

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

**1563**<sup>rd</sup> MEETING: 8 DECEMBER 1970

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1563) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Guinea:	
(a) Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);	
(b) Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1) .....	1

208

## NOTE

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

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

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

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 8 December 1970, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1563)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Guinea:
  - (a) Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);
  - (b) Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Complaint by Guinea:

- (a) Letter dated 22 November 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9987);
- (b) Report of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) (S/10009 and Add.1)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): May I remind the Council that when it discussed the present item at previous meetings it decided to invite the representatives of Guinea, Senegal, Mali, Saudi Arabia, Mauritania, Algeria, Liberia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Yugoslavia, Mauritius, the Sudan, the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Southern Yemen, Cuba, Uganda, India, Somalia, Haiti and Pakistan to participate, without the right to vote, in its consideration of the item.

2. In view of the limited number of seats at the Council table, I propose, in accordance with the Council's practice, to invite the representative of Guinea to take a

place at the Council table. The other representatives will be invited to take the places reserved for them in the Council Chamber, it being understood that each one of them will be invited to take a seat at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Touré (Guinea) took a place at the Council table; and Mr. G. Sové (Mali), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. N. Barnes (Liberia), Mr. S. A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. A. Psoncak (Yugoslavia), Mr. R. K. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. T. Gebre Igzy (Ethiopia), Mr. R. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. P. Ofwono (Uganda), Mr. S. L. Seh (India), Mr. M. Antoine (Haiti), and Mr. A. Shahi (Pakistan), took the places reserved for them.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda as it appears in document S/Agenda/1563.

4. I wish to inform the members of the Council that the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Syria and Zambia has been circulated as document S/10030.

5. Mr. ESPINOSA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, allow me to start my statement by extending my congratulations to you because it is once again your turn to be President of the Security Council. You represent a great country and, moreover, you are held in high esteem as a statesman and diplomat within the United Nations. I am sure that your guidance of the debates will effectively contribute to the success of the work of the Council during this month. My delegation is pleased to offer you its active cooperation.

6. I also wish to express my admiration to your predecessor, Ambassador Tomeh, the representative of Syria, for the brilliant manner in which he exercised his mandate in a month full of problems and difficulties. I am also most grateful to you, and I wish to state this publicly, for having decided, in consultation with the Secretary-General and the other members of the Council, to include Colombia in the membership of the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea established under resolution 289 (1970) to discharge the specific mandate entrusted to it.

7. To the signal honour of representing the Security Council was added that of sharing grave responsibilities

with distinguished spokesmen from friendly countries, with whom the intense and delicate work was carried out in the greatest harmony, prompted by the desire to find the truth, in order to bring it to the Security Council, together with the explanation of how we had arrived at it and with the basic elements on which we formed our judgement. This task, which was complex in itself, was facilitated by the talent and prudence shown at all times by the Chairman of the Mission, Ambassador Khatri, the representative of Nepal, to whom I am pleased to express my friendship and gratitude. May I also say that I was honoured to have been able to work with such prestigious colleagues as Ambassadors Jakobson, Kujaga and Mwaanga, the representatives of Finland, Poland and Zambia respectively who, in this important trip, also displayed many of the virtues which are characteristic of them.

8. The Secretariat staff acted with exemplary devotion and efficiency, a fact which I deem it necessary to record and applaud. I do so as an elementary act of justice.

9. Personally I never hesitated for a second. Since the President of the Security Council invited me to go to the Republic of Guinea, I recalled a maxim which is well known in Colombia because we quote it frequently—all of us who have gone through its law schools. It states: "The law is without a heart and the magistrate who lends his heart to it thereby violates it." This was, in fact, the frame of mind in which I went to the Republic of Guinea: as a magistrate of the international community has its laws, with no more heart than the internal laws of countries, severe and strict, and which must also be complied with strictly, under pain of incurring the penalty prescribed for those who disobey or violate the law. Such a magistrate could not afterwards declare anything but the truth, as it has been given him to perceive it, giving no thought to the possible results of what he said.

10. The distinguished colleagues on the Special Mission were also magistrates. Hence the objectivity of our report [*S/10009 and Add.1*], the few words we used and its very brevity. It was sufficient for us to describe what we saw, how we saw it and then record our frank opinion on what we saw. No considerations could distort our reasoning. Our honesty and the dignity of the countries which we represented protected us from that. As a spokesman for Colombia it came to my mind that it had been the delegation of my country which had most strenuously fought in San Francisco for embodying in the Charter of the Organization the principle of good faith. I am proud to affirm now that the same good faith guided us and was the essence of the work which we discharged on behalf of the Security Council.

11. No one could have thought that there would be no consequences following on the report of the Special Mission. The preservation of the supreme rules of the international community require timely, effective and equitable decisions.

12. My delegation will proceed in this new phase with the same spirit that guided us in the previous one. And we shall be faithful to a glorious Colombian tradition which has its roots in the very origins of the Republic, when its founding fathers heroically fought for independence and freedom, and which later was integrated in the tradition of the sister republics of America, in our persistent endeavour to create not only a legal consciousness, but also a set of rules, to prevail against the blows of force, to protect our individuality and ensure our right to self-determination.

13. It has been a long road of more than 150 years, with painful setbacks which at no time weakened our spirit nor clouded the minds of those who created our homelands. At this stage of the twentieth century we look back with pride on the foresight of those who created what can rightly be called the law of the Americas. Before, long before the last world conflagration made it necessary for the United Nations to be set up, the American countries had signed on 26 December 1933, the Montevideo Convention<sup>1</sup>, which in its articles 4 and 11 states that the rights of each State do not depend on power to ensure their exercise, "but upon the simple fact of its existence as a person under international law"; nor is it feasible to recognize "territorial acquisitions [nor the] special advantages which have been obtained by force, whether this consists in the employment of arms, in threatening diplomatic representations, or in any other effective coercive measure".

14. As important as those principles are, and even more important, because they reveal the spirit and determination with which they were agreed to and the unshakeable will to put them in practice, is article 8 of the Montevideo Convention, whose text is brief and concise: "No State has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another." That unequivocally means that within the Americas we condemned foreign intervention before any other continent had formulated such a rejection, and that the legal standards of our world were rules of international conduct which only years later were accepted by all States.

15. I trust that the preceding affirmation will not be considered a proof of arrogance. I have mentioned this for the very different purpose of proving that there are certain ideas, certain principles which are a fundamental part of the history of the Americas and, therefore, of Colombian history. We are faithful to them, not because we are sentimental nor because we venerate the past too much, but because we agree with them completely and because we are aware that their implementation is as logical and as necessary today and tomorrow as they were throughout the years when they were transformed from individual and bold or ambitious thoughts into a felt need, into an ideology and doctrine for millions of human beings.

<sup>1</sup> Convention on Rights and Duties of States adopted by the Seventh International Conference of American States (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXV, 1936, No. 3802).

16. The equality proclaimed for States, and respect for which must be uncompromisingly demanded at the risk of perishing, has a necessary corollary: non-intervention. For there will always be small and medium-sized States side by side with the great Powers and even the super-Powers. Rules, principles, law, jurisprudence, are their protective shield, against which the weapons of the ultra-powerful must be shattered. That is the reason for civilization, just as in the past there was a law of the jungle.

17. One cannot remain indifferent when faced with so lofty a principle. Its violation obviously, begins by affecting the smaller or medium-sized nations but culminates in a disaster for the great. We, the countries which lack the means to mobilize gigantic war machinery, must out of preference mount guard to defend that principle—it is our survival which is at stake—but the principle must also be respected by the industrial and warring Powers, since international peace and harmony would otherwise not be feasible.

18. As the representative of Colombia, I approach the study of the delicate matter with which we are dealing from another standpoint too. It is true that the African continent in the last years, and even now, has lived through episodes and adventures which are as far-reaching as those which shook life in our Americas a century and a half ago, when peoples rebelled against a foreign yoke and gained their independence with untold valour and sacrifices. Our forefathers uttered the first cry against colonialism in America about 1810, and started their careful course towards freedom and the quest for the betterment of their peoples. The African peoples are doing the same now or did so recently. Like ourselves and like all peoples in the world they are worthy of having their self-determination and independence to determine their own fate. Their struggle does not surprise us. We understand it with the ever-present memory of our heroes and great statesmen.

19. We have resolved that the land of the Americas will not be the soil for selfishness. Hence our principles, our legal concepts, are not for our exclusive use on our vast territory. When we stigmatize foreign intervention in the life of nations, this condemnation is also valid when the principles of non-intervention is violated in Africa, in Asia, in Europe, in any continent. When we proclaim the right to self-determination, independence and freedom, we never do so for our own benefit; but with a profound sense of solidarity, we therefore view with sympathy and support with fervent enthusiasm the strivings for independence of all peoples. Nations do not always experience at the same time the shining hours of their development. But these shining hours are recognized and arouse feelings of understanding and harmony. We in the Americas are not unaware that Africans are living through this epoch in this century, just as our predecessors did in the last one, resolved to wrest their nations from foreign domination.

20. On the other hand, nor are we unfamiliar with the categorical terms of resolution 1514 (XV), whereby

the General Assembly of the United Nations condemned colonialism and solemnly affirmed the right of peoples to their independence. These were our rules, rules for the Americas, and they became universal rules. The clock of history cannot be stopped. The international community has decreed the extinction of colonialism, and it is not permissible for any country to try to ignore the evolution of the times nor dream of maintaining situations which should have disappeared years ago.

21. One hundred and fifty years ago there was no such organization as the United Nations with its vocation of universality, its purposes of peace and harmony in which the equality of all Member States is axiomatic. In the distant past international organizations did exist but only among the super Powers of the time, which were passionately and vehemently devoted to maintaining the *status quo* and rushing the irresistible march of nations to their liberation. Because of that terrible and bloody wars were necessary, in which valour and lives were wasted on all sides. It would be deplorable if at present violence, destruction and death were required in order that the territories subjected to foreign control might accede to their independence. What would the difference then be? Why should we have the United Nations? Should we be resigned to being convicted of powerlessness? I hope that these questions will lead to adequate responses and correlative action.

22. The foregoing considerations explain the consistent position of Colombia in international assemblies. It is a logical, juridical position, which will be reflected in the final attitude of my delegation with regard to the item now being discussed in the Security Council.

23. An African State has been the victim of reprehensible external armed aggression, which implies a grave violation of the principle of non-intervention. Vast areas of the African continent are still subject to foreign domination, in flagrant contradiction with resolution 1514 (XV).

24. The United Nations, and specifically the Security Council, cannot remain passive. This Organization, besides being a meeting place for the great Powers or a place for the alternative confrontations and meetings of the mind of the super-Powers, must watch over the security of the small and medium-sized nations.

25. The case of the Republic of Guinea is not an isolated one. Were we to tolerate that the external attack of which it was the object remain unpunished, other aggressions would inevitably follow against other States, and nobody knows against how many other States. There would be no peace on earth.

26. These are the reasons why my delegation has decided—and we wish to announce it now—that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Syria and Zambia, which condemns the attack perpetrated on the Republic of Guinea by an invading force which, according to the information available to the

Special Mission of which I was a member, "was assembled in Guinea (Bissau)" and "was carried out by naval and military units of the Portuguese armed forces, acting in conjunction with Guinean dissident elements from outside the Republic of Guinea" [S/10009, para. 41].

27. The draft also declares that the presence of colonialism on the African continent is a serious threat to the peace and security of the independent States of Africa, thus merely reiterating what has already affirmed in resolution 1514 (XV). That at least is now my delegation sees it.

28. The new text is within the framework of resolution 1514 (XV), and it is nothing other than a requirement that that resolution be complied with. No other interpretation would be valid, in the opinion of my delegation. Nor would it be valid to try to link it to any special chapter of the Charter. This draft resolution, in the aspect I have referred to—I think it is fitting to repeat it—can only refer to resolution 1514 (XV), which has been quoted several times.

29. The explanation given here yesterday by the representative of Burundi [1562nd meeting] in introducing the draft resolution on behalf of all the sponsors in regard to the consultations held and the manner in which they took into account important observations, clearly indicates their will for understanding and harmony. My delegation expresses its confidence that it will be adopted unanimously. It would be a historic and far-reaching step, a step towards the consolidation of a new world which is being created with the independence of all countries and which, unlike the past world, should ensure uninterrupted peace for several generations.

30. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank you for your words of welcome to the President of the Council and for your kind assurances of co-operation.

31. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Pakistan, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table.

32. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, the Pakistan delegation is grateful to you and to the other members of the Security Council for according it permission to participate without vote in the discussion of the question currently under consideration by the Council.

33. In requesting this permission, we are not unmindful of the normal construction of Article 31 of the Charter of the United Nations. Nor are we insensitive to the opinion strongly and persuasively expressed that a distinction must be preserved between a debate in the Security Council and one in the General Assembly, with respect at least to the range of participation of Member States. However, when a situation is brought before the Security Council which involves the issue of freedom from armed attack of newly independent Asian and African States, the issue is one which transcends regional boundaries and affects the direct inter-

ests of the entire Asian-African membership of the Organization. It is in the areas of Asia and Africa that colonialism, not any the less destructive because it is anachronistic, still prevails. It is in these areas that the self-determination of peoples is still thwarted. It is in these areas that a number of peoples are still the victims of chauvinism and aggression, some uprooted from their homes, others condemned to living in perpetual fear, all of them prevented from deciding their own future without coercion or constraint. As an Asian nation, Pakistan cannot but be deeply perturbed that no action taken by the Security Council so far has served to provide an assurance that aggression by armed attack is bound to be punished and that the world order envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations will be made a reality as much in Asia and Africa as elsewhere. As an Asian nation, therefore, Pakistan feels it a duty to voice its anxiety over the situation confronting the Republic of Guinea before the Security Council.

34. The question currently under debate has several features which distinguish it from certain other items on the Council's agenda. That it is a case of an armed attack on the territory and government of a Member State is by itself something that lends it a special gravity. But its added distinction is that an authoritative special mission of the Security Council itself has, after careful investigation, confirmed the fact of aggression. There could be no greater clarity than is furnished by the conclusion of the Special Mission that:

"The invasion of the territory of the Republic of Guinea on 22 and 23 November was carried out by naval and military units of the Portuguese armed forces, acting in conjunction with Guinean dissident elements from outside the Republic of Guinea." [S/10009, para. 41.]

35. The degree and scale of the attack or its success or otherwise are factors which affect neither its culpability nor its political ramifications. It is a fact that the Republic of Guinea, like many other newly independent Asian-African States, does not yet dispose of deterrent military power. In its case, therefore, an organized attack on its territory designed to bring about the overthrow of its Government does not become any the less an invasion because it was carried out by a few hundred armed troops. A well-planned attack of a kind which might appear quite minor from outside is enough to threaten the independent life of many a State. It is such a State which, more than any other, needs to be assured by the Security Council that the Council will not let any assault on its political independence or territorial integrity to remain unpunished.

36. My delegation is aware that proposals for suitable action by the Security Council are currently being negotiated among the Council members. It is not my intention to make any statement in prejudice of the outcome of these negotiations. However, my delegation would feel remiss in its duty if it did not make the earnest submission before the Council that the fact of invasion by the forces of one Member State upon the territory of another having been so clearly and

conclusively determined, the matter is now one which calls for measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, the case is one where it can be shown that there is a whole range of such measures available to the Security Council. If the application of one type of measure is not feasible, another can be taken which will be effective and proportionate to the circumstances. It seems to us that the stoppage of military assistance to Portugal and the enforcement against Portugal of reparations for the attack constitute the minimum requisites of this situation. This is an occasion when it is imperative for the Council to prove that, in this day and age, one State cannot invade the territory of another and escape the consequences. This is an occasion when the Council has to move beyond the pronouncement of an anathema in the form of a mere condemnatory resolution. It has to decide upon concrete action including the restitution of damage to the victim State. We must express our deep apprehension that any hesitancy on the part of the Council in this regard will undermine the trust which is the very foundation of international security.

37. There is another consideration on which, we hope, will weigh with the Security Council in reaching its decision on the question. The invasion of the Republic of Guinea by Portugal comes as the culmination of many other actions which were the subject of complaints lodged by the Republic of Guinea, Senegal and Zambia. All these are actions forced on Portugal by its own persistence in its outmoded colonialist course. All these are actions previously condemned by the Security Council. They demonstrate how international peace and security are jeopardized by Portugal's campaign of suppressing the struggle for liberation being waged in African territories now under Portuguese control. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly have affirmed the principle that peoples under colonial or alien domination have the right to receive moral and material support from other Member States in their fight for freedom. The Government of the Republic of Guinea is therefore entitled to the gratitude of other Member States of the United Nations for the support and assistance which it gives to the people of Guinea (Bissau). Portugal's audacity in attacking the Republic of Guinea in order to stop such assistance is an act of determined opposition to the whole process of the liquidation of colonialism in which the United Nations is deeply and vitally involved. It is an act therefore, which, not only calls for commensurate measures by the Security Council. It also underlines the necessity of such courses of action being adopted by the permanent members of the Security Council, in the domain of their own policies, as will exert sufficient pressure on Portugal to abandon its colonialist position in Africa and give expression to the non-racist genius of its own people. If the permanent members of the Security Council could only persuade themselves to act unitedly in the full discharge of their special responsibility for the maintenance of peace and international security, the deplorable attack on the Republic of Guinea—which has rightly been called an attack on Africa—may in retrospect seem to have brought about the end of colonialism and all its attendant tensions and dangers in Africa.

38. Finally, my delegation would urge the Council to bear in mind the long-term implications of Portuguese actions for the situation in Africa. The phrase "a threat to international peace" does not always imply the full consequences of a certain action or situation. Portugal's adventures in a desperate bid to retain its colonial possessions not only have an immediate impact on independent African States. If they are allowed to continue, and in the absence of a peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations to guard against invasions, a situation will develop which will force African States to acquire military weapons, to enlarge their military establishments and, if necessary, to forge new alliances. Year in and year out we debate the question of disarmament in the General Assembly and we all deplore the enormous waste involved in the diversion of mankind's material resources to armaments. Yet there is a situation where an arms race can be prevented, not only by injunctions or appeals, but by a concrete act which would give the African States an assurance against armed attack. It would be an assurance of the needlessness of entering an arms race. The prevention of such a race is one of the prime responsibilities of the Security Council. What it has not been able to achieve in other regions can still be accomplished in Africa. The present is an occasion where it can make a desirable contribution to that end by judicious and timely action.

39. Mr. YOST (United States): Mr. President, I should like to welcome you on your assumption of the Presidency of this Council, an office you have so often filled in the past with your customary distinction and dignity. I assure you of the entire co-operation of my delegation in carrying out the responsibilities of this Council.

40. I should also like to pay a tribute to our President of last month, the representative of Syria, who performed his duties at a difficult time with skill, patience and impartiality.

41. The armed raid made on the Republic of Guinea, which led to the creation of the Special Mission whose report is now before us, is a matter of particular concern to the United States. I should like to emphasize at the outset that the Government of the United States deeply deplores the loss of life and the injuries that resulted from the action, as well as the physical destruction it caused. We view in the most serious light an attack of this nature, which appears to have been prepared and mounted outside the country.

42. President Nixon made that clear in a message he sent to President Touré declaring:

"On behalf of my Government and the American people I should like to express sympathy to you and to the Government and people of the Republic of Guinea in this difficult period. I should like to take this opportunity to renew to you my assurances that the United States opposes any infringement of Guinean national sovereignty or outside interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Guinea."

43. I should like to join in the remarks that have been made commending the work of the Special Mission and to thank its members for a most useful report. The charges under consideration by the Council are extremely serious, and it was fitting and proper that the Council should have made an independent effort to determine the facts before considering what action it wished to take.

44. Clearly, the Special Mission was not able to investigate all the possible elements of this situation, but we congratulate it for its success in gathering a substantial body of data concerning the events of 22 and 23 November.

45. It is evident that in drawing up its conclusions the Special Mission considered all information made available to it with the care and measured judgement a matter of this gravity deserves. Its conclusions were not arrived at lightly or in haste. My Government has no reason to question the Mission's considered opinion and judgement concerning responsibility for the attack.

46. The report concludes that elements of the Portuguese armed forces participated in the armed raid, an action my Government must condemn as contrary to the injunction of the Charter that we should refrain from the use or threat of force directed against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State and in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

47. An event of this nature leads us to ask why it occurred and what can be done to prevent its recurrence. In considering those questions, my Government can agree with those who believe we should view the particular events under discussion in a broader context. That context involves the unrest and violence to which differences over the question of the future of the Portuguese Territories have given rise over almost a decade. My Government has repeatedly made clear, and reaffirms now, its support for the exercise by the people of those Territories of their legitimate right to self-determination. The United States continues to support that principle and will continue to work with those concerned to see it carried out.

48. In working toward that goal, however, my Government believes we must avoid violence and seek peaceful solutions. Violence can only bring counter-violence, with its attendant misery and suffering. No one involved in this situation, least of all the peoples of the territories whose interests we are trying to advance, can gain through resort to force. It is for that reason that the United States provides no arms to Portugal for use in Africa and is unwilling also to provide them to those who would use them against the Portuguese Territories in Africa.

49. Some of the speakers in this Council have objected that the Council did not on 22 November comply with the request of the Government of Guinea by sending at once a United Nations peace-keeping force instead of a fact-finding mission. Let me make two points in regard to that objection. First, it is prop-

er—indeed essential—that the Security Council, the principal organ for the maintenance of peace and security, should do its best independently to ascertain the facts relative to any serious issue on which it is contemplating action. If it did not insist on doing so, it would soon lose its credit and authority and would involve our Organization in the greatest difficulties. Secondly, members of this Council are well aware that the United Nations disposes of no forces that can be sent immediately to a troubled area. My Government has long worked without avail for improved procedures that would permit the prompt dispatch of peace-keeping forces. I hope that those who have spoken out during this debate will in the future give firm support to efforts to strengthen peace-keeping procedures. Fortunately, in the present case the Guinean forces gained control of the situation successfully and rapidly without requiring the help of United Nations forces.

50. I would appeal once again to all concerned to examine their consciences and exert renewed efforts to develop fresh, imaginative approaches to the basic problem underlying so much of the violence that disturbs the normal lives of so many of the people of Africa today. The attack on Guinea must not be repeated, but beyond that we must all redouble our efforts to resolve the more fundamental problem.

51. The spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations commits us and the parties here concerned first of all to seek the solution of disputes likely to endanger peace and security by discussion and by a common will to look for and find peaceful means of settlement. In our view, the draft resolution now before us would be more realistic and do more to promote a peaceful settlement if it also took that view into account.

52. I should like to pay a tribute to the way in which the Afro-Asian members of the Council went about developing the draft resolution submitted on their behalf by the representative of Burundi yesterday [1562nd meeting]. The authors of that draft showed an awareness of some of the special problems associated with this particular complaint. They had the courtesy to seek the views of other members of the Council before deciding to introduce their draft, and we appreciate their consideration. During our consultations with the sponsors we made known our reservations about the Council acting under Chapter VII in this instance. We recognize that, in response to the concerns of my Government and certain other members of the Council, the sponsors made substantial alterations in their original draft, which was circulated informally.

53. I should like to comment briefly at this point on a few aspects of the draft resolution that has been submitted to the Council. I have already indicated the United States position concerning the action of Portuguese forces involved in the armed raid on the Republic of Guinea. There are a number of other provisions of the draft resolution before us, however, that my Government cannot support, and we shall therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.



54. In the view of the United States, the draft resolution does not constitute a finding that a Chapter VII situation now exists, nor could it commit the Council to taking action under Chapter VII in any future situation. Nevertheless, the draft resolution does seem to us to go much too far in this direction and to create presumptions about our future action in a very broad range of situations which are not warranted at this time.

55. We view the events of 22 and 23 November as very serious, but we cannot support the very far-reaching conclusions that some of the provisions of the draft resolution seem to draw from them. With regard to paragraph 6, I have already reiterated the well-known policy of the United States, in effect since 1961, of providing no arms to Portugal for use in Africa. In the view of my delegation, that policy fully meets the objectives of paragraph 6. An effort to broaden the scope of the Council's recommendations concerning assistance to Portugal would be unjustified in our opinion and not in the interests of the people of the African Territories under Portuguese control.

56. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank you for the words you have addressed to the President of the Council and for your offer of co-operation.

57. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

58. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I thank the President and the members of the Council for allowing me to address the Council again on the item under consideration. After having read the report of the Security Council's Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea, my doubts that a European Power had organized the aggression against Guinea have been dissipated. My last statement in the Council [*1558th meeting*] has unfortunately been vindicated.

59. All of the members of the Council may recall what I said: that if Portugal—and it was a big “if”—was really the aggressor, it would indeed be a serious matter. It is most unfortunate that although we know who perpetrated aggression against Guinea, we find that a watered-down draft resolution has emerged after intensive consultation among the Council's members.

60. Why do I say a watered-down draft resolution? Because I had the privilege of seeing the original joint draft resolution, which was turned down by certain Council members. Allegedly, that draft resolution was too strong, and those members considered it as lying outside the pale of the classical Council consensus. I use the word “classical” judiciously, because since the veto has been shelved for the last four or five years, the Council has abjured any confrontation between the members and has opted for a consensus, which is the lowest common denominator of agreement regardless of those who are aggrieved. The consensus, in effect, dealt with platitudes and gave no redress to the victims.

61. I submit that the original draft resolution was turned down by the friends of Portugal, the Portugal which has been absent from these proceedings. Portugal's absence is tantamount to contempt of the Council, but in spite of that contempt, what do we find? The friends of Portugal are very careful to spare its feelings. I do not want to say Portugal; it is the Government of Portugal, because I have known many Portuguese people who are as good and as bad as any one of us here or outside.

62. I must say, with all due respect to those who worked on the latest draft resolution which is before the Council, that it is ineffectual and repetitious, if we consider the provisions of other resolutions that were adopted by the Council under the terms of a consensus. Why?

63. The representative of the United States just mentioned that the Council should not go as far as to apply Chapter VII. Why should there be a mention of Chapter VII in the Charter for that matter? Why did those who formulated the Charter include Chapter VII? Is it only a sort of museum piece in the Charter to be looked at? Is it academic or functional? If it is academic, let us strike it out of the Charter. If it is functional, let us use it.

64. I think that looking at the whole question in retrospect will give us a better perspective and show more clearly why we are confronted with such ineffective resolutions.

65. Our colleague from the United States mentioned that no arms that the United States gives to Portugal are being used—or at least, the United States had seen to it that no such arms were being used—for anything other than the defence of Portugal. But has the United States any jurisdiction over Portugal? Do they tie a red thread into the arms they give them, saying “this is for use in self-defence” and that any of those arms with the red thread tied to them, if they are used abroad, will create a grave situation? What if Portugal untied that thread from the arms that are earmarked for the defence of Portugal? And for defence of Portugal against whom? Spain has no designs on Portugal; that is irrefutable. Nor has France any designs, nor any other European State for that matter, on Portugal.

66. This is why it behoves us to look back into the history of Portugal. If we do not learn any lessons from history, then why should we have history books? I am not talking about historiography, but of history.

67. As you all know, after the destruction of the Carthaginian power by Rome, the civilization of Rome spread over the Iberian peninsula, including, of course, what is now known as Portugal. When Rome declined, barbarian races took over, and the Visigoths ruled, only to be overthrown by the Arabs—who incidentally, stayed for eight centuries in the Iberian peninsula. The Arabs came, under the leadership of Tariq ibn Ziyad, who crossed from Africa with his troops to the Iberian peninsula. He gave his name to Gibraltar—Jebel-Tariq, the mountain of Tariq. Later the Arabs were conver-

ted—they were not chased out, but were converted to Christianity by Isabel and Philip, and many Spanish people, ethnologically speaking, have been Arabs. Towards the end of the eleventh century, Portugal was still an obscure territory, a fief of the Kingdom of León, as I am sure my colleague from Spain will affirm. Its name was derived from a small seaport, Portus Cale. At that time it began to derive the rudiments of civilization, mostly from León and from Arab sources. In the twelfth century, a Portuguese kingdom was established. In the early fifteenth century, the period of exploration began, culminating in the discovery of an ocean route to India. That was in 1497 to 1499. It was from 1499 to 1580 that Portugal acquired a vast empire, including Brazil and possessions in the Old World. But it was not long before Spanish kings were ruling over Portugal, and that was for a period of approximately sixty years, between 1581 and 1640. However, the Portuguese monarchy was restored, after a long struggle lasting from 1640 to 1675. The following seventy years witnessed the reforms of Portugal, which, after the Pensinsular War, led to a change from absolute to constitutional monarchy. That was, if my memory does not falter, in 1833.

68. Why does Spain not lay claim to Portugal, then, since they ruled that land? Why has Spain not said that Portugal is a province of Spain? Because Spain had the good sense to let the people decide for themselves, after the conflict between Spain and Portugal.

69. Why have I mentioned all these historical episodes? Because Portugal claims that its African Territories, including Portuguese Guinea, are provinces. Have you ever heard of provinces of Portugal that are not inhabited by Portuguese?

70. But this is not all. When did Portugal become a Member of our Organization, this United Nations? In 1955. I recall when it was admitted to the United Nations. And under what terms was it admitted? That it would respect the Charter. But Portugal has consistently refused to transmit information to the United Nations on the territories under its administration, on the pretext that they are provinces of Portugal. Those territories include Angola, Mozambique and Guinea, which is known nowadays as Guinea (Bissau). However, it was not until 1969, fourteen years later, that the United Nations, through the General Assembly, expressed its deep concern about the persistent refusal of the Government of Portugal to recognize that its overseas Territories are inhabited by people who are not by any stretch of the imagination Portuguese. We have been calling upon the Government of Portugal to adopt immediate measures for granting the right of self-determination to the territories under its domination. And what do we hear our colleague from the United States say? That we should abjure violence in trying to redress the grievances—I am paraphrasing; that is what he meant by implication—of those against whom a colonial Power, in this instance Portugal, has committed aggression.

71. But why did not the United States—and the European countries, for that matter—not abjure violence

in 1939, when they waged a war that cost them 60 million people? They did not abjure violence. Where is the wisdom of abjuring violence? And against whom is violence committed? Is Guinea trying to invade Portugal? Guinea and Senegal, and every African State, are committed to the liberation of territories that are still under the colonial yoke.

72. Some of our European colleagues, time and again, say: "We should not resort to force". They say that from a guilty conscience. They are the first to resort to force when their economic interests are threatened. But when people who are living under the yoke of foreign domination rebel here and there, they say: "Try and crush them"—as they are trying to do in Palestine. Crush the Palestinian people! Crush the Angolan people! Crush the people of Mozambique!

73. Why? Is there a double standard in the United Nations? It was that double standard that spelt out the dissolution of the League of Nations. Do you want to follow in the wake of the League of Nations and let this Organization founder? I warn you, gentlemen: that is what we are in effect doing.

74. Now, what is the population of Portugal? I am told, between 9 and 10 million—I do not have the exact figures in front of me. But what is the African territory—or what are the territories—under the control of Portugal? About 2 million square kilometres, if I am not mistaken; and 15 to 16 million Africans are still under the yoke of a European Power.

75. What shall we do? adopt another resolution? Let us examine this draft resolution very carefully—first, how the preambular paragraphs begin: "gravely concerned"; "gravely concerned"—another paragraph; "Grieved at the loss of life". And then, in the operative part: "endorses . . . the report of the Special Mission"; "strongly condemns the Government of Portugal"; "demands"—demands from whom? From Portugal? It is treating you with contempt; it is not represented here. Are you demanding *in absentia*? "Appeals to all States to render moral and material assistance to the Republic of Guinea". No one heeded that appeal except a few African sister States, who were ready to render moral and material assistance. But tell me, did any European States send troops—except mercenaries to invade Guinea and perhaps overthrow its Government?

76. "Declares that the presence of Portuguese colonialism on the African continent is a serious threat to the peace and security of independent African States". What has the Security Council been doing since 1955, when Portugal was admitted? What has the Security Council been doing about this threat to the peace and security of independent African States? Do you want to act *post mortem*, when the whole of Africa will rise one day, massacring the Europeans and everyone else from outside the continent who is associated with colonial rule directly or indirectly? Will you act then? It will be too late.

77. Then here is the watered-down paragraph 8: "Solemnly warns the Government of Portugal that in the event of any repetition of armed attacks against independent African States, the Security Council shall immediately consider appropriate effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Why do you not specify those relevant provisions? "Relevant"? Let us know what they are. This only confuses the issue. Why are you afraid to specify those relevant provisions? This is a word that should have been explained by quoting the Charter, not by dismissing it as "relevant".

78. And then the usual thing: "Requests the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution". What can the President of the Council or our illustrious Secretary-General or anyone else do while they sit here in New York, whether they are permanent members or those who are present by rotation? They sit academically on this question.

79. This watered-down draft resolution has no teeth in it and you think you will thereby allay the fears not only of the people of Guinea but of all suppressed peoples, whether they be in Namibia, Guinea (Bissau), Angola, Mozambique, or any other territory or enclave where colonialism prevails?

80. If you will bear with me, I should just like to refer you to the following international instruments: none other than the International Covenants on Human Rights. The first article of each of those Covenants on Human Rights was worked out in the early 1950s, and it was my privilege, together with my colleagues, to elaborate those Covenants—in the early 1950s, mind you, before Portugal had become a Member of the United Nations. What does article 1 of each of those Covenants say? I am referring to the Intervention Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the one hand, and to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, on the other—which were opened simultaneously to the signature of States.

81. Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights reads as follows:

"1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

"2. All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation . . ." <sup>2</sup> etc.

82. Are the people under the yoke of Portugal freely disposing of their natural wealth and resources or are they being exploited? I maintain that not only are these African people being exploited but the people of Portugal are also being exploited because they have to

provide armies and shed their blood. On whose behalf? On behalf of a few, comparatively speaking, on behalf of hundreds, perhaps thousands of Portuguese exploiters. It has happened in other empires that the people of the metropolitan State not only provided men to fight in defense of those narrow interests for the benefit of a few thousand but were also taxed and had to engage in warfare against colonial people. They paid in blood and treasure and this article 1 was enunciated after several years of debate with the metropolitan Powers before Portugal was admitted to the United Nations.

83. Some of us here say, "Portugal is a small country, we should use patience, we should not use violence". I see some members of the Council criticizing others in an academic fashion about peace-keeping operations and so on, in order to rationalize their refusal to act in a manner that will lead to the liberation of those people living under the yoke of a foreign country on the European continent.

84. Is there no solution? Of course there is a solution. What am I here for, just to tell you the things you know? There is a solution, but I dare the Council to put in a paragraph about that solution. It is not too late, but I am sure it will refuse. What is the solution? The solution is very simple, it is not even conceptual, it does not need exploration. All you have to do is to use common sense and be faithful to the principles of the Charter. We know very well that Portugal is a member of NATO, an alliance. In Europe there is NATO and there is the Warsaw Pact. We are told that the *raison d'être* of NATO is to defend Europe. I am not going to tell you from whom, you know who it is. But does membership of NATO mean that its members can commit acts of aggression against territories abroad? What kind of club is this? Since Portugal is a member of that club called NATO, if it errs, we will chastise it by words and we will allay the fears of those simple Africans. They are young and immature, we will appease them; they are good-hearted. I have known them and they are very good-hearted and trustful, but they are beginning to be a little foxy. Those Africans do not rely on empty promises. The Asians passed through that stage of being good-hearted with the colonists, but our African brothers are learning the hard way not to believe in empty promises.

85. If I were a member of the Security Council, I would have a paragraph calling upon members of NATO not to sit in judgement over Portugal but to question it. After all, Portugal is a small State and one should not pass hasty judgements on any State. But why does not the United States, the most powerful member of NATO, and our French colleagues, who have also fought for the liberty of peoples under de Gaulle— may God rest his soul in peace—interrogate that country. At one time, before de Gaulle, France also alleged that Algeria was a province of France. I used to ask them in the 1950s: "What separates France from Algeria—the sand?" It took a man of the stature of de Gaulle to change that. they do come like him every day or every year or even perhaps in fifty years. He was a man who stood for justice, who liberated

<sup>2</sup> See General Assembly resolution 2220 A (XXI), annex.

the Algerians who were fighting for their independence. It fell to me to inscribe the Algerian item on the agenda; I know about it, because I worked on that item. It took a man like de Gaulle.

86. We do not think that the Portuguese have anyone with charisma, with statesmanship nowadays, because, after all, as I said, the Portuguese themselves are the victims of their Government which conscripts and sends them to fight and kill the Africans for the benefit of a few thousand persons who are exploiting both Africa and their own people.

87. All you would have to do, members of NATO, would be to call on Portugal in a friendly manner and tell it that a Mission was sent to Africa under the guidance and chairmanship of our illustrious colleague and friend from Nepal, and say to Portugal, "Listen here, there is an investigation going on. Is it true?" They may say "It is not true", but they cannot say that much when they talk in private. The members of NATO, including the United States, would be in duty bound to report to the Council and tell us what Portugal has told them. That is an effective way of going to the root of the matter.

88. Why has no one thought of inserting a paragraph like that, to ask the NATO members to call on the representatives of the Government of Portugal and discuss this alleged aggression—and I say "alleged" because I am not a judge sitting on a tribunal. We will still give them the benefit of the doubt regarding this "alleged" aggression against Guinea.

89. Secondly, another important paragraph could have mentioned something else. Either NATO is solely defensive or it has a dual role: to defend itself from outside aggression and to perpetrate aggression if that serves its interests. If a member of NATO, a body which is dedicated to self-defence, errs, it should be brought to task and should be disciplined just as the doctor in the medical association is expelled if he does not obey the code. A lawyer in the Bar Association or in an association of lawyers would be expelled in a similar case. But we should not be too hopeful that we shall reach the second paragraph which I am suggesting. Let us first ask our friends, the members of NATO, to call on Portugal quietly and confront it with the report of the Mission that was sent to Guinea and let it answer and let the members of NATO which sit on this very Council tell us what happened.

90. This would be an effective way of dealing with the situation. We should not endlessly condemn. People have become thick-shinned like crocodiles. They do not care about condemnation. "Deplores", "condemns," the same rubrics, the same stereotype phrases in the preamble as well as in the operative part of resolutions.

91. But this is not all. We seem to have forgotten that our Charter has a chapter which deals with Trusteeship. Nowadays we use the Trusteeship Chamber for meetings of the Committees of the General Assembly, because fortunately most of the colonies

have been liquidated. Why does the Security Council not think of putting some life into the Trusteeship Council? And through the NATO members, and also members which have economic ties with Portugal—they need not be NATO members—say, "You cannot keep the lid on those millions and millions of Africans. Why do you not abdicate your alleged responsibilities towards the people? Why do you not bring those Territories within the pale of the Trusteeship Council, conjointly with other trustees?" We do not want Portugal to be expelled from Africa. Let it be a co-trustee of those Territories. Let there be some African co-trustees; and some of our Scandinavian friends, if they want to be neutral about them, or the Swiss, for that matter, or the Austrians, to prepare those Trust Territories for independence.

92. We should like to see Portugal benefit economically, because it has had a long history and an economic and political background. We do not want to change it, but Portugal cannot claim that Mozambique, Angola and Portuguese Guinea are mere provinces. For our friends from Spain would say, "Well, we will go back to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and claim Portugal as a province". The Spanish preceded Portugal. No, you will not do that, because the Spanish are content with their country.

93. In conclusion, there are two things: first, NATO should investigate the question and report to the Council; secondly, the Council should seriously negotiate through NATO to see whether it would be feasible to put those Territories under Trusteeship on the understanding that Portugal would be one of the co-trustees. Then there would be no friction. There would be no aggression one day against Guinea, and another day against Senegal, or a third day against someone else in Africa.

94. That is the role that the Security Council, I humbly submit, should play. For if we do not take any new action of that kind we shall become repetitious. Also we may expose ourselves to the whole world as being ineffectual. And I am afraid, from what I saw in the 1930s, during the era of the League of Nations, that this Organization which should maintain not only peace, but peace with justice and equity, will then founder. There is no alternative to the United Nations and we might just as well know that and repeat it. But, at the same time, if the United Nations becomes anaemic, then it will dissolve. Therefore we should see to it that we strengthen its sinews not by engaging in violence but by trying every ingenuous method to make it a going concern.

95. MR. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the destiny of the highest body of the United Nations has been entrusted to you in circumstances painful for the Organization of African Unity, since the dignity of one of its most valiant Members has been injured by an act of infamous aggression from abroad. Nevertheless if the present situation causes us bitterness, we do have reasons for compensatory pride. The Security Council is called upon to make good the wrong done to a sovereign State by

Portugal, at a time when the Council's presidency is held by one of the most ardent advocates of the liberation of African peoples. The major part played by the Soviet Union, for more than a decade, in the decolonization of our continent, compels the admiration and commands the gratitude of those that have benefited from this active friendship. As for yourself, Sir, your diplomatic seniority and great political experience, the fruits of a hard-working career stretching over some twenty years, have left their clear imprint on the history of the international community. To those trump cards we should add other human qualities that are not less appreciated: your simplicity and your affability, which have won you the wide popularity you enjoy in all diplomatic circles in the United Nations and which invariably put you in the thick of things.

96. In the course of this year you have on many occasions, particularly last January, during my presidency of the Security Council, and on 13 October 1970 during your impressive statement on the strengthening of international security at the 1738th meeting of the First Committee, you had the generosity to emphasize the contribution of my country, Burundi, to international peace and security, despite its modest size.

97. My delegation, in turn, is happy to express its gratitude to you for the encomiums addressed to its country, and pays tribute on behalf of the Government of Burundi to the Soviet Union for its dynamic role in the struggle for the emancipation of Africa.

98. May your great country, side by side with Africa, hasten the death-blow directed against the bastions of colonialism on our continent. The some five million citizens of Burundi, under the prestigious leadership of His Excellency Mr. Michel Micombero, President of the Republic, will continue to play the part incumbent on them in working for the peace and security of nations.

99. These past weeks we have seen an aggressor caught red-handed. At the time of its previous attacks on African countries, the Portuguese Government never confessed its crimes or admitted its guilt for those crimes. It tried instead to exculpate itself by making declarations as fallacious as they were evasive.

100. The objective of the Security Council Special Mission, in addition to establishing that an independent State's national sovereignty had been violated, was to unmask Portugal's falsification of the facts, a falsification which has become its sole legal recourse before this distinguished body.

101. In its blindness, Portugal cannot grasp the fact that the Security Council, wearied of Lisbon's impostures, resolved to remedy these by the dispatch of a mission whose members have distinguished themselves both by their moral rectitude and by their political stature and diplomatic skill.

102. My delegation would like here to salute Mr. Khatri, the Chairman of the Mission, and Mr. Espinosa, Mr. Jakobson, Mr. Kujaga and Mr.

Mwaanga. Their report, based on a variety of sources, illustrates the professional approach and real skill with which these pilgrims of peace discharged objectively and impartially the important, delicate and complex mission that was entrusted to them.

103. The success of the Special Mission, nevertheless, cannot be referred to without being directly linked with the crucial role played by the Ambassador of Syria, whose far-sightedness we must thank for the judicious choice of the members. As president of the Council for November, Mr. Tomeh displayed both energy and effectiveness, those two criteria being imperative in the circumstances created by the Portuguese aggression. We are very grateful for the skill with which he conducted the Council's proceedings.

104. Secretary-General U Thant, who had a lion's share in this healthy precedent in the annals of the Council, is entitled to our unreserved gratitude and our limitless esteem, which he has so greatly deserved thanks to his unflinching dedication to the cause of Africa.

105. Cynicism carried to the point of frenzy: the testimony and the facts, which flooded in from all quarters, impute to Portugal the invasion of which the Republic of Guinea was the Victim. Whereas diplomats representing opposed ideologies and even antagonistic interests, persons belonging to different professions such as a Belgian professor and a Yugoslav doctor, official authorities and ordinary citizens of the Republic of Guinea, prisoners and captured mercenaries, newspapers whether favourable or hostile to the Guinean régime, neighbouring countries whether or not friends of the Republic of Guinea, foreign circles whether admirers or detractors of the Guinean Head of State, Powers outside Africa sympathetic or indifferent to the fate of the Guinean people, partisans or opponents of African unity, all agree as to the authenticity of the report contained in document S/10009 and Add. 1, of the Special Mission, while the Lisbon Government alone disputes its veracity—that is brazenness carried to the point of frenzy by the devious Portuguese.

106. Even caught in the very act, Portugal has the audacity to add insult to injury by braving the unanimity of eye and ear-witnesses.

107. Everything goes to prove that Portugal prepared, planned and executed the plot to attack a sovereign State in violation of the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 2, paragraph 4, which prohibits the threat or use of force against the national sovereignty or political independence of any State.

108. Despite this mass of evidence and proof against Lisbon, the Portuguese leaders alone endeavour not only to call in question but even to challenge the credibility and integrity of the Special Mission and the Security Council and of all the most prestigious international figures, from all circles, even to the very ranks of Portugal's allies, who directly or indirectly, in one form

or another, have ventured to recognize the overwhelming proof that Portuguese armed forces, were landed from warships and overran the territory of a free country to besiege its capital.

109. This is a crushing indictment. Let us suppose that the reality were such as Lisbon would have us believe. According to that argument Portugal is the target of false accusations which, this time at least, are not the doing of the fanatical Afro-Asian Group acting in connivance with the socialist States that are bitter enemies of "great democracy", incarnated in a régime which is in every respect fanatically fascist, but rather the result of a world conspiracy. It is dumbfounding that Portugal, placed in the dock in such a concerted manner and facing such a crushing indictment, should confine its defence to the circulation of notes verbales in the United Nations and the publication and circulation of mere communiqués in Lisbon. The Portuguese Government, setting aside its partner in Pretoria, is of course the most delinquent Member of our Organization. The representatives and leaders of a country whose behaviour is diametrically opposed to the ideals and principles of the Charter, both in its aberrant colonialism and its shocking aggressiveness, would surely not dare to appear before the international tribunal.

110. The picture we have painted in our statement calls more than ever for recourse by the Security Council to Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. If the provisions contained in these Articles are not applied, notwithstanding the repeated brazen challenge of Lisbon to the well-meaning resolutions adopted in the past, it will be vain to pretend that the punishment inflicted on the Portuguese Government is proportional to the enormity of its aggression against a State Member of the United Nations.

111. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Burundi for the kind words he has spoken about the Soviet Union and about the President of the Security Council.

112. Mr. NICOL (Sierra Leone): My delegation, in sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document S/10030 of 7 December 1970, would again like to thank the Chairman of the Special Mission, Ambassador Khatri of Nepal, and the other members, for their report which was produced under such difficult circumstances. We should also like, Mr. President, to thank your delegation and the other delegations on the Council and those which have been invited to speak for the strong support they have given to the spirit of the draft resolution.

113. My delegation would never accuse this body of any kind of prejudice. But we are inclined to wonder whether, if the aggressor had not been a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or if the country attacked had not been a black African country, and one committed to socialism, events in the Council would not have taken a different trend in speed and substance when the matter was first reported.

114. To return to more detailed examination of the report, as we did in our last intervention on Friday [1559th meeting], we have been informed that the Special Mission was offered the possibility of interviewing all seventy or so prisoners of war captured by the Guinean army, but that it decided, quite rightly, to interview instead a sample of them. That testimony is included in the addendum to the report. The full details of the campaign were given by some of those prisoners. It has been admitted by the Government of Portugal that one of the key witnesses was an officier of the Portuguese armed forces. It should also be noted that another of the key witnesses before the Special Mission was the United States Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea, a man of obvious integrity who was interested in giving only facts and not political opinion.

115. The complicity of the Portuguese Government is demonstrated by the fact that the white Portuguese prisoners who were in Guinea have now arrived in Lisbon. The racialism and hypocrisy of the Portuguese Government when it speaks of racial brotherhood is demonstrated again by another fact, that is, that the Portuguese invaders freed the white Portuguese prisoners in Conakry during the raid and left behind the black Portuguese African prisoners, who had served them equally and had been captured by the liberation movement led by Mr. Amilcar Cabral.

116. The draft resolution states, in the third paragraph of its preamble:

*"Gravely concerned that the invasion of the territory of the Republic of Guinea on 22 and 23 November 1970 from Guinea (Bissau) was carried out by naval and military units of the Portuguese armed forces, and by the armed attack against the Republic of Guinea on 27 and 28 November 1970."*

117. Members will note that the invasion was found to have been launched from Guinea (Bissau) and that this was established by the fact-finding Mission. A certain section of the international press has tried to place the origin of the invasion in Sierra Leone. They have tried to confuse the issue and deflect the beam of condemnatory light from Portugal. They have failed. The Governments of Sierra Leone and the Republic of Guinea have had a long history of friendship, buttressed both by family ties and by continuing affection, which will remain and be strengthened long after the last arrogant, imperialist Portuguese invader has been driven from the shores of the African continent as they were from the Indian subcontinent.

118. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I have no more speakers on my main list. If no other members of the Security Council or representatives who have been invited by the Council to participate in the discussion of this item wish to take the floor, we shall consider the general debate concluded.

119. The next stage of our work today is to vote on the draft resolution in document S/10030. Before we proceed to a vote, however, I shall give the floor

to those members of the Security Council who have asked to speak in explanation of vote before the vote is taken.

120. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): In the consultations which the sponsors of the draft resolution held yesterday with other members of the Council, my delegation, along with several other delegations, put forward some suggestions designed to make the draft more widely acceptable. Our main purpose in making those suggestions was to make it clear that the Security Council would not be committed in advance to considering any recurrence of an armed Portuguese attack against an independent African State as a situation requiring the measures envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. We believe the Council should be free to consider each situation on its merits without being either bound in advance to one particular set of measures or precluded from using any of the possibilities offered by the Charter. In practical terms, the members of the Council in any event freely determine, separately in each case, whatever course of action they regard as appropriate. We are grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking into account those suggestions, which were made by several delegations, and for submitting a text which we believe implies no advance commitment of the kind I have mentioned. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

121. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation did not participate in the general debate and this should surprise no one since, as is known, the factual part of the report of the Special Mission—that is, the verbatim records of the meetings and the written statements—have not been published in French. That is regrettable, not only for my delegation, but also for all French-speaking delegations, particularly those of Africa, who have been unable to take cognizance of this important document. This is all the more bizarre since most of the statements which appear in the document were made in French, and most of the hearings were conducted in that language.

122. That practice is not new, but it is most shocking. At the very least it reflects a defect of organization. There would have been no translation problem, since there was nothing to translate. Out of consideration for our African friends, we did not wish to slow down or halt the work of the Council. We shall, however, adopt a less conciliatory attitude if such methods are repeated.

123. We therefore regret that we have been unable to study the report of the Special Mission as thoroughly as we would have wished, and to be able to give only rather general views on it. We first wish to pay a tribute to our eminent colleagues, who have accomplished a praiseworthy task in the confining conditions and limited time of which we are aware, and in particular, we pay tribute to their Chairman, our colleague from Nepal.

124. It is, nevertheless, difficult for us to endorse the report submitted to us. In some parts it is obscure;

in others it would have gained had it been more thorough. Some of the indications it contains seem to be affirmations of principle rather than testimony. However, the report does represent an important contribution in determining the facts.

125. One point at least seems to be clear: the Republic of Guinea was the subject of an armed attack by persons coming from Guinea (Bissau). We formally condemn that aggression. Even though the attack took place in conditions which have not been made entirely clear, we believe that in one way or another the responsibility of the Government of Portugal is involved. The Government of Portugal is responsible for what happens on a territory over which it claims sovereignty; consequently it is responsible for undertakings that are fomented from such a territory. As soon as news of the events of 22 November reached us, and the Security Council was convened, my delegation, while denouncing that attack, endeavoured to demand its immediate cessation, the withdrawal of foreign troops and the sending of a special mission.

126. My country has always protested, and protests now, against any attack on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State, against any outside support for internal subversion, against any interference in the internal affairs of a country. That is true on whatever continent it may happen, whatever the size, political, economic or social régime of the country in question. But it is particularly grave when what is at stake is the fate of a country whose independence is still comparatively recent.

127. The Council will understand how we feel concerning the case of Guinea. We were first to recognize its right to independence and we gave it, as we gave all the countries we administered, the possibility freely to choose their own road. Allow me to express our sympathy to the Republic and people of Guinea and also to its President, whose passion for the well-being of Africa and whose uncompromising dignity I have known personally for a long time.

128. We are most happy that the Government of Conakry was able to repel the attackers and has the situation under control. While we rejoice at the happy outcome of the affair, we should nonetheless remain vigilant and we do not intend to accept any undertaking which might jeopardize the independence, sovereignty and integrity of the Republic of Guinea.

129. It is in this spirit that my delegation intends to look at the draft resolution before us. Some of its paragraphs are very acceptable and we would be prepared to pronounce ourselves in favour of them. Other paragraphs seem more questionable. We cannot, in particular, associate ourselves with certain formulations, nor with certain assertions in regard to which much remains to be clarified. We are grateful, of course, to the sponsors for having deleted any reference to Chapter VII of the Charter. Nevertheless, several provisions of the text still prompt legal reservations on our part, which we already have had occasion to express in regard to similar resolutions.

130. It is in view of those considerations that we shall not prevent the adoption of the draft resolution and we shall abstain.

131. Sir COLIN CROWE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, since this is the first occasion on which I have spoken this month, I wish to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in welcoming you to the presidency of the Council, an office which you have filled so excellently before. I know you will do so again and I assure you of the co-operation of my delegation.

132. I should also like to pay a tribute to our outgoing President, the representative of Syria, for the distinguished manner in which he so ably carried out his duties last month. We are most grateful to him.

133. I must begin by expressing the sympathy of my delegation to the Government and people of Guinea for the loss of life and property which they have suffered as a result of the attack which they underwent on 22 November. I should also like to express my appreciation to this Council's Special Mission, for the devotion and speed with which they worked.

134. The draft resolution now before us is the outcome of the report of the Special Mission, and so perhaps I should turn to the sending of the Special Mission first and say a few words about that.

135. On 22 November—or, to be strictly accurate, in the early hours of 23 November—the Council quite rightly decided to address itself first to trying to establish the facts of the situation. This was the obvious and logical thing to do first and it is the approach that my delegation has always recommended in such cases.

136. The method chosen, namely the dispatch of a Special Mission of selected members of the Security Council, has been warmly endorsed as though it were a new departure. In fact, of course, there are many precedents for the Security Council appointing sub-committees or commissions of its members to examine evidence and report back to the Security Council, just as there are many precedents for the Security Council asking the Secretary-General to send a special representative or representatives to examine and report. Our procedure on this occasion recognized both the role of the Secretary-General and the authority of the Security Council and its members. I hope that those who see this as an encouraging new departure will be equally ready not to put obstacles in the way of other peace-keeping operations when they come to be considered.

137. As I have already said, we are all indebted to those of our colleagues who agreed to serve on this Special Mission. I should also like to pay a tribute to the hard-working members of the Secretariat who deserve congratulations for the speed and efficiency with which the report was produced, at least, that is to say, in English. In such cases it is never easy to establish facts in precise detail after the event. The Mission was not able to conduct a judicial inquiry as such. Nevertheless, my Government considers that the

oral evidence received, taken together with strong circumstantial evidence, justifies the general conclusions presented by the Special Mission in its report.

138. We deplore these events and the behaviour of those responsible for them. As my Government has said many times, we cannot condone the use of force in such circumstances, whoever may use it. In the present case the facts as established by the United Nations Special Mission justify strong condemnation of the Portuguese authorities for this attack.

139. This was an exceptionally grave incident. But it cannot ultimately profit anyone to let accusations outrun the facts. Many speakers in the debate have sought to widen the discussion from the specific incidents involved to impute motives and actions to others for which there is not only no evidence in the present case but no foundation in fact. I refer in particular to allegations that have been made against NATO and its members as perpetrators of "crimes" against Africa and as "the worst enemies of Africa". Such accusations are quite unjustified and I must reject them entirely.

140. NATO is a defensive alliance to preserve the freedom and independence of the countries which belong to the alliance within the NATO area, which does not include any part of the African continent. NATO has no responsibility for the defence outside its area of the overseas territories of any of its members; in other words, it has no responsibility for the defence of Portuguese overseas territories. NATO as such does not supply arms or military aid to Portugal; any arms supplied to Portugal are on a bilateral basis.

141. As regards the United Kingdom Government, for which alone I can speak on this issue, no arms or military equipment have been supplied by us for use in Portuguese overseas territories since the adoption of Security Council resolution 180 (1963) on 31 July 1963. In spite of the loose accusations that are often made, no evidence has ever been advanced that arms supplied to Portugal by the United Kingdom in recent years are being used in its African territories. Paragraph 6 of this resolution in fact reflects just our policy.

142. With regard to the draft resolution, I should like to place on record the position of my delegation concerning the references in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5 to "a serious threat to the peace and security of independent African States". Paragraph 5 in particular goes beyond the scope of the report of the Special Mission and these references are at most descriptive expressions which respond to the understandable concern and apprehension of States in this region.

143. By this wording these paragraphs do not constitute, either separately or together, a determination of the existence of a threat to the peace in the technical sense of Article 39 of the Charter. Neither of them embodies the positive and definite assertion of the existence of a threat to the peace which that Article envis-



ages. The first is a preambular statement of concern and the second is couched in the terms of a declaration rather than a determination.

144. As regards paragraph 8, my delegation considers that, in the event of the circumstances referred to, the Council is free to proceed under whatever provisions of the United Nations Charter it considers appropriate to the case.

145. I should also like to mention the reference in paragraph 9 to "obligations under Article 25". We do not, for the reasons which I have explained earlier, interpret this reference as applying to the present resolution or as suggesting that this resolution itself involves a decision under Chapter VII.

146. To sum up, therefore, my Government is glad that steps were first taken to establish the facts of the situation. We accept the general conclusions of the report of the Special Mission. We agree that a severe condemnation by the Security Council of those concerned in the attack on the Republic of Guinea is justified. We do not agree, however, that the situation in question justifies a determination of a threat to the peace in the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter. In our view, the draft resolution does not do this; but the wording of certain paragraphs is obscure. There are also certain other elements in this draft resolution which seem to go beyond what is reasonably justified by the Mission's report.

147. For these reasons we shall abstain on the draft resolution.

148. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his remarks about the President.

149. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to congratulate you, on your accession to the presidency of this lofty body. You are a veteran of the United Nations and have held your present office on several occasions in the past, and the debates over which you have presided and those you are conducting at this session are proof of the objectivity which guides your actions. My delegation, therefore, on congratulating you, also wishes to state that in the discharge of your duties you can always count upon our co-operation.

150. I also wish to congratulate the representative of Syria, my illustrious friend Ambassador Tomeh. It was he who guided our debates during the past month, and, like my other colleagues here, I wish to pay tribute to him for the way he discharged his duties. He knows that in my country we deplore the fact that an important part of Syria remains under foreign occupation, and we most earnestly hope that this will be brought to an end.

151. My delegation has studied with due attention the report of the Special Mission—although we have not had the text in Spanish. In view of response to the appeal made by you, Mr. President, I only wish

to place on record this minor oversight and I should like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Mission for the work it accomplished. To the Government of Guinea we also wish to offer our deepest condolences for the considerable number of casualties, when Guinea had to confront the gravest situation ever experienced in the history of its country. We were impressed by the statement made by Mr. Ismael Touré, Minister of Finance, before the members of the visiting Mission of the Security Council. It contains a dramatic recollection of the facts, together with an entire philosophy regarding the inability of this Council to act with the required swiftness at times when aggressions are committed against Member States. Perhaps the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations will, in the light of this grave experience, devise some formula which, in due course, will make it possible for this body to act with the necessary effectiveness it lacks today.

152. The visiting Mission, in our opinion, while staying in Guinea, arrived at the conclusions set forth in section III of its report, document S/10009. Perhaps a longer stay and broader contacts would have made it possible for the Mission to lay a more solid foundation for its conclusions. In any case, my delegation repudiates any foreign invasion or interference in any State. Nevertheless, in our view, the draft resolution perhaps goes rather beyond what we would have wished, and my delegation therefore feels compelled to abstain.

153. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Spain for his words of welcome to me as President of the Security Council.

154. I should like to inform the Council that the list of those wishing to speak before the vote is now exhausted. I should also like to state that, before proceeding to the vote, a number of delegations expressed the wish to speak in explanation of their votes after the vote.

155. I now call upon the Security Council to vote on the five-Power draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Burundi, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Syria and Zambia, which has been circulated to the Council as document S/10030. The representative of Burundi was kind enough to read out the full text of the draft yesterday and since no changes have been made in the text since then, I see no reason for it to be read out again; everyone is quite familiar with it. I therefore request the Council to proceed to vote on the draft resolution.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*<sup>3</sup>

156. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

157. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): I apologize for the delay and inconvenience caused by this intervention, but I have asked to speak in order to express my deep personal gratitude to my colleagues, the members of the Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea—Ambassador Espinosa of Colombia, Ambassador Jakobson of Finland, Ambassador Kujaga of Poland, and Ambassador Mwaanga of Zambia—for the kindness and consideration they have shown towards me. I feel honoured and privileged to have been associated with such distinguished and widely respected members of the Security Council and I have greatly enjoyed working with them in the fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to the Special Mission under paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 289 (1970). Each of those esteemed colleagues displayed objectivity, responsibility and personal integrity of the highest order.

158. I should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretariat staff, whose advice and assistance were invaluable to the Special Mission in the performance of its task.

159. The Security Council has endorsed the conclusions in the report of its Special Mission. To each member of the Mission this, I am sure, is a source of great satisfaction.

160. Finally, on behalf of the members of the Special Mission, I should also like to thank all delegations which were kind enough to express their satisfaction at the work of the Special Mission.

161. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Guinea.

162. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has reached the end of its debate—a debate which began almost two weeks ago, during a most tragic time for the people of Guinea.

163. The Security Council, as soon as it received the appeal addressed to it by the Guinean Head of State, Comrade Ahmed Sekou Touré, thought fit to dispatch a mission to the Republic of Guinea—a mission which some speakers have described as being unique in the history of the United Nations and of the Security Council. May I say here that the Government and people of Guinea, during those tragic hours through which they were passing, had placed enormous trust in the United Nations. May I also say how quick was our disappointment at the response to our tragic appeal—which was supported by our faith in the United Nations—for the dispatch of United Nations forces to the Republic of Guinea because of the considerable

forces which were present not only off our coast, but on our very soil and in our capital.

164. The Government and people of Guinea have learned through inspiring and convincing experience that no invading force can overcome the strength and resistance of a people that is resolved to defend its freedom and the territorial integrity of its country.

165. The Mission that was dispatched to the Republic of Guinea, despite all the diversionary manoeuvres attempted by the eternal enemies of Africa, was able to establish the facts and realities of the situation. It was also able to carry out its mandate with the co-operation of the Government of the Republic of Guinea which, despite the very tragic circumstances, did not hesitate to make available to your Mission all the facilities at its disposal which it thought necessary.

166. The conclusions contained in the Mission's report, have been the subject of doubts and challenges in certain obvious quarters, whose only attitude in the face of the truth is to deny it.

167. The debate which has just taken place goes far beyond my own little country. The events that took place in Guinea are a final warning to the Security Council, the organ primarily responsible for safeguarding international peace and security. Must the African countries consider that their defence and their security will be taken into account only to the extent that they enjoy the sympathy and esteem of those that unconditionally support Portugal? Portugal has committed an act of flagrant armed aggression against the sovereignty and integrity of a Member State. The Charter of the United Nations—our Charter—in Chapter VII stipulates the appropriate sanctions in such cases; but since it is an African State, certain members of the Council have felt that to invoke Chapter VII went beyond whatever decisions or measures could be taken when it was an African State that found itself the victim of aggression.

168. The Republic of Guinea paid for this; it takes note of the fact. Africa paid for this; it is aware of the fact; it takes note of it, for tomorrow Africa meets in Lagos, in the light of the decisions that you have taken here.

169. We should like to believe that all the tokens of sympathy given us here are indicative not of sympathy for the Government of Guinea, its President Ahmed Sekou Touré, or the people of Guinea, but far more for the shining cause in whose defence the Republic of Guinea fell victim. This cause is inseparable from international peace and security. The resolution does not state that if an African country is the victim of a flagrant act of open armed aggression by a Member State, that constitutes a threat to peace and security; it merely says it is a threat to the security of the African States.

170. Must we then conclude that the Security of African States is inseparable from world security? Or rather that the African States are Member States, but on a lower level, and that the sanctions that should be

<sup>3</sup> See resolution 290 (1970).

imposed on aggressor countries like Portugal depend on the colour of the victim's skin or on the continent from which he hails? We refuse to believe such things.

171. But we should merely like to state before the Security Council, as it concludes its debate, that Portugal has woken us up to the problem of our own survival, and has helped to teach us that the defence of our liberty and independence can come only from ourselves.

172. Portugal has effectively helped to give concrete shape to the active solidarity of Africa, because friendly countries, brother countries, everywhere in Africa, from the east to the west, from the north to the centre, have mobilized themselves to defend what is dearest to every one of us here: our freedom and independence.

173. We should like here before the Security Council to express our deep gratitude to these friendly and fraternal countries, to all those who in the debate have expressed their active solidarity and sympathy with the struggle being waged by the people of Guinea, which is inseparable from the struggle we are waging on the international level to defend peace, justice and international security.

174. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I should like, in my capacity as representative of the SOVIET UNION, to make the following statement on behalf of the USSR delegation.

175. The delegation of the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction that in its decision the Security Council strongly condemns the aggressor for the aggression it has committed against independent and sovereign African States. The Council has thus responded as it should to the unanimous appeal of the African States, many representatives of which have spoken here, to the effect that Portugal, a State member of NATO, should be censured and strongly condemned for its aggression against a free and independent African country. Those who have spoken have also rightly observed that a mere condemnation is not enough. The fact that Council resolution 290 (1970) includes a provision indicating that the aggressor bears material responsibility for the damage sustained should therefore be regarded as a positive factor.

176. The Security Council's approval of this principle of the responsibility of the aggressor is all the more important because the fact that imperialist States are continuing to commit or are supporting acts of aggression with impunity in various parts of the world has encouraged and is encouraging colonialists and aggressors to commit similar acts against other newly independent States. It is also highly significant that in its resolution the Council calls upon all States to refrain from providing the Government of Portugal with any military and material assistance, since it is only such assistance that enables Portugal, an under-developed country, to commit its international crimes and aggression against African countries. We cannot agree with the United Kingdom representative who endeavoured to prove that the weapons supplied by NATO countries

to Portugal can shoot in only one direction (he did not say in which direction, but that is well known), and that they are not shooting at Africa. Experience shows that they shoot in the direction of Africa just as in any other direction. As the representative of Saudi Arabia has brilliantly demonstrated here, weapons cannot be divided into those that shoot in one direction and those that shoot only in another. Weapons are weapons, and in the hands of the aggressor they are directed against the victims of aggression. The Security Council will expect this appeal, which is addressed primarily to Portugal's military allies, to be complied with by them. The whole of Africa, united in its noble impulse of fraternal solidarity in defence of the rights, interests and security of the Republic of Guinea which has been the victim of unprovoked aggression, will now be watching to see how this provision is carried out.

177. Accordingly, the provision prohibiting assistance to the Portuguese colonialists on the one hand and the second of the provisions appealing for assistance to the victims of aggression on the other constitute an important aspect of the Security Council resolution.

178. The resolution reflects—although inadequately and, I should say, weakly—the just demand of the African and Asian States that the presence of Portuguese colonialism in whatever part of the African continent should be brought to an end.

179. In the Council's discussion of this item the Soviet delegation strongly supported the position of the African and Asian States as set forth in the original version of their draft, in which they called for a clearer and more definite reference in the Council's resolution to the application of sanctions against aggression, against Portugal as the aggressor, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

180. The Soviet delegation insisted that in its decision on the application of sanctions against Portugal for the aggression it has committed the Council should take the action provided for in Article 41 of the Charter.

181. The aggressor has been officially unmasked by the Council's Special Mission. The fact of aggression has been established, and the aggressor should be punished. The Security Council should apply the sanctions against aggression provided for in Article 41 of the Charter. The Soviet delegation insisted on this.

182. Furthermore, we proposed that if after such a decision was taken the aggressor disregarded it and committed another act of aggression, Article 42, which provides for stronger action against the aggressor, should be invoked.

183. Unfortunately, the aggressor had fairies on its side in the Security Council. According to myth and legend there are both good and bad fairies. In the Security Council they took the form of two-headed Janus. They were good towards the aggressor and bad towards the victims of aggression. As a result, the draft resolution was weakened and the Security Council had to adopt that weakened version. The representative of

Guinea was quite right to express dissatisfaction with the resolution which was adopted.

184. The Soviet delegation also notes with satisfaction that the Security Council has endorsed the conclusions of the report of its Special Mission. In those conclusions, Portugal is unmasked and denounced as the aggressor, no matter who attempts, or how, to justify its actions or to defend it. It is true that there were no open justifications, but attempts to justify the aggression could be heard in certain statements. The resolution which has been adopted views in the correct perspective the question of responsibility for supervising its implementation. It is unquestionably correct that, under the United Nations Charter, supervision of the implementation of resolutions in such cases should, first and foremost, be exercised by the Security Council itself, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The resolution we have adopted entrusts that task to the President of the Council and to the Secretary-General. We are hopeful and confident that the Secretary-General co-operation in supervising the implementation of the Security Council's decision will be as valuable and useful as was the assistance he gave to the Security Council's Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea.

185. The United States representative, Ambassador Yost, raised the question of peace-keeping operations. Yes, it is high time we started making faster progress towards the solution of this question. But the reasons why we have not done so are well known. It has been the practice, since the dark days of the cold war, for these operations to be conducted along the lines of the operations mounted in the Congo, which cost the life of him who invited armed forces to come and help him. To avoid the recurrence of such unfortunate events, United Nations peace-keeping operations must be conducted in strict compliance with the Charter. This is the firm and unswerving position of the Soviet Union.

186. In the whole course of the work done by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and during the elaboration of the relevant models and provisions—concerning who is to participate in peace-keeping operations, what contingents, who should command them and how they should be organized—we have firmly upheld the Charter and rejected the shameful, anti-Charter and illegal practice established during the cold war when all questions were settled by the automatic majority vote without the participation of, and in circumvention of, the Security Council. We strongly support the establishment of military contingents of the Security Council or the United Nations which would be made available to the Council by neutral, socialist and Western States, and not by specially selected States. We feel that the Council should make a special appeal in that connexion to all States without exception and not just to one particular select group. We advocate that provisions should be thought out and elaborated for financing these operations and that a special fund, independent of the United Nations regular budget, should be established, and we are sub-

mitting a whole series of other proposals which we insist should be adopted. There are some, however, who prefer that these operations should continue to be conducted along cold war lines. So long as the desire to conduct such operations in this way persists, it will be impossible for either the United Nations or the Security Council to have effective armed forces, military contingents with which to render assistance quickly to the victims of aggression.

187. Bearing in mind the decision taken on this important question by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [*resolution 2670 (XXV)*], to the effect that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations should accelerate its work and submit specific proposals in the coming months, we hope that all members of that Committee will heed both the wishes of the General Assembly—it is stated clearly in the General Assembly's decisions that peace-keeping operations should be conducted strictly in conformity with the Charter—and the instructive lesson to which the representative of Guinea referred here, i.e. Portugal's aggression against Guinea; we hope that United Nations armed forces will be established and that with respect to their command, direction and operational supervision there will be strict compliance with the United Nations Charter. Then they will be able to give effective and speedy assistance to any victim of aggression.

188. The Security Council is concluding its consideration of the question of Portugal's aggression against the Republic of Guinea. It has adopted a decision which is basically the right one, although, for reasons which are all too well known, it is a weak one. The important thing is that the resolution adopted by the Security Council, weak though it is, should be implemented immediately and strictly. If Portugal or its protectors impede the implementation of this resolution in any way, the Soviet delegation feels that the Security Council should reconsider what additional more decisive and effective measures would be required to put the resolution into effect and that such sterner measures against the aggressor should be taken.

189. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I have asked for the floor in order to address my thanks to all representatives who during this debate have expressed appreciation towards myself and my country, Syria.

190. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): There are no more speakers. Before adjourning this meeting, I should like to point out to Council members that paragraph 12 of resolution 290 (1970), which has just been adopted, states that the Council: "decides to remain actively seized of the matter". I request all members of the Security Council to keep that provision in mind.

191. I should also like to remind members that the next meeting of the Security Council, at which it will consider the question of the United Nations operation in Cyprus, has been scheduled for Thursday, 10 December, at 3 p.m. The documentation on this item has been circulated by the Secretariat to the members of the Council and I invite them to study it and transmit any comments they may have to the Secretariat.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*