

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1098th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 26 January 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 27:

The situation in Angola: report of the Sub-Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) (continued). 1291

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 27

The situation in Angola: report of the Sub-Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before calling on the speakers on my list, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the revised version [A/5085/Rev.1] of the statement of financial implications of the revised forty-four Power draft resolution [A/L.384/Rev.1].

2. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): The delegation of the Republic of Guinea finds it impossible to enter the debate on Angola without first drawing attention to the peculiar atmosphere in which the resumed sixteenth session has opened. This atmosphere is characterized by manoeuvres which have the aim, and very often the effect, of discrediting the United Nations and of exerting intolerable pressure on delegations, with the obvious purpose of jeopardizing the outcome of our deliberations on the important problems concerning decolonization which are on our agenda.

3. Speaking from this rostrum a few days ago [1091st meeting], the representative of Ceylon referred to the violent attacks levelled against the United Nations by the Prime Minister of Portugal and the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. But that is not all. Since the close of the first part of the sixteenth session, there has been constant talk of a crisis in the United Nations, of serious dangers and of the threat of bankruptcy. People are complaining openly about the large number of African and Asian States who, it is said, have by their votes overthrown many established practices, traditions and majorities, but whose true crime is to have given a decisive impetus to the policy of decolonization. Not a day goes by without the United Nations and its action, in the Congo and elsewhere, being subjected to violent criticism in the Press and radio and in the speeches of many statesmen. All this has engendered an atmosphere which is somehow intended to sow panic amongst the small delegations.

4. We realize that it is the intrinsically positive nature of the measures adopted during the fifteenth session and the first part of the sixteenth session

with respect to decolonization which has prompted this campaign of agitation.

5. In view of this, we must state here quite plainly that we have not been surprised by anything that has happened. On the contrary, we were expecting this agitation and these cries of distress in the colonial camp. The only thing that may be surprising is the scope of the manoeuvring and the extent of the means brought into play; but in order to understand the origin and the vigour of these campaigns of denigration and intimidation we must go back to the very origin of the United Nations, the Conference of San Francisco, which drafted the Charter of the United Nations.

6. President Sékou Touré, the Head of State of Guinea, in the two statements he made from this rostrum in 1959 [837th meeting] and 1960 [896th meeting], and more recently our Foreign Minister, speaking on 2 October 1961 [1020th meeting], have given sufficient prominence to the fundamental criticism that the peoples of Africa and Asia, and in particular the Republic of Guinea, have had to make regarding the Charter of this international Organization, which was drafted for the purpose of ensuring lasting peace based on justice, equity and freedom for all peoples. This fundamental criticism is that the crucial problem of decolonization has been shirked. We know that thanks to some subtle intrigues the colonial Powers brought off the master-stroke of preventing the San Francisco Conference—which was intended to ensure the freedom of all peoples—from concerning itself, with a view to a settlement, with the fate of those peoples whose need was greatest, namely, the colonized people. Thanks to these tactics, which were made easier by the policy of alliances, the colonial Powers even succeeded to some extent in involving the United Nations in their colonial adventures through the establishment of the Trusteeship System.

7. It was for these various reasons that the peoples of Africa and Asia, who, although deeply disappointed, were not discouraged, thereupon devoted all the means at their disposal to the struggle for liberation, carried on both on the spot, in Africa and Asia, and by appealing to international opinion in all possible forums, especially in the United Nations. The number of African and Asian States which are now Members of the Organization provides the most concrete proof of the success of that campaign for liberation.

8. At the United Nations level, we feel justified in considering that the crowning achievement of our pacific struggles has been the adoption of the solemn Declaration on the granting of immediate and unconditional independence to all colonial countries and peoples [see resolution 1514 (XV)]. This Declaration represents the just amends that the colonized peoples of Africa and Asia were expecting the United Nations to make in expiation of the injustices that they suffered at San Francisco.

9. This situation that we deplore today is one of the consequences of these major victories which have been gained by the peoples of Africa and Asia over colonialism, their oppressor. For, finding themselves vanquished on the spot by the unshakable will for liberation of the oppressed peoples, condemned by international opinion and ordered by the United Nations to **relinquish the privileges that they have** usurped, the colonial Powers have nevertheless been unwilling to disarm. No longer being in a position to use the United Nations as a convenient instrument for implementing their policy of domination and exploitation, these Powers have brought to bear all the financial means at their disposal, they are stirring up Press campaigns against the United Nations, which they do not hesitate to describe as an instrument of subversion, and are speaking openly of the threat of dismemberment that the African and Asian majority is causing to loom over the United Nations.

10. In any case, the very scope of these manoeuvres, which can hardly cloak the panic that has broken out in the colonial camp, strengthens our profound conviction that together with disarmament, but in fact preceding it, decolonization is by far the gravest international problem with which the United Nations must content in fulfilling its essential aims of safeguarding and strengthening international peace and security.

11. At the outset of this resumed session, we must tell these colonial Powers bluntly that their attempts at blackmail leave us cold and that their threats do not frighten us, coming as they do from those who are responsible for the deplorable fragmentation of Africa and Asia and who today are still seeking by every means to bring about the total balkanization of our continent. To all those who have disrupted our unity and who now complain about the number of African and Asian States within the United Nations, we proclaim our determination never to bow to their dictates, to resort to haggling or to bargain away the honour, freedom and dignity of the peoples of Africa, and our unshakable resolve to use our reconquered sovereignty as an effective instrument to obtain the liberation of all our brethren in Africa who are still under foreign domination.

12. Neither these alarmist campaigns nor these defeatist manoeuvres, nor even the attitude of defiance and sabotage assumed by many States, including some great Powers, will prevent us on our part from striving with all our might to **make the United Nations a centre where the interests of all States are brought into harmony and the foundations for truly fruitful international co-operation are laid.** But in order to achieve these objectives, which are vital for world peace, we consider it imperative that the capital issue of decolonization should first be settled in a positive fashion.

13. Fortified by this sincere conviction and animated by these profound sentiments, the delegation of the Republic of Guinea is embarking upon the important debate on the situation in Angola, with a feeling of relief and special satisfaction. There are a number of reasons for this feeling.

14. First of all, my delegation is happy to note that almost all the items on the agenda of the resumed sixteenth session relate to colonial questions: namely, Angola, Ruanda-Urundi, and information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

15. Furthermore, with regard to the particular problem of Angola, my delegation is especially satisfied to note that since this item is the only one that has been referred direct to the General Assembly, on this occasion we shall have the time required to give this debate the solemnity, the scope and the importance which it warrants by reason, on the one hand, of the martyrdom that the people of Angola are undergoing and, on the other, of the extraordinary nature of the accused party in these proceedings.

16. Moreover, how could we hide our satisfaction at the fact that for the second time—and in plenary meeting—the arch-culprit of colonialism, which has been responsible for so many crimes and such suffering amongst the people of Africa and Asia, is to be called to account. Forced back to its last foxholes, thrown out of America, driven out of almost the whole of Asia, this colonialism, which cleaves to Africa with the stubbornness of despair, could not be better represented than by Portugal, which embodies its most retrograde, anachronistic and explosive features. It is an amazing thing to see Portugal hurling such insolent defiance at its victims in Africa and Asia, at all justice-loving peoples, at the United Nations as a whole, even seemingly at its own allies, and, in all events, at international opinion.

17. The vehement statements of the foremost Portuguese statesmen and the diatribes recently delivered at this very rostrum with unprecedented insolence and impudence by the representatives of the Portuguese Government all go to prove and to confirm that Portugal has learned nothing and forgotten nothing, that it is living wholly outside the context, and is unable to meet the demands of our times. The essence of the tragedy, however, is that despite the crumbling of the colonial empires throughout the world, the Portuguese colonialist system, in the midst of an Africa swept by the riptide of nationalism, affords the scandalous picture of a cynical ultra-conservatism which is desperately seeking to maintain itself by dint of repression, terror and murder.

18. Of course, all colonial systems are tainted and all the colonizers have their heavy burden of crimes and misdeeds which history has recorded as so many dark pages in the unfolding story of international relations. Many of these Governments have at a given moment played leading parts in the colonial tragedy, which has caused bloodshed successively in Europe, America, Asia and Africa. It should be noted, however, that many of these star performers have nowadays been relegated to a backstage role and some of them have even become mere bystanders seeking to find in vain neo-colonialist intrigues, a meagre consolation for the bitter disappointments caused by their misfortunes, in their empires, lost for ever.

19. As for Portugal, as soon as it was admitted to the United Nations, in 1955, it became one of the chief preoccupations of all the anti-colonialist forces which have striven in the United Nations to secure the triumph of the principle of self-determination and the right of all peoples to independence.

20. Without even dwelling upon the fruitless attempts made in the course of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the General Assembly, we may say that during the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions, Portugal, by its behaviour in Angola and its general attitude in the United Nations, qualified easily for a seat in the front rank of those accused of colonialism.

21. It will be recalled that in the course of the fifteenth session resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 1542 (XV) were directly and primarily aimed at Portuguese colonialism, as were General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) and the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 9 June 1961,^{1/} both of which were mainly concerned with the situation in Angola.

22. With regard to the present session, two important items on its agenda, namely items 27 and 79, concern Portugal alone.

23. Item 79, entitled "Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV)", was discussed at great length during the first part of the sixteenth session and resulted in resolution 1699 (XVI), which unequivocally condemned the continuing non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with its obligations as a Member State.

24. Item 27, on the situation in Angola, is actually only a corollary of the other, but gives much more serious cause for concern in all respects. For this time it is a matter of the non-compliance of the Portuguese Government not only with General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) but also and above all with the resolution of the Security Council. Both these resolutions, it should be emphasized, have clearly stressed the threat to international peace and security represented by Portugal's persistent misdeeds.

25. The question before us today is the subject of an important report of the Sub-Committee set up by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV), the terms of reference of which were confirmed and strengthened by the Security Council resolution. We have perused this report [A/4978] very carefully. Although on the whole it states some specific facts, mentions some interesting aspects of the real situation in Angola, takes note of the serious grievances of the Angolan nationalists and puts forward some very timely proposals, the report nevertheless has some shortcomings to which the authors themselves have drawn attention, ascribing them mainly to lack of co-operation on the part of the Portuguese Government, which, in open rebellion against the United Nations resolutions, absolutely refused the Sub-Committee permission to enter the territory of Angola. In our opinion, however, these difficulties and setbacks do not entirely suffice to account for certain shortcomings of form and substance which appear in the report and which we feel it our duty to describe briefly, in the interests of frankness and impartiality.

26. In the first place, we greatly regret that, from the point of view of form, many paragraphs of the report, in particular paragraphs 429 et seq., are peppered with such expressions as "rebels" and "rebellion" with reference to the Angolan nationalists, "tribal societies", "tribal territories" and "tribal loyalty" and many similar terms typical of the phraseology used in colonialist tainted literature to describe certain specific characteristics of our societies and, in this case, the noblest manifestations of African solidarity.

27. But it is mainly with regard to the substance of the report that we have the strongest reservations. In the first place, we regret that the Sub-Committee

fell into the trap laid for it by the Portuguese Government. Despite the insolent and contemptuous refusal of its request to enter Angola, the Sub-Committee authorized its Chairman to accept the invitation addressed to him personally by Lisbon and thus created confusion which could not fail to have repercussions on the report which is before us. One of the consequences of this initial error is undoubtedly the use in the report of information supplied by the Portuguese Government, despite the explicit statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal that the information and documents provided were not to be "understood as transmitted under the terms of Article 73 of the Charter" or "within the framework of the resolutions which the General Assembly ... has recently adopted" [*ibid.*, para. 68].

28. It is obvious, however, that the Sub-Committee had no terms of reference beyond the provisions of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and that the use of this information was therefore a highly dubious decision, to say the least, and in our opinion a serious irregularity. On the basis of the documents thus used, we are surprised to see a certain insistence on Portugal's alleged historic mission in Africa and to see these references side by side with findings concerning torture, napalm bombs and many other negative aspects of the policy of genocide conducted by Portugal against the people of Angola.

29. Furthermore, the report also refers to the need for evolution by means of economic, social and other reforms—all of them ideas which, even if advanced in good faith, seem to my delegation to constitute violations of the spirit and letter of resolution 1514 (XV). This resolution dismisses as a fallacious pretext any delay in the granting of independence on the ground of lack of political, economic or social preparedness and, on the contrary, lays stress on the need to transfer all powers to the dependent peoples immediately, without any conditions or reservations, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

30. It should also be noted that Portugal's consistent position is sufficiently well known to eliminate any possibility of its sincere co-operation with the Angolan nationalists and to enable us to state that, in the present circumstances, Portugal is absolutely incapable of undertaking this preparation for independence which for five centuries it has done everything to avoid.

31. The most serious error in the report, however, is undoubtedly that appearing in paragraphs 450 et seq., in which the Sub-Committee seems to regard the caricature of reforms announced by Portugal as a sign of liberalism in Portuguese colonial policy in Angola or as an indication of the Portuguese Government's wish to co-operate with the United Nations. The best arguments against these assertions are to be found elsewhere in the report itself, where it is stressed many times that the purpose of this Portuguese move was, firstly, to facilitate the assimilation of the Angolans, contrary to United Nations resolutions—para. 461—secondly, to accentuate the new settlement of Portuguese in Angola, in order to "perpetuate Portuguese sovereignty" by a systematic policy of establishing soldier-settlers on all the fertile land in Angola—para. 463—and, lastly, to mislead international public opinion—para. 467.

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1961, document S/4835.

32. Many other parts of the report, especially paragraphs 469, 472 *et seq.*, raise controversial questions and offer suggestions which we feel are quite out of date, such as preparation for autonomy, and the safeguarding of Portuguese interests and assets in Angola.

33. All these ideas seem to us to be regrettable and in any case not to fall within the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee, which are strictly limited by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) and the Security Council resolution but which the obstructive policy of the Portuguese Government has prevented the Sub-Committee from fulfilling completely.

34. With these reservations, however, we are grateful to the members of the Sub-Committee for the efforts they made, despite many difficulties, to supply the United Nations with an important report which, on the whole, confirms both the extreme gravity of the situation in Angola and the Portuguese Government's open rebellion against the United Nations.

35. With regard to the situation in Angola, the Sub-Committee, after denying in paragraph 430 of its report the false Portuguese assertion ascribing the serious incidents in Angola to foreign intervention, successively notes the continued use of force by the Portuguese Government, in violation of United Nations resolutions—para. 76; the continuation of reprisals of all kinds, particularly against the intellectuals who are to become the leaders of the future Angolan State—para. 125; the constant aggravation of the situation in Angola, and particularly the bombings which have sown terror and desolation in many places—para. 89; and the use of napalm bombs, weapons of destruction and terror—para. 126. Lastly, summing up the results of Portugal's policy in Angola, in paragraph 437, the report refers to thousands of dead, the flight of over 150,000 refugees, the existence of a veritable atmosphere of war, acts of violence, terror caused by attempts to exterminate or annihilate racial groups—in other words, genocide—not to mention the destruction of property, the abandonment of villages, serious economic repercussions and a mounting bitterness which is prejudicial to any co-operation among the racial groups for the progress of the territory and its population.

36. In short, the report provides many examples and telling illustrations of the Portuguese Government's failure to co-operate and of its open rebellion against the United Nations. Throughout the report there is clear and abundant evidence of the insolence and arrogance of the Portuguese authorities.

37. In paragraph 57, the report speaks of Portugal's refusal to allow the Sub-Committee to enter Angola, thus depriving it of an opportunity to verify on the spot the information supplied to it and to obtain freely the additional information which would have enabled it to prepare a more complete study of the situation in Angola. The same refusal to co-operate and the same violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions are referred to explicitly and specifically in paragraphs 76 *et seq.* of the report.

38. As a conclusion of all these facts and observations, the Sub-Committee notes with regret, in paragraph 446 of the report, that the Government of Portugal has not seen its way to co-operating with the General Assembly and the Security Council to fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Angola and has thereby failed in its obligation, as a

Member State, to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

39. In order to understand fully the whole significance and the full scope of this vitally important debate on Angola, it is important to consider it in its real framework, which is that of one of the last colonial crusades at grips with African nationalism. As we have always thought and said, Angola is both an example and a symbol: an example of the martyrdom of all African peoples under Portuguese domination which are fighting for their total emancipation, and a symbol of the blindest, cruellest and most retrograde colonialism that Africa has ever known.

40. Whether we speak of muzzled Mozambique, of so-called Portuguese Guinea, which has been turned into a vast military fortress and which, since the independence of the Republic of Guinea, has been reduced to an immense concentration camp, of the Cape Verde archipelago, or of São Tomé and Príncipe, where, as we know, the heroes of African nationalism are languishing—everywhere and always we find the same struggle to the death between Portuguese colonialism and African nationalism.

41. In these circumstances, it will be readily understood that in this debate there is naturally Portuguese colonialism on one side, and on the other all the peoples of Africa expressing their solidarity with their brothers in Angola and in the other Portuguese African colonies.

42. For us Africans, the question everywhere and at all times is to regain the sovereignty of which we have been robbed, our dignity which has been dragged in the dust, our freedom of thought and action and, in a word, our own identity as peoples, nations and free and sovereign States; for Portuguese colonialism, the question everywhere and at all times is to pursue the impossible task of trying to keep the African possessions it has usurped away from the tide of nationalism and from the desire for total emancipation which is the moving spirit of all African peoples.

43. The various debates during the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions, in the Fourth Committee, in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, the Sub-Committee's report which is before us now and the various statements made from this rostrum since the sixteenth session was resumed have shed sufficient light on the characteristics of Portuguese colonialism and the extreme gravity of the situation in Angola.

44. We do not therefore consider it necessary to repeat the obvious facts which have been mentioned by a number of speakers and which have convinced all men of goodwill of the vast extent of the tragedy of the Angolan people.

45. The documents supplied and the statements made seem to us to be sufficiently enlightening with regard to the régime of repression and terror, the practice of forced labour, the systematic violation of all forms of freedom, the innumerable humiliations, the acts of vandalism and the policy of genocide which the Portuguese colonial administration is pursuing in a vain attempt to stem the tide of Angolan nationalism.

46. We shall therefore content ourselves with a mere mention of all this and shall simply declare unequivocally that all these facts and this policy are to be found also in all the other Portuguese colonies in Africa, and that through the debate on Angola it is the

entire Portuguese colonial system that we are called upon to judge and to condemn once and for all.

47. Accordingly, while the Guinean delegation does not consider it necessary to dwell at length on the crimes of which Portugal is accused in Angola, it nevertheless considers it essential to ponder very seriously the attitude which should be taken as a result of our debates, with a view to securing the speedy accession of the people of Angola to independence and national sovereignty, which is the only realistic and definitive solution for the sufferings of the African populations under Portuguese domination.

48. This solution, which is unanimously demanded by all democratic organizations in Africa, Asia and elsewhere, is the one solemnly proclaimed in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which condemns the subjection of any people to foreign domination and exploitation and advocates the immediate and unconditional independence of all colonized peoples.

49. The General Assembly and the Security Council subsequently and consistently adopted similar decisions, so that the only obstacle to this policy, which is called for by African nationalism and has been approved by the United Nations, is the constant defiance and open rebellion of the Portuguese Government against international opinion and the United Nations.

50. It is clear to the whole world that ever since its admission to the United Nations in 1955 Portugal has violated both the spirit and the letter of the provisions of the Charter and the successive resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on decolonization.

51. The facts speak for themselves. Since the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization, the Portuguese Government has alleged that, since it has no colonies, it is in no way affected by this solemn decision of the United Nations. Moreover, Portugal has literally made a mockery of resolution 1541 (XV), which laid down the principles which should guide Member States in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for under Article 73 of the Charter.

52. In resolution 1542 (XV) the General Assembly, recognizing that the desire for independence was the rightful aspiration of peoples and that the denial of their right to self-determination constituted a threat to the well-being of humanity and to international peace, requested Portugal to supply information on the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Angola. The Portuguese authorities responded to this resolution with nothing but sarcasm and disdain, which led to the condemnation, in resolution 1699 (XVI) of 19 December 1961, of the continuing non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with its obligations as a Member State.

53. In resolution 1603 (XV) of 20 April 1961 the General Assembly appointed a Sub-Committee to investigate the situation in Angola and called upon the Government of Portugal to consider urgently the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). Later the Security Council, in its resolution of 9 June 1961, called upon the Portuguese authorities to desist forthwith from repressive measures in Angola and to extend every facility to the Sub-Committee to enable it to perform its task; it also expressed the hope that a peaceful solution would be found. Again these two resolutions met with nothing but an arrogant refusal

and a total lack of comprehension, which Mr. Salazar, the Prime Minister, himself expressed as follows before the Portuguese National Assembly on 30 June 1961:

"The invitation to the Portuguese authorities to desist forthwith from repressive measures in Angola was theatrical and there was not the least hope of its being accepted."

54. Such, in brief, is the eloquent list of the rebellious activities of the Portuguese Government with respect to the United Nations and its successive decisions.

55. What can be done in the face of this defiant and provocative attitude of the Portuguese Government? The answer is clear. Since the plan is already defined and since the goal to be achieved has been clearly stated in the various resolutions of the United Nations, the role of the General Assembly at the conclusion of this debate should be basically one of firmness in the procedure for implementation.

56. There can be only two kinds of solution: a peaceful solution, which we desire with all our hearts and which we call for most earnestly, or a solution by force, which the rash policy of the Government of Portugal seems determined to impose upon us.

57. In this connexion, it should be recalled that when the Portuguese commandant of the tiny fort of Saint-Jean-Baptiste d'Ouidah was courteously invited by the Government of Dahomey to evacuate the fort, which he held by some incomprehensible sort of senile pride, he did not comply, on 31 July 1961, until the police had intervened. But he took good care to burn his house and records and to reduce the little enclave to ashes before he left.

58. This same policy of "scorched earth" and total destruction was what the intelligence, foresight and patriotism of the Indian leaders prevented Portugal from putting into effect in Goa, Damão and Diu, which have been freed forever from Portuguese colonialism. The enthusiastic welcome given by the population of these enclaves to the liberation forces—a welcome which demoralized and paralysed the local representatives of Portuguese colonialism—the encouragement and the marks of sympathy given by all the active anti-colonialist forces of Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, and particularly by the Indian people, whose transports of joy and enthusiasm showed the Prime Minister of India vividly, if somewhat boastfully, how popular was the historic decision he had just made—all this might have served as a lesson to Portugal and its friends. Alas, this does not seem to be the case—quite the contrary. The alleged misfortune of Portugal is used as an argument for insisting here and there on the necessity for moderation. In our opinion there is no better way of ensuring that Portugal will be lost.

59. The most extraordinary arguments have been advanced and exploited to gain some reprieve for Portuguese colonialism. Nevertheless, there are some outstanding exceptions, which we are happy to be able to point out. For instance, the editorial in The New York Times of 17 January 1962 painted the following picture of Portugal. After noting that Salazar had spoken of the "so-called wind of change in Africa" and that the representative of Portugal at the beginning of this debate had spoken of "the so-called situation in Angola," the editorial continued as follows:

"This failure to see and grasp the reality of the era we live in, this Portuguese dream-world in which the greatness of past history survives like a ghost—this is what the rest of the world, with a few anachronistic exceptions ... faces with bafflement or contempt. How can ... friendly powers—Britain, for instance ... or Brazil ...—penetrate minds closed to logic, truth, reality? ...

"There is an old belief in Europe that crops up now and then when the Portuguese are mentioned. It is that they are a people with suicidal tendencies, not as individuals but as a race. It is hard to escape this thought today when Portugal is contemplated, living with its antiquated dictatorship and its ideas of empire in a world that has passed Portugal by like the hurricane that guts a building and leaves a shaky facade.

"Somehow the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique will achieve independence. It will be better for them, as well as for Portugal, if the Lisbon Government helps in the process."

60. It is an undeniable fact, as attested so eloquently by *The New York Times*, which no one could suspect of serving the cause of African nationalism, that Portugal is showing evident signs of abnormality and senility. But we say that this is all the more reason to help it to put an end to its colonial adventures, to halt the martyrdom of the African populations whom the curse of history has placed under Portuguese domination and to prevent it from further endangering international peace and security. It would be paradoxical to devote our attention exclusively to the aggressor while completely neglecting the victims, in this case the Angolan people, and the consequences of the aggression, which concern the freedom of the African peoples and the peace and security of the world.

61. It is a fact that when a man loses his reason he is subjected to special protective measures whose nature and severity vary with his condition and range from careful supervision to a straitjacket. There is no reason why the same should not apply in the international field when the Government of a State has manifestly lost its reason, which is the present case with the Portuguese Government.

62. We wish to state clearly that we are not opposed to the Portuguese people but that the policy pursued by their Government, among whose first victims are the Portuguese people themselves, can no longer be tolerated. It is essential, in the interest of the Portuguese people themselves, that the Portuguese Government should be confined in a diplomatic straitjacket.

63. Liberty, justice, respect for the Charter and for the resolutions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council all demand the immediate cessation of the war Portugal is waging in Angola and the application to this Territory, and to all other Territories under Portuguese domination, of the provisions of the historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

64. In concluding its report, the Sub-Committee on Angola points out that the Portuguese Authorities face a historic choice: whether to rely on the use of force, with the inevitable miseries, losses and uncertainties or to respond to world opinion and take the appropriate measures to build a new relationship with the people of Angola.

65. We are in complete agreement with this analysis. Most unfortunately, Portugal has made its choice and has chosen force. This can be clearly seen from the statement which Mr. Salazar, the Prime Minister, made recently in the Portuguese National Assembly. Speaking of the objective of Portugal's colonial policy, he did not shrink from affirming the following:

"... This policy in favour of an integrated multi-racial society is causing very serious difficulties for those who now wish to devote themselves to the emancipation of Portuguese Africa. They come too late, for the work is already finished. This unity precludes any transfer, cession, or surrender. The juridical notions of plebiscite, referendum and self-determination no longer have a place in our structure."

66. There could be no clearer or more precise declaration of war against African nationalism, which requires that no segment of our continent may be the extension of a State or group of States foreign to Africa.

67. The situation being what it is, it behoves the General Assembly to make its position clearly known. Seldom, in our opinion, has the duty of this Assembly appeared so clear and so simple at the conclusion of a debate. It is indeed a fact that war is continuing in Angola, where the situation, far from improving, continues to deteriorate steadily, since Portugal has chosen the solution of force. It should be clear to everyone that it is not merely to obtain some petty reforms, much less to carry out the impossible assimilation policy of which the Portuguese Government dreams, that the Angolan people have taken up arms under the leadership of the best of their sons. The final success of this people cannot be doubted. The independence and sovereignty of the Angolan people will be the inevitable outcome of this tragedy, which has already lasted too long. The only question is whether this independence will be brought about by a normal and peaceful process, which is what we desire, or whether, on the contrary, it will be won after unnecessary sacrifices and disturbances with unpredictable consequences arising from the desperate rear-guard action Portuguese colonialism is fighting in Angola.

68. One of the obvious conclusions from our debates is that Portugal has shown itself to be fundamentally incapable of arriving at the peaceful and just solution which the situation in Angola demands. With their minds closed to "logic, truth and reality", the leaders of Portugal should be the subject of special protective measures by the United Nations in order to contain and extinguish the fire which they have kindled in Angola and which is smouldering in all the Territories they occupy in Africa.

69. In these circumstances, the General Assembly should not hesitate for a single moment to take concrete steps to ensure the prompt satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Angolan people to independence and sovereignty, in accordance with the inexorable requirements of our times. These steps should provide *inter alia* for:

(1) The immediate cessation of repressive measures;

(2) The liberation of all political prisoners, wherever they may be detained;

(3) The return to Angola, with no threat of penalties for their activities, of all the Angolan nationalists who are outside the Territory;

(4) The refusal of all of Portugal's NATO allies to give it any aid or assistance, in particular arms and ammunition which can be used against the Angolan people;

(5) A total embargo on the shipment of any arms and ammunition to Angola and the withdrawal of the Portuguese troops assigned to intensify the repression;

(6) A general and unconditional amnesty for all actions connected with the political events which have taken place in Angola.

70. My delegation also considers that the Portuguese Government should be unequivocally condemned for the colonial war it is waging in Angola and that strong sanctions should be applied against this Government in accordance with Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. These two steps would merely constitute the ratification and confirmation of the hope of the vast majority of international opinion.

71. Above all, however, we wish to emphasize the special responsibility of the General Assembly towards the people of Angola and the other African peoples under Portuguese domination. Since the Government of Portugal has shown itself deaf to any appeal and has proved its fundamental inability to act in accordance with the demands of our times, any weakness on our part at the conclusion of this debate would be a failure to fulfil our specific obligations, a disservice to Portugal and a disastrous prolongation of the martyrdom of the Angolan people.

72. These, in the opinion of my delegation, are the suggestions which we required for the prompt and peaceful solution of the grave situation in Angola. If the United Nations fails to shoulder all its responsibilities in the terrible tragedy which has produced so much physical and moral suffering, so many manifestations of horror and humiliation, the Angolan people will have no choice but continue their fight for liberation, assured of the active solidarity of all the peoples devoted to justice, liberty, and peace. In such an event, the Governments of the independent African States, for their part, would have no recourse but to undertake concerted action for the defence of the vital interests of their African homeland, which are so gravely endangered in Angola.

73. No matter what happens, the Government of the Republic of Guinea will calmly and resolutely, in close co-operation with its friends and natural allies in Africa, fulfil its obligation of complete solidarity in the cruel ordeal which the Angolan people, and through them all the African peoples struggling for total liberation from colonial domination, are undergoing.

74. We fully realize that the decision we are called upon to take at the conclusion of this debate will be fraught with consequences for the people of Angola, for peace in Africa and throughout the world, and for the moral authority and future prospects of the United Nations.

75. We sincerely hope that the sense of responsibility of each representative and the collective wisdom of this Assembly will make it unnecessary for us to mount this rostrum again to say once more, when it will perhaps be too late: "We told you so".

76. Mr. BROOKS (Canada): The Government and people of Canada have viewed with deep concern the course of events in Angola over the past year. That this concern was shared by the great majority of Members of this Assembly is evident from its decision to appoint the Sub-Committee whose report we are now considering. The appointment of this Sub-Committee emphasized the conviction that there is indeed an essential role that the United Nations can play in helping to resolve this tragic situation.

77. The Canadian delegation commends the members of the Sub-Committee for the conscientious and objective manner in which they have approached and carried out their difficult task. There will be differences of view on some particular points of their report, but in our opinion, it merits the full support of this Assembly. There certainly can be no reservations about the Sub-Committee's hope, as expressed in its report,

"... that the United Nations and its Member States would take further action as appropriate to persuade and assist the Government of Portugal and the Angolan people to embark on a policy of peaceful settlement in conformity with the Charter" [A/4978, para. 474].

78. I repeat, Canada commends the report and notes with satisfaction that the Sub-Committee's recommendations have been closely followed by the sponsors of the African-Asian draft resolution [A/L.384/Rev.1].

79. The Sub-Committee in its report emphasized the tragic situation of the Angolan people. In the uprising which took place last spring, thousands of persons were killed, many more than thousands were wounded, 150,000 Angolans took refuge in the Congo (Leopoldville), and there was wide-spread destruction of homes and villages in northern Angola. Information received by churches in Canada of the destruction of Christian missions and of the suffering of the Angolan people gives confirmation to the report.

80. The Sub-Committee has expressed its belief that the conflict which has torn Angola during the past year arose from the Angolan people's dissatisfaction with existing conditions. As the report points out, Portugal has recently introduced reforms which, when implemented, could provide some measure of satisfaction of these grievances. We welcome this action. The reforms, however, fall far short of the requirements of the Assembly's resolution of last April [1603 (XV)].

81. It would have been unrealistic to expect the people of Angola to remain unaffected by the wave of desire and demand for independence, freedom and equality which has swept over Africa in the past few years. The prerequisite to satisfactory political development is that there should be broad, general agreement on ultimate objectives between the people of a Non-Self-Governing Territory and its Administering Power. This entails a clear acknowledgement that self-determination is the goal of political development. The result need not be a sharp disruption of long-established ties with the Administering Power; we have seen how economic and cultural links may survive and grow after the achievement of independence, and even a continuing political association need not be excluded. But the people of dependent territories—and the people of Angola will not allow themselves to be made an exception—insist on deciding their own political destiny.

82. In the opinion of the Canadian delegation that part of the draft resolution which asks the Government of Portugal to undertake political, economic and social reforms with a view to the transfer of power to the people of Angola constitutes an essential step towards the restoration and preservation of peaceful conditions. While the means of achieving self-determination and the timing of progress toward that goal are subject to negotiation, the acknowledgement and definition of that goal will not wait.

83. My delegation shares the Sub-Committee's judgement that, in view of the provisions of the Charter, the international repercussions of the situation and its significance for peace in Africa and in the world, the United Nations must continue to be concerned with finding a peaceful solution of the problem of Angola.

84. The draft resolution, which has been sponsored by forty-four Members of the Assembly, enables the United Nations to keep under review the problem of Angola and the implementation of its recommendations. Constructive co-operation by the Government of Portugal offers the best hope of bringing the conflict to an early end, of promoting peaceful achievement of the objectives stated in the United Nations resolutions on Angola, and of restoring a harmonious relationship between Portugal and the people of Angola.

85. It is our deep conviction that there is a compelling urgency about embarking upon this co-operative effort. Portugal has made substantial contributions to the material development of the country. A wrong decision could destroy all that has been accomplished. A wise decision now could lay the foundation of a new and prosperous nation, with a close relationship to Portugal based on friendship and mutual interest.

86. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): While listening to the debate on the question of Angola one gets the impression that, almost without exception, representatives agree that the colonial empires are a phenomenon of the past. We are all witnesses to their decomposition and to the emergence of new nations, new States, on the international scene, first of all from the continent of Africa. It has been both declared and proved here in this Organization, too, that colonialism has finally and effectively to be abolished.

87. Under resolution 1514 (XV), which has become known all over the world as the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the General Assembly "Solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

88. In the course of the first part of its work, the General Assembly at its sixteenth session, in examining the implementation of the Declaration, was forced to state, in its resolution 1654 (XVI) that:

"... contrary to the provisions of paragraph 4 of the Declaration, armed action and repressive measures continue to be taken in certain areas with increasing ruthlessness against dependent peoples, depriving them of their prerogative to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence".

The same resolution states that the Declaration's stipulations have not been carried out faithfully in the case of a number of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

89. It is obvious to all of us that, although colonialism has reached the stage where it has to disappear, some colonialist countries are still clinging to their so-called "possessions", Portugal being the foremost of them. At present Portugal itself, with its conception about its colonies, is becoming the symbol of anachronism—the symbol of a past which is not only hated but also distant. We have not only to declare, but also to make Portugal understand, that one cannot combat the twentieth century's main ideas with those of the Middle Ages.

90. Looking more closely at the problem, we can say that the vehement assertions of the representative of Portugal, made before his withdrawal from this debate in the Assembly, have raised two distinctly different sets of problems. One set concerns facts, that is: what happened last year in Angola; the other concerns principles, that is: what is Angola?

91. I should like to deal first with the second problem. In doing so, the right yardstick to be used is the General Assembly's Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. In the light of that Declaration, just as much as in the light of the United Nations Charter, Angola is a colony and not a province of Portugal, being an entirely different country on a different continent. In fact, it never was a province during the centuries of Portugal's domination. The whole idea of calling it a province came as a concession from the fifteenth century to the twentieth, and as such it is a typical example of the squaring of the circle. As an American expert, Professor James Duffy, wrote last year in his article in the journal *Foreign Affairs*:

"Today small Portugal is still mistress of three African territories which are the oldest European colonies ... in the world, and with a little luck she may soon regain an earlier distinction of being the only colonial power in Africa."^{2/}

92. The same author, in the same article, analyses the reasons why, first, Angola is a colony, and, secondly, why Portugal fights with tooth and claw to maintain it. I shall quote some relevant passages. At one point he says: "The fact is that more than 95 per cent of the population of Portuguese Africa are not enfranchised citizens of Portugal".^{3/} At another point he goes on to say: "... the African has been maintained in a world of mediaeval ignorance and isolation".^{4/} And he adds further: "What in essence the Government proposes to do is to convince the Africans that it is better to be Portuguese than to be independent"—or, in other words—

"... what the Government hopes to achieve in a few years is to transform African society into a semblance of Portuguese peasant society: devout, diligent, semi-literate and politically conservative".^{5/}

93. As far as concerns the success of these Portuguese goals, the author of the article makes the following revealing remarks:

"Portugal, even if she wanted to, cannot afford to carry out any large-scale program of social and educational reform. Portugal is a poor country.

^{2/} *Foreign Affairs*, April 1961, p. 481.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, p. 484.

^{4/} *Ibid.*, p. 486.

^{5/} *Ibid.*, p. 487.

She has the lowest per capita income in Western Europe—slightly over \$230 a year—as well as the highest illiteracy rate, about 45 per cent. A considerable portion of her people live on a subsistence level".^{6/}

94. There are many other relevant statements in this, as well as in a number of other books, articles and declarations, from which one could quote, and a considerable number of them have indeed been quoted already in this debate. They are more than sufficient to enable conclusions to be formulated.

95. According to any and every mid-twentieth century standard, Angola is a colony, and according to the same standards, it has the right to full national independence. The two sides in the debate, the world community on one hand and Portugal on the other, are not speaking the same language. The world community, as it has expressed itself in numerous almost unanimous resolutions, speaks in the language of the twentieth century. The voice of Portugal is that of the Middle Ages. This is a contradiction that cannot be solved, and could not be even with the famous "time machine" of the author H. G. Wells. Such is the picture from a purely academic point of view.

96. The argument advanced repeatedly, that Angola is not able to stand on its own if and when Portugal withdraws, is a contradiction in itself. Portugal the colonizer, having lost a colony, may suffer from it; but a colony, becoming independent, can only gain from this act. More than sufficient proof of this is to be seen in all the newly independent African States.

97. My purpose in recalling these points is merely to show that even if the monstrous mass extermination of the Angolan population had not taken place, there was not a single point in Portugal's position that could stand in the light of the ideas born within the last two centuries. As a matter of fact some faint realization of this began to appear in the speech of the representative of Portugal [1088th meeting]. It will be recalled that when the first violence erupted last year he appeared on the scene in full armour, blaming the bogey of international communism for what was actually the result of Portugal's century-long régime of terror and oppression and the indigenous population's reaction to it. In his speech during this part of the sixteenth session the representative of Portugal changed the tenor of his words. He spoke vaguely of certain Members of the United Nations and about neighbouring countries, and so on. He became quite vague because of the total lack of truth in his previous and present assertions.

98. Last year's events have changed the situation drastically. Let me recapitulate very briefly—briefly, because the relevant facts have been amply and clearly brought out by many of those who have spoken before me—what happened.

99. In this part of my statement I shall use two sources. The first is the report of the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola. The report, recalling the events of February 1961, states that "there had been severe repression and reprisals by the government forces and that a large number of Africans, including defenceless men, women and children, had been killed and wounded as a result of machine-gunning and bombing by Portuguese parachutists and other security forces" [A/4978, para. 73].

100. As time passed, the loss of life increased. According to the report, "By the end of May 1961, the conflict had led to the loss of thousands of lives, the flight of tens of thousands of refugees ..." [*ibid.*, para. 105].

101. We all remember that the number in both categories increased steadily as time went on. As a matter of fact, it is still increasing. It is also an established fact that, contrary to the assertions of Portugal, the events were not confined to the northern part of Angola and that, according to the report of the Sub-Committee, "a large number of educated persons have been the victims of the conflict ... because of suspicion that they were the real or potential leaders of the indigenous population" [*ibid.*, para. 129].

102. The other source to which I shall refer is a publication of the Department of News Service of the Joint Section of Education and Cultivation of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church entitled "The War in Angola". The material in the article is based for the most part on on-the-spot findings of their church representatives in Angola. This publication gives concrete illustrations of some of the points which were raised in a general way in the report of the Sub-Committee. The Press release published on 11 July 1961 is entitled "Angola's Modern 'Police' Trained by Hitler's Gestapo". It says, among other things:

"Portugal's tough international police (PIDE) was reportedly first trained by Hitler's Gestapo. Many of Gestapo's methods ... are now being widely practised in Angola."

103. As to the approach of the average Portuguese colonist to the solution of the "problem" of Angola, the following passage is a good example:

"Said one rural Portuguese to an African Mission teacher: 'If we permit your school to continue, your children will be smarter than ours, and in due course they will become the masters and ours the slaves. We cannot allow this to continue.'

"So the school was destroyed and the teacher in that instance was allowed to flee. Many of his colleagues either fell with their schools or were imprisoned."

104. Turning now to the other side, the resistance of the Angolan people, in the course of the past year, has become organized. In fact, the Portuguese—as is customary in the colonial wars of this century—with their ruthless methods of oppression, contributed to the organization of the national liberation movement. These conclusions are more or less implicit in part three, section VII of the report of the Sub-Committee.

105. Locally assessed, the radical change which took place during last year consists of two elements: the Portuguese colonists, being unable to maintain their mediaeval rule with "regular" colonialist oppressive methods, resorted to large-scale massacres; the national liberation movement took definite shape in the course of the fight of the Angolan people. Both these factors have made it necessary as well as possible for the United Nations not only to act, but to act resolutely and swiftly.

106. We cannot, however, stop there. Neither Angola nor Portugal can live out of the world today. In this connexion I wish—again briefly—to touch on two aspects of the problem facing the General Assembly.

^{6/} *Ibid.*, pp. 489-490.

107. The first is the context in which Angola, as an African country, is situated. From this point of view, the part of Africa south of the Sahara is at present divided into two groups of countries. One group consists of all the independent and not yet independent African countries; the other group is composed of the Afrikaners of the Republic of South Africa, the white settlers of Rhodesia and the white settlers of the Portuguese colonies, among them those of Angola. Professor Duffy defines the Portuguese colonists in his article in *Foreign Affairs*, to which I have already referred, in the following manner: "Their words and deeds find a closer parallel with Afrikaner policy in South Africa."^{7/} I do not think that there is any need to go into factual detail in order to prove the above conclusion.

108. The parallel is not only striking but true in all its aspects, as well as in the aspirations of all three white colonialist minorities concerned. I offer one example by way of illustration. According to the agreements between Portugal, on the one hand, and the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia, on the other, the former provides a yearly quota of 165,000 to 200,000 Africans from its colonies for the mines of the two latter, according to the English newspaper *The Guardian*.

Mr. Ortiz Martín (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

109. As far as the opinion of the Africans themselves is concerned, I should like to refer to the quotation in the report of the Sub-Committee from the resolution of the Monrovia Conference of Independent African States in May 1961. The Conference called on:

"... 'all African and Malagasy States to pledge their wholehearted material and moral support to the Africans in Angola in their struggle for autonomy; appeals to the universal conscience against the atrocities and the bloody repression of the Angolan population'" [A/4978, para. 413].

110. Our picture is still not complete, however. We would precisely miss the substance of it if we stopped at the boundaries of Africa. The root of the problem is contained in the old Latin question: *qui prodest*? In whose interest is it to maintain the indigenous people of Angola, South Africa, South West Africa and Rhodesia in their present colonial and oppressed status?

111. The subject of our discussion is Angola. In its case, the most obvious and evident reply to this question is Portugal. Professor Duffy has expressed this thought in the following words:

"A large part of Portuguese exports, notably wine and cotton goods, is destined for Africa, and increasing percentages of Portuguese African products—coffee, tea, sisal, copra, diamonds—go into the world market. The economic picture is not entirely favourable, but it has never been better, and without the African provinces continental Portugal's economy would suffer seriously."^{8/}

112. However, like Belgium in the case of the Congo, Portugal in the case of Angola could never maintain itself there either financially or militarily, if it had to depend on its own resources only. Portugal is not alone, however. It gets the wholehearted support of

its NATO allies. Again I do not want at this stage of the debate to quote many factual details. I wish merely to recall two of them, first the 10,000 sub-machine guns which, according to the *The New York Times*, were supplied to Portugal for use in Angola by West Germany, and second, the \$300 million of military aid from the United States without which the Portuguese army would not be capable of engaging in such protracted warfare.

113. Here, however, we have to stop for a minute. The hypocritical attitude of the United States could actually mislead some of the more credulous people. Why? Because American professors condemn Portugal's attitude in Angola, American missionaries—no doubt many among them out of genuine conviction—denounce Portugal's deeds in Angola; more than that, official United States representatives in the United Nations formally and officially shake their heads at Portugal, as did the representative of the United States, Mr. Stevenson, yesterday. I quote what he said:

"We have made clear to the Portuguese Government our view that this solution must embrace full self-determination for the peoples of this territory, and have sought to persuade it to modify its policies and make adjustments to this end." [1097th meeting, para. 21.]

114. We were really delighted to hear these words advocating peaceful solutions and favouring the right of self-determination, but we cannot ignore the fact that at the same time the Secretary of State of the United States made a declaration in quite a different spirit at another conference. What a fine anti-colonial attitude it would be if these contradictions and diametrically opposed deeds did not exist in the United States!

115. As we all know, the same United States shook the same heads at the Republic of South Africa. But the very same United States did everything in its power to prevent both the General Assembly and the Security Council from adopting any effective measures in the case of the Republic of South Africa. The very same thing is being done by the United States in the case of Portugal and Angola.

116. Let me remind the General Assembly, for instance, of the strenuous efforts of the United States delegation to prevent the question of Angola being debated in the Security Council, where sanctions could be adopted. It would apparently be embarrassing to vote against them, because that would crush the anti-colonial myth which has been very diligently created lately. However, in our century, myths are very short-lived, and the one in question is no exception.

117. It is well known that a major part of the United States' African investments have been placed precisely in the Republic of South Africa. Hence the zeal witnessed by us. A parallel to this is the case of Angola, where we do not have to deal simply with the innate solidarity of the United States monopolies and Government with the worst colonialist methods of her ally. As the saying goes, "Even the devil isn't bad just for the love of it." The United States monopolies have a firm foothold in Angola. I will give just one concrete example. They share the capital in the Diamond Company of Angola. Do you remember Professor Duffy's laconic list, which showed how diamonds too go into the world market? This is the way they get there. The Company is notorious for paying the lowest wages to its miners. Its profits

^{7/} *Ibid.*, April 1961, p. 493.

^{8/} *Ibid.*, p. 481.

amounted to \$20 million in 1958. I am not sure how valiantly the United States shareholders fought against their Portuguese colleagues' inhuman practices, in following their Government's representative's "lofty" stand in the United Nations. Could it not be compared with the Rockefeller Group's oil concessions in Mozambique or Portuguese Guinea?

118. It is here that a picture begins to be complete. Now the answer can be given to the question, qui prodest? The reply, as in all other colonial problems, is NATO under United States leadership, because of the United States direct profits, which are being squeezed out of the sweat and blood and life of the peoples involved.

119. We cannot ignore the historical conditions now prevailing in the world. There are no local wars any more. Each local conflict may explode into a general war involving many interested Powers who are either favouring or opposing progress, prosperity and freedom for the peoples concerned. It is clear from the foregoing that in Angola at this stage several members of NATO, principally the United States, are already quite intensively involved, and it is this circumstance that enables Portugal to continue her shameful expeditionary war, causing still more destruction of human lives and property and at the same time threatening the security of neighbouring peoples, thus creating a hotbed for a large-scale international conflict.

120. As we all know, the question of Angola has already been discussed previously by both the General Assembly and the Security Council. Resolutions have been passed. My delegation is of the opinion that, in view of the seriousness of the situation, the General Assembly has first to take a definite stand, and then to ask the Security Council to apply the necessary sanctions against Portugal.

121. It is for these reasons that my delegation supports the draft resolution sponsored by Bulgaria and Poland [A/L.383]. In our opinion, that draft resolution is an expression of United Nations support for the right of the Angolan people to independence, based on the Charter and on General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). When it comes to the practical application of the anti-colonial Declaration, the United Nations cannot sit back "objectively" and watch. It has to take effective steps in defence of the anti-colonial stand of its Members. That is why it would be correct to raise the problem in the Security Council. The United Nations cannot stop short at "wishing away" colonialism. It has an important contribution to make, whenever the fight against colonialism makes it necessary. Independence should be given to the people of Angola, and the United Nations should guarantee it. A strong and clear resolution is necessary to end, completely and definitively, colonial oppression and colonial war. My delegation will vote for the draft resolution, and we hope that that draft will obtain the support of all those who are genuinely against colonialism and who are prepared to act, and not merely to speak, in defence of the right and of the life of the Angolan people.

122. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is not my intention as representative of Saudi Arabia to engage from this rostrum in condemning or condoning any of the parties directly or indirectly involved in the Angolan conflict. Likewise the majority of my African-Asian colleagues have taken the floor on the Angolan issue not to remonstrate with hatred in their hearts

nor to vent their anger at Portugal's obdurate stand, since neither hatred nor anger could contribute to the well-being of this Organization of which Portugal and all of us are Member States. Nor will hatred or anger hasten the process of finding a speedy solution. The United Nations is predicated upon peace and negotiation and not upon accusations and incriminations.

123. In view of Portugal's non-co-operation, we may well be asked what effect oratory in the General Assembly could have on deafened ears, when Portugal has practically boycotted our deliberations, isolating itself by adopting an archaic attitude far removed from the stark realities of the present time. The reply is that although Portugal is firmly closing her ears to wise counsel, she cannot but hear and heed the anguished voices of the Angolan people clamouring for independence. Withdrawing from the Assembly will not stop any people from fighting for their liberation. Other representatives of colonial Powers have walked out of the Assembly, but their temporary boycott did not dampen the spirit of the fighters for freedom nor did it discourage us or deflect us from our duty to explore ways and means for finding a solution in a similar situation.

124. Having conquered Angola nearly five centuries ago, Portugal claims that she has a title-deed, as it were, to that country and its people. This is what is known as the historical argument. For that matter, at one time the Arabs conquered the Iberian peninsula, where they remained for well nigh eight hundred years. Gaul was a province of the Roman empire for a long stretch of time, and so was a sizable part of the British Isles. One has only to look at ancient maps to see how the frontiers of empires have shrunk or totally disappeared and how new nations have been born. Can we swing back the pendulum of history? Can we, as Arabs, say to the Iberian people, including the Portuguese, "Surrender your land to us, because we exercised power and dominion over your peninsula for eight hundred years"?

125. How would the French and the British react if Italy were to say to them that she had the right of sovereignty over their respective countries because at one time they were component parts of the Roman Empire? It would indeed be ludicrous if such hypothetical contentions were made in earnest by any modern State, basing its claim on such historical argument. An additional argument has been adduced by Portugal, none other than that which has come to be known as the constitutional argument. By a stroke of the pen in Lisbon some years ago, Angola and other Portuguese colonies were incorporated into the metropolitan country, of which they were considered to be provinces.

126. Distance, equal to half the length of the Atlantic Ocean, did not matter. The fact that ethnologically the Angolan people had no affinity with the Portuguese did not matter either. The right to self-determination of peoples and nations was totally ignored by the Portuguese Government. The Angolan people were not asked whether they liked their country to be part of Portugal. The powers that be arbitrarily decided that Angola was part of Portugal—and that was that. What has in recent times befallen vast colonial empires, and the fact that millions of colonial peoples all over the world have by their indomitable will gained their independence, seem to have been totally lost on the Portuguese Government. For indeed they still base their claims on bogus constitutional ties

with their colonial territories—ties which have proved to be nothing less than fetters; otherwise the Angolan people would not be fighting to liberate themselves from those fetters. Since all of the antiquated historical arguments have proven untenable, owing to the national awakening of peoples everywhere in the world, and whereas the artificially constitutional links referred to have not been found to be in practice either just or valid, one may well wonder what deep-seated motive is driving Portugal to behave in the manner in which it is behaving in regard to Angola. That motive is not hard to find. We wish that Portugal, or rather the Portuguese Government, would articulate what lurks in its mind—what, indeed, is the cause, as it were, of Portugal's fears, so that we may all co-operate in assisting Portugal in finding the right and suitable solution.

127. We all wish Portugal would come out and say, "My interest in Angola is primarily economic". If only Portugal would make a clean breast of it and tell us that it needs Angola to bolster its national economy, then and only then would Portugal and ourselves be able to grapple intelligently with the problem and find ways and means of solving it. Portugal, like the other colonial Powers, acquired territories for three main reasons: first, access to raw materials; secondly, cheap native labour; and thirdly, to provide protected markets for manufactured goods. It is true that certain colonies were acquired for strategic and military purposes, but the motive was basically economic. Some vainglorious Powers once in a while claimed that their prestige would be at stake were they to relinquish their colonial territories—a spurious sort of prestige, not unlike false pride, which usually marks hidden motives. But, I believe that in the case of Portugal the *raison d'être* of its fears is, more than likely, that it would sustain great economic losses were it to allow the Angolans to gain their independence.

128. But the crux of the whole situation is that the Angolan people will achieve their independence, and the sooner the better for all concerned. Should the Angolan fight for freedom be protracted, the already tottering Portuguese economy would utterly break down and, as a consequence, the unfortunate Portuguese masses would suffer as great, if not greater, hardships than the Angolan people. Why this senseless loss of blood and treasure on both sides when, indeed, it is unwarranted? Portugal would be the loser in the end; we have witnessed other colonial Powers giving way before the surging forces of freedom. On the other hand, Portugal stands not only to maintain but to develop on a larger scale its economic interests in a free and sovereign Angola, if it would but give Angola independence. Portugal has only to look at the burgeoning trade between various metropolitan Powers, on the one hand, and their respective former colonies that have gained their independence, on the other.

129. We do not come here to condemn Portugal or to threaten it. All we are endeavouring to do is to reason with Portugal and to assure it, judging by our experience in other parts of Africa and Asia, that a free Angola would be the best safeguard for promoting the community of interests between the Portuguese and the Angolan peoples.

130. What will be the alternative if Portugal persists in repressing the Angolan people? The alternative is

nothing short of war, which could very easily involve many other nations in Africa and elsewhere. Even the mighty nations have come to realize that in war there are no longer victorious or defeated nations for all are losers not only in blood and substance, but that man is brutalized and degraded to the lowest level.

131. I have not dwelt on the importance of safeguarding human rights in Angola, although this has been my subject for many years in the United Nations. Can any fundamental human right be upheld in war? It would be a mockery if I were to invoke the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or to cite the provisions of the draft covenants on Human Rights, the substantive articles of which were adopted by the Third Committee at this session, and stand to be ratified by the General Assembly in the not too distant future. Yes, it would be a mockery when, while it is mandatory upon us to promote these rights, we find that they are trampled upon by none other than the mighty Powers, who claim to be their staunchest champions. When the blind and unenlightened interests of these mighty Powers are threatened, they call the nationalist a rebel and sing the praises of law and order, whilst they butcher the patriots and kill like flies the innocent in their colonial territories.

132. More than ever man is paying lip service to human rights. More than ever hypocrisy is the result of rationalized behaviour in situations like that of Angola and others. It is only when man reaches the stage of recoiling from killing his brother man to shield what he considers to be his interest, that our world will truly become civilized. The rationalization of any colonial war is sheer demagoguery.

133. The Angolans are fully justified in endeavouring to liberate themselves from their colonial yoke, for is not the right of peoples to self-determination a fundamental human right, without which the other human rights may not be fully enjoyed? It is in the spirit of our solidarity with our African brethren and of desiring to maintain friendly relations with those European Powers allied to Portugal that we appeal to those Powers to prevail on Portugal to bring the conflict in Angola to an end with a view to allowing the Angolans to achieve their independence peacefully. In no other way can Portuguese interests be better served.

134. With respect to the joint draft resolution [A/L.384/Rev.1] which my delegation has sponsored, I can add little to what has been said by some of my colleagues in presenting it from this rostrum. One thing, however, deserves to be mentioned. This joint draft resolution was the result of long, careful and judicious deliberations by the African-Asian group of nations. In the preamble, the draft resolution objectively states the facts as they obtain in Angola, whilst in the operative part it sets forth what its African-Asian sponsors believe to be reasonable and effective steps for bringing about a peaceful solution.

135. Before concluding, we would like to express our thanks to the Sub-Committee on the situation in Angola for the exemplary report [A/4978] it has submitted to us. The Saudi Arabian delegation believes that continued use should be made of the Sub-Committee's good offices, with a view to prevailing on not only Portugal but on its allies to declare Angola an independent and sovereign State in the near future.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.