



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

**1372<sup>nd</sup>**

MEETING: 8 NOVEMBER 1967

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1372) . . . . .	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Letter dated 3 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8218) . . . . .	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.

## THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 8 November 1967, at 4 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Mamadou Boubacar KANTE (Mali).

### Adoption of the agenda

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, India, Japan, Mali, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1372)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Letter dated 3 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8218).

### Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before we begin our work I should like, on behalf of the Security Council and in my capacity as President for the month of November, to pay a tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Tsuruoka, the representative of Japan, for the valuable service he rendered to the Council as President for the month of October.

2. The outstanding ability and devotion shown by Mr. Tsuruoka in conducting our deliberations helped in large measure to make our task less formidable. We should like to express our gratitude to him for having given us so completely not only the benefit of his talents but also his time, patience and courtesy.

3. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan) (*translated from French*): First of all I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for your kind and flattering remarks. Although my merits are few, I assure you that I did my best to serve the cause of peace, a cause which is entirely consonant with the foreign policy of Japan, the country which I represent here.

4. I should also like to offer you my warmest congratulations on this solemn occasion when you assume the presidency of the Security Council for the first time. I am happy to have the opportunity of working for peace under your direction, the more so since we already know you. We got to know you during the informal meetings we held during the month of October. We know how able you are and how devoted to the service of peace, and I am especially pleased to see you presiding over the Security Council.

5. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The letter dated 3 November 1967 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [S/8218] requesting this meeting of the Council contains references to two previous complaints which were submitted by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 21 September 1966 [S/7503] and 6 July 1967 [S/8036] and considered by the Council in October 1966 and July 1967. These facts have been taken into account in drawing up the provisional agenda for this meeting; that is why the reference to the letter of 3 November is preceded by the heading: "Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo".

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo

**Letter dated 3 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8218)**

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, I should like, if there is no objection, to invite the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to participate without vote in the discussion of this agenda item.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Umba di Lutete (Democratic Republic of the Congo) took a place at the Council table.*

7. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In a cable dated 5 November 1967 [S/8221], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal requested that the Portuguese delegation be invited to participate without vote in the discussion of this item. If I hear no objection, I shall invite the representative of Portugal to take a seat at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. F. de Miranda (Portugal) took a place at the Council table.*

8. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The President of the Security Council has also received communications from the representatives of Burundi, Zambia and Algeria requesting that they be invited to participate without vote in the discussion on this agenda item. Since

there is not sufficient room at the Council table for all these representatives I propose, in accordance with the practice followed on previous occasions, to invite them to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. They will, of course, take a seat at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. T. Nsanzé (Burundi), Mr. J. B. Mwemba (Zambia) and Mr. T. Bouattoura (Algeria) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

9. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now proceed to the consideration of the second item on the agenda. The first speaker on my list is the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, on whom I now call.

10. Mr. UMBA DI LUTETE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I shall try to make the most of this opportunity without being too lengthy and abusing the Council's patience. Accordingly, I shall endeavour to be fairly brief, although the facts which I must bring to the attention of the Council and which most of you already know are extremely serious.

11. A little over a year ago, on 14 October 1966, the Security Council adopted a resolution [226 (1966)] calling upon Portugal not to allow the Territories under its domination to be used for interfering in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As will be remembered, the complaint [S/7503] arose from the discovery of a training camp in the Department of Ardèche, France. We had an opportunity of thanking the French Government at the time for the attitude it took in the matter. The complaint, therefore, came at the time of the discovery of the Ardèche camp, a discovery which served only to corroborate the information already in the possession of the Congolese Government, namely, that there were training camps for mercenaries in Angola and that those mercenaries were only waiting for the appropriate moment to move into the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

12. Mr. President, since Mali was a member of the Security Council at that time, you are familiar with the spirited and self-assured manner of the honourable representative of Portugal, Mr. de Miranda. Not only did he deny that such camps had ever existed in Angola; he said in essence that the Portuguese Government would not tolerate the existence of such camps and that the camp the existence of which was being denounced in the Security Council was nothing but a figment of our imagination.

13. I shall not dwell on how the distinguished representative of Portugal categorically denied what we contended were the facts. Be that as it may, a few months later, on 10 July 1967, a meeting of this Council was convened to consider a similar complaint [S/8036]. During the discussion which took place on that occasion, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo declared:

"But I should like to stress the need for the Security Council, when it takes up the questions of Angola and

Rhodesia, to bear in mind that the existence of this anachronistic situation on the very borders of our country will continue to be a threat to our country." [1367th meeting, para. 144.]

It should be noted that at that time our representative had the gift of prophecy. He went on to say:

"Since all the members have shown today that they favour peace in the Congo and uphold its territorial integrity, they will no doubt find a practical way to put an end to the colonial situation that exists in South Africa." [Ibid.]

14. This is the third time in the space of a year that my country has had to come before the Council in connexion with a matter which has become, alas, all too notorious. Portugal, which administers the territory of Angola, continues to represent a threat to my country's territorial integrity. In actual fact, the mercenaries stationed in Angola launched an aggressive attack on our country on 1 November 1967, as can be seen from the letter dated 3 November 1967 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [S/8218] enclosing a letter from the Congolese Minister for Foreign Affairs and External Trade to the President of the Security Council.

15. What does the first of November represent? In our country, as in many others, it is All Saints' Day. Therefore, it is a holiday when we honour the saints. The second of November is All Souls' Day. In our country, we honour the dead and we do not work on that day either. We had relaxed our vigilance, so it was a good time for the mercenaries stationed in Angola to attack the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

16. Through the numerous paths along our common border with Angola, bands of mercenaries invaded my country via Luashi. From there, they advanced towards Kisenge, an important town where manganese is mined. There the mercenaries presented a requisition order signed by the notorious mercenary and bandit Bob Denard for trucks which happened to be there and they requisitioned them on the spot.

17. Another group tried to outflank our troops by way of Bulolo, but since Bulolo is a large town, the soldiers stationed there were able to cope with them and crush the attack of the mercenaries. At Divuma, on the other hand, they requisitioned a rail car in order to go to Kasaji and then to Mutshasha. Fighting took place in those two places and it was there that the mercenaries' advance was checked. There too most of the mercenaries were dispersed.

18. Where were the mercenaries heading? What were their plans? In the first place, they wanted to provoke a popular uprising. In that way no one would have been able to accuse the mercenaries and they would have been able to repeat the same old refrain, that this was nothing but an internal conflict and that outside forces had absolutely nothing to do with it. Unfortunately for the mercenaries, it did not work. The local population did not obey them.

19. What else did the mercenaries want? They wanted to reach Kolwezi, which is one of the large towns in the

Congo, situated on a plain of great strategic importance. Once they held that plain, they could receive help from outside and establish an operational base which would have given them a firm foothold in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. From here they could have gone to the help of their friends in Bukavu; at that time, as you know, the situation was very bad for the mercenaries in Bukavu. The Congolese National Army was gradually closing in on the mercenaries in Bukavu. That was what motivated the intervention of the mercenaries who entered through Angola. Unfortunately for them and happily for us, the National Army was on the alert and was able to nip the invasion in the bud.

0. This is the second time in 1967 that my country has come before this august Council. I was even afraid I might weary some of you by coming here. However, we come here through no fault of our own. With so few means at our disposal and such a weak position, we are forced to denounce this aggression in this Council, so that it will be aware of what is happening and be able to take the necessary measures against these forces of evil.

1. Every time that we have come before this Council, Portugal, in its usual composed, sadistic and cynical manner, has denied that anything happened in Angola, or that there were any mercenaries there who crossed the border to attack us. The fact that there are mercenaries in Angola at this very moment is so self-evident that I should not even dwell upon it or make any effort to prove it. The facts of the case are so simple that I would find it very difficult to prove them if I were asked. For example, Mr. President, if I was asked to prove that you are sitting here in front of me, although it is quite obvious, to do so would put me in a very difficult and embarrassing situation.

2. What I have to say will only serve to support the impression and conviction you already have. Indeed, the press agencies on the spot have given you a full account of the facts and eyewitnesses have provided abundant information to their Governments.

3. However, as for myself, I should like to bring a few facts to the attention of the Council. I merely wish to add that some Governments, which have been particularly disturbed by Portugal's attitude, have remonstrated with the Portuguese Government. But you know that it is always the same—Portugal is not disarming and even ridicules some of those who have approached its officials.

4. I can assert here without any fear that I may be wrong that training camps for mercenaries do exist at Nova-Chavès, at Henrique de Carvalho and at Teixeira de Souza. I should like to distribute a few photographs taken at Nova-Chavès. I shall not comment upon them, since the members of the Council will be able to see from them that I have not deceived them. These photographs were to have been sent to the younger brother of Mr. Tshombe, doubtless in order to show that the family's money was being well spent! You may say: "But these are Portuguese soldiers." But you will see that the jeeps have no licence plates, and that the soldiers are dressed as they please. If these were really Portuguese soldiers, I think that I should have an even poorer opinion of Portuguese soldiers than I

already have. These are not Portuguese soldiers; they are mercenaries who are also training former Katangese *gendarmes*.

25. I should also like to circulate to the members of the Council a Belgian magazine which has reproduced and enlarged most of these photographs. If I knew these mercenaries or had anything to do with them, I might be able to identify some of them. But since I have never had the honour of meeting them, I cannot recognize them! Members of the Council will be able to see clearly what is shown in these photographs which, I repeat, were taken at Nova-Chavès. But let that be as it may. How did we manage to obtain these photographs? That is our business. The members of the Council have only to look at them.

26. I have other things to say. When I was in Brussels before coming here, I received the following note which I have taken the trouble to have copied. It comes from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and External Trade. I feel that I am all the more justified in using this note as a basis for my argument as no one can accuse me of collusion with the Belgian Government. I also feel I can use it because it is written on paper with an official letter-head by an ally of Portugal, no less, indicating that it should be regarded as an important document. This note, for which the Belgian Government takes responsibility, takes up the narration of events obtained from eyewitnesses who saw the mercenaries attack, saw where they came from, saw those who fled and those who returned to Angola and saw how they fought. I hasten to add that this note was signed by the Comte d'Ursel, Minister Plenipotentiary in the Belgian Foreign Office. I should like to read it to you:

"Wednesday, 1 November. Eighteen European mercenaries and two Katangese *gendarmes* entered Kisenge. They entered Kisenge on bicycles, coming from Luashi over the Cornu Bridge."

Kisenge is the place I was speaking about just now, where there is a manganese mine, and Luashi, which I also mentioned before, is the first important post reached by the mercenaries on entering the Democratic Republic of the Congo from Angola. The note continues:

"They went to the headquarters of the B C K Corporation (the manganese mining firm) to requisition vehicles. Their requisition order bore the letter-head of the National Liberation Army and was signed by Denard. The mercenaries, who had appropriated a truck, patrolled the area of the town inhabited by the Congolese workers firing machine-gun bursts into the air in order to intimidate the people. However, considering that they were too few in number to hold the whole town, they ordered the European population, men, women and children, to assemble at the Cercle d'Agrément. The wounded were taken to a convent. This first group of mercenaries was under the command of a Frenchman, Major Piret, and naturally included no Belgians. Most of them were French, but there was one Colombian and one Viet-Nameese. The group of mercenaries took up battle positions along the Divuma-Kisenge Road."

Divuma is the place where the mercenaries requisitioned a rail car.

"Meanwhile three men left for Luashi in a truck to bring reinforcements, expecting to return at midnight.

"Thursday, 2 November. After a quiet night without any shooting, during which the mercenaries awaited reinforcements, the three trucks returned at 11 a.m. with about thirty whites armed with machine-guns, ammunition, mortars, and two bazookas. A few minutes later, the Congolese National Army attacked in force with 150 men, according to the mercenaries. Thereupon, Major Piret summoned the management of the manganese firm and ordered them to evacuate the locality immediately. At 5 p.m., while the fighting was going on between the mercenaries and the Congolese National Army, the former using mortars and the latter sniping from the bush where they had fanned out, the column of refugees set out in private cars with a small escort of mercenaries. Only three wounded, two nuns, a nurse and a doctor remained. However, at 5.30 p.m. the mercenaries gave the order to evacuate the sick. They were evacuated to Kayanda in Angola, in a truck belonging to the Tabac-Congo Corporation."

27. Sometimes the representative of Portugal is not familiar with the names of some places in Angola, but I did not invent the name of Kayanda and I should like to remind the Portuguese representative that Kayanda is situated in Angola. I continue to quote:

"On the way, Dr. Baudry decided to call at the Kasaji mission to pick up three nuns who had remained there. The local Congolese told him that everything was quiet there. However, contrary to their report, he ran into a group of about fifty mercenaries who took him to their command post. Here he found Bob Denard, who had his men pick up the nuns from the mission, which was about eleven kilometres away. The journey was resumed towards Luashi. The mercenaries had ordered the driver of the truck to continue towards Kayanda in Angola, taking care to flash his headlights and directional signals ten kilometres before and beyond the border so that the mercenaries would let him pass. In fact, the refugees encountered many mercenaries in the area who, on seeing the agreed signal, allowed them to pass. The truck arrived in Kayanda (hence, in Angola) on Friday, 3 November, at about four or five o'clock in the morning.

"Friday, 3 November. In Kayanda (Angola), the refugees were taken in hand by the Portuguese Army, which offered a helicopter to transport the seriously wounded and the doctors. Among the seriously wounded were Mr. Stiévenart and Father Van Peteghen, who had been in hospital prior to these events. Mr. Stiévenart died en route and was buried in Henrique de Carvalho (also in Angola). On arriving in Luanda, the doctor and the surviving wounded man boarded a plane for Brussels where they arrived on 5 November at 10 a.m."

28. Thus the witnesses who made this statement arrived in Brussels direct from Angola. I did not invent this, nor was this statement issued by the Congo. Finally, the note says:

"As for the refugees who have remained in Angola, their evacuation to Belgium will be arranged shortly."

The facts, gentlemen, are quite plain and need no comment. You have only to draw your own conclusions.

29. However, I should like to add in support of the information I have just given a few quotations from an article which appeared several days ago in *The New York Times*. *The New York Times* of 5 November 1967 reported that since last June there has been an intensive traffic in arms of all kinds, including fighter planes, ammunition and mercenaries, between Lisbon and African areas, especially the troubled areas of Nigeria and Angola. This material and these men are being delivered to the dissident forces in Nigeria and mercenary camps in Angola. However, in spite of these facts some Governments have remained sceptical. But since everyone knows the facts which I have just laid before you and some have had first hand experience of them, they cannot but give the lie to the scepticism of some Governments. Nearly 600 mercenaries have entered Angola to date. Here they were joined by Bob Denard who, after recuperating in a private hospital in Belgium, no less, continued his convalescence where—in Lisbon, of course—while waiting to return to Angola, which was his jumping-off point for another attack on the Congo.

30. But what is even more serious is that the planes taken by Bob Denard when he was wounded and fleeing with a group of mercenaries have not yet returned to the Congo, and I should not be surprised if they were now in Angola. It would be useless to go and look for them: planes fly and you would never find them. Perhaps the Portuguese authorities in Lisbon are unaware of all this. That is the only excuse they can have. If Lisbon is really unaware of all these facts, I have this to say: it is not possible for Lisbon not to know what is going on. Portugal has a fanatical police force known, I believe, as the PIDE. This police force even tracks down Portuguese citizens and imposes incredible sacrifices on them. With such a police force, of a type highly suited to a colonialist and medieval country like Portugal, how can Portugal be unaware of movements of such great scope? Be that as it may, if Portugal were indeed unaware of such movements, it would have reason to comply with the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly calling upon the Lisbon Government to accelerate the decolonization process.

31. The Lisbon authorities are no doubt also unaware that this traffic is co-ordinated by Mr. Laurès, a Frenchman, who buys the arms and ammunition from French, Spanish and Swiss firms and transports them by means put at his disposal by adventurers who obtain them from companies such as Air France, Iberia, TAP, etc. In spite of all the evidence, the Portuguese authorities are presumably also unaware that mercenaries coming from Angola crossed the Congolese border and started trouble in Katanga.

32. Portugal is responsible for many of our troubles—I do not say all our troubles, but many of them—and it is certainly responsible for those about which we have just learned. Consequently, Portugal should be penalized for its reckless and criminal enterprises. In a word, what does my country want? We repeat that we have suffered a great deal, and many countries represented here have helped us in our misfortunes. All we want is to live in peace in our own country, and we want both the Congolese and the

foreigners living among us to be able to go about their business in peace without having to defend themselves against highway robbers and mercenaries.

33. What has just happened in Bukavu—the destruction caused by the mercenaries, all the ruined houses and devastated fields left behind by the foreigners, everything that constitutes our country's wealth and its infrastructure—all this has been destroyed through the fault of one country. I can understand its reaction: that country is not very rich itself, either in natural wealth or in intelligence, but this is no reason to bear a grudge against us.

34. Before concluding, there is still one important question which my delegation would like to see clarified. How is it that such large bands of mercenaries can leave their country, pass through Lisbon, arrive in Angola and continue their training there? In short, who pays them? In the end, who reaps the benefit of these crimes? With respect to this latest aggression of which we have been the victim, I hasten to quote the proverb that it is an ill wind that blows no one any good. This attack, this aggression against us from Angola was perhaps necessary to some extent, since it tore the mask away from Portugal once and for all. Up to the present, as long as the mercenaries were in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, their mutinies have always been regarded as an internal affair. Now the mercenaries have come from the outside and attacked us. Portugal has been unmasked and can no longer deny the facts. But Portugal is like a toad which is accustomed to walk with its belly on the ground. Perhaps we cannot now ask Portugal to change its ways. It will not change; it will continue to deny what it has always denied in the face of the evidence. A man or a child can repudiate his mother, but the biological bond between them is still there. This is the case here. Portugal may deny the facts, but the facts are there and speak for themselves.

35. One may wonder how a small and, what is more, a poor country like Portugal can continue to disregard the unanimous wishes of the international community. Indeed, the General Assembly has repeatedly called upon Portugal to decolonize. The Security Council has twice requested Portugal not to use its territory to interfere in our domestic affairs. But Portugal flouts the resolutions, wishes and recommendations of the international community, even though some, if not most, of those resolutions have always been supported, at least verbally, by the great Powers. In the circumstances, how can a country like Portugal persist in flouting all these resolutions? In the relations between Portugal and some of the great Western Powers are there not, unfortunately, some disturbing elements, proof of which may be seen by what is happening in so-called Portuguese Africa? Is not Portugal encouraged to pursue its colonialist policy through the sale by some great Western Powers of arms and ammunition which are obviously used for the relentless repression of the African population? How can one fail to see a regrettable collusion between Portugal and some Governments which allow their territory to be used for the activities of imperialist and colonialist forces directed against the liberation movements which those same Governments claim to support? Is not this contradiction between the words and deeds of those Governments sufficient reason for Portugal's obdurate

non-compliance with the decisions of the Security Council?

36. For our part, we would point out to the Western Powers that Portugal is doing a disservice to the interests of the West and of peace. Its African policy, which consists in perpetuating the monopoly of certain financial circles or in resurrecting the old slavery-like concept of international co-operation, is doomed to failure. As a Member of the United Nations, Portugal's attitude is contrary to the obligations of the Charter. My Government therefore requests that in addition to a unanimous and purely moral condemnation of Portugal, concrete measures be taken against that country.

37. The progressive forces of the young African States, the movements towards emancipation and freedom in Africa, carried out with the effective aid of justice-loving and peace-loving peoples, are determined to fight and to frustrate racist and colonialist policy in Africa.

38. After all the evidence which I have given the Council, my country, which has suffered enough, only wants to be left in peace with its neighbours and with all the nations of the world. In view of that evidence, I would request the Council—since that is all I can obtain from it—that this time at least there be an unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation of Portugal's attitude.

39. The second request I would make—for perhaps Portugal may now pay attention—is a reaffirmation of the Security Council's previous resolutions concerning this matter, particularly resolution 226 (1966) of 14 October 1966, and resolution 239 (1967) of 10 July 1967.

40. My third request to the Council is a condemnation of the whole principle of mercenary armies. It is inconceivable that men should be able to be hired as paid killers to bring devastation upon specific countries. In this connexion, Member States should take whatever measures are necessary to prevent the recruitment of mercenaries in their territories. Some countries have already had occasion to take such measures. Some countries have taken strong measures when it appeared that their territory might be used for such purposes. I have already mentioned the case of France. It is to be hoped that others will follow its example.

41. Finally, I ask that countries which have privileged relations with Portugal should decline to support it in its undertakings; for Portugal could not continue to flout the resolutions of the international community if it did not feel that it had the support—at least the tacit support—of certain countries.

42. That is what I wanted to ask of the Council.

43. Now the only problem is that the mercenaries who attacked us, and whom we defeated in Bukavu, are now in Rwanda and are going to return to their respective countries. It is essential that their countries of origin, which are going to give them asylum, should take the necessary measures to prevent those mercenaries from using their regular channels to make another foray and from coming back through Angola to attack us again. For what guarantee

have we that these mercenaries will not return once they have been evacuated? The example of Bob Denard is particularly cogent. He was wounded, he left, he recuperated in a private hospital in Belgium, he then returned to Lisbon, he recruited mercenaries and here he is again.

44. Those are the requests my delegation wishes to lay before the Council. We earnestly hope that the sufferings we have endured throughout the last few years, and particularly this year, will induce the Council to heed our requests.

45. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Portugal.

46. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): Mr. President, it is my pleasant duty to thank you for inviting me under the relevant rules of procedure to participate in this debate and through you I should also like to thank your colleagues in the Council.

47. A little over a year ago the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo came to this Council with a complaint against Portugal [*S/7503*]. The Government of Kinshasa, on that occasion, could not establish even a *prima facie* case; it could not produce the slightest shred of evidence. Yet it wanted Portugal to be condemned by this Council on no other basis than its own unfounded and entirely gratuitous allegations. Then, without waiting for a decision of the Council the Government of Kinshasa acted on its own. After our embassy in Kinshasa was attacked and our diplomatic and other personnel, including our *Chargé d'Affaires*, manhandled, the Government of Kinshasa, as if to demonstrate its solidarity with the assailants, cut off diplomatic relations with us. Having done that, the Government of Kinshasa came back to this Council, which had meanwhile suspended its deliberations, to reiterate its demand that Portugal be condemned, which the Council of course did not do.

48. I recall these facts because they are indicative of the peculiar processes which the Government of Kinshasa finds convenient to adopt against Portugal in the United Nations, while back home it indulges in daily acts of hostility against Portugal. It all fits into a single pattern. What we are witnessing today is but a repeat performance of what the Congolese Government did last year—and for the same reason. Every time trouble flares up in the Congo, which as everyone knows happens frequently enough, the Government of Kinshasa finds it convenient to blame Portugal. And when the trouble deepens into a crisis, the Government of Kinshasa rushes to the Security Council with dramatic accusations against Portugal. But the fact is that the Government of Kinshasa is caught in a web of its own making. It is not by coming to the Security Council with false accusations against Portugal that Kinshasa will disentangle itself from that web. The diversionary tactic will not help. Portugal has nothing to do with the internal situation in the Congo.

49. Last year the Congolese Government complained to the Council about Portugal. It imagined that there were mercenary bases in Angola. Portugal denied this and offered to have the Congolese accusation investigated by the

Council and by the Secretary-General. The Portuguese offer of investigation contrasted flagrantly with the unsubstantiated Congolese accusation. Unfortunately our offer was not followed up. Instead a resolution was adopted asking Portugal to conduct itself towards the Congo in terms of its own declaration of non-interference—an entirely superfluous resolution.

50. Several months later, in July 1967, there was a mercenary uprising in the Congo. The uprising was a purely internal development in the Congolese Democratic Republic. Yet the Government of Kinshasa invented all sorts of stories insinuating that the rebels had entered from Angola and elsewhere and did not fail to send complaints about Portugal to the Security Council. Portugal rejected the complaints. Today everybody knows that the mercenaries of Kisangani and Bukavu did not go there from outside: they had been in the Congo all the time serving in the Congolese armed forces.

51. I mention those past facts in order to demonstrate what I have stated: that whenever there is trouble inside the Congo the Government of Kinshasa tries to throw the blame on some outsider and finds Portugal a convenient target for that purpose.

52. Before I go further, I must tell the Council most emphatically that Portugal does not interfere in the internal affairs of the Congo. Portugal practises the policy of good neighbourliness and scrupulous respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States. Portugal has followed that policy in relation to the Congo. Quite independently of any resolutions of the Security Council—we do not need resolutions to do what we have never failed to do spontaneously—and notwithstanding the acts of hostility which the Government of Kinshasa commits against us daily and avowedly, Portugal has not at any time deflected from its policy of good neighbourliness. For the last seven years the Congo has been promoting armed aggression against us. It makes no secret of providing bases and all sorts of other material aid to those who cross into Angola on their murderous missions. Here in the Security Council itself the Congolese Government has admitted by word and in writing that it assists the groups and individuals who carry out armed raids against Angola.

53. Notwithstanding those avowed acts of hostility against us we have not failed to be good neighbours to the Democratic Republic. Without going into details of the manifold assistance we have given the Congo, in former times even at the personal request of its present Head of State, I should like only to recall the inestimable service we continue to render to the Congo by keeping open our lines of transport for its external trade. The Congolese Government does not seem to appreciate the fact that without our co-operation its external trade would be facing enormous difficulties to say the least. On the other hand, while the Congolese Government has given bases in its territory to be utilized for armed attacks against us, we have not paid the Congo back in the same coin. We have never allowed bases in our territory nor consented that our territory should be utilized in any way for attacks against the Congo.

54. Having made this categorical statement, which I ask the Council to note, I now turn to the complaint which the



Congolese Government has brought against Portugal this time. I request you, Mr. President, and the Members of the Council, to examine the letter dated 3 November 1967 from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [S/8218]. That letter begins with a reference to an earlier letter sent by the Congolese Government to the Security Council dated 10 August 1967 [S/8118]. That letter has been fully answered by the Portuguese Government in its letter dated 19 August 1967 [S/8129] to which I draw the attention of the Council. The Portuguese answer is a point-by-point refutation of the Congolese complaints of 28 July 1967 [S/8102] and 10 August 1967 [S/8118].

55. In the remaining text of the letter now under consideration one searches up and down in vain for any new grounds of accusation against Portugal. In fact, one wonders on what grounds this complaint is based. There is a description of mercenary activities inside the Congo, which are sought to be linked with messages said to have been intercepted, apparently by the Congolese authorities. Now what about those messages, Mr. President? I read from the Congolese letter: "A number of messages from Major Schramme requesting armed intervention on behalf of the mercenaries have been intercepted on their way to Angola from Bukavu." [S/8218.] As this is the only ground on which the Congolese Government bases its complaint it calls for some comment.

56. Granted that the Congolese Government captured messages: who sent them? Major Schramme. Portugal has nothing to do with that. From where were they sent? From Bukavu. Portugal has nothing to do with that. To whom were they sent? That is not stated, but they are said to have been intercepted in transit on their way to Angola. Were they addressed to someone inside Angola? Were they going between Bukavu and the Angola frontier but addressed to someone inside the Congolese Territory? If the latter were the case, Portugal is evidently not concerned at all. But would the Portuguese authorities be responsible if messages were addressed by Major Schramme from Bukavu to someone inside Angola? If someone here in New York were to receive a message from abroad, would the American authorities be held responsible?

57. But supposing, for argument's sake, that Major Schramme did ask for help from Angola. What followed for which the Portuguese authorities could be held responsible? The mischief, as far as the Portuguese authorities are concerned, is not in someone having received messages asking for help supposing, I repeat, for argument's sake, that they were received. The mischief would arise if, as a result of such messages, help were sent from Angola.

58. Let us examine that point. It seems to my delegation a matter of no mean significance that certain news media undertook to invent and propagate the wildest fantasies alleging an invasion of the Congo from Angola, and that Portuguese and foreign troops had crossed the border supported by heavy artillery, aviation, etc.

59. Later the Congolese Government no longer alleged an invasion but an infiltration of some hundred mercenaries across the Angolan border. The Congolese Government, which officially allows infiltrations of armed men across the

border into Angola, perhaps thought that we were paying it back in the same coin. In this it is mistaken. But in this connexion let me quote the official statement issued by the Portuguese Government on 3 November 1967. The Portuguese Government, after alluding to the fanciful allegations of the news media and the Congolese Government, says:

"With reference to the foregoing, the Portuguese Government denies most emphatically the good foundation of these reports and desires to affirm categorically that the Republic of the Congo has not been invaded or threatened, or attacked by any Portuguese troops or other forces, or by any foreign troops or other forces, which might have been stationed in Angola. The Portuguese Government desires to affirm equally categorically that there are no bases in Angola and there have been none at the service of mercenaries, nor have any groups, whether armed or unarmed, crossed the frontier posts in the direction of the Congo. The Portuguese Government is not aware that any incidents took place along the frontier. In view of the reports which have disseminated, and although it is not essential to go from Angola in order to get into the Congo, the local authorities are investigating, as a matter of scruple, whether along the extensive frontier line there might have been any infiltrations other than those which the Congo allows against Angola and which are carried out by persons enjoying the protection of the Congolese Government and having their military bases in its territory."

The Portuguese Government's statement goes on:

"The Portuguese Government, like all other Governments, has received other reports giving accounts of unrest in various parts of the Congo. In order to explain or justify that unrest, it is not correct to seek to throw the responsibility on Portugal. The Portuguese Government desires, on the other hand, to recall the numerous invitations it has already addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to visit Angola, and to the Congolese Government, on the terms which were indicated, to investigate the alleged mercenary bases which, according to the Congolese Government, exist in that Province. These invitations were never accepted, and the least that can be said is that it must be considered hardly proper for organizations and governments to insist on gratuitous accusations which they refuse to investigate."

I should like to repeat this part of the Portuguese Government's press note:

"These invitations were never accepted, and the least that can be said is that it must be considered hardly proper for organizations and governments to insist on gratuitous accusations which they refuse to investigate."

"In the course of the last two years, the Congolese Government has levelled the same kind of accusations a number of times and has asked the Security Council to take up its complaints as a matter of urgency. It could never produce any proof, and all that it succeeded in doing has been to bring discredit on its own attitudes and to lower the prestige of the Security Council."

The Portuguese Government's statement says in conclusion:

"In the face of the present allegations, the Portuguese Government maintains the above-mentioned invitations and insists that they be accepted with a view to assessing the grounds of the accusations, which have been given a facile hearing in certain international circles."

60. I have read out the statement which the Portuguese Government issued, and which I think answers in full the accusations brought against us by the Congolese Government. I have not had time to examine the exhibits which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has circulated here in the Council and I certainly cannot comment off-hand on the alleged Belgian document which he read out some moments ago. I should like to go into these matters carefully and, if I find it necessary, should like to reply. Therefore I should like to reserve my delegation's right to intervene again. But I think the purposes of this debate will be served by what I have already stated and, having read out the official statement of my Government, I need only reiterate here the invitation to investigate the charges which the Congolese Government gratuitously levels against us. We have nothing to conceal, and we can give no better proof of our good faith than to ask the Council to investigate their charges.

61. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): We daily read accounts of the confused and tangled situation in the Congo. It is not by any means easy to be clear or confident in our conclusions but one thing is plain, one thing we can be sure about. We can be sure of the baneful and evil consequences of the activities of these new mercenary intruders. Mercenaries are the curse of the Congo. They stand in the way of a return to order and peace; they are barriers on the hard road back to constructive development and revived prosperity. They perpetuate the violence and destruction, and disruption too, which have plagued the Congo for far too long. It is the clear duty of this Council to do everything possible to eliminate this evil. It is a responsibility which must surely be recognized and faced by every one of us.

62. I said last July in this Council [*1367th meeting*] that we consider it vital, if the Democratic Republic of the Congo is to be permitted to develop peacefully, that there should be no external interference whatsoever from any source in its internal affairs. We voted for Security Council resolution 239 (1967) of 10 July 1967 calling on Governments to ensure that their territories are not used for the planning of subversion and the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries designed to overthrow the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is with that resolution in mind that we must now deal with the present situation.

63. It will be a matter of most serious concern if it is shown that the resolution of the Council has been disregarded or flouted. I am not going to attempt now to state conclusions on the reports we have received. Without an impartial inquiry, I agree that it is difficult to know all the facts. But I say now that in spite of what the representative of Portugal has said to us today, it is hard—it is very hard—to believe that the latest band of mercenaries, who apparently came into the Katanga Province of the Congo from Angola, could have been assembled and armed

in Angola without the knowledge of the Portuguese authorities.

64. I do not think that anyone will doubt that in fact a new contingent of mercenaries has just arrived. And I do not imagine that anyone can suggest that they came from anywhere else. It is and was a clear duty of the Portuguese Government to take every possible measure to prevent any force from assembling in Angolan territory or using Angola as a base. Still more, it is their positive duty to prevent mercenaries from attacking the Congo from Angola.

65. I am glad that the representative of Portugal has informed us that an inquiry is being undertaken by the Portuguese authorities. But if the facts reported to us are established, that the force of mercenaries in fact entered the Congo from Angola, then my Government, and indeed all Governments here represented, could not fail to be gravely disturbed. And all those who had made such a mercenary attack possible would carry a very heavy responsibility indeed.

66. The stand of my Government is based on the resolution [239 (1967)] we adopted in July 1967 and on the necessity of preventing external interference of any kind in the internal affairs of the Congo. It is based on the necessity of putting a stop to all mercenary intervention which has led to so much needless terror and bloodshed. We have a right and a duty to expect the Portuguese Government faithfully to discharge its responsibility to support and observe those clear requirements.

67. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Mr. President, allow me first of all to take this opportunity of addressing to you my delegation's felicitations and best wishes on your election to the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of November.

68. You are one of the latest to join our ranks, but already, within the short span of time of close association with us in the work of the Council, you have impressed us with your great qualities of wisdom and good judgement. You have thus lived up to the high tradition already established by your predecessors at the United Nations, and we all feel sure that your presence here will ensure the valuable contribution that your country has been making to work of our Organization. The Ethiopian delegation wishes to assure you of its whole-hearted co-operation in the fulfilment of the high mission entrusted to you during these critical times.

69. Once again the Security Council is convening to consider a matter with which it should by now be familiar: foreign subversion against the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Foreign interference is by no means new to the Congo. The Congo was, in fact, baptised at its independence by disorder and by chaos provoked by foreign intervention. This intervention has continued up to now in one guise or another. The only difference is that today more indirect and more subtle methods of intervention are being employed.

70. The United Nations has, of course, been seized of the question of foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of

the Congo since the independence of that nation. Thus the various forms this interference assumed, and the various stages it passed through, are all too well known for me to necessitate a recital of events. The very first resolution which the Council adopted on the Congo in 1960 [143 (1960)] contained a demand that foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the Congo should cease and that the United Nations should assist the Government of the Congo in maintaining law and order. Characteristically, nearly all the other resolutions adopted subsequently, both by the Security Council and the General Assembly, either affirmed the necessity of preventing foreign interference, or have called for the cessation of foreign interference.

71. Only three months ago, the Security Council, concerned by the threat posed by foreign interference to the independence and the territorial integrity of the Congo, in its resolution 239 (1967), condemned any State which "persists in permitting or tolerating the recruitment of mercenaries, and the provision of facilities to them, with the objective of overthrowing the Governments of States Members of the United Nations". Again, in its resolution 226 (1966) of 14 October 1966, the Security Council was even more pointed in its request. In that resolution the Council urged "the Government of Portugal, in view of its own statement, not to allow foreign mercenaries to use Angola as a base of operation for interfering in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo".

72. Having regard to this history of foreign interference, a history of a continuing and persistent intervention from outside since the independence of that country, it is quite understandable that we should have listened with much concern and preoccupation to the statement just made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As it has always done in the past, my country hastens to declare its solidarity with this sister African nation, which is once again a victim of foreign machinations and interference. The serious development that the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has brought to our attention today is but part of a greater offensive launched by the enemies of African independence. The latest manifestations of intervention and subversion are the continuation of that same action which the United Nations has repeatedly condemned and with which the United Nations has continually sought to cope.

73. Today, once again, the evidence of interference and subversion in the Congo is at the doorstep of Portugal. The launching pad for these activities is, of course, Angola, a territory under Portuguese control. The evidence is there for all to see, and those who are engaging in these acts of international banditry have made little effort to hide their hideous deeds from the international community or the world press.

74. *The New York Times*, which is usually authoritative, had this to say in its editorial columns on Saturday, 4 November 1967, with regard to the activities and preparations of white mercenaries on Portuguese controlled territories:

"Portugal denies that the mercenary force came from Angola, but the United States and other Western Govern-

ments have been accumulating evidence for weeks of its presence there. Washington was right to emphasize 'strongly' to Portugal its 'grave disquiet' over this development."

Again, *The New York Times* went on to say:

"The thrust from Angola into Katanga is evidently linked to the presence in Bukavu of the forces led by the Belgian, Col. Jean Schramme . . .

"The ramifications of this latest development, if it is not checked quickly, could be very dangerous. Many Africans are convinced that the white minority régimes in South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories have been planning a power move against hostile African governments to the north. They believe the invasion of the Congo represents a first step in that strategy."

This telling and informative analysis was followed by a report on Sunday, 5 November 1967, in which *The New York Times* said that Lisbon was seen as becoming increasingly the centre for a traffic of arms and mercenaries and that Lisbon airport was the jump-off point for what had developed into a regular airlift to the Portuguese territory of Angola. The cargoes were a mixed bag of people and arms from various sources.

75. The Congolese Foreign Minister in his letter of 3 November 1967 to the President of the Council [see S/8218] requesting a meeting of the Council states that

". . . an armed band of mercenaries invaded the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo at Kisenge. They went to Kasaji, where they seized a track motor car, and they are now approaching Kolwezi".

The Foreign Minister went on to say that this band occupied Mutshatsha at 1 p.m. local time on 2 November.

76. As was to be expected, the Portuguese Government has of course characteristically denied that it has ever been responsible for such activities, but the statement made today by its representative is as convincing, I am afraid, as other Portuguese declarations in this regard. There is one thing that cannot be denied. These activities take place. And if they do take place such activities cannot simply come from out of thin air.

77. On the contrary, it is clearly obvious that operations of the magnitude and character that have been launched from Angola against the Democratic Republic of the Congo through the instrumentality of mercenaries could not have taken place without the knowledge and, I would even say, the tolerance of the Portuguese authorities. That much the international community at large must recognize. To us, and surely to all impartial observers, Portuguese complicity in organizing such operations must be all too evident. Subversive operations carried out by mercenaries with the overt and covert assistance of the twin alliance of colonialism and racism have increasingly become a source of concern to African Governments. The long-term consequences of this offensive, launched through the instrumentality of nameless and faceless soldiers of fortune, a

method clearly designed to "denationalize" intervention, have recently been examined by African Governments at the highest level. The fourth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which met in September 1967 in the capital city of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, addressing itself to the problem posed by mercenary activities, considered all such activities a serious threat to the security of African States, and the continued presence of mercenaries, as a danger that would inevitably arouse strong and destructive feelings and put in jeopardy the lives of foreigners in the Continent. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity also condemned the aggression of mercenaries against the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and called upon the United Nations to deplore and take immediate action to eradicate such illegal and immoral practices, and appealed urgently to all States of the world to enact laws declaring the recruitment and training of mercenaries in their territories as a punishable crime and deterring their citizens from enlisting as mercenaries.

78. My delegation would like to take this opportunity of requesting the Council to agree in this respect with the assessment of African Governments, the pertinent parts of which I just quoted, and to condemn the activities of Portugal and its allies of oppression in Africa. I should also like to submit to the Council that it should examine the broad implications of mercenary activities and their possible effect on race relations in Africa and take appropriate action to prevent their repetition. We cannot, however, let this occasion pass without reminding the Council once again of the fact that the problem of mercenary activities is only a ramification of more fundamental problems in southern Africa with which the United Nations has failed, up to now, to cope effectively. I have in mind, of course, *apartheid* in South Africa; the rebellion of the white settlers in Rhodesia; the usurpation of an international territory in South West Africa; and Portuguese colonialism. All those forces have now joined hands to frustrate United Nations decisions. Apparently, they all feel that they are threatened by the expanding horizon of African independence and cannot reconcile themselves to the equality and freedom that this independence implies. Thus they want to sabotage and thwart that independence. In their effort in the Congo, they also enjoy the covert support of powerful business interests which see in a strong, unified and independent Congo a threat to their ability to exploit on their terms the riches of that country, and are unwilling to contemplate, let alone accept, economic co-operation based on mutual respect and common benefit.

79. Never has the United Nations been as patient and as tolerant as it has been of Portugal and also of South Africa. Over the years they have continued to defy the authority of the Organization and to trample upon the decisions of both the General Assembly and the Security Council. They have continued to scorn the principles of the United Nations Charter and to disregard the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And yet, in spite of this open demonstration of defiance, the United Nations has not taken stern measures against these Governments, nor has it taken effective steps to have its decisions implemented. Is it therefore surprising that those Governments should now

take a new offensive just as much against African independence as against the United Nations itself, an offensive conceived in a new colonial adventure through the intermediary of mercenaries?

80. And yet, what can you expect these racist régimes to do when their defiance of international authority goes unchecked, when they continue to enjoy the privileges of membership in an Organization that they continue to defy, and when many Members of this Organization continue to patronize them through the maintenance of trade and profitable relations?

81. It is the view of my delegation that the Council must arrest this dangerous new development of mercenary activities in its infancy before it is too late. The Council must say to Portugal that it is really going too far in its defiance of the United Nations. This Organization of ours cannot sit and look on when Governments of Member States that have already openly challenged its authority carry their challenge and defiance even further by encouraging organized subversion of the constitutional authority of another Member State. The Council is duty bound to condemn those that are accomplices in such criminal and illegal acts of subversion and interference and should demand the immediate cessation of mercenary adventures once and for all. This is the least that the Council must do and my delegation urges that it be done without delay.

82. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I should like to thank the representative of Ethiopia for the tribute he has paid to my country and for his very flattering words about me, which I am sure I do not deserve.

83. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Before turning to the topic on our agenda today, I should like to join you, Sir, in the tribute which you paid to Mr. Tsuruoka for the way in which he presided over our work last month. I believe that we are all deeply indebted to the representative of Japan for the wisdom, patience and perseverance which he showed in the conduct of the Security Council business during the month of October. This was perhaps not a month in which we had as many formal meetings as has sometimes happened in the past. However, as we all know here, frequently the work which is conducted informally outside the Council chamber is as important, if not more so, than the work conducted in open meetings, and I think that we all share a feeling that his conduct of those consultations revealed a willingness to labour long, hard and patiently and in a manner which carried our work forward as far as could humanly be expected.

84. At the same time, Mr. President, I do join in welcoming you to the Presidency. As Mr. Makonnen pointed out, you take on this job at a particularly difficult time. It is a difficult enough job in any event, and it must be especially so for a relative newcomer to our table. It is, therefore, with special pleasure that the United States delegation has already observed the very capable, dedicated and impartial manner in which you have undertaken your duties. We look forward to close collaboration with you during the coming month and I wish to assure you that the United States will co-operate in every way to try and contribute to a fruitful outcome of the work which lies ahead of us.

85. Turning to the business at hand, it is a matter of some regret to my delegation that the Security Council once again finds it necessary to convene on a serious charge relating to the activities of armed mercenaries in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As we were reminded by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it has been less than four months since we were called upon to consider the potential threat to the independence and territorial integrity of the Congo posed by mercenaries then reported to be assembled in neighbouring territory. On 10 July 1967 in resolution 239 (1967), the Security Council expressed its concern over this circumstance and condemned "any State which persists in permitting or tolerating the recruitment of mercenaries, and the provision of facilities to them, with the objective of overthrowing the Governments of States Members of the United Nations". That resolution also called upon "Governments to ensure that their territory and other territories under their control, as well as their nationals, are not used for the planning of subversion, and the recruitment, draining and transit of mercenaries designed to overthrow the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo."

86. I have listened very carefully to the statement made today by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Congo. His account of the recent incursions into his country gives cause for deep concern. It is admittedly very difficult under the prevailing circumstances for any government in a short time to marshal and present those concrete kinds of evidence which one would like to have before making a formal judgement on the merits of a complaint. However, his report on the current situation and our own knowledge of the history of the mercenary problem in the Congo create a strong presumption that the resolutions of this Council have been violated. Confirmation of his report would mean, notwithstanding the denials made by the Government of Portugal and repeated to us today, that Angola had indeed been used by mercenaries to prepare an armed incursion into the Congo. It is very difficult for my delegation to understand how foreign mercenaries could be present in Angola, make preparations for such a misadventure and then leave Angola for the Congo without the knowledge or at least acquiescence of the Portuguese authorities. The implications of Portuguese responsibility, even if only tacit, would therefore appear to be serious. It is for this reason that my Government has made known to the Government of Portugal its concern about this matter.

87. It is the hope of the United States that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be able to deal effectively with this latest mercenary threat so that it can continue the development of national unity and economic progress in a framework of peace and security.

88. It is the proper concern of the Security Council that the mercenary danger which has threatened the Congo for so long be eliminated and not be permitted to recur. All countries, particularly those bordering on the Congo, have a very grave responsibility to ensure compliance with the resolutions of this Council on the mercenary problem. My delegation, consequently, calls upon all countries to comply scrupulously with both the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 239 (1967).

89. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I should like to thank the representative of the United States for the kind remarks he has just made about me.

90. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has met again today to examine the question of continuing interference by the forces of colonialism in the internal affairs of an African State which is a Member of the United Nations, the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

91. A letter sent to the Security Council by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and External Trade of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [*see S/8218*] provides facts which reveal another aggressive invasion of that country by armed mercenaries from Angola, a country under Portuguese colonial administration. The letter states that armed bands of mercenaries crossed the border of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and occupied several Congolese towns along the railway line linking Angola with the mining centres of Katanga.

92. We have followed closely the statement just made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, who has provided the Security Council with additional information concerning this new act of aggression against his country. We feel that he showed most eloquently the criminal role played by the Lisbon régime, which is carrying out a policy of colonialism, racial oppression and unrelenting aggressive interference in the internal affairs of the Congo. Once again he appealed to the Security Council to restrain the forces of Portuguese racism and colonialism, which are supported by their Western allies, and to take effective steps to prevent a repetition of aggression against the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He also appealed to the Council to put an end to the shameful practice whereby the forces of colonialism and imperialism send mercenaries with impunity to the territory of the Congo to commit acts of repression, destruction and violence against the peaceful population of the Congo and overthrow the existing Government of the Congo.

93. The Security Council cannot close its ears to these legitimate appeals of the Government of the Congo and is in duty bound to fulfil the task entrusted to it under the Charter of our Organization.

94. Thus, the Security Council is faced, as so often before, with attempts by the forces of colonialism to intervene openly by force of arms in the Congo, to undermine the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and to strike at the national liberation movement of the Congolese people and of other countries on the African continent. The forces of colonialism continue to use the Portuguese colonies in Africa as bases for acts of armed provocation against the Congo and other African countries. The actions of the colonialists are a threat not just to the integrity and independence of the Congo, but to peace in that part of Africa. For seven years, ever since the independence of the Congo, the imperialist Powers and the forces of colonialism have tried time and time again to undermine the movement of the Congolese people towards freedom and have blatantly interfered by force of arms in the affairs of that country.

95. We recall that in October 1966 the Security Council examined the alarming situation created in the Congo area by the concentration of armed mercenary bands which were being trained to invade the Congo in neighbouring Portuguese territories. On 14 October 1966 the Security Council adopted resolution 226 (1966), in which it

“Urges the Government of Portugal, in view of its own statement, not to allow foreign mercenaries to use Angola as a base of operation for interfering in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.”

Despite the Security Council's appeal, and in defiance of the Council's resolution, this summer the forces of colonialism launched aggressive action against the Congolese State and dispatched to the Congo armed mercenary bands, which started military operations against the Congolese national armed forces. Just over three months ago, in July 1967, the Security Council examined a complaint by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [S/8036] about this aggression and on 10 July 1967 adopted resolution 239 (1967), in which it reaffirmed the appeal to all States made in paragraph 2 of its resolution 226 (1966) “to refrain or desist from intervening in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo” and in which it condemned “any State which persists in permitting or tolerating the recruitment of mercenaries, and the provision of facilities to them, with the objective of overthrowing the Governments of States Members of the United Nations”.

96. However, despite these clear demands on the part of the Security Council, the imperialist forces will not leave the Congolese people in peace and are trying by force of arms to regain the positions which they lost as a result of the Congolese people's long struggle for independence and freedom from the colonialist yoke. This new criminal attack against the Congo shows that the imperialists, far from abandoning their plans to suppress national liberation movements in the African countries and to deprive the young African States of the independence which they achieved at such cost, are now stepping up their activities and trying to take advantage of the general state of international tension caused by the further escalation of United States aggression against the Viet-Nameese people and by Israel's aggression in the Middle East.

97. It is obvious that what is taking place in the Congo is not an isolated action by a band of mercenaries undertaking a criminal adventure in the Congo at their own risk; it is a link in the general conspiracy of the forces of imperialism, which are trying in various parts of the world to stop by force of arms the movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America towards genuine national independence and liberation. But where the aggressive inroads meet firm resistance from peace-loving forces, colonialism cannot achieve its criminal ends.

98. In the Congo the forces of imperialism have organized an invasion by bands of mercenaries, under the illusion that they will be able to delude the Africans by claiming that the major imperialist Powers are not involved in aggression against the country and are even ready to come to its aid. But nations have learned to recognize these imperialist

tactics. They understand that the aggression against the Congo is only a part of the monstrous plan of African racists and colonialists together with international imperialism to strike at the whole national liberation movement on the African continent and to thrust back the peoples of Africa who are striving to wipe out the colonialist bastions of the racist régimes in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique.

99. The Security Council has just heard a statement by the United Kingdom representative, in which he positively hurled curses at the mercenaries who have invaded the Congo. But is not a policy of connivance with the racist régime in Rhodesia, and the statements by United Kingdom representatives that the United Kingdom will not use force against the Smith régime, at the very time when the colonialists are waging an offensive against the African peoples, is not such a policy an encouragement to those forces whose aim is to strike at the freedom and independence of the African peoples?

100. Nor was there any lack of verbal condemnation or protestations of innocence from the United States representative with regard to the Lisbon régime's criminal practice of using mercenaries for its criminal purposes. But are the speeches made by the representatives of these States in the Security Council really what count? Surely the point is that in practice they act as accomplices and protectors of the Lisbon régime in its criminal activities.

101. The events in the Congo area show that the political alliance of racism and colonialism, set up in the southern part of the African continent with the support of the major imperialist Powers, constitutes a major threat to the peoples of Africa. The facts are so obvious that even *The New York Times* could not ignore them and on 4 November 1967 wrote:

“Many Africans are convinced that the white minority régimes in South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories have been planning a power move against hostile African Governments to the north. They believe the invasion of the Congo represents a first step in that strategy.”

102. Of course, the peoples of Africa are fully aware whose criminal hand equipped those armed bandits and dispatched them to the Congo, where their bases are, with whose money and whose assistance they are attacking the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The letter written by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and External Trade of the Democratic Republic of the Congo [see S/8218] states, in particular, that the facts of the renewed aggression

“constitute irrefutable proof of Portugal's collusion with the mercenaries for the purpose of overthrowing the established order in the Congo. They clearly disprove the Portuguese authorities' claims that they have not intervened and the statements of their representative to the United Nations”.

103. It is quite clear that the responsibility for these constant acts of provocation against the Congo and other



African countries does not lie with Portugal alone. Without the support of more powerful imperialist countries, whose representatives are sitting here at this table, Portugal would not be able to pursue its present colonialist policy in Africa, in opposition to all the African peoples and in defiance of world public opinion.

104. Portuguese colonialism also derives its strength from the military alliance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), from the loyal assistance and political support given it by its allies and senior partners in NATO, who are extraordinarily generous in providing Lisbon with weapons for its struggle against the African peoples.

105. There can be no doubt that the alarming situation in the Congo and the constant acts of provocation against the sovereignty of that country are the result of continuous interference by the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Portugal in the affairs of the Congo, with the aim of strengthening the imperialist influence of those Powers, continuing the rapacious exploitation of the natural resources of the Congo by various foreign monopolies and maintaining the position of Western imperialism not only in the Congo but in many other countries of Africa.

106. It is, of course, no accident that the forces of aggression and colonialism are aimed primarily at those parts of the Congo where in the past foreign monopolies held sway under the auspices of the Union Minière and for a long time pumped enormous wealth out of the country. It was this region that served as the main arena for acts of provocation by the colonialist agent Tshombe against the territorial integrity of the Congo, aimed at the partition of the country and the secession of Katanga.

107. It goes without saying that the policy of interference in the internal affairs of the Congo, which is directed by certain NATO Powers, a policy of supporting Portuguese aggression against that country, is a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, which was adopted unanimously by States Members of the United Nations in a well-known resolution of the General Assembly, resolution 2131 (XX). May we remind the Council that NATO countries which are allies of Portugal, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium and others, also voted in favour of that resolution?

108. We see again that it is Katanga and its mining centres which are the main attraction for the colonialists, who dream of their former wealth and cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that the Congolese people have angrily driven out the so-called owners of the Union Minière and have replaced it by the National Congolese Company. The colonialists' response to the lawful and moderate measures taken recently by the Congolese Government to protect the country's economy from domination and plunder by foreign monopolies has been to redouble their efforts to undermine the normal life of the Congo, to send armed bandits in to its territory and to engage in sabotage and terrorism in order to stir up dissatisfaction with the national Government of the Congo among the people. The

events in the Congo region show yet again that effective steps must be taken by all countries concerned with the maintenance of international peace, to condemn and put an end to aggression. This would be greatly helped by more rapid progress in drawing up a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation, a matter which, as the Council knows, is due for consideration by the present session of the General Assembly.

109. These facts also show that the activities of the forces of imperialism against African countries are a serious threat to the freedom and independence of all African countries and to the maintenance of peace in Africa.

110. The Soviet delegation firmly supports the demands of the African countries for a condemnation of the criminal activities of the forces of imperialism against the Congo and other African countries. It considers that the Security Council should take effective steps to put to an end the aggression against the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to protect the sovereignty of the Congo and other young African countries from acts of provocation by the forces of colonialism and imperialism.

111. The conduct of Portugal should be condemned as strongly as possible in this connexion, since it constitutes a violation of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty. The Security Council must demand the immediate cessation of the criminal practice of recruiting mercenaries, who are nothing but hired bandits and murderers, and providing them with territory and facilities so that they can interfere in the internal affairs of the Congo and other independent African countries.

112. The Security Council should also demand that all Portugal's NATO allies, which give the Lisbon régime military aid and political support and thus share Portugal's responsibility for the interference and aggression to which the Congo is subject, should immediately put an end to their aid and support, adhere strictly to the principles of the United Nations Charter and respect the sovereignty and independence of the young African States.

113. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): I do not need to tell you, Mr. President, how happy I am to join with those who have expressed our pleasure that you are presiding over this Council and in assuring you of our warmest co-operation.

114. I do not intend to prolong our meeting this evening, but I would not want it to come to an end before I had had the opportunity of telling the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo how attentively we listened to his statement and how sympathetically we considered his Government's concerns.

115. My delegation and my Government were disturbed at the new raids by mercenaries into Congolese territory. Fortunately, our concern was to a large extent allayed by the evidence which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has given us indicating that we are concerned with the activities of only a handful of merce-

naries and that the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have been able quickly and effectively to meet that threat by using their own resources. The French Government was extremely gratified because we, perhaps more than any other Power, want to see internal peace and stability permanently restored in the Congo as well as economic development and steady progress towards prosperity. In order that this may be achieved, as the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo said, the activities of mercenaries must cease once and for all.

116. My delegation wishes to reaffirm that it would find it inadmissible for the existence of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to be threatened once again by foreign interference and for the United Nations not to condemn that interference. We in France, devoted as we are to the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, are against any action by any foreign Power whatever in a country where, I repeat, tranquillity and economic development are so necessary for that country itself, for Africa and for the world.

117. As the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo pointed out, it is difficult to obtain actual proof on this question of mercenaries. However, the circumstantial evidence is serious. With regard to the raid carried out by the mercenaries which began on 1 November, it is only natural, while awaiting more complete information, that we should question the attitude of the authorities administering Angola, since they control the frontier separating that country from Congolese territory. We should like to be satisfied that they have brought to bear all the means at their disposal to avoid complaints such as the one we are considering today. We ask the representative of Portugal to dispel any doubts we have on this point.

118. France has been taking radical measures against the activities of mercenaries for many years. I myself, in 1961, had the honour to announce to this Council [974th meeting] the following measures we adopted.

119. Recruitment for foreign armed forces is prohibited and punishable under the French Penal Code. However, the French Government not only adopted general measures, on the basis of the provisions of the Code, it prohibited all recruitment on French territory for the *gendarmerie* or other forces in the Congo. Furthermore, in order to discourage adventurers who might have been tempted to go to the province of Katanga, it strengthened the legislation now in force by means of an ordinance passed on 4 February 1961. By modifying article 97 of the Code of French Nationality, that ordinance provided that anyone who joined a foreign army would run the risk of losing his nationality and his rights as a French citizen. No more stringent measure could be taken in this matter.

120. As a result of the provisions made in 1961 we were able to nip in the bud attempts such as that of the secret training camp to which the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo referred. He was kind enough to thank France for the measures it had taken to disperse that camp and to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

121. A few moments ago, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo said that there were

several Frenchmen among the mercenaries. That may well be: I have no information on that point. What I can say, however, is that if such is the case, they are soldiers of fortune. The fact that France is not at war in any part of the world may explain why these men are seeking other climes.

122. I should like to add that we do not think it is enough to take measures to stop mercenaries from leaving the country. Like the Congolese representative, we think that it is not enough to throw the mercenaries out through the door if they could come back through the window.

123. This is why my Government is prepared to associate itself with the measures of co-ordination which may be proposed to prevent the mercenaries from returning and resuming their activities. Any suggestions along these lines and the co-ordination that may be established will receive the greatest attention of my Government.

124. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I should like to thank the representative of France for the kind and encouraging words he has addressed to me.

125. I call upon the representative of the United Kingdom to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

126. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I do not wish to keep the Council at this late hour, but there was one particular point raised in the wide-ranging speech of the representative of the Soviet Union to which I think I should make a very brief reply.

127. He referred to the question of Rhodesia. I would only say that if the representative of the Soviet Union cannot distinguish between a condemnation of the use of force in the Congo and a reluctance to use force in Rhodesia, then I cannot help him. At least he must recognize that our opposition to the use of force is consistent, and I think that it would be difficult for him to argue that our attitude is contrary to the principles and precepts of the United Nations Charter.

128. I would only say further that I trust that, in this respect as in many others, my country will continue to find itself in the happy relationship with France in that we shall not be waging a war in any part of the world.

129. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of the United States to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

130. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): I too apologize for taking the floor at this late hour. I had not intended to do so until the unwarranted intervention of the representative of the Soviet Union in which he played a very familiar record that we have heard often before in this Council, that is, the so-called plot theory. He said that the policies of my Government were designed to impede the process of freedom and independence in Africa.

131. At the age of fifty, we would normally expect a man to have gained a certain amount of wisdom about world affairs, and it would seem to us equally reasonable that a



régime of fifty years would gain a more objective and more informed view of the world scene than is humanly possible if one tries to squeeze every development around the globe into a preconceived theory of a world-wide imperialist conspiracy.

132. The policy of the United States towards the Congo has been consistent ever since that country achieved its independence in 1960. We have sought to help the Congo to maintain its political independence and territorial integrity. We have done this both in our bilateral relations and through our support of United Nations operations in the Congo. It might be well to recall, since this issue has been raised, that Soviet policy on the contrary has been to support secession in the eastern Congo when it suited its purposes and to oppose every United Nations effort to assist that troubled country to retain its independence. So I would say that the United States is quite prepared for a full and open comparison of the records of the Government of the Soviet Union and my Government at any time.

133. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in exercise of his right of reply.

134. Mr. UMBA DI LUTETE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): Following the example of the preceding speakers, I must first of all apologize for detaining the Council at this late hour. I apologize also for referring back to a statement which provided no grounds for criticism or paraphrase—I refer to the statement by the representative of Portugal. I said that the representative of Portugal would deny everything and he did deny everything, with the self-possession and cynicism which are so characteristic of his country. He brought up all the old stories again; indeed, merely by looking up all the statements he has made before this Council one can see that he always repeats the same things and never supplies any new argument in support of his allegations.

135. With regard to the assistance received by my country, I do not know whether there are many States represented in this chamber which receive assistance from that country. But I should like to say that my country is indeed privileged to receive assistance from it. I shall not, however, venture to dwell too long on this point.

136. I have been cheered by the fact that, in the various interventions which have been made, all the speakers have recognized, perhaps in a somewhat veiled fashion, the flippancy which has characterized the Portuguese representative's reply. I hope that he will continue in this manner and trap himself even more in lies, since this will serve to strengthen still further the conviction of the members of the Council.

137. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

138. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have taken the floor to reply to some rather hasty statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United

States of America. Our colleague from the United Kingdom complained that no clear distinction was made in the Soviet Union representative's statement between the idea of open armed intervention by one State in the internal affairs of another for the most improper purposes and what is happening in the case of the racist régimes in Rhodesia and other territories, with which the United Kingdom Government, as is well known, maintains quite clear relations. The United Kingdom representative also said that he was unable to help the Soviet representative to make the necessary distinction between these ideas.

139. We did not actually ask for the assistance of the United Kingdom representative in defining these ideas. We are quite capable of working out for ourselves what is going on. The fact that this does not coincide with the ideas of the United Kingdom representative is quite another matter, and of course he can hardly expect us to help him there. He has only himself to blame. We have already said that a policy of connivance with the racist régime in Rhodesia, and a statement from London that the United Kingdom will not use force against the Smith régime at the very time when the colonialists are waging an offensive against the African peoples, can only encourage those whose aim is to strike at the freedom and independence of a people. Is this not one of the many links—and a very important one—in the endless chain forged by the colonialist Powers and the forces of imperialism in an attempt to suppress the national liberation movement, to undermine the democratic régimes in African countries, and to prevent the African peoples from raising their heads in those countries where white minorities exercise merciless domination? Does it not expose the policy of the United Kingdom as the very same colonialist policy which is pursued by its junior partners, including the Portuguese régime? Are they not one and the same?

140. The United States representative, as was to be expected, could not bear the accusations levelled at Washington policy. But is it not a fact that the Portuguese colonialists are encouraged to defy decisions of the United Nations and to use mercenaries to commit acts of aggression against the Congo by the huge quantities of weapons of various kinds supplied by the United States and other States members of NATO, and that they are using those weapons in their criminal fight against African peoples struggling for their right to freedom and independence? Can the United States representative produce any evidence to refute this? It is the United States of America and other Western Powers which maintain the closest commercial and other economic links with Portugal and which are increasing their investments in Portuguese dominions in Africa, and we have not heard one single word from the United States representative to indicate that Washington has the slightest intention of putting pressure on Portugal to comply with the principles of the United Nations Charter by decreasing its assistance to that country. We have only heard a sort of murmur of surprise and incomprehension, on the grounds that the Lisbon régime has allegedly been unable to detect the presence in its territories of the mercenaries who are committing criminal acts against the Democratic Republic of the Congo. But who can be deluded by such an argument? Who can believe such

words? We have long since learned the value of that sort of statement in the Security Council.

141. The United States representative even ventured to make a kind of excursion into past history, touching on the tragic fate of the long-suffering people of the Congo. We feel we must remind the United States representative of the true facts in the history of the struggle of the Congolese people for independence against the forces of colonialism and imperialism.

142. Possibly the United States representative's memory fails him and he has forgotten the suffering and the bloodshed caused in the Congo by the intervention of the forces of imperialism in an attempt to regain their former rights and privileges and to maintain their colonialist domination in the Congo. The blood of the many Congolese who gave their lives for the liberation of their homeland, the blood of thousands of Congolese patriots, including Patrice Lumumba, will always keep this alive in our minds. The United States representative should not forget these facts, when he so rashly makes excursions into the recent past, when he starts going into such facts and taking over a history which cannot fail to expose the policy of imperialism.

143. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of Portugal who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

144. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): I regret very much delaying the Council at this late hour, but I feel that some observations from my delegation are called for in view of the remarks made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the exercise of his right of reply. He said that, as he had expected, my delegation had limited itself simply to denying everything. Such a remark is very surprising. It would seem that the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo expected me to admit everything simply because the Congolese Government had made accusations.

145. We are fully conscious that the accusations levelled against us do not correspond to any facts. I quoted a statement made by my Government, and I must say emphatically that my Government is a responsible Govern-

ment, which made its statement with a full sense of responsibility.

146. There has been a lot of talk of mercenaries and although, as I understand, the Congolese Government itself has not alleged that the mercenaries in question were of Portuguese origin, it has been said here—and repeated—that Portugal has been sending its mercenaries. So it appears that the allegation made against us goes even further than was originally intended by the Congolese Government. In this respect I should greatly appreciate it if the Soviet delegation, which made such a statement, would ask the Congolese delegation sitting at this table if it confirms that there were any Portuguese nationals among the mercenaries.

147. Finally, I must remind the Council that my delegation has not simply limited itself to denying everything; my delegation made a very positive and very constructive suggestion. We said that if there should be any doubt about the statement we have made, the Council should undertake an investigation. I submit that this is fair enough. In fact this is what any delegation, any Government, would offer in proof of its good faith; and that would give the Council an opportunity of basing its decisions not on mere gratuitous accusations, not on mere presumptions, but on facts.

148. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The photographs and the magazines brought by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which the members of the Council have had a chance of seeing during the present meeting, will be left with the secretariat of the Security Council and be available to delegations wishing to refer to them.

149. I have no further speakers on my list. In the light of the Security Council's agenda for tomorrow, it appears from informal consultation that members of the Council would agree to suspend the discussion on the complaint of the Democratic Republic of the Congo until Friday, 10 November, at 10.30 a.m. Since there is no objection, it is so decided.

*The meeting rose at 7.20 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 по всем районам мира. Наводите 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.

---