

2034th meeting

Tuesday, 9 October 1973, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2034

AGENDA ITEM 71

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration
(continued) (A/9023/Add.3, A/9048, A/9053, A/9061,
A/9079, A/9085, A/9089, A/9099, A/9111, A/9113,
A/9132 and Add.1 and 2, A/9174, A/C.4/760, A/C.4/763)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania), reiterating what had been said by the representative of his delegation in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, referred to the hopelessness of the colonial war waged by Portugal and its inability to achieve a victory. In Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, even after the brutal murder of Amílcar Cabral, the freedom fighters had not been deterred and would go on to score victories until they had achieved independence.

2. Similarly, reaffirming the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania in the General Assembly (2133rd plenary meeting), welcoming the new independent State of Guinea-Bissau, he congratulated the new State and the people of Guinea-Bissau on the bold step they had taken. As the proclamation of independence¹ showed, the struggle of the people of the new State would continue with greater vigour and determination until those small parts of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde which remained under the occupation of the Portuguese aggressors had been completely liberated. His country would provide the greatest possible support to the new State and would do everything possible to help it if it wished to join the United Nations.

3. Portugal's brutality and the inhuman acts it committed against innocent people in the Territories under its administration were a disgrace to humanity. Portugal's record in those Territories was a catalogue of acts of terror, repression and depredation. His delegation supported the proposal transmitted by Sweden on behalf of the Nordic countries (see 2030th meeting) regarding the setting up of a commission of investigation, whose work would reveal the cruelties perpetrated by the Portuguese.

4. Despite all the measures of repression, the liberation movements were daily growing in strength and vigour. At meetings of the Special Committee, the authentic representatives of the people of those Territories had provided important information regarding the state of the struggle and, in the Fourth Committee (2028th meeting) the representative of the Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola (FNLA), Mr. Mangala Tula, had exposed Portugal's

barbarism, all of which proved that the liberation movements were achieving great victories and liberating large areas where a new way of life was being constructed to replace the colonial system. The people were shouldering new responsibilities and working together for a better future. Portugal, however, denied the existence of the liberated areas, and even brushed aside the report of the special mission that had visited Guinea-Bissau.² Such continued obstinacy by Portugal could only be overcome by the intensification of the armed struggle and the internationalization of the efforts of the liberation movements.

5. Portugal continued to receive massive assistance from its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), from Southern Rhodesia and from the South African régime. Portugal was incapable of resisting by itself the pressures from the liberation movements. That it was able to wage its wars of oppression was due to the unconditional support of its allies.

6. Portugal must stop its wars of repression against the people of those Territories. The process of liberation was irreversible and the sooner Portugal and its allies recognized that fact, the better. As long as Portugal refused to negotiate with the authentic representatives of the people, the struggle would continue, since the people of those Territories wished to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and if they could not achieve that through negotiations, the only alternative left to them was armed struggle.

7. Peace-loving countries should stop assisting Portugal in its campaign of terror and repression. He commended those countries which were beginning to work against Portugal in various European organizations, and praised the conclusions contained in the programme of action of the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973 (see A/9061, annex, sect. IV). The Oslo Conference had recommended that support should be given to the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in their armed struggle for national liberation. The work of reconstruction in the liberated areas must go hand in hand with the struggle, and that was why the question of economic assistance for the purposes of reconstruction must also be given the attention it deserved. The Oslo Conference had called upon the United Nations to place an international embargo against the supply to Portugal of arms and military *matériel*, including civil aircraft, ships and other means of transport capable of being used for transporting military *matériel* and personnel, thus enabling Portugal to continue its colonial

¹ See document S/11022.

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/8723/Rev.1), annex I.

wars. The Oslo Conference had also denounced and repudiated the alliances, agreements and other similar forms of collaboration between Portugal and other countries, such as the Anglo-Portuguese alliance, the Azores Agreement of December 1971 between Portugal and the United States, and the military pact between Portugal and Spain.

8. At the twenty-seventh session (1975th meeting), the Committee had agreed to the participation of the representatives of the liberation movements in an observer capacity and the General Assembly had taken the historic decision to recognize the liberation movements as the sole authentic representatives of their people in their respective Territories (resolution 2918 (XXVII)). That decision had been justified by the emergence of the independent State of Guinea-Bissau.

9. The only way left was to deny Portugal the means that enabled it to wage its wars of genocide, for its allies to withdraw all investments from the Territories and stop all loans to Portugal, for the United Nations to mount an international boycott of exports and imports by Portugal on behalf of the Territories, for Portugal not to be allowed to speak on behalf of the people of Angola, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe, and for the United Nations to treat the liberation movements as the only spokesmen for their respective peoples.

10. Portugal's allies were responsible for the prolongation of the Portuguese colonial administration in Africa. Their continued collaboration helped to spill the blood of the people of those colonies, but the wars of liberation would never cease.

11. He congratulated the Government of Norway on having acted as host to the Oslo Conference and said that he thought the Fourth Committee should take cognizance of the main recommendations of the programme of action as they reflected the thinking of the international community.

12. The Organization of African Unity had unreservedly committed itself to the total liberation of Africa and unconditional support of the armed struggle. The non-aligned States, meeting at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973, had thrown in their lot with the liberation movements in their just struggle against Portugal. Anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces throughout the world were helping the liberation movements in their struggle for independence. The African States, at the twenty-first ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of OAU, held at Addis Ababa in May 1973, had issued a Declaration on Territories under Portuguese Domination, in which they had decided to reinforce their moral and material support to the struggle for national liberation and had called upon all States and international organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, to render assistance to the national liberation movements to enable them to pursue the armed struggle until complete victory had been achieved.

13. The United Nations could stop the murders being committed by Portugal. Peace could only be achieved with the collapse of the decadent Portuguese administration in

Africa. If the United Nations really stood for peace, it must give total support to the armed struggle for national liberation.

14. Mr. LOZANO GARCES (Colombia) said that it was inconceivable that, as the twentieth century drew to a close, there were still Governments which tried to prevent by force the liberation of other peoples, although fully aware of their need to live free from political, economic and social oppression. The non-aligned countries of the third world wished to remove the shameful yoke of colonialism from peoples which should belong to the great community of free societies.

15. The United Nations must act more decisively and vigorously to safeguard the right of peoples to self-determination, which was in no way opposed to the peaceful coexistence of nations with different ideologies. It was essential to act with decision and determination to promote the freedom of the African national majorities, which armed minorities were trying to suppress with a fervour that ran counter to the logic of historical facts.

16. Colombia viewed with profound sympathy the heroic struggle waged by all the peoples of Africa for independence against oppression, from whatever source.

17. The United Nations could not remain indifferent to the certain fact that there were peoples that desired both political and economic independence. No economic reason could justify opposition to the self-determination of the peoples. In Africa, or in any other part of the world, the right of peoples to give themselves the government and type of political organization they wished must be respected.

18. The colonial Territories formerly under Portugal's control were now in open armed struggle in defence of their right to independence. In resolution 18, of 3 April 1973,³ the Commission on Human Rights had rejected the allegations and observations offered in a letter dated 31 March 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations Office at Geneva and deplored the perpetuation of the inhuman treatment of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese occupation in Africa. In order to save the prestige of the United Nations, it was essential to move on without delay from written statements to the type of action provided for in the Charter to compel a Member State to cease violating the human rights of considerable segments of the population. Something must be done to ensure the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), which affirmed the need for the immediate cessation by Portugal of its colonial wars and all acts of repression against the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde and Mozambique, the withdrawal of its military and other forces and the elimination of all practices which violated the inalienable rights of those populations.

19. Colombia, which had been a political and economic colony for more than three centuries and had struggled to achieve an independent political system, shared feelings of brotherhood with the peoples who had not yet broken the chains that were such an anachronism in a world set on an irreversible course towards freedom.

³ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6 (E/5265), chap. XX, sect. A.*

20. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) recalled that at the opening of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (2117th plenary meeting) Mr. Trepczyński had described it as a session in which hopes would be fulfilled. That desire had already been confirmed by the declaration of independence of Guinea-Bissau, which was the realization of a long-cherished dream and, furthermore, gave the lie to the allegations of the representative of Portugal, who even recently (2138th plenary meeting) had attempted to cast doubt on the very existence of the freedom fighters in Guinea-Bissau. However, everyone knew that the Portuguese authorities did not shrink from the absurd and, for that reason, his delegation believed that it was useless to attempt, once again, to alert those who, by their silence, were tacit accomplices of the executioners of Lisbon.

21. In 1972, at its 1975th meeting, the Committee had taken the historical decision of permitting the liberation movements to take part in its discussions in an observer capacity and the Committee had thus been able to hear Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC) (1986th meeting) and Marcelino dos Santos, Vice-President of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) (1987th meeting). The leader of PAIGC had made concrete and conciliatory proposals, some of which were very similar to those in the peace plan that the President of the Republic of Senegal, Léopold Sédar Senghor, had proposed in 1969, namely: that negotiations should be started with Lisbon to obtain the independence of the people of Guinea-Bissau and to study Portuguese interests in the Territory; that PAIGC should be granted the status of observer or associate member by the specialized agencies of the United Nations, following the example of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA); and that Members of the United Nations, and Brazil and the other allies of Portugal in particular, should support efforts to achieve the independence of Guinea-Bissau and to help it to take its place in the community of nations.

22. The Portuguese leaders had refused to consider those proposals, as they had done on so many occasions before with regard to the decisions of the international community. It was enough to recall the case of Security Council resolution 322 (1972), which called upon Portugal to enter into negotiations with the parties concerned and to cease forthwith its military operations and all acts of repression.

23. Portugal had ignored that resolution, and many others, because the authorities of Lisbon enjoyed the support of certain States which, in order to secure their interests, did not hesitate to threaten to use their right of veto when the international community attempted to impose economic sanctions on Portugal. Those States approved the resolutions of the Organization and proclaimed themselves in favour of self-determination and against any form of racial discrimination; however, they did not hesitate to offer political, military and economic support to the fascist régime of Lisbon.

24. It was therefore not surprising, since they could count on the support of their associates in South Africa, that the Portuguese authorities dared to assert that they represented the African masses and that those African territories were Portuguese overseas provinces.

25. At Oslo, in April 1973, the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa had recommended in its programme of action (see A/9061, annex, sect. IV), an embargo on the supply of arms and military matériel to Portugal, including civil aircraft, ships and other means of transport; an international boycott of exports and imports handled by Portugal on behalf of the Territories under its administration; and moral, material and political support for the liberation movements in order to enable them to carry on their armed struggle. The international community was still waiting to see what the Portuguese authorities would do with respect to those recommendations.

26. Chancellor Willy Brandt had stated in the General Assembly (2128th plenary meeting) that the United Nations was not a clinic where peoples could be cured of their neuroses by world doctors. That was precisely what should be regretted, since members of the Committee wished to cure their Portuguese friends in order to bring them to their senses. Indeed, Portugal—which was the most backward nation in Europe—should be entirely concerned with its own under-development and should understand that the colonial era had passed. The allies of the Portuguese Government, who bore some of the responsibility for the crimes being committed in Africa, could assist it in that endeavour instead of supporting its ignominious colonial policies.

27. Finally, he hoped that all Members of the United Nations would recognize the new State of Guinea-Bissau and would give their unconditional support to the liberation movement. For its part, his delegation believed that the crimes of the Lisbon executioners, which had been recently confirmed by Mr. Tula, the representative of FNLA, were sufficiently well known and did not require any comment. The Portuguese authorities, if they so wished, could continue to live wedded to mediaeval concepts for which they would be answerable to their people and to history.

28. Mr. MOLINA (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica, as its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Facio, had stated in the General Assembly (2136th plenary meeting), being true to its principles and a supporter of freedom, reiterated its support of the Security Council resolutions condemning colonial policies. Fortunately, many countries had succeeded in exercising their right to self-determination and were, today, Members of the Organization; not only had colonialism not disappeared, however, but, in southern Africa, there was brutal repression of the movements of the peoples fighting to shake off the colonial yoke.

29. Chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3) gave hair-raising accounts of the inhuman repression of the inhabitants of the African colonies, and the report of the Reverend Adrian Hastings (*ibid.*, para. 28, enclosure) could not have been more gruesome. It was inconceivable that in the twentieth century such acts could take place, acts which confirmed that Portugal held human life and fundamental values in complete contempt.

30. The United Nations had adopted many resolutions and decisions, but colonialism persisted. The international community must therefore seek more efficient means of

eradicating colonialism. Costa Rica, which was a peaceful country, appealed to those who were in a position to do so to prevent deadly weapons from decimating the oppressed colonial peoples and to refrain from supplying arms to Portugal, before the situation became increasingly more violent and brought about total chaos.

31. Portugal, obviously, was responsible for that situation, but so too were those who provided it with weapons and military equipment, since, as was stated in the consensus of the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para. 27), all Governments must withhold from Portugal any support which would enable it to continue its colonial wars.

32. Finally, he reiterated his support for the provisions contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and in the Preamble to the Charter, which reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women of nations large and small.

33. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan), first of all, congratulated the delegations of the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas on being admitted to membership in the United Nations.

34. Turning to the item under consideration, his delegation wished to reaffirm the unqualified support of the Government and people of Japan for the principle of self-determination, which was the underlying cause of the struggles being waged for many years by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau.

35. In accordance with that position, Japan had been rendering assistance to the peoples of those Territories through the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and other channels. Japan's annual contribution to the Programme, which previously had amounted to \$US 20,000, had quadrupled, beginning with the current fiscal year. That substantial increase was a clear manifestation of Japan's staunch support for the indisputable case for decolonization in Africa.

36. As had been stated on many occasions, his delegation believed that all peaceful means should be explored for the settlement of that question. In that connexion, he wished to recall that Amílcar Cabral had made it clear in a statement before the Committee at the previous session (1986th meeting) that PAIGC was ready to enter into negotiations with the Government of Portugal, and Marcelino dos Santos of FRELIMO had made a similar statement at the 1987th meeting. Japan had welcomed such manifestations and believed that the majority of delegations shared its view. For that reason, it had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII) and Security Council resolution 322 (1972), both of which recommended that the Government of Portugal enter immediately into negotiations with the liberation movements.

37. Nevertheless, almost one year had passed since the adoption of those resolutions, and Portugal had not yet favourably responded to the offer. On the contrary, statements during the past year by the representatives of

the liberation movements and reports in the international press clearly indicated that Portugal had increased its brutality and had intensified its military operations against the liberation movements.

38. In the face of those unfortunate developments, it was inevitable that the flexibility demonstrated by all the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration would be exhausted and that the possibilities for a peaceful change would disappear. It was therefore more urgent than ever that the international community should warn Portugal to desist forthwith from its antiquated colonial policy in Africa.

39. During the past year there had been several important developments. In January, Amílcar Cabral, one of the most outstanding leaders of the decolonization movement had been brutally assassinated. Japan hoped that the new Secretary-General of PAIGC, Arístides Pereira, would follow the example of his predecessor and pursue an equally flexible and realistic policy. On 10 July, *The Times* of London had published a report on the massacres committed in several villages in Mozambique.

40. Furthermore, his delegation had noted with great interest the proposal for an investigation made by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the Nordic countries at the 2030th meeting. On the understanding that the details would be worked out in due course, his delegation wished to state its support, in principle, for the suggestion that a widely composed, impartial international commission should be established, preferably under the auspices of the United Nations.

41. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) welcomed the new States which had been admitted to the United Nations. With regard to the item under consideration, he said that the Argentine Republic, having also suffered from the evils of colonialism, fully sympathized with the people struggling for independence in Africa. It had therefore hailed the declaration of independence proclaimed by the freedom fighters in Guinea-Bissau, which was undoubtedly a historic event. It was to be hoped that the liberation process there would soon be completed. It did not matter that the new independent Government of Guinea-Bissau did not yet control the entire territory of the new State, for neither had the countries of Latin America been able to do so when they had become emancipated, and that had not made them any less independent. The Fourth Committee and the United Nations as a whole should adapt their activities to that new reality.

42. It was regrettable that General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), which his delegation had supported, had not been implemented, for it contained realistic elements that were still valid. It might still be put into effect if Portugal took the opportunity to initiate negotiations as recommended therein.

43. His delegation reserved the right to speak again on any specific proposal that might be made.

44. Mr. SAM (Ghana), after welcoming the representatives of the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas,

greeted the new independent Republic of Guinea-Bissau. Since declaring its independence, Guinea-Bissau had been recognized by over 50 countries, including Ghana. It should be noted that, with the declaration of independence by Guinea-Bissau, an entirely new element had been introduced into the situation; any Portuguese forces that remained in any part of Guinea-Bissau without the permission of the authorities of the new State could be viewed as aggressors in illegal occupation of the territory of a sovereign State. The independence of the new republic would no doubt be a source of encouragement to the people of Angola and Mozambique who were still struggling to rid themselves of Portuguese colonial rule.

45. Portugal had been able to continue its wars in Africa only because of the massive financial and military support it received from its NATO allies. The member countries of NATO must therefore share the responsibility for the brutalities committed by Portugal in its colonies. Those countries gave military assistance to Portugal in the hope of thereby protecting the large profits they expected to reap from their huge investments in such economic ventures as the Cabora Bassa dam and in gas, oil and other mineral exploration. That, in the view of his delegation, was an illusion.

46. Portugal's allies could, if they wished, persuade Portugal of the futility of its policy. It was legitimate to wonder why, in spite of their declared commitment to the principles of democracy and respect for human rights, they continued to give assistance to a country that pursued policies which they claimed to reject.

47. Portugal had sought to justify its continued presence in its so-called "overseas territories" by the unacceptable fiction that those Territories were part of metropolitan Portugal. The Portuguese Government had recently sought to elicit sympathy by telling of the vast sums of money it was spending on development and aid in the colonial Territories. However, the people suffering under the Portuguese colonial system did not want bread: they wanted the right to live as human beings with dignity. What they wanted was not prosperity and material welfare but the freedom to govern themselves. Even if Portugal could develop its African colonies to such an extent that the people could live in great comfort, they would still be dissatisfied.

48. When the General Assembly had adopted the historic resolution 1514 (XV), and had confirmed it by resolution 2621 (XXV), it had been reflecting not only the will of the Organization but also that of the entire world community. In its resolution 2918 (XXVII) the General Assembly had again generously afforded to Portugal an opportunity to give up its outmoded policy. Unfortunately, Portugal refused to take the advice of the international community and was continuing its hopeless war, which, in the end, would prove disastrous for it. Portugal should remember what had happened not long before, when it had suffered the humiliation of being driven out of Goa by India.

49. The General Assembly, in its resolution 2918 (XXVII), had deemed it imperative that negotiations should be initiated between the Government of Portugal and the national liberation movements with a view to the

implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The late lamented Amílcar Cabral had given his assurance that the liberation movements would agree to negotiations. The Committee should therefore recommend to the General Assembly that it appoint someone acceptable to Portugal and the national liberation movements and give him the necessary mandate to negotiate a peaceful solution to the present problems.

50. Once Portugal ended its wars and atrocities in Africa, Ghana and the rest of the international community would forgive it and welcome it back into the fold of civilization with open arms. His delegation wished to assure Portugal and its allies that the countries of Africa did not resent their investments in African territory. What they did abhor was the territorial rape that those investments had tended to cause. They had abhorred, and always would abhor, the situation which denied the indigenous people of Africa any say in their own government. History had shown that no self-respecting people would tolerate degrading conditions forever. The only solution lay in the early cessation of hostilities, followed by negotiations aimed solely at the granting of independence to the territories in question. It was to be hoped that Portugal would recognize the futility of its present actions and would accept the realities before it was too late.

51. Mr. OKIA (Uganda) said that when, early in 1973, Amílcar Cabral had been assassinated by agents of Portuguese colonialism, the world in general and Africa in particular had gasped with horror and indignation. Undoubtedly the Portuguese authorities had thought, by that brutal and cowardly deed, to stem the inevitable process of decolonization in Africa. But the blood of Amílcar Cabral had not been shed in vain. His delegation unreservedly welcomed the new State of Guinea-Bissau, which it had recognized soon after its proclamation of independence. From now on, the presence of Portuguese troops in any part of Guinea-Bissau should be considered nothing short of foreign aggression. It was to be hoped that all Governments that respected fundamental human rights and the principle of self-determination would recognize the new State and give its people the necessary political and military assistance to liberate the remaining parts of their motherland. The majority of Governments denounced the practices of imperialism and colonialism; Africa was now waiting to see if that vehement criticism was translated into concrete action of support for the people of Guinea-Bissau. Mere words were not enough.

52. With regard to Angola and Mozambique, the Portuguese authorities were still confident of perpetuating their rule over those Territories forever. They were confident because of the economic and military assistance they received from their NATO allies. He hoped that Portugal and its allies would heed the lessons of history and realize that a people's will and determination were stronger than heavy guns and bombs.

53. Portugal was a poor country, and without the help of the NATO members it would not be able to wage its protracted wars of repression in Africa. Those countries, which proclaimed themselves the custodians of democracy and leaders of the free world, were actively helping Portugal

to trample on the freedom of millions of people and to kill not only the freedom fighters but also innocent women and children. Some claimed that the military help given to Portugal was intended for use only in Europe. However, that argument was specious, for there was no way of preventing arms given in Europe from being transferred to Africa.

54. The people of Angola and Mozambique would eventually win their independence. The Portuguese realized that, and that was why they were increasing their military expenditure in Africa every year. In Angola, military expenditure had risen from 12 per cent to 27 per cent of the total budget between 1960 and 1970, while in Mozambique it had gone from 14 per cent to 27 per cent in the same period. In desperation the Portuguese had resorted to chemical warfare and were utilizing herbicides and defoliants for the utter destruction of crops in Angola and Mozambique. They had also intensified their campaign of terror in the hope of frightening the Africans into submission. But justice would prevail.

55. The conduct of the Portuguese troops in Africa was characterized by massacres of innocent villagers—acts to which no publicity had ever been given. As an example it could be mentioned that in February 1961, at Guerra de Maria (Angola), when Africans had launched a campaign against the forced cultivation of cotton so that they would not be continuing to support their oppressors' economy, the Portuguese had carried out indiscriminate aerial and ground attacks against the population, killing thousands in a single day. In June 1960, at Mueda (Mozambique), the Portuguese authorities had invited the people to air their views at a meeting. When they had gathered, the troops had opened fire and more than 600 persons had been killed. Those incidents were recorded in the book *The Struggle for Mozambique*, by Eduardo Mondlane.⁴

56. Those and many similar atrocities had been committed but had gone unnoticed by the world. The recent horrible massacre at Wiriyaumu had had repercussions only because some priests had undertaken to bring it to light. Africa would always owe a debt of gratitude to the Reverend Adrian Hastings and the Spanish missionaries for their courageous stand. Those who had heard Father Hastings in July 1973, at the 929th meeting of the Special Committee, knew that the massacres at Wiriyaumu, Chawola and Juwan would go down in the annals of history as an example of the hypocrisy of the white man's "civilizing mission" in Africa and of the moral bankruptcy of the Western world.

57. The situation in the African Territories under Portuguese domination was aggravated by the presence in those areas of Southern Rhodesian and South African troops. That had been testified to not only by a number of missionaries but also by Lord Gifford, a member of the British Labour Party who had spent 16 days with the Mozambique freedom fighters. They had confirmed that Southern Rhodesian troops were helping the Portuguese to burn villages, massacre the inhabitants and defoliate their crops. The *Christian Science Monitor* had recently published an article quoting an unimpeachable source at Salisbury as declaring that he was virtually certain that large

numbers of troops from his country were in Mozambique. Thus, the freedom fighters were fighting not only against the Portuguese régime but against the collective might of Lisbon, Salisbury and Pretoria.

58. Mr. Caetano, the Portuguese Prime Minister, had recently stated that his country would not "abandon" the overseas Territories or negotiate with what he called "illegitimate groups" supported by foreign Powers. He had added that if Portugal capitulated, the result would be an orgy of revenge and devastation that would destroy the "work of civilization" carried out by Portugal. The international community had heard similar arguments before; the same had been said of Kenya, and now Kenya was an independent country.

59. It was gratifying to note that the international community had recognized the liberation movements in Africa as the authentic representatives of their peoples. In according that recognition in its resolution 2918 (XXVII), the General Assembly had reaffirmed the principle of universal self-determination embodied in the Charter.

60. He paid a special tribute to the specialized agencies and various Governments for their humanitarian assistance to the national liberation movements. He wished to recall the proposal made by the Netherlands delegation to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) at its sixteenth session, held at Geneva in June 1973, to the effect that UNDP should render humanitarian assistance to the liberation movements in southern Africa. Many delegations had supported that proposal and had called for a study, in consultation with OAU, regarding its feasibility. His delegation also welcomed the participation of the national liberation movements in ECA as associate members, a step that had been approved in General Assembly resolution 2795 (XXVI).

61. The African soil under alien occupation would ultimately be liberated, whatever action Portugal might take. The forces of justice and self-determination would see to that. In conclusion, he recalled the Reverend Adrian Hastings' appeal to the world community—and particularly to those allies of Portugal that were supplying it with arms and financial assistance—to bear in mind that, if they continued to do so and closed their eyes to Portuguese acts of genocide, the blood of the women and children of Wiriyaumu would be on their heads.

62. Mr. SYLLA (Guinea), noting that his delegation had carefully studied chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3), said that it made clear all the violence and horror of Portuguese colonialism, which could not but arouse scorn, hatred and condemnation. He thanked the Special Committee for its untiring efforts and its unshakable determination to bring about the rehabilitation of mankind and of the peoples of the world.

63. The fate of the African inhabitants of the Territories under Portuguese administration had become one of those persistent issues in the face of which the United Nations was almost powerless. Portugal was unwilling to recognize the right of peoples to self-determination and even spoke of the civilizing task that it was carrying out in the Territories under its administration. In reality, the Portuguese Govern-

⁴ Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd. (1969).

ment was committing acts of bloody repression and barbarous atrocities, bombarding towns, destroying villages, employing napalm and intensifying its efforts to reconquer its colonies.

64. Those acts constituted fresh evidence of the Portuguese Government's supreme contempt for human life and fundamental moral values. He deplored the fact that, 28 years after the signing of the United Nations Charter, the Organization still found itself obliged to discuss violations of international legal and humanitarian principles, which were invariably committed by the same offenders against the same victim, namely Africa. Portugal's was one of the vilest and most classical systems of colonialism—an administration that was anachronistic in its spirit and thinking, employing barbarous, mediaeval methods of oppression that contrasted with the subtleties of modern neo-colonialism. Vigorous condemnation must be directed at the intervention of Portugal's military allies, which, ignoring the repeated appeals of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and democratic forces throughout the world, were continuing to supply Portugal with many kinds of assistance without which that small country could not carry out its policy of domination. In that connexion, he had noted the statement made in the Committee by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany (2032nd meeting) to the effect that that country would not support Portugal either militarily or politically; that was particularly significant, because the Federal Republic's military assistance to Portugal had been substantial.

65. The international community was in duty bound to defend the cause of the oppressed peoples of the Portuguese Territories. It was essential to exert increasing pressure on the Portuguese Government at all levels and to provide more consistent aid and stronger support to the liberation movements. The members of NATO, and particularly those countries which were permanent members of the Security Council, must dissuade Portugal from persisting in its colonial policy. One of the consequences of that policy was the explosive situation created in the Territories under Portuguese domination and in neighbouring States, which were constantly subject to all kinds

of provocation under false pretexts. That was the situation facing the Republic of Guinea; it had culminated in the Portuguese aggression of 22 November 1970, which had been totally defeated.

66. The only effect of the acts of genocide perpetrated by Portuguese fascism and the assassination of Amílcar Cabral would be to increase the faith of the liberation movements in final victory; that was eloquently demonstrated by the declaration of independence by Guinea-Bissau, which the people and Government of the Republic of Guinea had greeted with enthusiasm. His delegation appealed to all Governments to recognize the new State and help it to consolidate its independence and take its rightful place in the United Nations as soon as possible.

67. His delegation also thanked Norway for the assistance it had given to the liberation movements and welcomed the unanimity of the Fourth Committee in condemning Portugal's reactionary colonial policy.

68. It was essential to take concrete measures, namely to create a vast surge of opinion on the subject through the press, radio and television by publicizing the atrocities committed by the Portuguese hordes, to bring about the severance of diplomatic relations with Portugal, to exclude Portugal from international bodies and to increase assistance to the liberation movements.

Requests for hearings (continued)

69. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a letter had been received from Mr. Romesh Chandra, Secretary-General of the World Peace Council, requesting that he should be granted a hearing. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided that the letter should be circulated as an official document.

*It was so decided.*⁵

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

⁵ The letter was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/764.

2035th meeting

Tuesday, 9 October 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2035

AGENDA ITEM 71

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (continued) (A/9023/Add.3, A/9048, A/9053, A/9061, A/9079, A/9085, A/9089, A/9099, A/9111, A/9113, A/9132 and Add.1 and 2, A/9174, A/C.4/760, A/C.4/763)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. KODJOVIE (Togo) said that the atrocities committed by the Portuguese in the Territories under their administration showed them to be the most backward and barbarous people in the world today. Portugal was not only waging an anachronistic colonial war but had been defying