

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

MAR 23 1976



UN/CA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1667th MEETING: 19 OCTOBER 1972

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1667)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Senegal: Letter dated 16 October 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10807)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 19 October 1972, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Louis de GUIRINGAUD (France).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1667)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Complaint by Senegal:

Letter dated 16 October 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10807).

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Council and on my own behalf, before proceeding to the agenda I should like to address my warm congratulations to the outgoing President, His Excellency Ambassador Huang Hua of the People's Republic of China, who guided our work during the month of September.

2. All the members of the Council were happy to see the representative of the People's Republic of China assume the Presidency of our Council for the first time. He presided over our meetings with authority, competence and dedication and with particular courtesy. I wish to express to him our deep gratitude for his efforts and for the distinguished contribution he made to our work.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Senegal:

Letter dated 16 October 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10807)

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In a letter addressed to me on 16 October, the representative of Senegal requested that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal be invited to participate in the present debate of the Council. In accordance with the rules of procedure and

the usual practice of the Council I intend, with the consent of the Council, to invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal to take a place at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion in the Security Council on the item before it.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. C. Diouf (Senegal) took a place at the Security Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representatives of Mauritania, Algeria and Mali, in letters dated 18 and 19 October respectively, have requested to be invited to participate without the right to vote in the debate of the Council on the question before it. In accordance with the rules of procedure and the usual practice of the Council I intend, with the assent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Mauritania, Algeria and Mali to participate without the right to vote in the Council debates on the item before it.

5. As there is no objection it is so decided.

6. Because of the limited number of places at the Council table, and in accordance with past practice, I shall invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber. I shall invite them to the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria) and Mr. S. Traoré (Mali) took the places reserved for them in the Council Chamber.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Council will now take up consideration of the complaint by Senegal contained in its letter dated 16 October 1972, which has been distributed in document S/10807. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the letter addressed to me by the representative of Portugal on 18 October 1972, which appears in document S/10810.

8. The first speaker on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal, on whom I now call.

9. Mr. DIOUF (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Senegal and on my own behalf I should like to thank you for having been so good as to authorize me once again to participate in your debate so as to inform you, in detail, of the new and cowardly attack of Portugal against my country. I should also like to thank the members of the Security Council whose foresight and dedication, unflinching

in the cause of the oppressed peoples, have definitely compelled the admiration of all nations which love peace and justice.

10. As you know, on 12 October at about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, Portuguese military forces, including five armoured cars, attacked the Senegalese post of Nianao in the district of Kourane, in the department of Velingara. The attack, carried out with tanks one of which came 4 metres 25 from our area, caused the death of a Senegalese lieutenant and a civilian worker in the fields, and seriously wounded a peaceful farmer. The immediate and energetic response of our soldiers stationed 5 kilometres from the frontier to observe incursions into our territory, compelled the Portuguese armoured cars to return rapidly to their base at Pirada, 3 kilometres from the frontier.

11. This is not the first time that the Council has had to be seized of provocations of this kind committed by the Portuguese troops in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal.

12. You will also have noted that since 1963 the Council has never had to reproach my country for having violated the territorial integrity of Portugal, although it has supported and continues actively to support those valiant fighters of the PAIGC,¹ whom we are proud to salute amid the deadly outbursts of war.

13. Indeed, no one is unaware that since the first month of its independence my country has had to confront on its southern frontier acts of deliberate aggression on the part of Portugal which maintains in Guinea (Bissau), that unfortunate African territory, a colonial war which the Council has condemned unequivocally.

14. Already, on 8 April 1963, the representative of Senegal requested the Security Council for the first time to find a solution to put a definite end to the actions of Portugal. As the result of the debates which the Council devoted to this question, resolution 178 (1963) requested "the Government of Portugal, in accordance with its declared intentions, to take whatever action may be necessary to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity". Obviously it is useless to remind the Council that this resolution has never been complied with by Portugal. Since then, Portugal, in defiance of the rights of peoples to self-determination and of the decisions of the Security Council, under the fallacious pretext of the right of pursuit has perpetrated against Senegal innumerable armed incursions which have been the subject of fresh complaints submitted by Senegal and of decisions of the Council taken on 19 May 1965, 9 December 1969 and 15 July 1971 [resolutions 204 (1965), 273 (1969) and 294 (1971)].

15. It is to be noted that the last complaint as well as the debates which followed it led the Security Council to seek a viable solution to the situation created by Portugal on our frontiers.

16. The resolutions of the Council constitute a serious basis for peace to prevail between Portugal and Senegal if

¹ Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.

Portuguese colonialism did not defy the international decisions of the Council.

17. In fact it was in July 1971, in the course of its debates on the question, that the Security Council decided urgently to send to the spot a special mission composed of members of the Council assisted by military experts in order to make an inquiry into the facts brought to the attention of the Council, examine the situation on the frontier of Guinea (Bissau) and Senegal, and report back to the Council by making recommendations so as to guarantee peace and security in that region. I need not insist here on the merit which Portugal chose to reserve for the report and the measures which it recommended. Rather, strong in its impunity Portugal has intensified its criminal actions against our country and taken yet another step in its deadly escalation.

18. To the long list of provocations committed and listed in the annex to the report of the Special Mission sent to the spot in July 1971² have been added increasingly frequent acts of aggression of particular gravity.

19. In fact, on the night of 10-11 August 1971, the village of Birkama in the district of Diattacounda was attacked with grenades by a band of Portuguese mercenaries, causing two persons to be seriously wounded. On 11 September 1971, two women were killed by two 155 mm shells, hurled by the Portuguese artillery against the village of Poubosse in the department of Ziguinchor. On 27 September 1971, Portuguese artillery and aviation fired shells on the frontier post of M'Pack in the department of Ziguinchor. On 17 November 1971, a public works tank of Ziguinchor was blown up by a mine between the villages of Goudomp and Kaout, in the department of Sédhiou; two persons were seriously wounded. On 22 November 1971, an unidentified Portuguese aircraft flew over the frontier of Bombato, at Bafata, in the district of Diattacounda. On 20 December 1971, a PAIGC vehicle travelling along northern route No. 6, in the direction of Ziguinchor Kolda, was bombed by four Portuguese pursuit planes. On 29 December 1971, a woman was wounded in the village of Mangaroungou, department of Sédhiou, following cannon fire. Shells fell in the centre of that same village on 29 March 1972. On 26 May 1972, Portuguese forces attacked the village of Santiaba Mandjak, killing several of its inhabitants. In the course of this incident six Senegalese soldiers were savagely mutilated and five others wounded. Faced with such horror our soldiers for the first time crossed the frontier and carried out reprisals against the Portuguese soldiers, killing several of them.

20. This indicates that while we maintain our faith in the value of the Security Council and in the wisdom of its decisions, my country believes that the time has come for it to ensure by all measures within its means the responsibility to defend its population and territory against repeated actions of Portuguese troops.

21. So eloquent a manifestation of our determination to defend our territory in future with all the required energy

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 3.*

should normally have led Portugal to be more prudent, but that has not been so.

22. From the beginning the cause has been sufficiently heard, I shall be told, after so overwhelming an account of the circumstances of the cause and, later, justifying the decision of my country, calling on this valuable decisive organ of the United Nations, the Security Council. In reply I would say *res, non verba*—acts, not words. A categorical decision, a condemnation beyond appeal of the act of aggression of which Senegal is today a victim—this is what Senegal expects of the Council which has the honour of having all the prerogatives capable of imposing peace and ensuring the coming into being of a reign of liberty, which means the absence of constraint of any kind. In brief, it is for the Security Council to take up the challenge Portugal has launched against the entire world community in pursuing with the most complete impunity an anachronistic colonial war in Africa under the ignominious pretext that it concerns Portuguese provinces whose economic development it must ensure just as it must for the provinces of the metropolitan country—a sad observation which consists in development by the sword, blood and land of others. It goes without saying that it is the most outrageous extravagance, the most aberrant reasoning to consider the African Territories at war as provinces belonging to Portugal. It is obvious that Portugal, being aware of the scarcity of its own territory and human potential, and being incapable of rising by its labour and its creative energy to the rank of the industrial and military Powers of Europe which are its neighbours, feels a complex of frustration which leads it to turn towards the weak peoples of Africa to ensure its fundamental need for power—hence its expansionist and bellicose ideas. You will understand then that it should be forbidden from any noble act of grandeur to persuade itself of the striking absurdity of the curious and ruinous efforts to which it consents in order to maintain a colonial domination of which the execrable crime at Nianao is the most relevant example.

23. The hateful cruelty of that unprecedented crime, which doubtless constitutes an act of real open war, places my country at ease against all skeptics, those bleeding hearts who would attempt to retort *testis unus testis nullus*—only witness, no witness: Portugal by a public and express declaration not only recognized unreservedly the physical facts, but even presented to my Government its apologies and offers of compensation for the victims at the same time that it announced that the chief of the military district who is the author of the horrible crime will eventually be court-martialled by the War Council for his allegedly demented behaviour.

24. I wish to protest most energetically against the subtle and immoral manoeuvre which would have us believe that the conduct of the captain in the Pirada region was that of a mad man. I declare persistently that it is inaccurate to imply that the captain had at any time lost his mental faculties. He knew exactly what he was doing and his attack with his armoured cars on the Nianao camp was deliberate, after having violated our frontier and travelled three kilometres on Senegalese territory. What is more, the captain conducted himself as a sophisticated strategist when he drove with his lights off and slowed down in order to

achieve a surprise effect, which alone could enable him to accomplish the sorry task which the Portuguese authorities now agree to reprove.

25. I am sure that members of the Council will not be duped into conceding the least clemency to the criminal raid of the free-booters, unscrupulous individuals who are alleged to have carried out this expedition without having been authorized to do so by their hierarchical superiors at Bissau. Senegal places its confidence in the Council and is sure that it will realize the monstrosity of these acts and render the serene justice which has ever been characteristic of this central decision-making organ.

26. We are faithful to the saying *vade retro, satanis*—get thee behind me, Satan—and categorically reject the proposal for compensation which Portugal hastens to present, when, in the month of May of the same year in the same peaceful village of Santiaba Mandjak we were victims of an aggression which left six dead and five seriously wounded. Only those who are naïve or backward in their thinking and avid for power could be tempted to credit any voluntary determination by Portugal to cease its repeated attacks against my country.

27. Already at the beginning of the present session of the General Assembly, when international terrorism was only just being evoked, did not all members here present hear on the radio Mr. Caetano, the No. 2 man in Portugal, in a threatening speech proclaim that he reserved the right to pursue beyond the frontiers of the territories at war any African fighters whom he would consider to be terrorists in the future? Declaring, without circumlocutions, that these are acts of war of course removes us from the legitimate self-defense and right of pursuit with which Portugal has steadily saturated members of the Council in mournful litany.

28. This is why Senegal cannot conceal its disquiet about the future given the inexorable and strange line of conduct of Portugal in maintaining under its yoke millions of peaceful people who aspire only to recover their dignity as men and their freedom.

29. Thus my country believes that without further delay one must shed the magic of words and the illusion of formulas. The time has come for all—and in particular for the Security Council—to act and to unify actions, because at present in Africa we are living in a decisive period for freedom and peace in the world.

30. But it is none the less surprising at first sight that Portugal can be so relaxed in the wars which it wages in turn against the African States which have boundaries with its colonies. Thus, one wonders by what means a country with such limited material and technical resources has been able not only to face the restraints imposed on it by 10 years of colonial wars, but even think unceasingly of enlarging the circle of its enemies. If Portugal shows such arrogance and commits so many violations of international law, it is because of the impunity guaranteed to it by the countries that have withdrawn from all “open” colonial actions. I am speaking of the countries members of NATO which at the time of certain votes did not hesitate

practically to approve the attitude of defiance permanently exhibited by Portugal in regard to the international community. This complicity between Portugal and the NATO Powers leads me to two categories of reflection. On the one hand, one can, strictly speaking, understand that a country with a glorious past like Portugal finds it difficult to adjust to its decline and wants at all cost to maintain its illusions of grandeur. But what one does not understand so readily is that Powers which have the merit of being in the forefront of the promoters of the United Nations can today be complacent in the club of oppressors of which Portugal is the best symbol.

31. Indeed, Portugal, a simple outgrowth of NATO, sees that for its colonial war it is allotted supposedly limited forces and means by the great Powers of the century in the name of faithfulness to the new moral code of the balance of terror which has led, in the East as well as in the West, to new monsters which are called "limited wars" and "local conflicts".

32. No one is unaware that the military balance achieved by the super-Powers, the blocs and the present ideological contradictions, has had as an essential consequence the adoption of a global strategy which admits the legitimacy of the permanence of armed local conflicts limited in time, in space and by the means used. It is precisely on behalf of that strategy that the NATO countries regularly and massively put weapons in the hand of Portugal, and doubtless are the really responsible dynamic agents for the distresses which at present befall the African continent. The NATO Powers must persuade themselves that, because of the volume of the means used and the great firing capacity with which they provide Portugal, the war which they would have wished to be localized is none the less total for the countries and the territories where it is actually waged.

33. In the meantime, Senegal follows with close interest the struggles for influence which are at present being carried out within the Government of Lisbon between the advocates and adversaries of the continuation of the colonial war. Daily, the war-mongers and the liberals with their various means of action confront each other, and the immediate results of this silent struggle cannot fail to influence the conduct and the attitudes of the competent authorities who are working on the spot in Africa. In the case of the offers of apologies presented by Portugal, it is easy to understand that some may at some moment and in good faith have thought that for Portugal these were merely skilful diversionary manoeuvres which would create trouble and confusion in the minds of the members of the Council, and induce them to clemency.

34. My country is prepared to understand the difficult problems of the internal situation in Portugal, but we cannot tolerate deadly raids and armed aggressions from a country which deliberately persists in setting itself against the most elementary lessons of history.

35. As I recalled a few days ago in the General Assembly,³ the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination,

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2052nd meeting.

as well as the sovereign equality of States, are fundamental to the Charter.

36. The Council will agree with me, then, that any colonialist system is in flagrant opposition to those principles, and the refusal of the colonial Powers to abandon their colonial possessions is beyond challenge tantamount to forced occupation of that same Territory and a unique kind of aggression. Because of this, it is assuredly and legitimately up to the brave liberation movements to wage the anti-colonial war against the invader, however disproportionate their means may be in comparison with the military arsenal available to the conqueror.

37. It is obvious that the procedure for the liquidation of colonialism as started under the Charter is not always applied completely. It was precisely because of the systematic obstinacy of certain colonial Powers—and Portugal participates in this—which led the United Nations, taking up its categorical advocacy of the abolition of colonialism, to adopt the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with a peremptory injunction to cease any further acts appropriating formerly occupied Territories. It is more urgent than ever for the Security Council to take energetic and sustained action to eradicate radically and definitely all forms of colonial wars, all forms of domination and occupation, wherever they may exist in the contemporary international community.

38. The time has come for the United Nations, which has so firmly reaffirmed the right to self-determination, to give this obligation, solemnly accepted by all its Members, a more specific and more concrete character by taking firm and vigorous measures to deliver the world from the tragic anachronism of modern times, represented by colonial wars.

39. No matter how, the jig is up for Portugal which, despite substantial assistance dispensed with such largesse by NATO, will slowly but surely, blow by blow, and in an inevitable chain reaction, see its empire and authority crumble.

40. The advocates of colonialism might not like it, but decolonization is an historical movement against which no palliative will work. Day after day, Portugal will realize the weakness of its ephemeral victories and its powerlessness to contain the terrible waves of liberation movements. Day after day, to paraphrase a great statesman, one will see the imperialists of Portugal perish in horrible contortions like those of a fish which is put into boiling water. They are condemned to capitulate before the enraged resistance and heroic sacrifices of those who fight for freedom.

41. This is why, while there is still time, the only sound way for Portugal is and remains to create immediate conditions of peace in Guinea (Bissau) by opening negotiations with the PAIGC on the basis of the peace plan in three stages, promoted by my country since March 1969. My country has always wanted to believe that Portugal would realize that its most immediate interest was to cease war at once so as to be able to devote its energies exclusively to economic expansion, in close friendship with

its former colonies. The first phase of peace would consist in a cease-fire, followed by negotiations without any pre-condition. The second phase would start, as a result of the negotiations, by a period of internal autonomy for Guinea (Bissau). The modalities and time-limits would be discussed freely between, on the one hand, the representatives of the Portuguese Government and, on the other, the representatives of the various political movements of Guinea (Bissau). Finally, in a third and last stage, independence would be granted after negotiations, within the framework of a Portuguese-African community, which nothing excludes *a priori*.

42. In the light of the extreme gravity of the charges against Portugal, I am sure that, at the same time as the Council unequivocally condemns the ignoble aggression against Senegal as a final judgement, it will give the order to the Lisbon régime to start negotiations without delay, as provided in the peace plan of Senegal. The Security Council would thus prove its unflinching will to consider the situation which now prevails on our southern frontiers, as a priority among the priorities to which one must devote oneself, leaving all other matters aside, for a negotiated solution to the conflict.

43. Forceful condemnation of Portuguese aggression will not in itself affect the virus of colonial war. Thus it is also necessary for the Council, this time, to take energetic, peremptory measures against all colonial Powers, so as to suppress all forms of colonial war promptly and radically, wherever they may occur in the world. In that way you will inaugurate a generation of peace on our planet, Earth.

44. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Mauritania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

45. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to convey to you, Sir, as President of the Security Council for this month, the congratulations of the Mauritanian delegation. Your qualities and your talents as a diplomat are a sure guarantee for us of the success of the work of this body.

46. Also, Sir, I should like to thank you and, through you, the members of the Security Council for having permitted the Mauritanian delegation to take part in this important and distressing debate.

47. The subject before the Security Council is a complaint brought by Senegal against Portugal for violation of its territorial integrity and flagrant aggression against the Senegalese population. On 12 October 1972—barely a week ago—a unit of five armoured vehicles of the Portuguese army in Guinea (Bissau) penetrated Senegal and attacked a Senegalese post in the department of Velingara in the region of Casamance. This incursion of Portuguese armed forces into Senegal resulted in the death of one officer and one Senegalese civilian and a severely wounded peasant.

48. Those are the facts. This is nothing but a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of Senegal and a very serious infringement of the sovereignty of an independent

State, a Member of the United Nations. But, at the same time, it is a challenge to the United Nations and to its most competent organ, the Security Council.

49. Of course, this is not the first time that Portugal has undertaken acts of aggression and provocation against Senegal and other African States. But the one which the Council is discussing today differs in many respects from other incidents which have occurred on the Senegalese frontier with which the Council has often had to deal in the past. It is different in terms of the means used and it also differs in the way it is being justified.

50. In April 1963, when Senegal brought a complaint against Portugal to the Security Council charging it with bombing one of its frontier villages, the Lisbon authorities at that time described those charges as "imaginary".

51. Since then and given its repeated acts of aggression, Portugal no longer describes charges made against it as imaginary, but invokes the right of pursuit and the right of legitimate self-defence. The right of pursuit and the right of legitimate self-defence—what fallacious pretexts. Senegal, a peaceful country, which has never provided any bases for the liberation forces of Guinea (Bissau), is faced with a complex situation, a very difficult situation resulting from the presence on its territory of some 80,000 refugees, driven out of their country and their homes by the Portuguese Army. It is, to say the least, insolent of Portugal to have recourse to such pretexts. This is how Portugal has, in the past, been justifying its acts of aggression.

52. Today the Lisbon authorities themselves acknowledge that this act of war which the Council is now discussing was committed by Portuguese armed forces without any justification.

53. From the point of view of the means used, this is the first time that a mechanized force—an armoured detachment made up of tanks—has crossed the Senegalese frontier, killing and wounding Senegalese officers and innocent civilians. For 12 years now Senegalese villages in the south of Casamance have periodically undergone artillery fire or have been the targets of Portuguese forces operating in Guinea (Bissau). Villages have been destroyed, peaceful inhabitants have been either massacred or forced to leave the villages with nowhere to go. But the point at issue now is a true and flagrant act of war whose essential aims were to spread insecurity in the region, to demonstrate the impotence of the United Nations and, above all, to highlight the ineffectiveness of the resolutions of its most authoritative body. That is why President Léopold Sédar Senghor has described this act as "the most serious act of war—but not the first serious incident"—which has occurred on the Senegalese frontier.

54. This means that, if in the past Portugal has succeeded to any extent at all in enjoying the benefit of the doubt, today the Council is faced with a violation of the territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations and with an infringement of its sovereignty.

55. This act of aggression, which in practice constitutes a declaration of war, is something for which Portugal

officially and publicly assumes the entire responsibility. Senegal's complaint deserves the most serious examination and a highly justified decision by the Security Council.

56. The international community cannot treat lightly acts of aggression committed against independent States, particularly acts committed against a country like Senegal, which is a peaceful State and one of the most fervent adherents to the principles and objectives of the Organization's Charter.

57. Senegal's attitude in the face of the repeated acts of aggression by Portugal of which it has been the victim for 12 years now and its attitude towards the incident which is now under consideration has always been marked by restraint and by a scrupulous respect for the provisions of the Charter relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes. Senegal could have undertaken acts of retaliation—it would have been easy for it to do so and, indeed, such a policy is characteristic of certain States—but, instead of having recourse to force and violence, once again it decided instead to report the matter to the Security Council, thus respecting the provisions of the Charter and the sincere desire of the Senegalese people to live in peace inside their own borders.

58. In the face of such a loyal attitude—loyal because it is so respectful of what constitutes the very essence of our Organization—the Security Council cannot fail to condemn Portugal vigorously and in the clearest possible terms. The Security Council cannot fail to take the firmest measures to prevent a repetition of such incidents in the future.

59. But Senegal's complaint—although in any case sufficiently revealing of the state of tension which is sustained by the Lisbon authorities in a large part of Africa—must, nevertheless, be placed in its proper context; that context is the persistence of Portuguese colonialism which, with the active support it enjoys, wants to perpetuate its domination with all its incalculable consequences.

60. This obstinate refusal of Portugal to grant the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique their right to self-determination and independence, the contempt and arrogance with which Portugal greets resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council are all motives and reasons why the Council should adopt the firmest possible sanctions against Portugal. This refusal, this attitude of Portugal, not only is accompanied by atrocities and crimes committed with the use of napalm and by indiscriminate bombing of African peoples, but also is characterized by repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

61. The most serious episode of which the Republic of Senegal has just been the victim is not an isolated act of Portugal; it is just part of a large-scale escalation of colonial warfare which the Lisbon authorities are imposing and want to impose on the African peoples still under their domination and on the independent States of Africa. This clear-cut cynicism of Portugal, this policy of intolerance and domination, this attitude of arrogance and scorn for the decisions of the United Nations must be denounced and energetically condemned by the Security Council, because beyond the peace of Africa it is indeed the peace of the world which is being jeopardized.

62. Mrs. CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to convey its thanks to the Foreign Minister of the sister Republic of Senegal for the very important information he has just given to the Security Council.

63. We are met here to examine, once again, the complaint of an independent and sovereign African State against Portugal for its continuous attacks against independent neighbouring States from territories which it occupies illegally. The deliberate aggressions of Portugal against sovereign African States are no surprise to the international community. Portugal, feeling confident of impunity for its acts of terrorism, and above all strong because of the support of its allies, will continue to commit its crimes in Africa, to dominate African Territories. Portuguese bombardments of Senegal cannot be isolated from the daily bombing by Portugal of the peaceful villages of the liberated zones of Guinea (Bissau), Angola, Mozambique and the Republic of Guinea. Nor can we isolate these repeated acts of Portugal against other African States from the phenomenon of its barbarous domination in Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola.

64. A small country like Portugal is at the present time waging war on several fronts, besides those resulting from the continuous state of war maintained by it in the African Territories which it occupies. For some years now Portugal has dared to attack with impunity independent African States. Yesterday, it was the Republic of Guinea, Senegal, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. Today, it is Senegal again. Tomorrow, who knows? It will be Guinea again, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Senegal again. As long as Portugal continues to possess colonies on the African continent, we will have other meetings of the Security Council about these attacks.

65. The fact that makes us most indignant is the communiqué published on 13 October by the Commander-in-Chief of the Portuguese forces in Guinea (Bissau) [*see S/10810*] which claims that they regret the incident which left two dead and one wounded. In addition, the Government of Portugal informed the Senegalese Government, through the Ambassador of Switzerland in Lisbon, that it was ready to pay compensation and to give all necessary guarantees to the Government of Senegal. The Portuguese Government states that, in the circumstances, it is unable to understand the purpose of the meeting of the Security Council convened at the request of Senegal. What an insult. What an outrage.

66. As we have said, does Portugal, a backward and underdeveloped country, really think it can find so much money to compensate for African lives every day? I leave this to the friends of Portugal to think over. Africa, for its part, already outraged by the arrogance of Portugal, feels only scorn towards such a proposal. We should also like to believe that the Security Council, faced with the persistent nature of Portuguese aggression against African States, will not continue to be satisfied with the adoption of resolutions merely condemning Portugal. What we are asking for, what the African States are asking for, is that an end be put to the causes of these attacks; in other words, the only way for Portugal to put an end to these aggressions is first and

foremost to liberate the Territories still under its domination.

67. That is why, apart from the condemnation which, we are sure, the Security Council will adopt against Portugal, my delegation, on behalf of the three African countries here—Somalia, the Sudan and our own—would like to submit draft resolution S/10813. The draft resolution, in its preamble, refers to the numerous resolutions already adopted by the Council. Furthermore, it expresses profound concern at the obstinate refusal of Portugal to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council. In the operative part, the draft resolution provides for a condemnation of Portugal, and we hope that the acts of violence and destruction committed by the Portuguese authorities against the people and territory of Senegal since 1963 will be severely condemned.

68. We condemn in particular the frontier violation and attack on the Senegalese post at Nianao committed by regular forces of the Portuguese army on 12 October 1972. We demand that the Government of Portugal stop immediately and definitively any acts of violence and destruction directed against Senegalese territory and scrupulously respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of that State and all other independent African States. We demand that the Government of Portugal respect the principle of self-determination and independence defined in particular in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and take immediately all necessary steps to apply that principle. We declare that if Portugal does not comply with the provisions of the resolution, the Security Council will meet to consider other measures and decide to remain seized of the question.

69. As we have just stressed, these attacks on the part of Portugal against neighbouring countries constitute, in our view, a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of neighbouring States and thus affect international security.

70. The African members of the Security Council are convinced that this Council will have no difficulty in unanimously adopting this draft resolution which we now submit.

71. Before concluding, on behalf of my delegation I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October and to assure you of our total co-operation in the accomplishment of the delicate tasks which await you. We should also like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Huang Hua of China, for his perfect conduct of our proceedings in September.

72. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

73. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, you have been so kind as to authorize me to participate in the debate and this enables me, first of all, to congratulate you on presiding over the Council this month.

Our relations of friendship with your country and the important role which France can play in a problem such as the one of which the Council is seized today make us sure that our voice will be heeded and that our concerns will be shared by the Council.

74. This meeting of the Council has been convened at the request of Senegal, which once again is the victim of an attack perpetrated by Portugal from Guinea (Bissau). Unfortunately, this incident is not the first of its kind; in preceding years the Council on many occasions has had to deal with similar events in which independent African countries have been the object of unjustified and premeditated aggression by the Portuguese army.

75. A little more than a year ago, as the result of another complaint lodged by the Government of Dakar, a Special Mission was sent to the scene by the Security Council to examine the situation at the frontier between Senegal and Guinea (Bissau) and to report objectively on the facts. It will be recalled that the Government of Portugal, although directly implicated by the precise accusations of Senegal, refused to co-operate with that mission. Nevertheless, the mission was able to gather complete information that made it possible to establish very clearly the responsibility of the Portuguese authorities. It was then for the Council to take the necessary measures to make Portugal bear the consequences of its aggression and to prevent a repetition of it.

76. But in the case we are dealing with today things are both simpler and clearer, and the Council will not need to have recourse to a mission of inquiry in order to form an opinion on what has happened. Contrary to its usual conduct, the Government of Lisbon has admitted the facts and has even offered to compensate the victims of its military attack on Senegalese territory. Perhaps we should congratulate ourselves on this frank attitude, to which, we must say, the Portuguese authorities have not accustomed us.

77. However, this in no way detracts from the serious and unpardonable character of the attack deliberately carried out against the sovereignty of the Republic of Senegal. The excuses invoked, which, by the way, are difficult to accept, cannot make us forget that this territorial violation follows a long series of provocations of the same kind and that there is nothing which warrants an assumption that this is the end.

78. The incident which is today the subject of the complaint by Senegal is serious enough in itself, despite Portugal's confession of guilt. But its real importance becomes clear when it is viewed in the atmosphere of permanent insecurity which prevails in that region and of which this is but one of the revealing signs. It is therefore this situation itself which should receive the attention of the Council, and it is only by dealing with its deep causes that the Council will be able to bring about real peace in that part of Africa.

79. Actually, the problem is well known to all; the Council has often taken it up and brought to light all its elements. I believe it is hardly necessary to repeat everything that has already been said on this subject. Merely reading

the conclusions of the Special Mission which went to the scene in July 1971 is sufficiently instructive. No one doubts that it is the colonial war that Portugal is pursuing with ever-increasing violence in Guinea (Bissau) which has introduced in that entire region an atmosphere of insecurity and exposed the neighbouring African countries to repeated violations of their frontiers and their sovereignty.

80. The policy followed by the Government of Lisbon in the African Territories under its domination has often been denounced by the African States, and it has been condemned by the entire international community. The repression of the liberation struggles in these various Territories has reached increasingly disquieting proportions and causes a real threat to loom over all of the African countries.

81. Those countries acceded to independence after having themselves been colonized for a long time and after having waged a long struggle to gain their liberation. Now they wish to devote their efforts to consolidating their sovereignty and emerging from an under-development which they inherited precisely from the colonial domination to which they had been subjected. The whole world bears witness to the energetic manner with which they wish to succeed in this difficult task—although they do not always receive the assistance and the understanding which they are entitled to expect from the international community and in particular from the most developed countries.

82. We cannot agree that these efforts, these sacrifices which our peoples consent to make, should be jeopardized by maintaining a colonialist presence in Africa which generates troubles and instability and which perpetuates on our continent a colonial domination which we have never ceased to combat. Our countries need to have peace and security in Africa: we have already suffered too much from foreign interventions, from the looting of our natural resources and from racist oppression. These are the scourges with which we are still afflicted and for the elimination of which we appeal to the international community to render us its assistance, in the well-understood interest of peace in the world and understanding among peoples.

83. Speaking in this debate, the delegation of Algeria wishes to express its complete support for the people of Senegal in its efforts to protect its sovereignty and guarantee its security. Everyone knows that Senegal is traditionally dedicated to independence and freedom and with what confidence it has embarked on a task of national edification which has won it the respect of all.

84. We expect from the Council that it will give particular consideration to the complaint before it today, and that it will take the measures required by the gravity of the situation. The admission of guilt by Portugal allows for no further hesitation in the decisions to be taken. But the Council should go beyond a mere pinpointing of responsibilities. The solution to be found would be completely inoperative were it not to attempt to go to the very root of the problem. Mr. President, perhaps you will allow me to quote this sentence spoken by your predecessor, Mr. Kos-

ciusko-Morizet, in one of his last statements before his departure:

“In order to put an end to that insecurity, to restore peace, our African experience tells us that there is a means: that is to recognize for the people of Guinea (Bissau) the possibility of pronouncing itself on its own destiny.” [1601st meeting, para. 24.]

85. Over and above the incident which has given rise to the debate today is the entire problem of the colonial policy of Portugal in Africa. The aggression which has struck Senegal affects all the African countries. That is why we are addressing an appeal to all the members of the Security Council to respond to our concerns and share our worries. This appeal is addressed in particular to the countries which maintain relations of friendship or alliance with Portugal, because we do not believe that friendship must of necessity imply complicity.

86. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Mr. President, I had the pleasant opportunity to dwell on your distinguished qualities when you joined this Council some time ago. I had a similar opportunity to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Huang Hua of the People's Republic of China. On this occasion, when you are acting as President for the first time, my delegation is very happy to see you presiding over this meeting of the Council. May I also pledge our co-operation to you in the future work of the Council during your presidency. I should also like to express our thanks to Ambassador Huang Hua for conducting the deliberations of the Council last month with tact and skill.

87. We are meeting against a background of grave provocation by Portugal against a Member State of this Organization, the Republic of Senegal.

88. Last week, the representative of Senegal submitted a formal complaint to you informing you that on Thursday, 12 October 1972, Portuguese troops, presumably using NATO weapons and NATO armoured vehicles, forced their way through peaceful Senegalese villages heading towards a specific Senegalese post. On their arrival at the post, they opened fire on Senegalese citizens, killing an officer and a civilian and wounding a soldier. The attack fortunately was repulsed.

89. This premeditated act of aggression was later on admitted by Portugal and, by expressing its apology and offering indemnity to Senegal through a press communiqué, Portugal naively added insult to injury. Senega! and world opinion might have been able to forgive if this armed aggression had been the first of its kind, or if it had been of the type of faulty crossing of frontiers by the troops of any State into a neighbouring one. It was nothing of the sort; it was neither the first nor will it be the last attack. Portugal is not a neighbour of Senegal nor do the white Portuguese troops that committed the slaughter and violated the sovereignty of Senegal represent a neighbouring African state or indigenous black African neighbours. The penetration into the interior of Senegalese territory, by-passing a number of villages, points to the fact that it was a planned armed penetration as distinct from any faulty crossing of frontiers.

90. No, the Senegalese Government acted rightly in presenting to the Council a case of familiar Portuguese aggression, as repeatedly practised by Portugal on various independent African Member States and, above all, on Senegal itself. Since the aggression in question was not provoked by any Senegalese action, it is a wilful act of aggression motivated by a desire to create terror and by the propensity in the nature of colonialist Portuguese troops to flout the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations, without any consideration of likely censure by international public opinion.

91. The deep penetration into Senegalese territory and the murderous attack on a Senegalese military post cannot be considered as anything other than a deliberate act of aggression, and should be considered so by this Council.

92. The Council will note that between April 1963 and November 1971 Senegal addressed nine complaints to the Security Council reporting violations of Senegalese territory and acts of aggression by Portuguese soldiers, which included burning and looting of property. This is the tenth time that Senegal has had to complain about similar acts of aggression. As regards relations between Senegal and Portugal, this Council has adopted six resolutions condemning or censuring Portugal for those attacks.

93. Members of the Council are fully aware that Portugal's relations with African States bordering on territories which Portugal occupies continue to deteriorate. Portugal has an infamous record of violations of those territories. This record has included air attacks on Guinea, on the Republic of Zaire and on Zambia. On those incidents the Council will recall that it has adopted exactly eight resolutions, the sense of which was to bring home to Portugal that its colonial policy was the root cause of tension between Portugal and the African States. This feeling of the Council was given clear expression last year at the 1603rd meeting when a consensus was reached by the Council after considering the report of the Special Mission to Guinea. In that consensus it is stated that:

"It is . . . clear that the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) is having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area".

94. Considering its duty to take a course of action regarding the latest Portuguese aggression against Senegal, the Council would be well advised to look at it in a wider context, the context of Portuguese colonial wars which Portugal is waging against liberation movements in Africa as well as against sovereign African States.

95. It is inconceivable that a small country like Portugal, with little industry or surplus funds and with the lowest standard of living in Western Europe, should be able to maintain some 125,000 well-equipped troops in its three-frontier war. It is also inconceivable that the wave of liberation that led to the independence of 65 countries with a population of 900 million persons during the last quarter-century should fail to have the same effect on the so-called Portuguese Territories. Because of this wave of liberation there evolved a world-wide recognition that

self-determination and independence are not the exclusive prerogative of the few, but the fundamental and inalienable right of all peoples everywhere. In the Declaration on decolonization of 1960 contained in resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly proclaimed the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence, and declared that:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation."

To that end the Declaration stated that all armed action and repression against dependent peoples should end and that "Immediate steps shall be taken . . . to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories . . . in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom".

96. Yet Portugal has consistently maintained that the so-called Portuguese Territories are overseas provinces and that Portugal is indivisible. Consequently, Portugal continues to terrorize and assassinate Africans inside and outside the so-called Portuguese Territories.

97. It is finally inconceivable that Portugal, underdeveloped as it is, continues to be a repressive colonial Power, refusing to discard its outmoded overseas conception and continuing its control over Angola and Mozambique, which are roughly twenty times its size.

98. We have to look beyond Portugal itself to find the real causes of its colonial indulgence. It is a well-known fact that Portugal expends half its meagre national budget on these wars, and we believe that its resources would have been exhausted long ago were it not for the help it receives from its NATO allies, and the interest that capitalists and mining concerns have in maintaining Portuguese presence in Africa. These NATO Powers try to give the impression that the weapons provided to Portugal are by agreement restricted to be used for the defence of metropolitan Portugal. None other than the spokesman for the Portuguese Ministry of Defence belies the NATO Powers. On the purchase of Fiat machines, the spokesman for the Ministry of Defence said in April 1966: "The transaction was agreed within the spirit of NATO. It was agreed that the planes would be used only for defensive purposes within Portuguese territory." and this is the important statement—"Portuguese territory extends to Africa, Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea".

99. It is in this context that the December 1971 aid agreement between the United States of America and Portugal should be examined. It is true that in the total package of \$436 million of aid to Portugal, the largest part is a promise of "expenditures handling" application from up to \$400 million in Export-Import Bank loans for airport and harbour construction. Yet, while none of these sums will be used in Africa, the agreement will undoubtedly release Portuguese money and material for use in Portugal's African wars. Thus the United States can hardly be acquitted of the charge that it has retreated from its earlier rhetoric of support for racial justice and peaceful progress

towards majority rule in southern Africa to a policy of active assistance to the white minority régimes. As to the other NATO Powers, we will not be satisfied with mere statements that arms supplied by them are subject to the agreement that they will be used for defending metropolitan Portugal while the latter is using them for wars in Africa. At best they are guilty of conspiracy of disinterest regarding the aspirations of Africans, or at worst of being accomplices in the colonial wars.

100. In the same manner, Portugal is depending to a great extent on South Africa, which provides it with extensive economic and military support for fighting liberation movements in southern Africa. This identity of purpose in fighting liberation movements is better understood against the background of the attempt by South Africa to isolate national movements in South Africa and Namibia by using Portuguese Territories as a buffer zone State.

101. For the reasons we have already enumerated, Portugal has been able to maintain its control over African Territories and repeat its military aggressions against African States.

102. It is our strong belief that these repeated aggressions by Portugal against Senegal are but links in a series of aggressions and part and parcel of a predetermined policy of terrorism against the liberation movements and sovereign African States.

103. Therefore, it appears that after nine years of increasing concern over violations of the territories of African States by Portugal, the Security Council has yet to get a single one of its resolutions—now totalling 14—accepted by the authorities of Lisbon. Portugal has come to believe that it can defy not only the General Assembly but also the Security Council, even in matters where the Council has voted unanimously, without seriously risking anything.

104. This is a serious challenge to the prestige of the United Nations and to the authority of the Security Council.

105. For those reasons, my delegation would like to see the Council censure Portugal in the strongest possible terms for its violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Senegal. The Council should give a clear expression to Portugal that it will have to consider other measures to prevent it from repeating these aggressions. To the Republic of Senegal my delegation, on behalf of the Government of the Sudan offers its fullest support.

106. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Since this is my first opportunity to speak in the Security Council under your presidency, Sir, let me stress that it is my particular pleasure and privilege to express our great satisfaction at seeing you in the responsible post of the President of the Security Council for the month of October. Your deep knowledge of international relations, your long-standing experience and always brilliant performance on behalf of United Nations causes constitute a special contribution to the office of President of the Council. We shall, of course, extend to you our utmost co-operation as you guide the Council through the complex tasks ahead of it. The

traditionally friendly and firm relations between our two countries, which have often been intimately related through some of the most crucial events of modern times, make us particularly happy in congratulating you.

107. Mr. President, your skill and deep humanity have been once more demonstrated by your understanding in so effectively and speedily responding to the request of a small country under attack. The complaint of Senegal contained in document S/10807 of 16 October 1972 requested "that a meeting of the Security Council should be convened as a matter of urgency, in order that the matter may be considered without delay". Now, we sometimes hear that meetings of the Council should not be asked for or take place for "small things". One hears that most often only when a small country makes such a request. No one has a right to be so cynical, as to consider requests for meetings an inconvenience when an outbreak of international violence takes place, however "small". Of course, no one feels that way when his country is in question. And what are we here for if not to try to protect peace and security by dealing with a matter at its very outbreak, and to try to stop the deadly logic of spreading hostilities. We should be grateful to the Government of Senegal for bringing the matter before us immediately, for having confidence in us, the Council, as the organ of the United Nations ready and able to protect the victim of aggression, without responding itself with military action in the exercise of the right to self-defence.

108. What we are dealing with today is a very serious act of aggression and provocation by Portugal against Senegal. The facts of this particularly disturbing case are not in dispute; I shall not recount them here as they are contained in Senegal's complaint in document S/10807, and are substantially admitted even by the perpetrator of the attack. Senegal's complaint is fully justified in stressing that the attack "must be considered the most serious and significant [*incident*], because this time a deliberately planned act of war is involved".

109. It is particularly so as it is only one in a long sequence of attacks, invasions, aggressive military acts that Portugal is systematically perpetrating in its campaign of terror and intimidation against Senegal and other bordering independent African States. We here in the Security Council are familiar with that, but familiarity must not breed acceptance. On the contrary it must give us firmer resolve to do everything to stop it.

110. Since 1963 this Council has adopted no fewer than six resolutions condemning Portugal for a sordid string of aggressive acts against Senegal alone: shellings, aerial bombardments, invasions, laying of mines, and so on. One has only to scan the most painful list of 259 incidents and all kinds of acts of aggression and harassment committed by Portugal against Senegal in the long decade between 1961 and 1971—as documented in annex II to the report of the Special Mission containing the documents submitted to the mission by the Government of Senegal—to get the true dimensions of that Portuguese campaign against Senegal, and really to feel under what provocation that small, independent African State constantly is, what human losses and material damage it has been suffering all this time.

111. The Council has already, on past occasions, expressed its assessments of the wider ramifications and actual and potential grave dangers with which the aggressive course of Portugal's policy of attacks against Senegal and Guinea and of its war against the people of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde is fraught. In resolution 294 (1971), the Security Council was "disturbed by the increasingly serious situation created by acts of violence perpetrated by the Portuguese armed forces against Senegal" since 1969. In several other resolutions, the most recent being resolution 312 (1972) adopted at its historic meeting in Addis Ababa, the Council has expressed its grave concern that such incidents, by threatening the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal, might endanger regional and international peace and security. It is because of that that in the last resolution on the matter adopted in Addis Ababa, after condemning Portugal, the Security Council called upon Portugal "to refrain from any violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of African States".

112. It is in the context of that long-established, systematic and carefully planned policy of aggression against African States, of its unremitting colonial wars, and particularly of the grave and dangerous aspects of the last incident that we must totally and unequivocally reject the contention that, just because the Portuguese High Command has issued apologies and described the incident as the result of the madness of one man, we should dismiss the matter, close the dossier, consider the incident almost non-existent and move on to another question. In the light of total experience with Portugal, where we are faced with the madness not of one man but of a policy that tries to stop "in its corner of Africa" the wind of change and the liberation struggle that is mightily sweeping through the African continent; we know that is an "apology" until next time, until the next aggression.

113. Has the Government of Portugal given us its solemn and formal pledge that it will never again commit attacks against any of the African States? Has it given us any proof that it is prepared to undertake all necessary measures to prevent any repetition of them? Has anyone discerned any change, any shift in Portugal's policy of continuing wars of oppression and extermination against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)? The mere asking of such questions and the total impossibility of obtaining any new answers to them is enough to suggest most convincingly that what we are faced with is a continuation of well-known policies of Portugal, and just because of that we here must act accordingly.

114. The root of the matter is that the Portuguese policy of trying to keep its colonial possessions and of attacking and threatening the sovereignty and territorial integrity of African States is one policy; it constitutes one whole. One needs the other; one feeds the other; and without removal of both, both will persist. That is why the Security Council, in its resolution 302 (1971), endorsed the recommendations of the Special Mission's report which in paragraph 128 establishes that as "prerequisites for eliminating the causes of tension in the region and creating an atmosphere of trust, peace and security," Portugal must "respect . . . the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal;" immediately cease all "acts of violence and destruction"; and respect

"the principle of self-determination and independence" of the people of Guinea (Bissau) whose "right deriving from this principle should be exercised without further delay".

115. Equally, without the removal of major political, economic and military assistance and support by the allies and partners of Portugal and South Africa, those two colonial and racist régimes, together with the illegal régime of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia, will not cease to conduct co-ordinated and mutually essential policies of subjugating southern Africa and threatening the rest of it. Without the elimination of that support and assistance, we cannot remove the major sources of strength that are at their disposal, given to them in total contravention of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Juxtaposed with these grave realities, bland apologies, like bland admissions of having violated mandatory Security Council resolutions while continuing to do so, cannot be seriously considered.

116. There is no need to explain my Government's policy of total commitment to the causes of African States and peoples in their liberation and development struggle. As for the particular situation we are dealing with today, I should like to mention only a few instances of recent concrete applications of that policy.

117. We strictly apply the embargo on arms supplies against South Africa and we apply it equally against Portugal. We have adopted effective regulations against trade with both South Africa and Portugal, in addition to the law against trade with Southern Rhodesia, and we think that sanctions, in order to be effective, must be applied against the three of them.

118. We traditionally and directly support and assist by all possible means African liberation movements; that is in keeping with many United Nations resolutions. The first foreign delegation ever to visit liberated territory in Angola was the delegation of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, which did so this summer.

119. We have supported United Nations resolutions in these matters. We have sponsored a number of them, and we insist on the strictest observance of them by everyone.

120. We are prepared to do the same, to accord the same support to any draft resolution here that would deal effectively with this most serious matter raised by Senegal's complaint.

121. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, before setting forth the position of the Soviet delegation on the item under discussion, I should like to offer you my warm congratulations on your assumption of the very important, responsible and, I may say—judging by the experience of many of us—extremely demanding office of President of the Security Council. The Soviet delegation is particularly happy to welcome you to that high position, since you are the representative of a country with which our own country is developing relations of friendship and co-operation which will further the cause of peace and mutual understanding and will guarantee security in Europe,

thereby strengthening international peace and security throughout the world. We are familiar with your outstanding ability, great experience in diplomatic affairs and loyalty to the principles of the United Nations and we are sure that under your Presidency the authority of the Security Council will be in reliable hands and will be maintained at the proper level, and that proceedings will be conducted in strict accordance with the Charter.

122. I should also like to take the opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Huang Hua, the representative of China, on his successful first Presidency of the Security Council.

123. On the initiative of the Government of Senegal, the Security Council is once again considering a situation which has arisen as a result of new acts of aggression committed by Portugal against that independent African State.

124. We have learned of the armed incursion by Portuguese military detachments into Senegalese territory from the letter sent to the President of the Security Council by the representative of Senegal, from the reports of international information agencies and from the statement made in the Security Council today by the Foreign Minister of Senegal.

125. We have been given convincing proof that on 12 October a detachment of the Portuguese regular army supported by tanks made an aggressive sortie and attacked a Senegalese post in an area bordering on the Portuguese colonial Territory of Guinea (Bissau). As a result of this unprovoked military attack on Senegalese territory by Portuguese troops, lives have been lost. The attack of the Portuguese colonialists on Senegal was on such a scale that, in order to resist it and defend its territorial integrity, Senegal was compelled to bring into action fighting units of its armed forces in order to beat off the attack and clear the invading troops of the aggressor from Senegalese territory.

126. Thus, the armed attack by Portugal against Senegal was a clear and extremely serious act of aggression, for it involved a clash between the armed forces of two States, a far graver matter than an individual isolated incident.

127. As the distinguished Senegalese Minister for Foreign Affairs pointed out, and as all members of the Security Council are aware, this new aggressive Portuguese attack on Senegal is not an individual, isolated act or a chance incident. For many years now Portugal has repeatedly carried out unprovoked aggressive attacks on Senegal and other independent African countries, violating their sovereignty and territorial integrity, undermining peace in Africa and jeopardizing the security of African peoples. It is precisely because this new attack by Portuguese troops on Senegal is not the first hostile action which Portugal has carried out against Senegal that the Security Council must approach this question with special attention and a due sense of responsibility. Moreover, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal stressed in his speech, this attack should be viewed as a most serious and clear-cut act of aggression, for we are dealing with an international, premeditated violation by Portugal of peace on the African continent.

128. References by the Portuguese Government to the emotional state of mind of the commander of the local Portuguese military unit might cause us to smile, if his highly wrought condition had not led to such a tragic event—aggression by one State against another. In view of the existence of dangerous hotbeds of war in many parts of the world today, such references are dangerous. If Governments are to try to justify acts of aggression by referring to the emotional state of mind of commanders of military units, then the cause of peace may be faced with the grave threat of armed conflicts and serious military clashes. If explanations of this kind are to be taken seriously, then we may expect that at any time a commander who is responsible for atomic weapons, for example, may, because of his emotional or tense state of mind, give the order to use those weapons; such action would be a catastrophe of the first magnitude, not only for the country against which the weapons were directed, but for the whole world. To say the very least, then, it is strange that the Portuguese Government, apparently in all seriousness, is attempting in its letter to convince the Security Council that this act of aggression was caused by emotional strain, or to put it in plain language, by the insanity of the commander of the military unit.

129. The Security Council must categorically reject such arguments for they are fraught with serious consequences for the cause of peace and security of the peoples of the world.

130. The latest attack on Senegal is a consequence of the policy of constant hostility and aggression maintained by the Portuguese colonialists towards the peace-loving Republic of Senegal. The Senegalese Minister for Foreign Affairs has reminded the Security Council of the interminably long list of acts of aggression committed by Portugal against Senegal. The distinguished representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mojsov, mentioned a figure which runs into hundreds of aggressive Portuguese acts against Senegal. Thus, this attack is not just an isolated incident, but one of the links in the endless chain of the aggressive policy of Portuguese colonialism. We need remind the Security Council of only the most serious attacks. Three times in 1961 Portuguese armed forces carried out acts of aggression against Senegal. In April 1963 the Security Council adopted a special resolution [178 (1963)] deploring the latest incursion by Portuguese military forces into Senegalese territory and requesting the Government of Portugal to prevent any violation of Senegal's sovereignty and territorial integrity. However, Portugal disregarded that Security Council request. In 1965 and 1969 the Security Council was again compelled to consider acts of aggression by Portugal against Senegal. In resolution 273 (1969), adopted in December 1969, the Security Council strongly condemned the Portuguese authorities for their aggressive actions against Senegal and declared that if Portugal did not end its violation of the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Senegal, the Security Council would meet again to consider other measures. However, Lisbon also disregarded that Security Council warning. On two occasions in 1971 the Security Council was again compelled to consider new acts of aggression by Portugal against Senegal.

131. In defiance of the Security Council and the whole United Nations system, the Portuguese colonialists have in recent years increased the scope and scale of their aggressive actions, extending them to other sovereign African States—the Republic of Guinea, Zaire, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

132. Only a few months ago the Security Council adopted resolution 312 (1972) at its meetings in Africa expressing serious concern at the repeated violations by the armed forces of Portugal of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States and again calling on Portugal to refrain from any such violations.

133. Portugal's acts of armed provocation against the independent countries of Africa, which have recently become more frequent, and the long-standing colonial wars waged by Portuguese colonialists against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) demonstrate that the colonialists, far from intending to give up their positions in Africa, are prepared, with the frenzy of despair, to commit any crime for the sake of preserving their colonial rule.

134. The struggle against colonialism is now becoming an acute and grave international political problem which is preoccupying the United Nations and its two main bodies—the Security Council and General Assembly. The General Assembly is at present considering an important international political question—the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session in 1960. Thus, the attention of the world, of Members of the United Nations and of the General Assembly is focused on the problem of colonialism, and the Security Council must approach the question before it today in full awareness of the importance of that problem.

135. We know that in their colonial wars against the national independence movements of the peoples of Africa, and in carrying out their aggressive policy towards the sovereign States of Africa, the Portuguese colonialists are acting in criminal collusion with the racists of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The policy of colonial aggression carried on by this unholy trio of colonialists and racists in southern Africa is supplemented and repeated at the other end of the continent where the Israeli Zionist racists are committing aggression to impede the progress of the national liberation movements of the Arab peoples.

136. The attack on Senegal shows that the African continent has now become the target of aggression and colonial wars waged from three sides by the forces of international imperialism, whose shock troops are the Portuguese colonialists, South African and Southern Rhodesian racists and Israeli Zionist racists—today's mouthpieces for the racist and fascist ideology of the "chosen people". The whole of this criminal group enjoys the protection and broad support of international imperialism. The aggressive actions of this aggressive alliance in such varied parts of Africa have one common purpose: to crush the national liberation movements of the African peoples and restore imperialism and colonialism to their positions at the key

strategic points of the African continent—a return to the political and economic domination of imperialism in the countries of Africa. This common purpose and the support received from the forces of imperialism also explain why the Portuguese colonialists, South African and Southern Rhodesian racists and Israeli Zionists conduct themselves so cynically and provocatively with regard to the United Nations, ignore its decisions and defy world public opinion. The common nature of their imperialist and colonialist policies makes them have recourse to similar methods. Indeed, this explains the fact that in the last two years the majority of Security Council meetings have been devoted to questions connected with the aggression of colonial imperialist forces against African and Arab peoples. On occasions in recent years the Security Council has been compelled to deal with various instances of imperialist aggression against the peoples of Africa on the part of Portuguese colonialists, South African racists and Israeli Zionists. Of the 118 Security Council meetings held in 1971 and 1972, 60 were devoted to questions connected with the aggression and terrorism of the colonialists in Africa, and 14 were devoted to consideration and condemnation of Israeli acts of aggression against Arab countries.

137. Such are the facts of the history of the past two years. United Nations decisions have legitimized the just and heroic struggle of the peoples of Africa against the aggressive policies of colonialism, racism and imperialism, a struggle which is bound up with the cause of strengthening international peace and security. Colonialism, racism and Zionist aggression threaten the African continent from three sides and are a dangerous source of international tension, bitter conflicts and wars. An end must be put to the aggressive policy of colonialism in Africa. It is the duty of the United Nations and of the Security Council, as the main organ of the Organization responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and lawful rights of the countries of Africa from the threat posed by the forces of aggression, racism and colonialism and to provide assistance and support for peoples fighting for their liberation.

138. With respect to the question under discussion—the new act of aggression by Portugal against Senegal—the Security Council, on the basis of its previous decisions and taking into account the dangers involved in the aggressive policy of the Portuguese colonialists, should categorically condemn Portugal for attacking Senegal and take effective steps to prevent the perpetration by Portugal of new acts of aggression. Acts of aggression must not go unpunished. We must not close our eyes in indifference to the fact of the flagrant violations by Portugal of the key provisions of the United Nations Charter. The Charter binds all Members of the United Nations to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

139. It was precisely in order to confirm and consolidate that principle in the form of an international political declaration of the General Assembly that the Soviet Union submitted for inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly the item entitled "Non-use

of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". We hope that all States will support the United Nations Charter by adopting this important international political United Nations measure, aimed at strengthening international peace and the security of States and their peoples, and that the Soviet proposal will gain wide support from all States Members of the United Nations, especially the African countries, which live under the constant threat of the use of force by colonialists and racists.

140. Portugal is flagrantly violating the most important provisions of the Charter by committing acts of aggression against the sovereign African State of the Republic of Senegal. It is also violating the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [resolution 2734 (XXV)]. It is the duty of the Security Council, as the

main organ of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to take immediate measures to curtail the aggressive activities of the Portuguese colonialists, who are waging criminal colonial wars against freedom-loving African peoples and encroaching upon the sovereignty and independence of Senegal and other African States.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no other names on the list of speakers. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to state that a draft resolution submitted by Guinea, Somalia and the Sudan has been circulated [S/10813]. I hope that members of the Council will be able to examine that draft and that we may be able to take a swift decision on it.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.