inevitability of decolonization should induce in the Government of Lisbon a healthier view of things, in a world of the United Nations wherein the sovereignty of States is equal and respect for the will of nations is the only guarantee of a fruitful and lasting co-operation.

40. We have just learned that, yesterday, a new aggression—even more serious than the previous one—has just been committed by the air and land forces of Portugal while the Security Council was in session, thus pointing to Portugal's deliberate intention to defy the international community. This lack of comprehension and realism and the persistence of an obsolete colonialism have, unfortunately, led to these tragic events and these losses of human life, mainly women and children, in any case of unarmed civilians.

41. Further, in the face of this attitude of moderation, the representative of Portugal has found nothing better than to stress the bilateral discussions which his Government would have liked to hold with Senegal, as if it were possible to negotiate successfully with a Government which deliberately tramples underfoot the resolutions adopted by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations. For what we are concerned with here is not material reparations, but essentially with putting an end to repeated aggressions committed by Portuguese armed forces.

42. The Council, which unfortunately has a long experience of this particular kind of situation, is still faced with the problem of colonial wars spilling over onto territories of neighbouring, independent States. Sometimes the right of pursuit is claimed, sometimes the right of self-defence. Yet Portugal should know that a colonial régime cannot, without insulting history, claim to possess any type of legitimacy whatsoever.

43. The General Assembly, since its adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, has referred on several occasions to the inalienable right of

peoples under Portuguese domination to self-determination, freedom and independence. It has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle waged by national liberation movements against colonial Powers. On several occasions, and as recently as in November 1969, the General Assembly has reiterated [*resolution 2507 (XXIV)*] its serious concern at Portugal's refusal to comply with the pertinent resolutions of the Organization. This situation is of a nature to strike seriously at international peace and security. The case we are considering today is the penultimate one in a long list. Recently another independent African country—Guinea—was the victim of military action by Portuguese forces stationed in Africa. Tomorrow, another action may be directed against another independent country of Africa, simply because, in the eyes of the Lisbon authorities, it will be guilty of conforming to the resolutions of the United Nations dealing with territories still under Portuguese domination.

44. Where do we go from here? Are the African States to be forced to give up the very reason for their existence, namely, their economic and social development, in order to cope with what is of immediate urgency and arm themselves to an ever greater extent to repulse by force these perpetual aggressors? Is this part of the continent to be engulfed in war? The Council should therefore urgently adopt here and now the measures necessary to avoid such a development. However, no genuine peace can exist in that part of the world so long as African peoples continue to endure the yoke of colonialism. This is our major concern and the concern too of many sincerely peace-loving countries.

45. I hope that the representative of France will allow me to quote one sentence of his speech made before the Security Council on 23 July 1969, at the time when it was considering Zambia's complaint:

"That situation cannot be improved in any truly lasting manner until the time when all the peoples of that region are in a position to exercise their right to self-determination." [*1488th meeting, para. 95.*]

46. I have referred deliberately to France because my country was faced with a similar situation in February 1958, when Sakiet was bombed by the French Air Force; France was then waging a colonial war in Algeria, though France and Tunisia had succeeded in settling their differences; I am very proud to see the representative of Algeria now sitting in the Security Council. The co-operation that exists today between these three countries is truly exemplary, and the relations between France and Tunisia can be described as privileged. Could this historical precedent inspire Portugal and make it realize that it is vain to try to go against the march of history? It is in its interest to sow seeds of understanding, friendship and co-operation, from which it would be the first to benefit, rather than to continue cultivating hate.

47. It is time for peace to spread and replace the horrors of war in that part of the world. The new generations in Portugal and Africa will judge us and will wonder what motives, vanity or lack of foresight held back the hour of brotherhood.

48. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Tunisia for his kind words addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the representative of the United Arab Republic, Ambassador El-Zayyat, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

49. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): Allow me, first, Mr. President, to thank you, and through you the members of the Security Council, for having invited me to participate in the discussions of the Council and allowing me to express our views on the complaint brought by the Republic of Senegal, which the Council is now considering.

50. Our delegation, together with 34 African countries, supported the request for the convening of this Council [S/9513] made by the representative of Senegal, Mr. Ibrahima Boye, following the recent Portuguese deliberate violations of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Senegal. As well as this initial complaint, we have heard today the report of other acts of aggression committed as recently as yesterday, while the Council was considering the complaint of Senegal. In taking this stand beside Senegal, we were animated by the natural sympathy for the people of a sister State: our stand rests upon what we believe to be a basic postulate of the charter of the Organization of African Unity and the Charter of the United Nations itself; namely, that peace is indivisible and that aggression, if allowed to be committed, without deterrence, in one place, is certain to lead to aggressions in other places in Africa and throughout the world.

51. Having listened attentively last Thursday, and this morning to Mr. Boye and having listened attentively last Thursday to the representative of Portugal, I concluded that the Portuguese Government does not challenge the long, unpleasant list of acts of aggression committed against the Republic of Senegal.

52. The representative of Senegal has reminded the Council of its resolutions 178 (1963) of 24 April 1963 deploring the incursion of Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory and requesting the Government of Portugal, in accordance with its clear intentions, to take whatever action might be necessary to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and of Council resolution 204 (1965) of 19 May 1965 in which the Council again deeply deplored such incursions by Portuguese military forces and again requested the Government of Portugal to take all effective and necessary action to safeguard Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

53. We have listened to the representative of Senegal recording before this Council new actions of the same type as those deplored and censured by the Council during the years 1963 and 1965. This morning we heard him report the murder yesterday of five Senegalese and the wounding and destruction that took place only last night while the Council was, as I said, debating the complaint of Senegal.

54. We have heard the representative of Portugal insist on two points in his reply. That such attacks are considered by his Government to be reactions in self-defence and retaliation against the activities of such nationalists as the African Party for the Independence of Guinea (so-called Portu-

guese) and the Cape Verde Islands, who are fighting the Portuguese in Guinea and who often enter Senegal for rest periods and to obtain supplies as he quoted from *Agence France-Presse* of 28 November 1969. The second point laboured in the statement of the representative of Portugal is the right of the Portuguese to defend themselves within their own territories. "No matter"—he said—"what are the theories invoked in this Organization or elsewhere, we have the right to defend ourselves." [1516th meeting, para. 121.]

55. The Security Council has, indeed, decisively dealt with the theory of retaliation, not only in this case, but in similar notorious cases, such as Israeli aggression against Jordan and Lebanon, under the same pretext—that of retaliation. On those occasions, it was made abundantly clear that this theory is contrary to the Charter and the contemporary norms of international law. With regard to Portugal, the Council has already rejected this theory when it condemned Portuguese attacks in the past.

56. Besides, retaliation simply ignores the cause of the evil and seeks a remedy for the disease by intensifying the wounds. The cause of the evil is the injustice imposed on a people by colonial rule, the reluctance of the colonial Powers to free these people at a time when colonialism is, or should be, dead. The remedy offered is force and violence. The effective remedy is the eradication of injustice and the freeing of the subjugated people—or simply the application of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

57. Self-defence is hardly a valid excuse to be offered by the Government of Portugal when there is no pretence that Senegal has attacked or tried to attack or permitted attacks to be begun from its territory against the people of Portugal or the territory of Portugal itself. The representative of Portugal says that there were several attacks on Portuguese Guinea this year, and he is sure that "nobody will be so absurd as to ask us to resign ourselves to the prospect of being killed [ibid., para. 119]. No matter from where the attacks are launched, we have the right to defend ourselves" [ibid., para. 124]. Again he says: "we exercise our right of self-defence within our own territory" [ibid., para. 126].

58. Surely, the representative of Portugal, as well as the members of this Council, are aware that such attacks, as reported by the representative of Portugal, cannot be considered attacks on Portuguese Guinea. They are not even attacks directed especially to the Portuguese people in Guinea. They are attacks on the forces of colonialism and the occupiers of Guinea (Bissau).

59. There should simply not be a Portuguese Guinea. There should be no colonial forces in Guinea (Bissau) or anywhere else in Africa. We had British Africa, French Africa, German Africa, Italian Africa and Portuguese Africa. I think now the only remnant of this old tradition is the Portuguese and that, I hope, will also be ended soon. That is the remedy.

60. What we are calling for here is neither startling nor novel. It is what the United Nations Charter says, the same Charter which Portugal has signed. It is what the General

Assembly decided in the famous Declaration contained in its resolution 1514 (XV). Portugal refuses to comply with the provisions of the Charter in Chapter XI, which establishes one of the basic principles of the Charter, namely, the accountability of the administering Powers of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the pledge on the part of the administrative Powers to enable the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to attain their independence.

61. The Portuguese authorities have sought shelter under the untenable thesis that the African territories it occupies are part and parcel of the Portuguese motherland. Such a thesis has been proved untenable in all other situations. We have here, as a member of this Council, Algeria, in whose land that thesis was tried and failed.

62. Retaliation is not acceptable nor is self-defence a valid excuse. Facing the reality of the freedom movement is the only way of solving the Portuguese problem in Africa. The line of colonialism in Africa has been receding throughout this last century—from the Sahara, where the continent has been divided between black and brown, to the line now extending from Portuguese-occupied Angola on one African coast to Portuguese-occupied Mozambique on the other coast. Behind that line are parts of Africa still dominated by racism and colonialism. Behind that line the riches of Africa are being mined away while the yearning of the Africans for freedom and peace is stifled, the cry for justice is silenced and their efforts for progress are let waste. Behind that line the racist Governments of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are using the Portuguese to keep the tide of change from submerging them.

63. While we are preparing for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, with the slogan "Peace, Justice and Progress", surely all the nations of the world, including, I hope, the great nation of Portugal, should do their utmost to honour those ideas.

64. The representative of Senegal told the Council on 4 December:

"...we are convinced that this time the Security Council, in which again we express our trust... will be able to eliminate the weak language it has used in the past"—referring to the past two resolutions—"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." [1516th meeting, para. 67.]

65. The Security Council is the highest forum before which such problems are to be submitted. Its central task is the maintenance of international peace and security. To achieve that, all forms of colonialism and subjugation must be ended.

66. The Council will recall in its resolution 268 (1969) of 28 July 1969 that it strongly censured the same Portuguese authorities for their violation of the territorial integrity of another African sister country, Zambia. It declared in

paragraph 5 that: "...in the event of failure on the part of Portugal to comply with paragraph 2 of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet to consider further measures;". The General Assembly has already this year, in its resolution 2507 (XXIV) of 28 November 1969, pronounced itself in clear terms, reaffirming the inalienable rights of the peoples of the territories under Portuguese domination to self-determination, freedom and independence.

67. The representative of Portugal has stated that there is no hostility between his country and Senegal. In fact, there is no hostility between the people of Zambia and the people of Portugal; there is no hostility between the people of Guinea and the people of Portugal; there is no hostility between the people of Senegal and the people of Portugal; and certainly there is no hostility between the people of Egypt, the United Arab Republic, and the people of Portugal. However, the battle does exist in which those who are still under colonial rule in Africa are determined to be free, and those who still maintain colonial rule are blindly resisting. The result of this battle is certain: colonialism will be eradicated. Do we have to arrive at this certain conclusion through a trial of blood and suffering?

68. The centuries of European expansion saw the men of Europe in the service of their respective countries penetrate territories and acquire new lands for their people. Within the context of the international morality of those days these were praiseworthy acts and those were brave men to be remembered. The Portuguese have thus demonstrated their courage and dedication. The courage and dedication expected of Portugal today is the courage to heed the tide of history and to welcome Africans to the family of free nations, to honour Africans yearning for freedom and independence. The dedication expected of Portugal today is its dedication to the principles of the Charter which it signed, and the realization of man's dreams for freedom and justice, for security and peace.

69. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to see you in the Chair during the final month of your country's service in this Council. May I borrow from your opening statement in this debate your hopes and wishes that the Council will give the world something of the spirit of Christmas by trying to do all that it could to end all strife on earth.

70. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Zayyat, for the kind words addressed to the Chair.

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

72. Mr. SOW (Mali) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, though the events brought before the Council are most serious and urgent, I hope I may first be allowed to thank you and the members of the Council for having given us this opportunity to speak in the debate without the right to vote. In the name of my Government I should also like to thank the Council for having agreed to consider urgently the complaint of Senegal against the Portuguese aggression in the territory of Senegal. Finally, I should like to take this

opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you warmly on behalf of my delegation on your accession to the Presidency of the Council, the body whose main role is the maintenance of international peace and security. Although my country is not at present a member of the Council, you may be assured that the delegation of Mali will at all times give you its full support, for it feels sure that, with your customary courtesy and your recognized talents, you will acquit yourself honourably of your difficult task.

73. Unfortunately this is not the first time, and I fear that it may well not be the last, that Portugal, which is permanently accused, stands before the bar of the Security Council, to answer for its most reprehensible aggressions against Senegal, a peace-loving State, a State Member of the United Nations and a non-permanent member of the Security Council.

74. Once again, Portuguese troops have fired on a peaceful Senegalese village, killing and seriously wounding people and causing substantial damage. Thus, Portugal's acts of aggression against peace-loving States, Members of the United Nations, are successively or even simultaneously being multiplied. Last month, Senegal and the Republic of Guinea were the victims of an odious aggression committed by Portuguese troops. In the past, we have had to deplore extremely grave acts of aggression on the part of Portugal whose victims were your country, Mr. President, Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, and other African States. Hardly had we heard of this odious aggression by Portuguese troops against a Senegalese village when we learned, only a few days later, that Portugal had been guilty of aggression against Guinean villages. This morning we were further shocked to learn, from the statement of the representative of Senegal, of a new aggression committed by Portugal against the same Senegalese village, causing more deaths, more seriously wounded and great material damage.

75. We ask ourselves with a certain amount of anxiety whether the small and undeveloped country of Portugal, hearing the bell toll for its anachronistic and decadent colonial system, is not frenziedly trying to commit as many crimes as it can before its doomed colonialist régime expires. This gives us food for thought and we would urge the Security Council to give the matter careful consideration without delay and in particular to provide for effective measures that could put an end to the aggressive actions of Portugal against States Members of the United Nations.

76. In reply to the distinguished Senegalese representative's statement on these extremely grave and painful facts, the Portuguese representative here who, like his Government, has never understood anything about the evolution of African peoples and their determination to free themselves once and for all from foreign domination, merely puts questions to the victim of Portugal's aggression and tries to invoke, in defence of the rotten régime he represents, the right of self-defence to justify the shameful acts perpetrated by the Portuguese troops against a Senegalese village. In the opinion of my delegation it would be in vain for us to try to convince the Portuguese Government in matters of decolonization, and it would be a waste of time to refute the allegations of its representative here.

All the attempts to make Portugal co-operate with the United Nations in order to bring about self-determination and independence through peaceful means for the Territories still under Portuguese domination have met with a categorical refusal. Those still naïve enough to believe that negotiations are still possible can see that this refusal is accompanied by acts of aggression against peace-loving independent States Members of the United Nations, as in the recent cases of Senegal and Guinea.

77. Conclusions should be drawn from the behaviour of Portugal, and more particularly from its recent acts of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republics of Senegal and Guinea. The United Nations has recognized as legitimate the struggle of the national liberation movements in Africa and elsewhere, and the duty of every independent State of Africa is to support those movements by all possible means. The Security Council should, in the opinion of my delegation, not only unanimously and energetically condemn Portugal for its aggression against Senegal and Guinea, but also, as I said earlier, provide for effective measures to ensure that the actions we deplore today will not be repeated in the future. Africa needs justice and peace. Peace with justice demands as an essential precondition the elimination not only of Portuguese colonialism in Africa, but also of Southern Rhodesian racism and South African *apartheid*. We hope the Security Council will realize this and do all in its power in the interests of peace and justice in Africa.

78. Before concluding, I should like again to express to the Governments and peoples of Senegal and Guinea, who are victims of the aggression of the Portuguese troops, the deep sympathy and assurance of total solidarity with and unconditional support of the government and people of Mali.

79. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mali, Mr. Sow, for his statement and for the brotherly compliments addressed to the Chair. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

80. Mr. ALATTAR (Yemen) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to extend to you and to members of the Council my gratitude for allowing me to participate in the debate on this item on the agenda. I also wish to extend to you the brotherly congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the Presidency of the Security Council.

81. A sister country, Senegal, has once again suffered from the colonialist aggression of Portugal. Guinea, another sister country, has also been a victim. Still other African countries have, on other occasions, found themselves in the same situation.

82. Portugal persists in believing that the international political situation has not changed. That colonialist country therefore continues to ignore all the evolutions and revolutions which have led to the inevitable and final condemnation of the colonialist system and the inhuman exploitation of free human beings that goes with it. Defying the Charter of the United Nations, General Assembly and

Security Council resolutions, and particularly the last resolution adopted by the General Assembly [2507 (XXIV)], Portugal persists in its behaviour, as in the period when the colonial countries used to take military action in complete disregard of international public opinion. This period of the past, which Lisbon wishes to perpetuate—and the same applies to other countries of Africa and Asia, including the Middle East—is not only past but has been irrevocably condemned by international public opinion as a whole and by almost all States, even those that made use of colonialist methods only a few years ago.

83. The time of colonialist expansion, of expeditionary forces, and of the bombardment of sovereign countries and peoples is at an end, for the world's new awareness on the one hand, and the movements of liberation and international solidarity, on the other, are facts of contemporary history which anyone who is not blind must accept. Countries far more powerful than Portugal have drawn the inevitable conclusions, and others, even more powerful, are still paying dearly for their expeditionary adventures. Portugal, the poorest country in Europe, remains intractable on the subject of defiance of our Organization and of the entire world.

84. It is true that in so doing it has been effectively or implicitly encouraged by certain countries, which, though Members of the United Nations, are thereby undermining the structure of our Organization. The Security Council itself has been too generous towards Portugal, as it has towards other countries. I am referring to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel, which refuse to implement resolutions adopted in the Security Council by a majority or almost unanimously.

85. Faced with the irrefutable facts that the representative of Senegal, Mr. Boye, submitted here, will the members of the Council once again content themselves with a resolution wherein they would use the words "deplores", "notes", "requests"? Do members of the Council believe that such a resolution, which would be added to the many that have already been adopted, could put an end to the actions and provocations of the Portuguese army?

86. We have been able to observe the arrogance with which the representative of Portugal replied to the fact of acts of aggression by using the pretext of "legitimate self-defence," as he said: "No matter what are the theories invoked in this Organization or elsewhere, we have the right to defend ourselves" [1516th meeting, para. 121]. Or, further: "... I must emphasize that we exercise our right of self-defence within our own territory." [Ibid., para. 126.] Has he not referred to a region that is several thousand miles from his country as "our territory", a territory moreover that is African and where the inhabitants are deprived of the fundamental right to self-determination? We have seen him shamelessly describe the men who fight to preserve that right as "armed bands" or "terrorists". The men of the liberation movements in Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola believe in the justice of their struggle and deride what the representative of Portugal thinks of them. They know that they will triumph over the tyranny of colonialism, and other formerly subjugated countries have now regained their independence. There

main objective is to recover their national territory, as other countries of Asia and Africa are doing that are now fighting for the same cause.

87. The President of Portugal has just launched a new attack against the United Nations by declaring before the tenth Legislative Assembly of Portugal on 4 December 1969 that: "an Organization which considers the attacks of irresponsible terrorist bands as legal and the action of the police to maintain order as illegal, could not permit itself to speak of justice and equity." The President of Portugal added: "It is true that no referendum in accordance with the rules laid down by the United Nations has been organized in the Portuguese African Territories to determine whether the peoples concerned wish to remain under Portuguese administration."

88. If Portugal persists in its policy of aggression and provocation because it knows it has the support of the other members of NATO, which supply it with weapons, munitions and assistance, it is the colonialist policy that is at issue. Portugal derives important resources from its colonial Territories. The report of the Special Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples dated 8 November 1966¹ quotes figures to show the economic advantages that Portugal derives from its colonized African Territories. An entire discriminatory agricultural system enables Portuguese settlers, colonial Portuguese industries and foreign interests to exploit both the resources of the soil and African manpower. Agricultural production has remained traditionally based on export crops: coffee, cotton and sisal; and most of the measures taken by the Government to assist the production of export goods have been favourable mainly to the European producers. In fact, only the Europeans legally had the right to be registered as producers in the colonial export councils. The colonial agencies, which are Portuguese companies, monopolize trade, export goods being bought at low prices from the African peasants—export goods are produced directly by Portuguese enterprises when they can profit from the low wages paid to their farm workers—and imported products being sold at exorbitant prices.

89. Another kind of trade, none other than the supplying of manpower to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, represents an important source of income for the Government of Portugal.

90. That "colonial contract" has been established in many colonized countries. A large part of the wealth of the mother countries may be derived precisely from that kind of colonial exploitation.

91. Portugal still derives substantial foreign exchange from trade. If the balance of trade and of payments are not in a catastrophic situation in Portugal, it is because of the colonized African Territories.

92. Every means has been and is considered to be appropriate if it favours these Portuguese companies

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23, document A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V.

operating on a system of forced and unremunerated labour, so that they may benefit from a fruitful field of investment for Portuguese capital. In any event, Portuguese capital is linked to international capital: hence, the support provided by certain Powers.

93. It would be most interesting to analyse in depth the national accounts of Portugal. I think it certain that such an analysis would prove what an immense role the countries colonized by Portugal play in its national accounts and would lead us to understand why Portugal obstinately seeks at all costs to maintain those Territories. However, the liberation movements show even greater obstinacy in their endeavours to liberate their countries from colonial domination.

94. The countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and all those who condemn colonialism, cannot remain silent about the struggles being waged by the men of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to conquer their independence and their dignity as free men.

95. We have, in the First Committee, already said: "there can be no peace or international security without national liberation, the abandonment of the policy of foreign intervention, the condemnation of racism and its corollary fascism, and the condemnation of colonialism and neo-colonialism".²

96. The Security Council must take energetic measures, on the one hand, to put an end to the systematic provocations of Portugal in Senegal and Guinea, and, on the other, to adopt the sanctions provided for under the Charter when a country refuses to implement United Nations resolutions, particularly those that pertain to self-determination.

97. In any case, my delegation expresses its solidarity with our brothers from Senegal and Guinea, and more particularly with the men who are fighting for their independence.

98. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Yemen for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

99. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council is obliged once again to consider new acts of aggression by the Portuguese colonialists against the young and independent African States. This time we are considering a report by one of the members of the Council, the African State of Senegal, in connexion with the shelling, on 25 November and 7 December, by the artillery of the Portuguese colonial army, of the Senegalese village of Samine, causing loss of life and material damage.

100. Today the representative of Senegal has reported on a new serious act of aggression committed by the Portuguese colonialists against Senegal on 7 December, at the very moment when the Security Council is considering the question of armed provocations by Portugal against this African country. This time, an even greater crime has been committed. The aggressors have killed five inhabitants of a

peaceful Senegalese village and seriously wounded one person. As can be seen from the letter of the representative of Senegal, the victims are mainly women. We thus see here a new barbarous act by the Portuguese colonialists, who are defying not only Senegal and the whole of Africa but also the Security Council and the United Nations.

101. The representative of Senegal has, in his statement and in the documents he has submitted, provided convincing and incontrovertible evidence showing that these attacks are, first, deliberate acts of aggression on the part of Portugal and, secondly, that they are new links in a continuous chain of such acts. As may be seen from the information given in his statement, there have recently been many violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Senegal by Portuguese troops, attacks by Portuguese mercenaries and regular troops against inhabited Senegalese areas, incursions by them into Senegalese territory, artillery shelling and other aggressive acts by Portugal.

102. The Security Council has on a number of occasions already considered the military actions of the Portuguese colonialists against independent African countries bordering on the Portuguese African colonies. Portuguese armed forces have attacked not only Senegal but also Guinea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), Tanzania and Zambia. Quite recently, on 28 July, the Security Council adopted resolution 268 (1969), in which it decisively condemned the attack by Portuguese colonialist troops on a village in the territory of Zambia. In 1963 and 1965, the Security Council considered the question of the violation by Portuguese troops of the territorial integrity of Senegal and demanded that Portugal should take all effective action to prevent the repetition of such acts. Yet, the Portuguese colonialists ignore these demands and warnings of the Security Council and are continuing their international criminal actions. Thus the colonial war that has for many years been waged against the peoples of Africa by the Portuguese colonizers is becoming more and more a Portuguese war against the independent States of Africa.

103. There is no doubt that the sovereignty and security of the independent African States of the southern and western parts of Africa and, consequently, the peace and security of the African continent as a whole can be strengthened only by the immediate cessation of the colonial war being waged by Portugal against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), and by the granting, without any further delay, of independence to these peoples in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The proposals of the Soviet Union for the strengthening of international security, which are before this session of the General Assembly, take these circumstances into account when they provide more particularly for the cessation of all measures taken to put down the liberation movements of peoples under colonial domination, and for the granting of independence to them.

104. The constant and increasingly frequent military provocations of the Portuguese colonialists against independent African States must inevitably attract the close attention of the Security Council and all peace-loving

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, First Committee, 1667th meeting, para. 55.

States. These aggressive actions are the direct result of Portugal's criminal colonialist policy of putting down national liberation movements in Territories under Portuguese control and keeping the peoples of those Territories under the colonial yoke. In Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), African patriots are continuing to shed their blood fighting for the liberty and independence of their peoples and in defence of their legal rights—rights that have been recognized by the United Nations and that have frequently been confirmed in resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The inalienable right of the people of these Territories to self-determination and independence has again been confirmed in General Assembly resolution 2507 (XXIV), adopted on 21 November 1969.

105. In attempting to defend the aggressive actions of the Portuguese colonialists, the Portuguese representative has been juggling with such phrases as the "right of self-defence", "penetration into Portuguese territory across the border", and so on. But for whom are these verbal acrobatics intended? Everyone knows that Senegal does not border on Portugal. It is an African country bordering on another African country, Guinea (Bissau), which is maintained by force of arms and the use of terror in a state of colonial dependence by the Portuguese colonialists against the will of the people of that country, in violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of many other United Nations decisions. For these reasons, the presence of Portugal and its troops in Guinea (Bissau) constitutes an illegal international action, whereas the legality of the just struggle of the people of this country for independence and freedom has been proclaimed and recognized by the United Nations and frequently confirmed by decisions of the General Assembly, including resolutions adopted at its current session. In these circumstances, we can speak only of the right of the people of Guinea (Bissau) to defend themselves, fighting as they are for their freedom and for their legal rights against the colonial pirates of the second half of the twentieth century. On the other hand, the cynical statements of the representative of Lisbon about some sort of "right to self-defence" on a foreign territory, and the "right to retaliation" through aggression and attack against foreign territories, represent the usual long-familiar methods of imperialist aggressors to cover up and justify the crimes they commit against the peace and the security of peoples.

106. In this connexion, it must be pointed out that no changes have occurred in the colonial policies of Portugal as far as the peoples of Africa are concerned, though temporary illusions had been entertained, even by some Africans, that such changes might occur as a result of the recent shifts in power in Lisbon. The facts show, however, that Portugal is increasing its military operations against the national liberation movements of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). As may be seen further from the last report of the Special Committee of the United Nations on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,³ Portugal is increasing its

military expenditure and the size of its army, and has strengthened its military police force to subdue the population by terrorism and to fight patriotic forces in African countries.

107. As was stated in the basic document adopted by the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow on 17 June 1969, the Portuguese colonialists are trying to maintain their colonial positions by force of arms and with the support of NATO. The wide military and economic assistance and important protection accorded to Portugal by its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are enabling the Portuguese colonialists to send into Africa troops and a large quantity of arms and materials, including aircraft, to crush the liberation war of the African peoples.

108. With insolent cynicism the Portuguese representative here tried to act as an accuser and demanded to know where the African freedom fighters obtain their arms. That is none of his business. To help the patriots of Africa is a legitimate action officially recognized and approved by the United Nations, whereas the receipt of arms by Portugal for its evil deeds and the murder of Africans are international crimes. The Portuguese representative is here not as the plaintiff but as the defendant. Consequently he must answer questions, not interrogate. He must answer the Council and say from where and from whom Portugal has received military supplies and continues to receive weapons to wage its long war against the African peoples and maintain them in a state of colonial bondage and what the nature and amounts of these weapons and supplies are. He must answer these questions, not put other questions to the Council.

109. In this assistance and support received by Portuguese colonizers lie the reasons for Portugal's ever more provocative defiance of and aggressive acts against independent African countries. In its resolution 2507 (XXIV), the General Assembly demands of States members of NATO to halt military and any other type of assistance to Portugal, since such assistance enables it to wage a colonial war against the African peoples. The granting of such military assistance to Portugal is a serious violation of the decision of the General Assembly and a crime against the African peoples.

110. The Portuguese colonialists are backed up by the military and political bloc which they have formed within the fascist, racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. This alliance of the racists who oppress the African peoples is one of the most hateful and most odious military and political colonialist blocs operating today. The Africans, quite rightly, call it the "unholy alliance". Its purpose is to prevent the liberation of African peoples who are still oppressed today and to maintain considerable territories of southern Africa as an imperialist bulwark and as a base for attack against independent African States. The Security Council is aware of the numerous criminal acts of the participants in this plot against the freedom of the African peoples. While Portugal wages a colonial war in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), the South African racists, having established the terrorist régime of *apartheid* in their own country, not only suppress the just

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/7623/Rev.1), chap. II-IV.

desire of the people of Namibia for independence and illegally occupy their country but openly grant economic and military assistance to the Portuguese colonizers. At the same time Portugal and the Republic of South Africa are jointly doing their utmost to prevent the application of sanctions against the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia laid down by a decision of the Security Council [resolution 253 (1968)] on 29 May 1968. In violating this decision they grant direct assistance and support to the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. This is how the fascist racist trio is operating in southern Africa. The development of events in southern Africa clearly confirms that this colonial bloc is an arm of imperialism for the suppression of national liberation movements in Africa and is a serious threat to the freedom and security of independent African States.

111. We can easily see what the real aims and significance of the aggressive actions of the Portuguese colonialists against Senegal and other African independent States are. Portugal, with the support from outside of its stronger allies, is endeavouring to frighten African countries and peoples struggling for the full and final liberation of Africa from colonialism and racism, to prevent free Africa from helping the national liberation movements which are constantly expanding their just and legal struggle against the remaining vestiges of colonialism on the long-suffering soil of Africa. This imperialist attack against southern Africa is being countered by the growing unity of African countries and their peoples standing for the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism in Africa. A clear confirmation of that unity and solidarity is to be found in the appeal to the Security Council by 36 African countries in connexion with the discussion of Portuguese aggression against Senegal [*S/9524 and Add.1*]. In this appeal Africa officially announces its full support of Senegal, which has become the victim of imperialist aggression. In this document the countries of Africa equally decisively condemn the Portuguese colonialists waging war against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The Security Council must give its most serious consideration to the situation thus created and to the facts pertaining to the growing number of military provocations by Portugal against the independent countries of Africa.

112. Resolution 218 (1965) adopted by the Security Council on 23 November 1965 drew the attention of all to the fact that the situation resulting from the policies of Portugal both as regards the African population of its colonies and the neighbouring African States seriously disturbed international peace and security. At its twenty-fourth session, the General Assembly, in its recently adopted resolution 2507 (XXIV), condemned once again the colonial war being waged by the Government of Portugal against the peoples of the Territories under its domination. It reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It strongly condemned Portugal's policy of using its colonial possessions for violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States. Only Portugal and a small group of its political and military allies opposed the adoption of this resolution. The implementation of this

resolution and of other decisions of the United Nations on the situation prevailing in the Territories still under Portuguese colonial domination must be an important step towards the elimination of the last strongholds of colonialism in Africa, to the liberation of the colonial peoples and the strengthening of the peace and security of the independent countries of this continent.

113. The Soviet Union, consistently implementing the Leninist foreign policy of peace, freedom and independence of all peoples, aids and supports the peoples fighting for their liberation. In the resolution I have just mentioned the General Assembly once again called upon all States "to increase . . . their moral and material assistance to the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination who are struggling for their freedom and independence". In response to this call of the General Assembly and in accordance with its policy, the Soviet Union is granting all possible assistance to the peoples of Africa in their noble struggle for liberation and supporting the consolidation of the political and economic independence of States that have achieved their national freedom as a result of the demolition of colonial empires. The Security Council should adopt all the necessary measures in order resolutely to put an end to the aggressive actions of the Portuguese colonizers who are attempting to strike at the sovereignty and independence of Senegal and other African countries. Through the adoption of such measures the Security Council will make an important contribution to the strengthening of peace in Africa and to the strengthening of international peace and security.

114. The Soviet Union fully supports the just and legitimate demands of Senegal that the Security Council should condemn in the strongest terms the Portuguese colonialists for their policy of aggression against an African country and that the armed attacks and other violations of the territorial integrity of Senegal should be halted immediately. The Security Council should warn Portugal in the most decisive terms that if such acts of aggression recur the Security Council will adopt further active measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

115. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): I would like, first of all, to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council, and to assure you that my delegation would endeavour to bring the Christmas spirit to bear on all its activities and efforts under your distinguished leadership during this month. I wish to take this occasion also to pay my respects and compliments to your eminent predecessors, Lord Caradon and Ambassador Yost, President of the Security Council for the months of October and November respectively.

116. The Security Council is seized of a matter brought before it by the Government of Senegal. It is said that, twice on 25 November 1969, units of the regular Portuguese army based in Guinea (Bissau) fired shells at the village of Samine in Senegal, killing one person and injuring several. A considerable loss of property occurred and people were obliged to leave the village. The statement made by the representative of Senegal shows that the incident of 25 November was not an isolated one and that it had taken place in the wake of other similar incidents.

This has been confirmed by the incident of yesterday, in which five persons were killed and one wounded. In his statement made before the Council the representative of Portugal has not attempted to deny the allegation: he has admitted the possibility of the incident of 25 November having taken place and the result such as that mentioned in the Senegalese complaint having followed. On the contrary, he has sought to justify Portuguese shelling of the village of Samine inside the territory of Senegal on the ground of self-defence. The representative of Portugal, furthermore, admonishes the Government of Senegal for not having taken recourse to conciliatory measures enumerated in Article 33 of the Charter before submitting the matter to the Security Council.

117. My delegation recognizes that in terms of Article 33 of the Charter, it is incumbent on all States Members of the Organization to seek solutions of all questions by peaceful means enumerated in that Article. But, in view of Security Council resolutions 178 (1963) of 24 April 1963 and 204 (1965) of 19 May 1965, both of which requested the Government of Portugal to ensure the prevention of any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity and also asked the Secretary-General of the Organization to keep the situation under review, my delegation strongly feels that the Government of Senegal is justified to address itself to the Security Council in the present case and seek to obtain additional protection of the Council against Portuguese incursions into its territory.

118. My delegation further feels that the argument put forward by the representative of Portugal in support of his Government's acts in so-called self-defence is fallacious and unsupported by facts, and therefore cannot be accepted by the Council. Those acts of self-defence have consisted, in this specific case, of shelling of a peaceful village across international frontiers and have resulted in a loss of life and considerable damage to persons and property. Those who died or were injured were practically all women, children and the old. None of them was a freedom fighter.

119. My delegation cannot accept Portugal's contention of self-defence in the particular case, also because by its own argument the Government of Portugal should have used various peaceful means available under the Charter to redress its grievances, if any—whatever their validity—before taking recourse repeatedly to violent and punitive measures in violation of the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal. But the good faith of the Portuguese authorities is in question here, because even as the Council is considering the matter they have taken further such violent measures.

120. Apart from these considerations, the high-handedness of the Government of Portugal becomes even more apparent when we view the matter in the context of Portuguese colonial policies in Africa. And it is the considered opinion of my delegation that the matter cannot properly be viewed except in that context.

121. The records of the Security Council are replete with matters involving justifiable complaints by African States concerning violations of their territorial integrity by the Portuguese armed forces based in Angola, Mozambique and

Guinea (Bissau). May I recall, in this connexion, that the Security Council, by its resolution 268 (1969) of 28 July 1969, strongly censured the Portuguese attacks against Zambia, and called upon Portugal to desist from violating the territorial integrity and from carrying out unprovoked raids against Zambia. In pursuance of its colonial designs which have been universally condemned, the Government of Portugal appears to have adopted a policy of all-out hostility and punitive actions against all African States whose territories adjoin those of its colonial possessions in Africa. The policies and actions of the Government of Portugal cannot be regarded as ones taken in defence and promotion of its legitimate interests. Those are policies and actions which have been characterized as a "crime against humanity" and declared to have constituted a "serious threat to world peace and security" by the General Assembly. They are designed to maintain and further Portuguese colonial domination in the colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)—Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization applies. The General Assembly, in its several decisions, has unreservedly upheld the right of the peoples of those territories to immediate independence.

122. However, the Government of Portugal has not paid the slightest regard to those decisions. It has learned nothing from the lessons of history. Bolstered up by the assistance in money and arms as well as the moral sympathy and political encouragement it habitually receives from certain quarters, particularly South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, Portugal has seen fit to cling to its colonial possessions. May I say that by doing so, the Government of Portugal has fostered a situation which is a permanent source of friction in the political horizon of the African continent. Responsibility for this situation should be placed where it belongs. The verdict of the Council should not be ambiguous on this count. For these reasons, my delegation will be prepared to support any measure calculated to ensure against further violation of the territorial integrity of Senegal.

123. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Portugal.

124. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): The Council will easily understand that my delegation is not in a position to comment right now on the contents of the letter addressed to you, Sir, earlier this morning by the representative of Senegal and distributed as document S/9541. This document came to the knowledge of my delegation only a short while ago and we have naturally had to contact our Government for information on the subject. We have done so already, but my delegation can hardly hope for a reply today since ultimately the information has to be obtained from Portuguese Guinea. However, my delegation will try its best to obtain the required information as soon as possible and place it before the Council. I make this statement in courtesy to the representative of Senegal and the members of the Security Council.

125. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Portugal for his statement. The next and last speaker inscribed on my list this morning is the representative of Mauritania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

126. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): It is right and understandable that my delegation should feel proud on seeing you take on the responsible duty of guiding the work of this most important body which was created for the maintenance of international peace and security. In fact, your competence, your sense of fairness and the depth of your thinking, which is recognized by those who have worked with you, make us confident that you will carry out your duties with the firmness and courtesy which have characterized the good work you, as a worthy African, have accomplished in other fields. Allow me also to express the gratitude of my delegation to you and through you to the members of the Council, who have kindly allowed the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to participate without the right to vote in this debate which has been made necessary by the repeated acts of banditry and unmistakable aggression perpetrated by Portuguese colonialism on the African continent.

127. Mr. Boye, the permanent representative of Senegal, our sister republic, firmly stated, at the 1516th meeting of the Council, the reasons which led the Government of Senegal to bring before the Council the most recent aggression of which his country has been a victim. In a devastating statement against Portuguese colonialism, whose acts of banditry and aggression against the people of Senegal were described with the requisite accuracy and clearness, Mr. Boye spoke in a dispassionate and restrained manner, the importance of which will not have escaped any member of the Council. This attitude has always been characteristic of the actions of Senegal, whose leaders have never ceased to show in their deeds their support for the principles of the Charter and their desire to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and their definite preference for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

128. Eminent African representatives have already spoken in this debate and have stressed that the position of the African States, when a State member of the Organization of African Unity is a victim of any aggression, is governed directly by the Charter of that Organization, which imposes on us the obligation to strengthen African unity and solidarity. That is what will enable the peoples of our vast continent to present a united front that can hasten the liberation of all the African territories still under foreign domination.

129. To this sacred obligation, which my country assumes, there must be added, in the specific case before the Security Council today and as far as the Islamic Republic of Mauritania is concerned, a special feeling of solidarity flowing from the many and century-old bonds which make us feel that any attempt against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our sister Republic of Senegal is as though it were a direct attempt against ourselves. This consideration explains the need which my Government feels to emphasize before this Council the intolerable character of the actions of a colonialism at bay, which, foreseeing its inevitable defeat, does not hesitate to violate the principles of the Charter in any way it can and multiplies its perfidious acts of aggression against a peace-loving State, whose villages it shells and whose property it loots and destroys.

130. This policy of provocation and intimidation will not deter the countries subjected to aggression from carrying out a sacred duty owed to the movements of African liberation struggling to eliminate the obsolete colonialism which is linked to those who uphold *apartheid* in Zimbabwe and South Africa.

131. The representative of Portuguese colonialism has once again tried to distort the facts in the hope of deceiving the members of the Council. This representative, whose country is ruining itself in carrying on an outdated and hopeless colonialist adventure, has tried to pass himself off as acting in legitimate self-defence, while seeking to live in peace with his neighbours, who are threatening his security. This act, which is in bad taste, has been tried out unsuccessfully by others, and can deceive no one.

132. Geographically, Portugal is not a neighbour of Senegal since it is not an African country. Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) are not and do not want to be provinces of Portugal. If the peoples of these African territories wanted to share a fiction which exists only in the imagination of those who obstinately oppose the current of history by placing themselves beyond the pale of the new international order, it would not be necessary for the fascist régime of Lisbon to maintain on African soil at great expense and thousands of miles from the frontiers of Portugal an army of more than 150,000 men. It seems to me that these are obvious facts which demonstrate the vanity of all that the Lisbon authorities have said in this Council, at a time when their unmistakable acts of aggression endanger the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations, which respects the principles of the Charter, and call for a meeting of this important international body.

133. Mr. Boye, the spokesman of the people and Government of Senegal, has, with the accuracy and clearness of a jurist devoted to the cause of peace and to the country he represents, furnished facts which the representative of the fascist authorities of Lisbon has not dared to contradict. The Senegalese village of Samine was shelled with premeditation by Portuguese forces on 25 November 1969. This act of deliberate aggression caused several victims, among whom there were women, children and old men. This was no isolated aggression. The representative of Senegal gave a long list of aggressions and stressed before this Council that he was expressly limiting himself to the most recent cases. None of these acts of aggression has been denied by the representative of Lisbon. All that we have heard from the representative of Portuguese fascism is a justification of an alleged right of pursuit, which has been condemned by the international community. The same representative had the arrogance to give to threats he proffered in this hall a dimension that went well beyond the bounds of Africa. In fact, he stated at the 1516th meeting of the Security Council that "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 for those resolutions and for Senegal" [*para. 134*].

134. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania does not merely want to add yet another statement to those that have already been made here. We asked to take part in this

debate to emphasize the danger that these aggressions, to which our sister country of Senegal is being subjected, would constitute to the United Nations and Africa if they were to be repeated and become permanent. In the course of this debate members of the Council have witnessed the scorn in which the fascist authorities of Lisbon hold the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. They have likewise heard the representative of Portugal threaten in barely veiled terms to let loose his soldiers on the peoples of the countries that neighbour on Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), where those who fight against Portuguese oppression or who have fled from that aggression find refuge. Such an attitude and such behaviour cause us to fear that without an energetic condemnation by the Security Council, accompanied by provision for specific measures to be taken by the Council in the event of a repetition of the offence, the Portuguese colonialists will renew their acts of aggression against the Republic of Senegal. Indeed, as everyone knows, the fascist Portuguese régime persists in its attempts to bring about the impossible and unrealizable dream of maintaining the colonial empire on the African continent.

135. My country, like many other members of the Organization of African Unity, cannot tolerate a repetition of such acts of aggression. For us, it is a question of dignity and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a country to which we are bound by many ties which go far beyond the sharing of a common destiny, though this too is something very real to us.

136. It is time for the Council to emphasize clearly that it is inadmissible for the fascist Portuguese régime to continue to benefit from logistics and *matériel* from its powerful military allies, while pursuing its policy of aggression and colonial oppression, whose victims are the peoples and States of Africa. It is impossible for these peoples and African States, victims of foreign domination, oppression and aggression, as well as for the entire international community, to see in the tolerance from which the Portuguese colonialist régime benefits in its abuse and criminal use of NATO supplies anything other than complicity, which the Security Council must cease to tolerate.

137. My country is acutely aware of how slender its means are to meet its own needs for economic and social development. Like all the other countries of Africa we want peace. But we know too that this peace cannot really exist on a continent where men continue to fight over vast areas to achieve their inalienable and indefeasible rights to dignity and the free choice of their destiny.

138. Only Portuguese colonialists can consider for an instant that the Africans who are fighting for the triumph of these ideals, ideals which are in the Charter, will not receive aid and support from their African brothers who have gained their independence. The Portuguese régime, which seems to have understood nothing of the historical evolution of peoples, denies this profound truth. It engages in aggression against the sister Republic of Senegal because that peace-loving country is aware of its responsibility towards the international community and towards Africa.

139. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania joins all those who consider that the Security Council should, when assessing situations such as those created by Portuguese colonialism in Africa, apply itself to re-establishing justice on our continent. The Council should energetically and unequivocally condemn Portuguese aggression against Senegal. Such unequivocal condemnation is necessary, and the Council should see to it that this is accompanied with specific measures to be taken without delay in the event that such aggressions, which constitute, as we have said already, acts of international brigandage, should be renewed.

140. Before I conclude, I should like to repeat what eminent representatives of African countries have already emphasized in the course of this debate. When Portuguese colonialist authorities proceed to abduct Senegalese nationals and to shell Senegalese villages, they are committing an act of aggression, not only against Senegal, but against the whole of Africa, and therefore against all those who signed the letter issued as document S/9524 and Add.1, including the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

141. The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Daddah, representative of Mauritania, for his statement and in particular for his warm and over-generous compliments addressed to the Chair.

142. I wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that, in his intervention this morning, the representative of Senegal, Mr. Boye, made an urgent request to the effect that the Council should take a decision on the question before it today. Mr. Boye, in keeping with his spirit of accommodation and customary courtesy, has informed me that he does not wish to insist on his other request for a continuous meeting. This has been done for humanitarian reasons, in order to allow representatives to have lunch and, it is hoped, conduct informal consultations

143. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you for the statement you have just made, but I should like to make one or two points clear.

144. First, I have asked, and I am still asking, that the Security Council should continue to meet. However, for the reasons that you have just mentioned, I think the Council should adjourn for luncheon before continuing its work.

145. Secondly, I should like to say again that the delegation of Senegal requests that the Security Council should adopt a decision on the question before it today.

146. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal, Mr. Boye, for his clarification. I do not know what came out in French interpretation, but that is precisely what I said in English.

147. There are no further speakers inscribed on my list for this morning's meeting and, in accordance with views expressed in informal consultations, the next meeting of the Security Council on this item will be held at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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