

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1524th MEETING: 18 DECEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1524)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Guinea: Letter dated 4 December 1969 from the Chargé d'affaires <i>ad interim</i> of Guinea addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9528)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 18 December 1969, at 3 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1524)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Complaint by Guinea:

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Guinea

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that since our last meeting letters have been received from the representatives of Libya and Yemen requesting to be invited to participate in the discussion [S/9566, S/9567]. In accordance with the usual practice of

the Council, and if I hear no objection, I shall invite the representatives of Libya and Yemen to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a seat at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) and Mr. M. S. Alattar (Yemen) took the places reserved for them.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the complaint submitted to it by Guinea on 4 December 1969, contained in document S/9528.

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

5. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): For the second time this month the Security Council has been seized of another complaint by a sister African State resulting from acts of aggression committed against the sovereignty of that State. The complaint which our sister Republic of Guinea has placed before the Council is based on a true and immediate wrong done to it, its territory and its citizens. The dozens of burned houses in Dana and Doubadou, the ravages caused by the shells falling on Satiguiya, both from fighter bombers and from mortar guns, the savage attack on a Guinean boat, killing one of its passengers, and wounding three, and the abduction of the remaining 21 passengers, are all flagrant encroachments on the integrity, sovereignty and security of our sister Republic of Guinea and its citizens.

6. And who is the aggressor? Again and again, it is the units of the colonial army which the régime of Lisbon sends to Africa in order to subject to its ruthless rule vast portions of that continent, to deprive its people of the right to self-determination, to harass independent African countries, to intimidate them, in the false hope that their voices in support of their suffering brothers would be silenced.

7. With the presence of a colonial army for the purpose of perpetuating colonialism, which has been declared by the United Nations to be a crime against humanity, the régime of Lisbon cannot logically invoke the right of self-defence. That right accrues rather to its victims, those who are under illegitimate occupation and those who are attacked by aggressive military units. Let the occupation cease, let the process of self-determination take its course, let the

colonial army and administration withdraw to their country of origin, and security will indeed prevail.

8. The African countries have neither the wish nor the interest nor the intention to antagonize Portugal as such. Their manifestos have made that quite clear. But when the Portuguese régime embarks on a colonial war to consolidate its conquest of African Territories, it is the duty of the African masses and independent African countries to fight. The liquidation of the remnants of colonialism is a basic premise of the very existence of the United Nations. The spirit of the United Nations cannot survive if colonialism does not completely disappear in all its forms. Indeed, the resolutions of the United Nations enjoin all countries to support the struggle of the subjected masses to attain self-determination.

9. What the régime of Lisbon accuses others of doing, what in the distorted thinking of the Lisbon régime is interference, is, in the view of the United Nations, a sacred duty to support the liberation movements for the sake of justice and for the sake of equality among nations.

10. Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola have no less right to be sovereign and independent than Portugal itself. When Portugal denies this right and annexes those Territories by sheer force, it is the whole community of nations that must meet the challenge. Hence we are all concerned about what happens at the criminal hands of the colonial forces against the United Republic of Tanzania, against the Democratic Republic of the Congo, against Congo (Brazzaville), against the Republic of Zambia, against Senegal, and against our sister Republic of Guinea, whose complaint it is the Council's duty to hear and to redress.

11. What justifications are the spokesmen of the Lisbon régime giving for their constant encroachments against the Republic of Guinea? The pretext that this or that incident dates back a few months, and that the accusation is invalidated, is indeed a most extraordinary pretext. If the Republic of Guinea has acted with self-restraint in the face of one incident after another, in the hope that the aggressor will refrain from its criminal course, can that be considered acceptance or acquiescence? Should not the Republic of Guinea be accorded appreciation for the restraint it has imposed upon itself, as well as for its recourse to the Security Council when the territorial encroachments and murder of Guinean citizens started to escalate? Should it be, in the opinion of the Portuguese Government, completely silent and let peace and security deteriorate to a point of no return? Should not the Republic of Guinea, fully and nobly engaged in the arduous process of development, for the sake of assuring an equitable standard of living for its toiling masses, be accorded the solidarity of all States against an insatiable oppressor, not content with subjecting to illegitimate rule an adjacent portion of African territory, but using it as a base against the independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Guinea?

12. It is now the Security Council which is called upon to put an end to the tragedies that colonialism creates, to the threat to international peace and security that occupation of territory by force inevitably poses, and to apply against the Lisbon régime and those who support it with military

and material assistance the appropriate pressures so as to dissuade them from continuing their colonial adventures, which not only put the peace of Africa and the peace of the world in danger, but threaten to corrupt the whole spirit of the United Nations.

13. Nor should the Security Council be impressed by the pretext expounded by the Portuguese representative when he said: "Until a few moments ago, we did not even know exactly what this debate was about" [*1522nd meeting, para. 43*], and that there had not been any indication of the question to be debated. The Portuguese representative and the Portuguese authorities should have had some premonition. Nine years ago, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and, in the interim, Portugal has been the recipient of many United Nations "recommendations". The Portuguese representative declared: "for aught all our statements could contribute to equitable solutions, they have not been taken into account" [*ibid., para. 49*].

14. His grievance is partially justified. We pass over much of the detail to get to the essence of the issue, which is the continued colonial presence of Portugal in Africa. That by itself negates basically any such statement about not knowing what the complaint was about. If Portuguese interests in Africa have suffered violence, we recall that they are colonial interests. The complaints from independent African countries are complaints of encroachment by the army of a colonial Power with no longer any valid reason for its presence in Africa. And it is the duty of the Security Council to see to it that this abnormal state of affairs ceases forthwith.

15. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

16. Mr. DIGGS (Liberia): Mr. President, my delegation would like on this occasion to pay special tribute to you for your understanding and patience and for the statesmanlike qualities which have helped you to sustain the strenuous routine to which you have been subjected during your term as President of this Council. My delegation and Government would also like to express its appreciation to you and to the members of the Council for allowing us to take part in this debate on the aggression of Portugal against the Republic of Guinea.

17. A few weeks ago the Liberian delegation came before the Council to support the complaint by the Republic of Senegal about certain premeditated attacks by Portuguese forces against that country. Now with an almost studied cynicism the Lisbon Government has forced us to come before you once again to request that action be taken now against the Government of Portugal for a violation of the territory of another African State, the Republic of Guinea.

18. In a calculated and brutal manner, units of the Portuguese army have shelled Guinean villages causing destruction of property whose value is immeasurable in the lives of the victims when all is taken into account. In other

instances peaceful villagers have been subjected to one of the most terrifying experiences to which they may be subjected in this day and age of modern and sophisticated weaponry. I refer to the mortar shellings followed by strafing of villages by fighter bombers. These incidents of terror are too numerous to itemize; but the letter of 12 December 1969 [S/9554] from the representative of Guinea, Mr. El Hadj Abdoulaye Touré, gives a full account of those incidents.

19. The particular complaint which we are called upon to consider at this time concerns attacks on the Republic of Guinea, a country having very close relations and a common border with our own. This raises the matter before us to a position where my delegation would like to state that we in Africa cannot be expected to be idle witnesses to this spectacle of Portugal's violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of African States, because of Portugal's determination to hold back the clock of history by pursuing the otherwise condemned colonial policy in its worst and most backward aspects.

20. The Government of Liberia would like once more to assure the Council of its complete adherence to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity; it is in this context that we should like to make the following observation.

21. It is with a sense of genuine regret and disappointment that my delegation is forced to state that every resolution adopted in the Council has had no effect whatsoever in stopping these attacks on independent African countries by Portugal, a European colonial Power. The reasons may well be quite obvious and need not to be enumerated in this statement. Suffice it to say that these acts of terrorism and the destruction of lives and property on the African continent by Portugal would not be possible were it not for the use of weapons in its possession which were given to it for defence purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but which are being converted by it for the suppression of the aspirations of the African people to freedom and independence in the Territories under its domination.

22. The Organization of African Unity has expressed itself in no uncertain terms, stating that it intends to achieve the liberation of the African continent by peaceful means but with the participation and good faith of all the parties concerned, which include Portugal.

23. The liberation of the African colonies by some of the erstwhile colonial Powers has not degraded those countries. Their economies did not suffer. Instead, they found a new strength and became, in the eyes of their former colonies, friends and partners. Portugal should realize that the African people under its domination want to be free and will be free. The lessons of history are too numerous for me to recount here, but each time an oppressor has ceased his oppression the oppressed peoples have become friends with the oppressor who, in turn, found a new and better political existence without depending on the blood, sweat and tears of the former colonized peoples.

24. Each time a cry comes from Africa it is treated as just another outburst from a newborn child that deserves only a

pat on the back. My delegation would like to state that the United Nations, as we conceive of it, is an instrument of peace and is capable of ensuring and preserving world peace and order, if those in whose hands the maintenance of international peace and security lie would undertake to stand up to their responsibilities and see to it that peace through justice is implicitly established.

25. I conclude with the hope that the Council will now take the necessary action under the Charter of the United Nations to redress the wrongs inflicted on the sister Republic of Guinea by Portugal.

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

27. Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the Permanent Representative of India [S/9568], asking to be invited to participate in our discussion without the right to vote. In accordance with the usual practice, with the consent of the Council, I shall invite the representative of India to take a place at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that he will be called upon to take a seat at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

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

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

29. Mr. EL BOURI (Libya) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, may I first of all express the satisfaction and pride of my delegation at seeing one of the youngest and most eminent representatives of new Africa presiding over the debates of this Council. The ability, devotion and objectivity that you have displayed during the Council's debates this month have borne out our conviction that you are a worthy representative of Africa.

30. We are very grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for being allowed to speak at this stage of the debate on the complaint made by Guinea against Portugal.

31. There are several reasons why Libya is taking part in this debate. First of all, we wish to draw the Security Council's attention to the fact that the use of force has become a rule of the Portuguese Government which in this manner is attempting either to intimidate the States adjacent to the African Territories it occupies or to prevent the African populations of those Territories from fighting for their inalienable rights or from fleeing its régime of oppression and terror by seeking refuge in neighbouring independent African States where already one half million persons have found refuge.

32. Another reason lies in the brotherly ties that link my country to Guinea in all fields and that lead us to common action for co-operation and the promotion of a free and prosperous Africa in which peace and harmony reign.

33. In addition there are the principles of the United Nations, to which we have all subscribed and which we must respect and defend. The signatories to the San Francisco Charter wished to erase from international practice the arbitrary domination of one people, one race or one State by another, no matter under what pretext, and more particularly when such domination was based only on an alleged superiority of race. They felt that the annexation of one people by another should also be prohibited, and the principle of self-determination was introduced into international law and became the corner-stone of our era.

34. It is indeed painful to hear, in this harmony of goodwill and mutual understanding, stubbornly discordant voices such as that of Portugal, which has for more than 400 years oppressed and exploited the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and refuses to abide by any of the decisions of the United Nations that formally proclaim the end of colonial enterprises.

35. Portugal is not satisfied with violating decisions of the United Nations by its systematic refusal; now, by its typical and repeated acts of aggression against a great many peace-loving African States, it is trampling underfoot the provisions of the Charter for the settlement of disputes that may arise between States.

36. If the small and medium-sized States, encouraged by the complacent attitude of our Organization, set out to violate the Charter of the United Nations with impunity and infringe the rules that the world community has laid down for itself to safeguard peace and co-operation among peoples, we are bound to ask ourselves, with some anxiety, where we are going.

37. It is barely a week ago that the Council concluded its debate on a complaint lodged by Senegal against Portugal on violations of its territory by Portuguese troops.

38. The Council now has before it another complaint presented by the Government of Guinea. The representative of Guinea informed the Council, at its 1522nd meeting on 15 December 1969, of a series of violations and provocations committed by Portugal against the territorial integrity and the civilian population of Guinea over a period running from April to November 1969. Portuguese armed forces used artillery, aviation and patrol boats against the villages and civilian populations, causing destruction of dozens of houses and bringing death to innocent victims, including women and children. The most serious fact, one that can be considered only as an act of piracy, pure and simple, is the penetration of the territorial waters of Guinea by Portuguese military patrol boats, which attacked a vessel carrying civilians and, after killing one of the passengers and wounding three others, carried off the vessel together with the 21 persons who were aboard.

39. On the fallacious pretexts that Portugal had acted in self-defence, that it had the right of pursuit, and that resistance movements were fighting against the Portuguese presence in the Territory of Guinea (Bissau) from alleged bases in the rear, Portugal has had recourse to the above tactics, which are well-known and had already been used by other colonial régimes, to make up for its inability to put down the revolt of peoples against its domination.

40. However, Senegal and Guinea have been the only victims of actions of banditry of this kind; about four months ago, Zambia, too, was attacked by Portuguese armies and the Security Council, in its resolution 268 (1969), strongly censured the Portuguese action. The United Republic of Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Congo (Brazzaville) have already been the victims of attacks and violations of their territories by Portuguese colonialist forces. But as this series of Portuguese aggressions and violations grows, it is bound to become an increasingly grave threat until it endangers peace in the African continent. For the Portuguese presence in Africa is itself, in this year of grace 1969, a permanent act of aggression against Africa which offends the universal conscience that has rejected colonialism.

41. Our Organization has already proclaimed the right to freedom and independence of African peoples who are now under Portuguese domination. Our organization has already conceded that all the acts that the Portuguese Government would like to have labelled acts of insubordination or subversion are in fact acts of legitimate self-defence by those oppressed peoples.

42. It is indeed strange that a small country like Portugal should so persist in its attempts to maintain these large African populations in a state of sterile dependence on it, when all the other colonial Powers have already disposed of their colonial possessions and have established new relations with their former colonies based on respect, mutual interest and friendship.

43. What can Portugal do when faced by the will of the peoples that it oppresses and by their uncontrollable need for freedom and independence? It will be futile for it to try to vent its ill humour on the peaceful African States adjoining the occupied Territories.

44. The representative of Portugal clearly told us the following at the Council meeting of 15 December 1969: "But it should not be forgotten that resolutions of the General Assembly are only recommendations which Member States may accept or reject [1522nd meeting, para. 51]".

45. The statement of the representative of Portugal affects the responsibility of the Security Council. If the Council intends to enforce respect for various resolutions of the General Assembly, and in particular resolution 1514 (XV), which is the corner-stone of all the great work of decolonization carried out by the United Nations; if it expects to safeguard peace, which is so seriously threatened on the African continent by the continued acts of aggression by Portugal, and if it wishes to impose respect for its own decisions on recalcitrant members, it must, with due regard to all its prerogatives, take up once and for all the question of the Portuguese presence in Africa and the dangers caused by that presence. Only energetic steps dealing with the very substance of problems of the Portuguese colonies in Africa can lead to a relaxation of tension and to a cessation of all the continuing series of provocations against African States.

46. It is for the Security Council, the watchdog of the United Nations, to put an end to these unjustified acts of

aggression by duly penalizing the trouble-makers and by settling once and for all the fate of African populations under Portuguese domination.

47. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Libya for his over-generous compliments addressed to me.

48. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Mali. I now invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to address the Council.

49. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*translated from French*): At the 1518th meeting of the Security Council on 8 December 1969, the representative of Mali had occasion to tell you personally Mr. President, and the other members of the Council how much our Government appreciated the urgency with which the Council met, and also how concerned it was at the wilful provocations of Portugal against African States. At that same meeting, Mr. Boye of Senegal described to the Council the incredible circumstances in which shells and bullets, regrettably placed at the disposal of the Portuguese authorities, had killed innocent nationals of his country. At the 1522nd meeting too, Mr. Touré of the Republic of Guinea described to the Council the circumstances in which peaceful citizens of his country had likewise been killed by Portuguese mercenaries.

50. In eight months the Territory of the Republic of Guinea has been seven times violated by the Portuguese authorities. Guinea has the means to put an early end to such encroachments on its sovereignty and its integrity. It has not done so because, like other African States, it knows what its commitments are when it adheres to international institutions and it does not wish to be reproached with failing to respect its commitments.

51. Besides, the cause being heard here is not a Guinean cause, a Senegalese cause, or a Zambian cause. The fact is that there are millions of men still fettered by colonialism and, with two or three exceptions, all the Governments in the world, whether Members of the United Nations or not, have proclaimed their determination to break those fetters. It is against this that Portugal invokes what it calls legitimate self-defence and its alleged right to ensure the security of populations which, fortunately, have a quite different notion of security and normal life from those worked out in the out-dated poison laboratories of Portugal.

52. The Governments and peoples fighting colonialism are, if we follow the logic of the representative of Portugal, accused of being anti-Portuguese. In that case we are all anti-Portuguese and we are happy to note that each succeeding day adds more anti-Portuguese to the already impressive number of anti-Portuguese.

53. In any event, if legitimate self-defence were to be accepted as justification for violence, it is the African States which should invoke this right of legitimate self-defence against Portugal. Guinea (Bissau) is in Guinea, and one would have to have a strange cast of mind to deny the evidence. In reality, what Portugal is trying to camouflage, in firing on States adjacent to Guinea (Bissau), is that the liberation movements, thanks to their revolutionary cour-

age, have succeeded in installing themselves in various parts of their homeland. The use of press reports to accuse States of having their regular troops participating in a liberation struggle waged only by those concerned is simply ridiculous.

54. And what is this legitimate self-defence which consists in firing only upon children, women and old men? In the name of what morality are we to believe that the peaceful citizens of Senegal and Guinea have taken up arms against Portugal? What miraculous means do these populations possess to enable them to cross the seas and to disturb the Iberian peninsula on the other side of the world?

55. The representative of Portugal, in his statement attempting to justify aggression by his country against the Republic of Guinea, spoke of ensuring the security of its colonial populations. That same representative told us that firm instructions—and I would emphasize that term—were given to the occupation troops to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the States adjacent to Portuguese colonies. But there has been aggression, which the representative of Portugal is trying to justify. We are then led to ask ourselves: On behalf of what Government is the representative of Portugal speaking—the Government which gives orders that are not obeyed, or the Government that does not feel itself in any way bound by those orders? For our part, that matters little; it is Portugal's business. What does matter is that such a Government cannot ensure the security of anyone. And that is what is so serious. The populations of Guinea (Bissau) are, in fact, living in a state of permanent insecurity, and it is to put an end to that humiliating and dangerous state of affairs that the freedom fighters have taken up arms against Portugal.

56. The representative of Portugal, replying to the representative of Senegal, expressed surprise that the Government of Senegal did not have recourse to the provisions of Article 33 of the United Nations Charter. But what he forgot to tell us was that no sooner had the Organization of African Unity been established than it dispatched Ministers for Foreign Affairs to the Government of Portugal to seek an honourable solution to the tragedy of Portuguese colonialism.

57. The representative of Portugal is better placed than I to tell the Council—and I hope he will do so—what his country's attitude was to this peaceful move by the African States. In any event, at the time of the attacks on Guinean territory, did the Government of Portugal no longer remember the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter, or are we to understand that these provisions are binding only on African States?

58. The representative of Portugal also tried to catch the Council napping by resorting to a concealment which, unfortunately, continues to frighten the representatives of some States Members of our Organization. In speaking of the weapons of the fighters, he attempted to involve the responsibility of countries which he did not name, and it is because he did not name them that his insinuations become dangerous. The fighters obtain their weapons where and as best they may. Logic would have it that all of us should arm the fighters since they are struggling for a cause which

we have recognized as our own and, consequently, they are also "our" fighters. I hope however that the representative of Portugal will tell us which countries are arming its mercenaries and by virtue of what provisions such execrable use is being made of these weapons.

59. Portugal is once more in the dock. A representative has intimated that this will again be the case in the days ahead; and that is what is serious. Experience has proved that the resolutions of the Security Council are not sufficient, however strongly worded, to bring Portugal to a normal understanding of relations between States and of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. The Security Council is the guarantor of international peace and security. The Security Council would not be true to itself if it agreed to stand aloof from the fate of millions of men enslaved by a system which is repugnant to human conscience. For, that is in reality the true substance of the debate, and the arguments advanced by the representative of Portugal cannot conceal the fact. If it were otherwise, the members of the Council, in the first instance, and all of us thereafter would be uncommonly like those doctors in Molière's comedies who are content to proffer fine phrases while their patient is dying. In this case the patient is none other than the colonized populations, none other than our humanity, made up of justice and love.

60. The Government of Mali, for its part, is convinced that the members of the Security Council have the means of eradicating the evil before it assumes tragic proportions.

61. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Portugal, on whom I now call.

62. Mr. MIRANDA (Portugal): My delegation would like, if it may, to add some remarks to the statement we made at the outset of this debate on 15 December 1969 [1522nd meeting]. Since our intervention at that time, we have received further information about attacks launched from the Republic of Guinea against Portuguese Guinea during the current month. I shall mention first those that took place on 12 December. There were three attacks in a single day. The area of Gadamael in Portuguese Guinea was shelled with heavy artillery installed in the Republic of Guinea. That attack left two dead, both women, and three injured, one of them a child of three years. Armed raiders coming from the Republic of Guinea attacked Canquelifa. The attack was repelled and the raiders were pursued up to the frontier. They retreated in the direction of their base at Missira Foulmansa in the Republic of Guinea.

63. A Portuguese patrol detected an armed band which had infiltrated from the Republic of Guinea in the area of Quiteje in Portuguese Guinea. On being pursued the raiders fled back into the territory of the Republic of Guinea and from there opened fire on the Portuguese patrol across the frontier. All of those attacks took place on a single day, 12 December, the very day on which the representative of the Republic of Guinea addressed his latest letter to the Council detailing his complaints against us, ten days after his original complaint and eight days after he asked for a meeting of the Council.

64. But that is not all. Only a few moments before my delegation entered this Council chamber, we received a cable giving information about an attack which took place only yesterday. An armed band coming from Fouta Moré in the Republic of Guinea attacked the village of Cambaja and left one dead and several wounded, some eight of them seriously, among the local population. The enemy group went back to the Republic of Guinea.

65. Now it is for the Council to say who is defying it, unless of course the Council should hold that attacks against us are in order, and then we shall draw our own conclusions. If we were to follow the example of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea, we too could have read out here the cables we have received from our authorities, describing one by one all the attacks launched against us from the Republic of Guinea. In fact I have the cables with me right here. But we will leave that method to the delegation of the Republic of Guinea.

66. We will not waste time and try to impress the Council by repeating information which, whether directly stated or quoted from cables, amounts after all to the same thing. Repetition is not made better by the addition of a summary table. These are attempts to impress the eye and the ear, but they cannot impress the intelligence of anyone. For our part, we wish to find out. But while the Republic of Guinea has come to the Council with allegations of incidents said to have taken place weeks and months ago, we have brought to the notice of the Council facts which are taking place currently. Perhaps even as we are sitting here now Portuguese Guinea is being attacked from the Republic of Guinea, for such attacks are constant.

67. We have already pointed out that on the dates of the alleged incidents or thereabouts, the Republic of Guinea did not think of calling for a meeting of the Security Council or even of bringing those matters to the attention of the Council. It will have been noted that the Republic of Guinea decided to come to the Council alleging destruction of huts, but it did not do so in connexion with the deaths and other casualties alleged to have occurred in April 1969. It will likewise have been noted that although the latest incident is alleged to have taken place on 13 November 1969, the Republic of Guinea complained to the Security Council only on 2 December and called for a meeting of the Council only on 4 December.

68. The representative of the Republic of Guinea said at the 1522nd meeting that his Government had lost patience. Apparently the Government of the Republic of Guinea waited patiently for months, or at least for weeks, and decided to lose patience only after a meeting of the Security Council had been called on a complaint made against Portugal by another country—obviously in order to avail itself of the atmosphere thus created.

69. But the complaint of the Republic of Guinea has other curious aspects. In the letter addressed to the Council by the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Guinea on 4 December [S/9528], it was stated that "full information" on the complaint would reach New York on 5 December. Nevertheless, the letter giving this alleged "full information" was sent to the Council only on 12 December

[S/9554]. The Council will draw its own conclusions. We have drawn ours, and our conclusion is that the allegation of frontier incidents was no more than a pretext to bring before the Council two old matters—the question of the plane and that of the boat—in the hope of achieving, through the Council, an objective which the Republic of Guinea has long been seeking, namely, the restitution of the nationals and the property of the Republic of Guinea without fulfilling its own obligation to release the Portuguese nationals illegally detained in that country.

70. The Government of the Republic of Guinea has long been working toward that end. It has approached friendly Governments. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has also used his good offices. As far as we are concerned these contacts have not been terminated, which makes it all the more surprising that the question of the plane and the boat should be passed on to the Security Council. In an attempt to move the Fourth Committee to tears, the representative of the Republic of Guinea, on 14 November stated that the issue was about “a boat carrying students returning from their vacation”.¹ Members of the Council can see for themselves, from the list submitted with the letter of 12 December [see S/9554, annex VII], how many students, if any, were on the boat.

71. The Council witnessed on 15 December the highly imaginative approach adopted by the delegation of the Republic of Guinea. My delegation places in this context the frontier incidents so belatedly alleged by the Republic of Guinea. The information we have received regarding those alleged incidents points in that direction. Those alleged incidents are old and it has been difficult to have them investigated. Nevertheless we have tried to find out what, if anything, was behind the Guinean allegations. We began, naturally, with the dates of the latest alleged incidents. As a result of the investigation we have been able to conduct since 15 December, we reject the allegations of the shelling incidents supposed to have taken place on 13 November and 10 September in the regions mentioned in the Guinean complaint.

72. As for the allegations concerning air raids, we also reject them, for the records of our military aviation do not show any planes having flown on the dates indicated in the complaint over the areas alleged to have been bombarded.

73. Finally, we have no evidence of shelling incidents alleged to have taken place over six months ago. But in connexion with those and all other alleged incidents, my delegation wishes to emphasize that whatever action we take, it is always taken in our own territory and it is always exclusively defensive action. We have no desire or intention to violate the territory of the Republic of Guinea or of any one else. But we also emphasize our right of self-defence against attacks launched on Portuguese Guinea; since the attacks come from the Republic of Guinea, we hold the Republic of Guinea wholly responsible for the consequences.

74. The Republic of Guinea, which aids and encourages violence against us, has no right to complain of conse-

quences, whatever they may be, arising from its own illegal offensive actions. It is the duty of the Republic of Guinea, by all norms of international law and by the most incontrovertible principles of the Charter, to stop the violence that is organized in its territory and launched against Portuguese Guinea therefrom.

75. Returning to the question of the plane and the boat, I must stress once again that the Portuguese nationals detained in the Republic of Guinea were kidnapped from Portuguese Guinea. They have committed no crime in the Republic of Guinea. There is no state of war between the Republic of Guinea and Portugal, even though the Republic of Guinea officially aids violence against Portuguese Guinea. The Portuguese nationals in question are held in a régime of duress. The Government of the Republic of Guinea cannot avoid responsibility for their illegal detention. Either that Government exercises sovereignty over the whole of its territory or it does not. If it does, then it must discharge its responsibility towards the foreign nationals illegally detained in its territory. If it does not, it must say so, and then we shall draw the logical conclusions and act accordingly. The position of the Portuguese Government is clear: the return of the Portuguese nationals is a condition *sine qua non* for the return of the nationals and the property of the Republic of Guinea. And here I should like to give the Council the names of the Portuguese nationals in question:

Kidnapped on 12 January 1968: Private António Castro Aguiar;

Kidnapped on 3 February 1968: Lieutenant António Júlio Rosa, Corporal Geraldino Marques Contino, Private Victor Manuel de Jesus Capitulo;

Kidnapped on 1 April 1968: Lance Corporal Joao Neto Vaz, Corporal José da Silva Morais, Corporal José Manuel Moreira Duarte, Private Domingos Noversa Da Costa, Private David Nóbrega Gouveia Pedras, Private Luis dos Santos Marques, Private José dos Santos Teixeira, Private António Angelo Duarte, Private Luis Salvador Antunes Da A. Vieira;

Kidnapped on 29 April 1968: Private Manuel Marques de Oliveira;

Kidnapped on 20 May 1968: Corporal Rui Rafael Correia, Private Manuel Augusto Leite da Silva, Private Agostino da Silva Duarte, Private Manuel José Machado da Silva, Private José Maria Magalhaes Medeiros, Private Jerónimo Manuel de Sousa;

Kidnapped on 1 June 1968: Private José Manuel Alves Vieira;

Kidnapped on 11 July 1968: Private Francisco Manuel Monteiro;

Kidnapped on 23 October 1968: Private Jacinto Madeira Barradas;

Kidnapped on 22 May 1963: Air Force Sergeant Antonio Lourenço de Sousa Lobato.

The total number of kidnapped persons is twenty-four.

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Fourth Committee, 1847th meeting, para. 28.

76. Many a fallacy has been invoked in this debate, as in the previous debate, to justify attacks launched against Portuguese Guinea and to deny Portugal the right of self-defence. It has been said, for instance, that Portugal is not in Africa. We reply serenely that Portugal—that is, the Portuguese State—is in Africa and has been there for nearly 500 years, which is a long period even in the perspective of history. Throughout that period Portugal's sovereignty in Africa has been internationally recognized. It was on that basis that Portugal was admitted to the United Nations. It is beyond the competence of the United Nations to question the territorial composition of the Portuguese State or its sovereignty in any part of its territory. Whatever may be said here or elsewhere in the United Nations, we have no doubt whatsoever as to the legitimacy of our sovereignty in Portuguese Guinea, as in other parts of our territory, and we mean to exercise the rights which our sovereignty confers on us in accordance with the time-honoured principles of international law.

77. We do not interfere in the internal affairs of any other State. We respect the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of all other States. And we demand that all other States respect our sovereignty and territorial integrity and avoid interfering in our internal affairs.

78. The Republic of Guinea, however, has not been respecting these norms of international good conduct in regard to us. For many years now the Republic of Guinea has been one of the major promoters of violence against us. It has been aiding and encouraging violence not only directly but also through third parties entirely alien to Africa and well known for their ideological cult of violence, which they try to sow throughout the world.

79. My delegation wishes to inform the Council that, according to reports received by our military intelligence services, the most modern type of war *matériel* is being received in the Republic of Guinea for use against Portuguese Guinea; foreign military experts are also arriving there in increasing numbers for the same purpose. The countries supplying the military experts and the war *matériel* are well known to the whole world, since they themselves make no secret of their active participation in the violence of which Portuguese Guinea is the victim. And the objective of those countries is also well known: it is to establish a people's republic in West Africa.

80. We cannot abdicate or in any manner compromise our lawful and sovereign right to defend ourselves against all violence from outside our frontiers, whatever its form and whatever the motives that may be set forth in order to justify it. No doctrinal considerations can alter this position and make us falter in our resolve to stand for our convictions, for we believe that violence has no legitimate place in international relations.

81. Nowhere in the Charter do we find consecrated either directly or by implication the principle that it is permissible to impose through the use of armed force and by aggressive action the solution of any question, whether it be for the satisfaction of any political ambitions or in the interests of any ideological expansionism. Rather, from the first page to the last, it must be underlined, the emphasis is on

conciliation, on the harmonious bringing together of parties in dispute, whatever the issue in question. It is to that end that the entire machinery of the United Nations is geared and directed by the Charter; not towards the sowing of the seeds of violence and strife, not towards the creation of conditions that must inevitably lead to that "scourge of war" from which the founders of this Organization expressly set out to save the succeeding generations of mankind. The only exception to that over-all prohibition of the use of force is to be found in Article 51, which is intended to cover cases of self-defence without any distinction.

82. If any of the Member States then present to sign the Charter did so with mental reservations as to the full intent and purpose of that basic ideal of the Organization, that fact cannot invalidate the conclusion that violence and war in any of their manifestations have been entirely excluded from international relations since the Second World War and the adoption of the Charter.

83. Nevertheless and despite that, the Republic of Guinea and its friends, obsessed by a false philosophy which, in the last analysis, boils down to a philosophy of expansion, have taken the path of cold-blooded and persistent hostility towards Portugal's national territory, in the course of which acts of bad-neighbourly relations and threats have been transformed progressively into open violence which cannot be condoned under any norms of international conduct based on the rule of law. And since it appears that that is being done in pursuance of a certain well-known ideology through methods that have been rejected as unacceptable in other parts of the world, it would be well to stress that their repetition in the present instance under cover of disputed resolutions of the General Assembly will not render valid and acceptable what was wrong and abominable from the very outset.

84. Mr. President, since I have the floor, allow me to make an important declaration. You have announced that the Indian representative has asked to be allowed to participate in this debate. The Indian Union, as is well known, committed premeditated aggression against another overseas province of Portugal, my own homeland, Goa, exactly eight years ago today. For that aggression, which perhaps the Indian representative wishes to commemorate by coming to the Council, the only explanation given in this Council by the representative of that country was that the aggression would go on "Charter or no Charter, Council or no Council". That aggression was condemned by the majority in the Council.

85. My delegation, therefore, does not recognize the slightest moral standing of a representative of an aggressor asking to participate in this debate, and my delegation will withdraw from the Council chamber while that representative takes the floor.

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

87. Mr. SEN (India): I think this is the best day of our life. If by my presence here we could drive out the

Portuguese delegation from this Council or from any other Council of the United Nations, I think we should all be the happier. India committed "aggression", according to the Portuguese definition of that word, but India has exercised a moral right, and I hope the day will come when all the Africans will also exercise a similar moral right. And if it lies in the power of India to assist in the slightest in helping the African countries to do so, we shall do so again.

88. I shall now turn to the subject before us. My written text was prepared before the Portuguese delegation withdrew, and I was so filled with enthusiasm and admiration for what we have achieved that I made those preliminary remarks.

89. I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for permitting me to participate in this debate on an important subject which concerns not only the African States but all of us who have the best interests of the United Nations at heart, and also those of us who care and dare to do their utmost to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter.

90. Before I proceed further, Mr. President, I should like to offer you the congratulations of my delegation on your Presidency of the Council for this month. We hope that under your guidance the Council will discharge its responsibilities as effectively and wisely as it has often done under the distinguished leadership of your predecessors.

91. Normally, the nature of complaints brought before the Council by the representative of Guinea could have been settled by bilateral negotiations between two sovereign States with common frontiers. Unfortunately, that procedure is not applicable in the present circumstances. On the one hand, the United Nations is committed to the elimination of colonial régimes—I know that the Portuguese delegation is still listening somewhere—and, on the other hand, Portugal staunchly refuses to abide by that principle or to carry out any of the resolutions adopted by the Council or by the other organs of the United Nations. That mulish and, I was almost going to say, quixotic refusal by Portugal to fulfil its obligations, is, of course, accompanied by much sanctimony and a feeling of being misunderstood.

92. The difficulty is that we understand Portugal only too well. Here again, if I might revert to the Indian experience, we tried our utmost for more than ten years to come to a negotiated settlement with the Portuguese. Nothing happened. Now Portugal talks about some fantastic theory which denies the Africans any right to claim sovereignty over their own territories. Surely, Portugal's continuing aggression has been recognized by the international community.

93. Now I leave it to the Council to judge who has been more fantastic. The representative of Portugal on many occasions has stated that his delegation would draw its own conclusions. We in the United Nations too can draw ours.

94. The problem is further complicated by the United Nations failure to give effect to its resolutions, as a result of which the African States are understandably frustrated and are obliged to take action which, as the representative of

Saudi Arabia pointed out yesterday, no government can afford to discourage.

95. In fact, we believe that if the United Nations cannot take suitable action to further one of the basic principles of the Charter, countries and peoples are under a moral and political obligation to take whatever steps they consider appropriate to put an end to the colonial tyranny of the Portuguese. That tyranny cannot be judged in terms of material benefits or lack of them, but has to be related to more fundamental values of human dignity and pride of patriotism.

96. In that context, any notion that these tragic events, which the Government of Guinea has brought to the Council's notice, should be investigated becomes meaningless. Similar complaints have been received from a great number of African countries which border the Portuguese possessions in Africa, showing a consistent pattern of the attitude of the Lisbon Government. Briefly, its policy seems to be that it must continue to maintain its colonial possessions and the suppression of the local peoples by force. The authorities of Lisbon demonstrate a high degree of callousness if, in the process, African lives are lost, property damaged and destroyed, and villages and fields burned and bombed. It is extraordinary that the representative of Portugal should complain—without details, of course—that African countries and communities, committed to seek the freedom of all Africa, are receiving aid from countries outside Africa.

97. The fact is that Portugal is outside Africa and every inch of territory it holds is being held not only illegally but as the result of aggression. So as an outside Power, it is Portugal, and Portugal alone—Portugal is not an African country, I repeat—which is responsible for suppressing Africans in Africa in a variety of ways.

98. The Security Council has considered similar complaints in the past and, rightly, Portugal has been condemned. But, in our opinion, that is not enough. We should not only condemn Portugal but make it quite impossible for it to continue to maintain its aggression in Africa. If it will not listen to reason or pay any respect to the principles of the Charter, it must be isolated more than ever before. I add this again because it has given me a great deal of satisfaction to see the Portuguese delegation withdraw.

99. As to that quotation of Mr. Miranda's which he brings out from time to time—and even those who were in the General Assembly will recall that in a right of reply at 7 o'clock one evening, when no Indian representative was present, he brought it up again—we are not ashamed to declare that if colonies cannot be liberated by the peaceful efforts of sovereign States, including my own, then there is no alternative but to drive them out by force. I repeat: we have no hesitation at all. And if for more than ten years we have tried and failed to convince the Portuguese, then I should like to ask the members of the Council what alternative they would put forth or suggest.

100. Those who help and support Portugal have particular responsibilities in ensuring that such help and support is totally withdrawn.

101. The present complaints of Guinea can, of course, be disposed of in the same manner as the Council disposed of the complaints of Senegal a few days ago. But the main purpose of my intervention is to indicate that these piecemeal solutions, if indeed they can be called solutions, will lead us nowhere. We have to consider Portuguese intransigence in respect of its colonial possessions in a much wider context. I suggest this not for effect, not even for the record, but out of an earnest wish to see some suitable action taken. We may not remove all the wrongs the Africans have suffered at the hands of the Portuguese colonialists over the centuries, but we can begin to make a beginning.

102. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of India for his kind and generous words addressed to me.

103. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Guinea, who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

104. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): I should like to say first of all, for the benefit of the Security Council, that the representative of Portugal has just eloquently demonstrated both the attitude of his Government and what it thinks about the problems of interest to the international community.

105. The representative of Portugal, in the fallacious justification that he attempted to give of the facts, forgot that what is happening here in the Security Council is a fact of history and that, in the struggle of all peoples for their liberation, nothing—not even all the forces, guns or armadas that Portugal owns, directly or indirectly—can put an end to the resistance of the African peoples.

106. In his statement a few minutes ago, the representative of Portugal attempted to obscure the issue, to camouflage the facts. For the information of the Council, may I review the acts that the Portuguese Government, using its colonial army, has been guilty of committing against the Republic of Guinea. I would refer to our letter dated 12 December 1969 [S/9554] and to my own statement at the 1522nd meeting of the Council.

107. The representative of Portugal implicitly recognizes the acts that his army was guilty of, namely—I repeat—the seven acts of aggression committed over a period of eight months against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country, by the kidnapping of persons, by the seizing of a vessel, by the taking of persons into custody and by the killing of others. Those seven acts have been borne out by documents. In accordance with the custom of the representative of Portugal already known to the Council, he has denied those acts. That is his only argument; he just denies the facts.

108. As we have said, the representative of Portugal implicitly recognizes that on the dates of the Portuguese acts of aggression against Guinean national territory, acts did indeed take place which he describes as “reprisals” for alleged attacks from the Republic of Guinea. But there we have a fact which I think deserves the attention of the Council: it is the fact that the national army of liberation

of Guinea (Bissau), through the African Independence Party of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, won sizeable victories in its liberation struggle. It liberated a considerable portion of Guinea (Bissau) and that is what the representative of Portugal does not want to admit to here. But in their hatred of and fury against the peaceful population, the soldiers of the Portuguese colonial army indiscriminately bomb the villages and countryside of those territories which have already been liberated and of neighbouring countries as well.

109. The representative of Portugal alleges that the Territory of the Republic of Guinea and that of Senegal are used as bases for those he calls “rebels” and that those rebels receive assistance from certain Powers, which he still refuses to name.

110. I should like to refer the Council to an article which appeared in the French newspaper, *Le Monde*, which reports the statements of an eminent African Head of State, President Léopold Sedar Senghor, of Senegal, whose country has been and still is the victim of Portuguese acts of aggression. We know that the sister Republic of Senegal, like the Republic of Guinea, has been the object of constant attacks. The representative of Portugal says that those attacks are justified because those two States offer asylum to or serve as bases for those “rebels”, and he claims that that is an infringement of Portuguese sovereignty. But this argument has been raised also against the Republic of Zambia, against the Democratic Republic of the Congo, against Congo (Brazzaville), against the United Republic of Tanzania and against all African countries.

111. From the very outset we have drawn attention to the fact that, whether we look at a geographical map or consider the facts as they are, Portugal has no common frontier with any African State. But the occupation of Africa by Portugal and its stubborn adherence to the belief that these African territories are extensions of the metropolitan country constitute an act of permanent aggression.

112. Here we may say that the various armies of national liberation have won considerable victories and that the part of Guinea (Bissau) which has now been liberated by the national liberation army is being organized administratively and in such fields as public health and education. Films have been shot by film technicians from Western Europe, Italians in particular. There is no longer any doubt in the mind of anyone, except perhaps of the representative of Portugal who is sitting here in New York far from the realities of the situation, that the Territory of Guinea (Bissau) is being liberated and that, were it not for the aid that Portugal continues to receive from its allies, the liberation of that Territory would have been finally completed. That is a fact, and that is what the Portuguese representative does not wish to admit here, in all humility, before the Security Council.

113. However, we would say again that in their fury and hatred the soldiers of the Portuguese colonial army are bombing indiscriminately both the liberated part of the Territory and the neighbouring territories. The representative of Portugal alleges that there are prisoners being held in Guinea, whom he lists; but, without giving thought

to the matter, he lists Portuguese soldiers, and then hastens to add that the Republic of Guinea is not at war with Portugal. Indeed, we affirm that the Republic of Guinea is not at war with Portugal. How then can the Republic of Guinea be holding Portuguese military prisoners on its territory?

114. What the representative of Portugal does not wish to recognize, and this is a point we would stress, are the victories won by the freedom fighters. An African weekly, which I have here, in relating more eloquent facts that occurred elsewhere with the FRELIMO (*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*) fighters in Mozambique, describes a ceremony on the occasion of the release of eight Portuguese soldiers who had been taken prisoner in the field by the national liberation army. The same occurred in the case of the fighters of the PAIGC (*Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*), who as a humanitarian gesture, released soldiers taken prisoner in the field of operations. What the representative of Portugal does not wish to admit is his refusal to enter into a dialogue, and when he does ask for that dialogue, we refer him to his own words and say that if there is a refusal to hold a dialogue it is Portugal itself that refuses.

115. The Organization of African Unity, in the Lusaka Manifesto,² has insisted on a dialogue. The representative of the Indian Republic a few minutes ago recalled the patience displayed by that great country for ten years in asking for a dialogue with Portugal. Portugal speaks of violence, when referring to the actions of patriots. Portugal speaks of violence when liberation movements are in action. I know that the Security Council will not allow itself to be swayed by the fallacious arguments presented to the

Council, which rest on no foundation. If there are prisoners held by the national liberation movements, all Portugal need do is to enter into a dialogue with those liberation movements and its prisoners. Knowing the humanitarian spirit, the African spirit devoid of rancour, I shall say that these innocent prisoners—who are all young Portuguese forcibly recruited into the mercenary army—will be released by the freedom fighters who have already released others like them.

116. However, what we cannot accept from Portugal are the typical overt and definite acts of aggression carried out as reprisals for the assistance we are rendering to liberation movements. If there is any State, any country that has placed itself beyond the pale of the United Nations and of the Charter, it is Portugal. That was demonstrated here a little while ago by the representative of Portugal, who, before the eyes of the Council, preferred to leave rather than to hear the truth. It is that attitude of closed eyes and deaf ears that Portugal maintains. I would ask the members of the Security Council if they think that a dialogue is possible when we are faced with such an attitude. We do not think so.

117. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on my list for this afternoon's meeting. If no representative wishes to speak at this stage, I propose to adjourn the meeting. On the basis of informal consultations that have taken place I should like to announce that the next meeting of the Security Council will be held tomorrow, 19 December 1969, at 3 p.m. It is the hope of the President—and I hope that the President is not hoping against hope—that the Council will then conclude its deliberations on the item before it.

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

The meeting rose at 5.30 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 вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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