

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1400th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 28 November 1962,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 54:

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV): report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (continued)
Hearing of petitioners (continued) 471

Chairman: Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO
(Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 54

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV): report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (A/5160 and Corr.1, A/C.4/582) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Jean-Pierre Bala and Mr. A. Kaziluki, representatives of the Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola (MDIA), took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) thanked the Committee on behalf of his party for having given it an opportunity of interpreting the will of the people that it represented, and expressed its gratitude to all those countries that were lending their moral support to Angola in its struggle to regain its independence.

2. Ever since its establishment, his party had consistently pursued a policy of friendship, which was the only one capable of preserving what was worth keeping and of preparing a happy future for all concerned. When faced with the choice between war or negotiation with Portugal, his party had preferred to attempt to enter into contact with the Portuguese Government. He himself had gone to Lisbon three times for the purpose of coming to terms with the responsible Portuguese authorities on the problem of the independence of Angola, and two delegations of his party had gone to Luanda for the purpose of contacting the local authorities. On those occasions, the representatives of his party had stressed that the Angolan problem should be seen in its true perspective, and that the Angolans wished to achieve independence in order, peace and harmony. Notwithstanding that pacific and constructive attitude, the Portuguese Government had pursued its vacillating and destructive policy and had not kept any of its promises. That was why his party was requesting the United Nations and countries friendly to Portugal to

persuade that State to desist from such a policy and to enter into negotiations. His party wished to declare that the Portuguese Government would bear sole responsibility for the consequences if the good relations that existed between it and his party's leaders were broken off; if the Portuguese Government refused to fulfil its undertakings, that Government and not his party would have to take the blame.

3. Mindful of the undertakings into which it had entered on behalf of the people it represented, bearing in mind the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, considering the stage of advancement attained by the people of Angola and their right freely to determine the political, administrative and social structure of their country, considering also the refusal of the Portuguese Government to satisfy the aspirations of the Angolans and the outbreak of inhuman acts which had resulted from that refusal and had had the effect of further widening the rift between the indigenous inhabitants and the Europeans, and considering finally, that the spirit of co-operation between the two peoples might yet be revived, his party was calling for the granting of full independence to Angola and for the convocation, by 5 January 1963 at the latest, of a round-table conference of representatives of the Angolan people and of the Portuguese Government for the purpose of fixing a time-table for the transfer of powers. His party rejected the resolutions adopted at the latest meeting of the Overseas Council at Lisbon, in October 1962, regarding the revision of the basic statutes of all the territories under Portuguese domination.

4. He then outlined a plan for the organization of the future independent State of Angola which he considered must be adopted before any negotiations could take place. The independent State of Angola would be a federal State provided with solidly established institutions capable of ensuring a real and workable democracy and of guaranteeing order, security and the execution of national and international undertakings, both public and private, as well as the protection of persons and property. It would consist of six provinces or federated states, each of which would have a legislative council elected on a basis of direct suffrage and an executive body presided over by a governor elected by the council; in each state, there would be a court presided over by an attorney-general, a tribunal of first instance and various tribunals having regional jurisdiction. At the federal level, the legislative power would be shared between a national council elected on a basis of direct universal suffrage and a council of state composed of an equal number of representatives from each province. The executive power would be vested in a body of ministers headed by a prime minister, and its prerogatives under the constitution would extend to all questions at the federal level. The judicial branch of the federal government would comprise a

high council of magistrates, which would be presided over by the president of the republic and would be responsible for guaranteeing the independence of the judiciary; the federal tribunals would include a supreme court of appeal, lower courts of appeal and military tribunals.

5. The action to be taken on the social and cultural plane would include a sweeping revision of the labour laws, which were not in keeping with modern requirements; the guaranteeing of a minimum legal wage providing a decent existence for all; and a revision of the policy and legislation in respect of land tenure. That programme, which would be devoid of any discrimination, would be supplemented by a system of social security, by the introduction of full employment and by the implementation of an advanced policy of investments in the social field. Illiteracy would be tackled by the establishment of an educational system which would allow every young person to receive primary education, while the best students would be able to pursue their studies at the secondary and university level; primary education would be compulsory and free. The training of technicians would be accelerated, teacher-training colleges would be established in each province, and two universities would be founded. Medical, pedagogical and administrative studies would receive priority, and craftsmen would be granted loans for the purchase of tools.

6. Angola's basic economic structure was already highly developed; the country had seventeen seaports, five railway lines, several airfields and a vast network of roads suitable for motor traffic. Its mainstay was agriculture, which provided a living for a large part of the population, and the main crops were coffee (45 per cent of total exports), sugar cane and cotton. With regard to industry, the working of the diamond, copper and iron deposits, oil fields and so on would require foreign capital. There were also other industries which, although less important, would lend themselves to development; they included cement works, breweries and textile mills. Fishing and animal husbandry were likewise important sources of revenue. Angola could thus be seen to have great economic possibilities; when that country had become independent, it would pursue a liberal policy, and foreigners would be welcome provided they complied with the laws of the land and did not interfere in its domestic affairs. The Angolans would seek public and private investments and would provide guarantees safeguarding the rights and property of investors. With the capital obtained from abroad, they would develop their industries and agriculture to a point where not only would the natural resources of the country be fully exploited, but the social and cultural progress of its inhabitants could be stimulated. In an independent Angola, the current system based on privilege would no longer be tolerated, and discrimination would be entirely banished.

7. In consideration of the desire of the Angolan people to discuss its future with qualified representatives of the Portuguese Government, and of the reticence displayed by that Government, MDIA was for the last time drawing the attention of the Portuguese Government and of international public opinion to the goodwill, the objective outlook and the maturity of its leaders. The latter realized that the patience of the Angolan people was at an end and that that people would lay the entire blame on Portugal if it had to abandon all prospect of agreement and co-

operation. Those leaders would also hold Portugal responsible for the consequences that its attitude might have for present and future relations between the two countries. They hoped that the fundamental problems involved would be honestly and speedily solved and that concrete decisions would be made which would enable Angola to extricate itself from its current impasse.

8. Mr. DELISLE (Canada) asked the petitioner what was the current membership of his party, and whether it included any Europeans.

9. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that the membership of his movement did not include any Europeans living in Angola, and was composed mainly of exiled persons. The last membership card issued in the Congo bore the number 75,631. He added that his movement had the support of thousands of Angolans living in the Territory, as well as of some 200,000 members of an Angolan religious sect.

10. Mr. DELISLE (Canada) asked whether MDIA advocated that Angola should be granted independence by a definite date, or whether it contemplated a period of progress towards self-government and, in either case, how many years it considered would be required for Angola to achieve independence.

11. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that MDIA would like a provisional executive to be set up from the beginning of 1963 and to remain in power for a period of twelve to eighteen months in order to prepare for the elections.

12. Mr. DELISLE (Canada) asked the petitioner whether he drew any distinction between self-government and independence.

13. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that MDIA was willing to accept an eighteen-month period of self-government prior to full independence.

14. Mr. DELISLE (Canada) asked whether MDIA considered the possibility of effective co-operation, or even union, with the other Angolan parties—including the Front national pour la libération de l'Angola (FNLA)—which were striving towards the same ideal.

15. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that there were many possibilities of agreement between his own movement and the other political organizations, and even FNLA, as all were fighting for a common cause: the complete independence of Angola.

16. Mr. DELISLE (Canada), recalling that MDIA was counting on the co-operation of the Portuguese Government in order to attain its goals, asked whether or not MDIA had succeeded in opening talks with the Portuguese authorities, or whether it hoped to open such talks in the near future.

17. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) recalled that he had gone to Lisbon in July and October 1961 and July 1962, and that a delegation from his movement had gone twice to Luanda to establish contacts with the local authorities with the object of finding a solution to the Angolan problem. MDIA considered that those contacts could be widened if it received the support of the United Nations, and that was why it had been led to put forward its views before the Organization.

18. Mr. ISSA (Niger) asked the petitioner whether his party, should the policy of non-violence or of the "outstretched hand" which it advocated prove unprofitable, would join with FNLA, which was already engaged in an armed struggle.

19. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that the central committee of his party gave no directives except those which its followers asked for and freely accepted. An attitude of solidarity with FNLA was not out of the question, but only on condition that the mass of the people who supported MDIA declared themselves in favour of such a course. Before involving people in a venture, it was necessary that they should be fully aware of the risks involved and that they should accept them of their own free will.

20. Mr. ISSA (Niger), observing that MDIA advocated a federal system, asked the petitioner whether that meant that in MDIA's opinion there was no possibility of Angola retaining its unity when it gained its independence. He asked further whether there was already a movement in favour of federalism and whether that trend was to be explained by tribal problems.

21. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that MDIA preferred a federal structure because of the diversity of the geographical regions, habits and customs of the country. Such a federal structure did not, however, exclude unity, which was represented by the federal government envisaged. What MDIA wanted was unity within federalism.

22. Mr. ISSA (Niger) thanked the petitioner and said that he was somewhat sceptical of the possibility of Angola obtaining its independence without resorting to force. He thought that, if peaceful methods and persuasion failed, Mr. Bala's friends would sooner or later have to join FNLA in an armed struggle.

23. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the questions put by the representative of Canada and the remarks made by the representative of Niger had anticipated some of her own remarks. It was unfortunately only too clear that the Government of Portugal had no intention of co-operating, and that the petitioner's party would have to consider resorting to other means if it failed to obtain the co-operation of the Portuguese Government by peaceful methods.

24. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that the Angolans whom he represented were at the end of their tether, and that was why the petitioners had come to inform the United Nations of the situation and ask for its support. Various proposals had been put forward at the Overseas Council which had sat at Lisbon in October. MDIA rejected the system of administrative decentralization which had been envisaged at the Council and which provided for the appointment of provincial secretaries under the authority of the governors. It had been as a result of the proposals made at the Council and their rejection by MDIA that MDIA had put forward the proposals which Mr. Bala had read out at the beginning of his statement. MDIA hoped to be able to discuss its proposals with the authorities at Lisbon as a result of the action of the United Nations.

25. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked the petitioner whether he did not think that it would be better for

all the nationalist forces to unite for the struggle against the common enemy.

26. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that one form of combat did not rule out the other. FNLA and MDIA were both fighting for the same cause. Differences might exist between them, but he did not think that their over-all fighting power was diminished by that. A field could be ploughed on several sides at the same time, and the fact that a game animal was fired on from several sides at once did not prevent it from being hit.

27. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the disunity of the parties played into the hands of the colonial Powers. The day of independence was as a result delayed, and the determination of the fighters for freedom was weakened. Experience proved that, when the forces of liberation were divided, the colonial Powers were able to destroy the parties after separating them from one another, and then set up new organizations devoted to their own cause. The followers of MDIA would do well to consider a union which would strengthen the common action. The delegation of Liberia believed Mr. Bala's party to be sincere when it said that it wanted to free its country; its sincerity and determination to take part in the struggle should enable it to overcome without too much difficulty the obstacles facing a union of the forces of patriotism.

28. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) said that it appeared, from all the information available, that the nationalists all seemed to be obliged either to give in or to go into exile, whereas Mr. Bala, on the contrary, seemed able to move freely between Lisbon and Luanda. He asked Mr. Bala whether he could say what results had been obtained from his contacts with the Portuguese authorities.

29. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that he had visited Lisbon three times. On his first visit, in 1961, his party had asked for recognition of the right to self-determination, the setting-up of a provisional executive, the provision of scholarships, the freeing of political or religious prisoners, and the abolition of the decrees sanctioning the division of the population of Angola into different classes. Satisfaction had been obtained in the matter of the scholarships: eleven Angolans had received scholarships for study in Portugal; in addition a number of political prisoners had been freed. As far as the other three points were concerned, the abolition of the decrees in question had been carried out on paper, but had not been put into practice, and no result had yet been obtained in the matter of setting up a provisional executive or recognition of the right to self-determination.

30. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) asked what the exact reply of the Portuguese Government had been in the matter of self-determination and independence.

31. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that, up to the present time, Portugal had refused to answer that question, and that was the reason why he was appearing before the United Nations and travelling all over the world seeking organizations capable of exerting pressure on the Lisbon Government.

32. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) observed that the petitioner had not replied, perhaps on purpose, to the last question but one put to him by the representative

of Tunisia, who would perhaps like to put his question again. The reply to that question would be of great interest to the delegation of Guinea.

33. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) pointed out that he had asked the petitioner to state what had been the outcome of his contacts with the Portuguese authorities, since he had been able to travel and to establish contact with the Government in Lisbon fairly easily.

34. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) repeated that the results were still negative.

35. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) recalled that the petitioner had said that the supporters of MDIA had begun to lose patience and it was not excluded that they might eventually abandon their policy of non-violence. He wished to know what the petitioner thought of the war which was going on in Angola.

36. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) repeated that the stakes remained the same and that shots fired at the same target could hit it even if they were fired from different directions. He was aware that a war was going on in Angola and that some were fighting for independence, as were the members of his own party.

37. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) pointed out that the people of Angola had already lost patience and that the petitioner's warning therefore no longer had any meaning. He wondered what methods the petitioner advocated for Angola's attainment of independence and for the establishment of the basic system of institutions which he had described at the beginning of his statement.

38. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that his party would welcome co-operation with Portugal for about a year and a half before the attainment of full independence. Thereafter the way would be open to all manifestations of goodwill, through which MDIA hoped it would be possible, at that juncture, to set up the administrative machinery to which he had referred.

39. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) said that the petitioner had not precisely answered his question. He had asked what methods the petitioner advocated using in order to achieve independence.

40. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that his party requested that a round-table conference be convened not later than 5 January 1963. All the Angolan political parties would be represented, and would hold discussions with authorized representatives of the Portuguese Government on a footing of equality. The solution should be worked out at that conference.

41. Mr. ABDELLAH (Tunisia) said that the answer was not to the point.

42. Mr. CISSE (Senegal) considered that the petitioner was evading the questions asked him. He seemed to rely upon the moral support of the United Nations for the next stage; but the colonized peoples already enjoyed that support in full, and what the petitioner should describe was his party's concept of the next stage.

43. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that he could not state in advance what decisions would be taken by his party's congress

following the round-table conference requested for 5 January.

44. Mr. CISSE (Senegal) said that his delegation had thought that the petitioner had presented himself in order to obtain the Committee's assistance. But since he did not agree to supply the information which would enable the Committee to give him effective assistance, the Senegalese delegation would not dwell on that point further.

45. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he had already met Mr. Bala at Leopoldville and had had occasion to tell him what he thought of him. The Tunisian representative had asked a very interesting question, which had not been repeated in its original form. Restating the question on his own account, he asked the petitioner how it came about that Angolan nationalists could not return to their country or to Portugal without being thrown into prison, whereas the petitioner was able to travel freely between Luanda and Lisbon and to enjoy privileges which were not extended even to Portuguese citizens. He would welcome explanations on that point.

46. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that he had gone to Lisbon at his own risk in 1961, and had not been arrested there; afterwards he had returned to the Congo (Leopoldville), where he resided. He had later asked the authorities at Lisbon for permission to go to Angola, which had been granted. There he had met the Governor-General, whom he had informed of the wishes of his party; again, he had not been arrested. Only Portugal could give the reasons for that tolerance. It was difficult to make the authorities at Lisbon understand the need to adapt themselves to the requirements of modern times. He tried to do so at his own risk, and when he went to Portugal or to Angola it was like going to war, in that he did not know whether he would return.

47. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) asked how—assuming that the Portuguese Government had taken the petitioner seriously, which was not certain—it was possible to explain Portugal's refusal to have any contact with other nationalists who had expressed the desire to negotiate on the basis of self-determination.

48. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that it was not for him to judge the methods of the other fighters for independence. He had begun by sending letters and petitions to Lisbon, and when no replies had been forthcoming his party had decided to send emissaries at their own risk. He had gone to Lisbon and had returned, and was now in New York to request the help of the United Nations. Some of his compatriots were seeking to attain independence by force of arms, while others preferred peaceful methods. It was for history to do justice to each.

49. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he hoped Mr. Bala would succeed in persuading the Prime Minister, Mr. Salazar, to negotiate with the true representatives of the Angolan people. If he was able to accomplish that "tour de force", the Fourth Committee would be very grateful to him.

50. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) observed that the petitioner's party seemed to enjoy, if not the confidence, at least the tolerance of the Portuguese Government. It was able to present its case at Lisbon and to obtain at least some sort of a reply. Other

groups did not have the same opportunities for discussion. He asked whether the petitioner considered that it would be impossible to establish co-operation between the group which he represented and the other groups, which had no possibility of making contact with the Portuguese Government.

51. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that he thought there was every possibility of working together. In his opinion, it was an internal matter which concerned the political organizations of Angola; it was the interests of the population that were in question. It was conceivable that results would be achieved when the situation became really clear.

52. Mr. HACENE (Algeria), speaking on behalf of a people which had been in the same situation as the Angolans, asked the petitioner whether he realized the psychological effect which disunity among the national parties might have on the fighters in the "maquis". In that connexion, he would agree with the representative of Liberia that, in face of a powerful enemy, it was impossible to win independence unless the fighters for that cause were united.

53. Like the representatives of Tunisia and Guinea, he was astonished that the petitioner and his friends should have been able to go to Lisbon. During the eight years of the Algerian war, it would have been inconceivable for a nationalist to go to Paris except as a prisoner.

54. Bearing in mind the contacts and preliminary negotiations to which the petitioner had referred, he would like to know what the attitude of MDIA would be if the solution which it advocated was not accepted by the Angolan fighters.

55. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) observed that the preliminary negotiations which had taken place served the cause of Angola alone. MDIA would like nothing better than a union of the political organizations; such a union was not beyond the bounds of possibility, provided that the country's situation was clearly understood. After all, the Angolan political organizations had only one adversary.

56. Mr. HACENE (Algeria) expressed regret that the petitioner had not given him a clear reply. The petitioner was forgetting that at that very moment Angolans were fighting in the "maquis". He asked how the petitioner could start negotiations with a country against which three quarters of his compatriots were fighting, without consulting the latter first.

57. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) repeated that it was not for him to judge the political attitudes of the leaders of certain organizations which were fighting in Angola. Nor was it for him to discuss the numbers of the adherents of each such organization, or to say how many of his compatriots favoured recourse to arms and how many favoured negotiations. All he could say was that he had come before the Committee on behalf and at the expense of the Angolan people, a large number of whom favoured a solution by negotiation. Those who supported MDIA knew that it was to a solution by negotiation that it would be necessary to come sooner or later, and they had preferred to resort to it in the first place. In that connexion, he thought he could

even claim to speak on behalf of the majority of the Angolan people.

58. Mr. HACENE (Algeria) could not pass over the petitioner's reply without noting the way in which he disowned his compatriots who were dying in combat. He wished to know what tangible factors in Portugal's attitude suggested to the leaders of MDIA that the Angolan fighters had been wrong to take up arms.

59. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that he had never said that the Angolans who had taken up arms to liberate their country had been wrong to do so. He had merely stated that his political organization had favoured negotiation and had resorted to it first. He and his friends had even taken certain risks; and they were convinced that, with the support of the United Nations, MDIA would be able to facilitate negotiations, which would also be in the interest of the fighters, since they were fighting for the same cause.

60. Mr. HACENE (Algeria) noted that the petitioner had not given a specific reply to the question about the factors in Portugal's attitude which led him to believe that negotiations could have a positive result. In the absence of any satisfactory reply, he concluded that the petitioner's hopes were quite unfounded; and he wished to pay a tribute to the fighters for liberation, who were sacrificing their lives and were not content to pursue illusions.

61. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said he still thought that his party's attitude was of advantage to all. When the time came, all Angolans would be able to welcome the results of the struggle which had been carried on in different ways by the different organizations.

62. Mr. NGANDO-BLACK (Cameroon) deduced, from the petitioner's replies, that MDIA was not opposed to Angola's accession to independence and thought that, despite the hostilities which had already broken out, it was perhaps still possible to reach agreement with the Portuguese Government. His delegation had doubts on that score, but it was glad to note that the Portuguese Government had not succeeded in completely disuniting the parties which were fighting for the liberation of Angola.

63. The petitioner had said that his party recommended that negotiations with Portugal should be pursued for some time more. Cameroon for its part had always recommended that disputes, however deep, be settled by peaceful means, and he was convinced of the good faith of the petitioner and his party in that respect. He would like, however, to know whether MDIA would recommend that its members should join those already fighting in the "maquis", if the negotiations of which the petitioner had spoken failed to bear fruit within the period he had mentioned.

64. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied that the principle of his party was non-violence. The executive committee of MDIA emanated from the people, was appointed by the people, and could speak only on behalf of those who gave it its mandate. Accordingly, in the case envisaged by the representative of Cameroon, MDIA would hold a congress which would determine the policy to be followed. Until such a congress had been held, he could not tell the Committee what his party would decide.

65. Mr. NGANDO-BLACK (Cameroon) quite understood that the petitioner hesitated to predict what the congress of his party would decide. As a member of MDIA, however, he might have some idea of the lines which his party might follow. As the representative of Algeria had emphasized, the petitioner should realize the possible harm done to the "maquis" fighters by the knowledge that some of their compatriots who professed to defend the cause of Angola were received at Lisbon, while the fighters themselves were pursued by the Portuguese forces.

66. He asked whether, without prejudging his party's decision, the petitioner could tell the Committee what policy he would like MDIA to pursue should the hopes of negotiations with the Portuguese Government be disappointed. His reply to that question would enable members of the Committee to form some idea as to the merits of the theory which he was defending.

67. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that he, for his part, would urge the adoption towards Portugal of a policy of persuasion, with support from the United Nations, especially as Article 41 of the Charter envisaged an exceptional procedure in cases of that type. The provisions of that Article had never yet been resorted to. He based his hopes on that procedure, and hoped that the freedom-loving Members of the United Nations would thus be able to help to bring pressure to bear on Portugal and persuade it to yield. That was the view which he, for his part, was determined to advance.

68. Mr. NGANDO-BLACK (Cameroon) feared that the reply just given by the petitioner might do ill service to the cause which he believed he was defending. If he had said that, in the negotiations which it sought to initiate, his party intended to act as a link between the Angolan patriots and the Government of Portugal, the Cameroonian delegation would have supported him whole-heartedly. But, given what was known of Portugal's policy in its so-called overseas provinces, it seemed that the petitioner was on the wrong track.

69. His delegation hoped that before it was too late the petitioner would reflect on the action which his party should take for the liberation of its country. After the failure of negotiations with Portugal, action would have to take a different form.

70. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that, after listening to the petitioner's replies, she was more than ever convinced that the view she had already expressed during the meeting was correct. She recalled the atrocious tortures inflicted by the Portuguese on the Angolan patriots whom they captured; and she asked the petitioner whether he did not think that, since it was in a position to hold conversations with representatives of the Portuguese Government, his party should make common cause with the parties already sacrificing themselves for the liberation of Angola and prepare a joint plan of action for ending the hostilities in Angola. In that way it might be possible to achieve an agreement between the Portuguese Government and the parties which had already commenced the struggle.

71. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) repeated that his party was trying to find a solution whereby agreement between Portugal and all the nationalist movements could be reached. As

he had already said, MDIA had given Portugal until 5 January 1963, at the latest, to hold a round-table conference at which the leaders of all the political organizations of Angola would hold discussions with representatives of the Lisbon Government on an equal footing. Before recommending extreme measures, he would prefer the populations whom he represented to decide freely, and in full knowledge of the facts, what course they proposed to follow in the future. He was not opposed to the formation of a joint liberation front, provided that those who formed it did so in full awareness of the consequences involved.

72. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thanked the petitioner. She had merely wished to remind him of certain events currently taking place in Angola. If MDIA was not prepared to blend with the other political organizations fighting to liberate the country, it would not be easy to find a solution. If the petitioner had any influence with the Portuguese authorities, his first duty was to ask them to put an end to the atrocities being committed in his country.

73. Mr. SATO (Central African Republic) noted that in his replies the petitioner had indicated that he represented a majority party reflecting the attitude of the entire population of Angola and that, if Portugal granted independence to Angola, MDIA would be prepared to share power and negotiate with the other political organizations. Was that what the petitioner had meant?

74. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) replied in the affirmative.

75. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) asked the petitioner whether, in view of Portugal's contempt for world opinion and for the resolutions of the United Nations, he thought that the time had come for the Organization to recommend application of the sanctions envisaged in Article 41 of the Charter. In fact, his party appeared already to have failed so far as negotiations with Portugal were concerned.

76. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) repeated that he had come to the United Nations in order to request it to use all means to enable his country to obtain independence as soon as possible. His reference to Article 41 of the Charter left room for no doubt on that score, and he hoped that the people of Angola would not have long to wait before the United Nations brought pressure to bear on Portugal with a view to the latter's granting Angola its independence.

77. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) asked the petitioner what his party's attitude towards the other political organizations which had already taken up arms would be if they were victorious. What would then be the relationship between MDIA and the victorious parties?

78. Mr. BALA (Mouvement de défense des intérêts de l'Angola) said that, so far as his party was concerned, if it had the opportunity to come to power it would invite the co-operation of all the political organizations which had fought for the country's independence. For the time being, it was not easy to ascertain the views of the other political organizations on that point; but, in the interest of the populations which it represented, MDIA would ask nothing better than to co-operate with the other political parties, when the time came and if they requested such co-operation.

79. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) thanked the petitioner for the replies to his questions. He hoped that, when Angola had obtained its independence, MDIA and the

other political parties would co-operate in peace and harmony.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

I