



Chairman: Mr. Zdeněk ČERNÍK  
(Czechoslovakia).

**AGENDA ITEM 65**

**Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (continued) (A/8723/Add.3, A/8758 and Add.1, A/C.4/745)**

**GENERAL DEBATE (continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN welcomed Mr. Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), Mr. Gil Fernandes and Mr. Oscar Teixeira, members of PAIGC, and invited Mr. Cabral to address the Committee.
2. Mr. CABRAL (Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde) said that for the second time he had the honour to address the Fourth Committee on behalf of the African people of Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands, whose sole legitimate and true representative was PAIGC. He did so with gratification, being fully aware that the members of the Committee were his comrades in the difficult but inspiring struggle for the liberation of peoples and mankind and against oppression of all kinds in the interest of a better life in a world of peace, security and progress. While not forgetting the often remarkable role that Utopia could play in furthering human progress, PAIGC was very realistic. It knew that, among the members of the Fourth Committee, there were some who, perhaps in spite of themselves, were in duty bound to adopt an obstructionist, if not negative, attitude when dealing with problems relating to the struggle for national liberation in Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. He ventured to say "in spite of themselves" because, leaving aside compelling reasons of State policy, it was difficult to believe that responsible men existed who fundamentally opposed the legitimate aspirations of the African people to live in dignity, freedom, national independence and progress, because in the modern world, to support those who were suffering and fighting for their liberation, it was not necessary to be courageous; it was enough to be honest.
3. He had addressed the Fourth Committee for the first time on 12 December 1962<sup>1</sup>. Ten years was a long and even decisive period in the life of a human being, but a short interval in the history of a people. During that decade sweeping, radical and irreversible changes had occurred in the life of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. Unfortunately, it was impossible for him to refresh the memory of the members of the Committee in order to compare the situation of those days with the present, because most, if not all, of the representatives in the Committee were not the same. He would therefore briefly recapitulate the events up to the present.
4. On 3 August 1959, at a crucial juncture in the history of the struggle, the Portuguese colonialists had committed the massacre of Pidgiguiti, in which the dock workers of Bissau and the river transport strikers had been the victims and which, at a cost of 50 killed and over 100 strikers wounded, had been a painful lesson for his people, who had learned that there was no question of choosing between a peaceful struggle and armed combat; the Portuguese had had weapons and had been prepared to kill. At a secret meeting of the PAIGC leaders, held at Bissau on 19 September 1959, the decision had been taken to suspend all peaceful representations to the authorities in the villages and to prepare for the armed struggle. For that purpose it had been necessary to have a solid political base in the countryside. After three years of active and intensive mobilization and organization of the rural populations, PAIGC had managed to create that basis in spite of the increasing vigilance of the colonial authorities. Feeling the winds of change, the Portuguese colonialists had launched an extensive campaign of police and military repression against the nationalist forces. In June 1962, over 2,000 patriots had been arrested throughout the country. Several villages had been set on fire and their inhabitants massacred. Dozens of Africans had been burnt alive or drowned in the rivers and others tortured. The policy of repression had stiffened the people's determination to continue the fight. Some skirmishes had broken out between the patriots and the forces of colonialist repression. Faced with that situation, the patriots had considered that only appropriate and effective intervention by the United Nations in support of the inalienable rights of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands could induce the Portuguese Government to respect international morality and legality. In the light of subsequent events they might well be considered to have been naïve. The patriots had believed it to be their duty and their right to have recourse to the international Organization. In the circumstances they had considered it absolutely necessary to appeal to the Fourth Committee. Their message had been the appeal of a people confronted with a particularly difficult situation but resolved to pay the price required to regain their dignity and freedom, as also proof of their trust in the strength of the principles and in the capacity for action of the United Nations.

<sup>1</sup> For the official summary of the speech, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Fourth Committee, 1420th meeting*.

5. What had the Fourth Committee been told at that time? First of all, PAIGC had clearly described the reasons for and purposes of its presence in the United Nations and had explained that it had come as the representative of the African people of "Portuguese" Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands. The people had placed their entire trust in PAIGC, an organization which had mobilized and organized them for the struggle for national liberation. The people had been gagged by the total lack of fundamental freedoms and by the Portuguese colonial repression. It had considered those who had defended their interests in every possible way throughout the preceding 15 years of Africa's history to be their lawful representatives.

6. It had been said that PAIGC had come to the Fourth Committee not to make propaganda or to extract resolutions condemning Portuguese colonialism, but to work with the Committee in order to arrive at a constructive solution of a problem which was both that of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and that of the United Nations itself: the immediate liberation of that people from the colonial yoke.

7. Nor had PAIGC come to inveigh against Portuguese colonialism, as had already been done many times—just as attacks had already been made and condemnations uttered against Portuguese colonialism, whose characteristics, subterfuges, methods and activities were already more than well known to the United Nations and world opinion.

8. It had come to the Fourth Committee because of the situation actually prevailing in its country and with the backing of international law, in order to seek, together with the members of the Committee, including the Portuguese delegation, the shortest and most effective way of rapidly eliminating Portuguese colonialism from Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands.

9. The time had come for his people and Party to dispense with indecision and promises and to adopt definitive decisions and take specific action. They had already agreed to make great sacrifices and were determined to do much more to recover their liberty and human dignity, whatever the path to be followed.

10. It was not by chance that PAIGC's presence in the Committee had not been considered indispensable until then. The legal, human and material requisites for action had not existed. In the course of the preceding years those requisites had been gradually accumulating, both for the United Nations and for the people engaged in the struggle, and PAIGC had been convinced that the time had come to act and that the United Nations and the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde could really do so. In order to act, PAIGC had thought that it was necessary to establish close and effective co-operation and that it had the right and duty to help the United Nations so that it, in its turn, could help it to win back national freedom and independence. The help which PAIGC could provide had been mainly specific information on the situation in its country, a clear definition of the position adopted and the submission of specific proposals for a solution.

11. After describing the situation prevailing in the country, especially with regard to the intensified police and military repression, the fiction of the so-called "reforms" introduced by the Portuguese Government in September 1961 and the future prospects for its struggle, PAIGC had analysed the problems relating to the legality or illegality of the struggle.

12. He would pass over some parts of that statement and confine himself to recalling that it had been said that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had not only imposed on Portugal and the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde the obligation to end colonial domination in that country but had also committed the United Nations itself to take action in order to end colonial domination wherever it existed, with a view to facilitating the national independence of all colonial peoples. The people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde had been convinced that the Portuguese Government could not continue obstinately and with impunity to commit an international crime and that the United Nations had all the necessary means at its disposal for ordering and applying practical and effective measures designed to ensure respect for the principles of the Charter, impose international legality in their country and defend the interests of peace and civilization.

13. The representatives of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands had not come to ask the United Nations to send troops to free their country from the Portuguese colonial yoke, because, even though it might have been able to do so, they had not thought it necessary as they had been sure of their ability to liberate their own country. They had invoked the right to the collaboration and practical assistance of the United Nations with a view to expediting the liberation of their country from the colonial yoke and thus reducing the human and material losses which a protracted struggle might entail.

14. Not only had PAIGC been aware of the legality of its struggle but also of the fact that, fighting as it had been by all the means at its disposal for the liberation of its country, it had also been defending international legality, peace and the progress of mankind.

15. The struggle had ceased to be strictly national and had become international. In Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde the fight for progress and freedom from poverty, suffering and oppression had been waged in various forms. While it was true that the victims of the fight had been the sons of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, it was also true that each comrade who had succumbed to torture or had fallen under the bullets of the Portuguese colonialists was identified—through the hope and conviction which the people of their country cherished in their hearts and minds—with all peace-loving and freedom-loving men who wished to live a life of progress in the pursuit of happiness.

16. In his country the fight had been waged not only to fulfil aspirations for freedom and national independence but also—and it would be continued until victory

was won—to ensure respect for the resolutions and Charter of the United Nations. In the prisons, towns and fields of his country, a battle had been fought between the United Nations, which had demanded the elimination of the system of colonial domination of peoples, and the armed forces of the Portuguese Government which had sought to perpetuate the system in defiance of the people's legitimate rights.

17. The question had arisen as to who were actually engaged in the fight. When a fighter had succumbed in his country to police torture, or had been murdered in prison, or burnt alive or machine-gunned by the Portuguese troops, for what cause had he given his life? He had given his life for the liberation of his people from the colonial yoke and hence for the cause of the United Nations. In fighting and dying for the country's liberation, he had given his life, in a context of international legality, for the ideal set forth in the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, especially General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

18. For his people, the only difference between an Indian soldier, an Italian pilot or a Swedish official who had died in the Congo and the combatant who had died in Guinea (Bissau) or the Cape Verde Islands was that the latter, fighting in his own country in the service of the same ideal, was no more than an anonymous combatant for the United Nations cause.

19. The time had come, in the opinion of PAIGC to take stock of the situation and make radical changes in it, since it benefited only the enemies of the United Nations and, more specifically, Portuguese colonialism.

20. The Africans, having rejected the idea of begging for freedom, which was contrary to their dignity and their sacred right to freedom and independence, had reaffirmed their steadfast decision to end colonial domination of their country, no matter what the sacrifices involved, and to conquer for themselves the opportunity to achieve in peace their own progress and happiness.

21. With that aim in view and on the basis of that irrevocable decision, PAIGC had defined three possible ways in which the conflict between the Government of Portugal and the African people might evolve and be resolved. Those three possibilities were the following:

(a) A radical change in the position of the Portuguese Government;

(b) Immediate specific action by the United Nations and

(c) A struggle waged exclusively by the people with their own means.

As proof of its confidence in the Organization, and in view of the influence which some of the latter's Members could certainly exert on the Portuguese Government, PAIGC had taken into consideration only

the first two possibilities and in that connexion had submitted the following specific proposals. With regard to the first possibility: the immediate establishment of contact between the Portuguese delegation and the PAIGC delegation; consultations with the Portuguese Government to set an early date for the beginning of negotiations between that Government's representatives and the lawful representatives of Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands; and, pending negotiations, suspension of repressive acts by the Portuguese colonial forces and of all action by the nationalists. With regard to the second possibility: acceptance of the principle that United Nations assistance would not be really effective unless it was simultaneously moral, political and material; immediate establishment within the United Nations of a special committee for the self-determination and national independence of the Territories under Portuguese administration; and immediate commencement of that committee's work before the close of the General Assembly session.

22. At the seventeenth session, he had also stated that PAIGC was ready to co-operate fully with that committee and had proposed that the latter should be entrusted with the task of giving concrete assistance to his people so that they could free themselves speedily from the colonial yoke. Since those proposals had not been favourably received by the Portuguese Government or the United Nations, the patriotic forces of his country had launched a general struggle against the colonialist forces in January 1963 in order to respond, by an armed struggle for liberation, to the colonial genocidal war unleashed against the people by the Government of Portugal.

23. Almost 10 years later, PAIGC was again appearing before the Fourth Committee. The situation was completely different, however, both within the country and at the international level. The Fourth Committee and the United Nations were now better informed than ever before about the situation. In addition to the current information such as reports, information bulletins, war communiqués and other documents which PAIGC sent to the United Nations, PAIGC had, in those 10 years, appeared before the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to describe the progress of the struggle and prospects for its future evolution. Dozens of journalists, film-makers, politicians, scientists, writers, artists, photographers and so on of various nationalities had visited the country on their own initiative and at the invitation of PAIGC and had provided unanimous and irrefutable testimony regarding the situation. Others—very few in number—had done the same on the colonialist side at the invitation of the Portuguese authorities and, with few exceptions, their testimony had not completely satisfied those authorities. For example, there was the case of the team from the French radio and television organization which had visited all the "overseas provinces", and whose film had been rejected by the Lisbon Government because of the part relating to Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. That film had been shown to the Security Council following one of its meetings at Addis

Ababa. Another case was that of the group of representatives of the people of the United States, headed by Congressman Charles Diggs, whose report on their visit to the country merited careful study by the Committee and anyone else wishing to obtain reliable information on the situation. However, the United Nations had at its disposal information which was, in his view, even more valuable, namely the report of the Special Mission of the Special Committee (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I) which, at the invitation of PAIGC and duly authorized by the General Assembly, had visited the liberated regions of the country in April 1972. He was not, therefore, appearing before the Committee to remedy a lack of information.

24. Furthermore, the United Nations and world opinion were sufficiently well informed about the crimes against the African people committed daily by the Portuguese colonialists. A number of victims of Portuguese police and military repression had testified before United Nations bodies, particularly the Commission on Human Rights. At the twenty-sixth session, two of his countrymen, one with third-degree napalm burns and the other with mutilated ears and obvious signs of torture had appeared before the Committee<sup>2</sup>. Those who had visited his country, including the members of the Special Mission of the Special Committee, had been able to see the horrifying consequences of the criminal acts of the Portuguese colonialists against the people and the material goods which were the fruits of their labour. Unfortunately the United Nations, like the African people, was well aware that condemnations and resolutions, no matter how great their moral and political value, would not compel the Portuguese Government to put an end to its crime of *lèse-humanité*. Consequently, he was not appearing before the Committee in order to obtain more violent condemnations and resolutions against the Portuguese colonialists.

25. Nor was he urging that an appeal should be made to the allies of the Government of Portugal to cease giving it political support and material, military, economic and financial assistance, which were factors of primary importance in the continuation of the Portuguese colonial war against Africa, since that had already been done on many past occasions with no positive results. It should be noted, not without regret, that he had been right in stating almost 10 years previously that in view of the facts concerning the Portuguese economy and the interests of the States allied to the Government of Portugal, recommending or even demanding a diplomatic, economic and military boycott would not be an effective means of helping the African people. Experience had shown, on the contrary, that in acting or being forced to act as real enemies of the liberation and progress of the African people, the allies of the Portuguese Government and in particular some of the main Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) had not only increased their assistance to the Portuguese colonialists but had systematically avoided or even boycotted any co-operation with the United Nations majority which was seeking to determine legally the political and other

steps which might induce the Government of Portugal to comply with the principles of the Organization and the resolutions of the General Assembly. It was not 10 years before but in recent years that the Government of Portugal had received from its allies the largest quantities of war material, jet aircraft, helicopters, gunboats, launches and so on. It was in 1972, not 1962, that the Government of Portugal had received some \$500 million in financial assistance from one of its principal allies. If States which called themselves champions of freedom and democracy and defenders of the "free world" and the cause of self-determination and independence of peoples thus persisted in supporting and giving practical assistance to the most retrograde colonialism on earth, they must have very good reasons, at least in their own view. Perhaps an effort should be made to understand them, even if their reasons were unavowed or unavowable. It was no doubt necessary to take a realistic approach and to stop dreaming and asking the impossible, for as the Africans would say, only in stories was it possible to cross the river on the shoulders of the crocodile's friend.

26. He was appearing once more before the United Nations to try, as in the past, to obtain from the Organization practical and effective assistance for his struggling people. However, as he had already said and as everyone knew, the current situation was in every way very different from that obtaining in 1962, and the aid which the African people needed was likewise different.

27. During almost 10 years of armed struggle and of enormous efforts and sacrifices, almost three quarters of the national territory had been freed from Portuguese colonial domination and two thirds brought under effective control, which meant in concrete terms that in most of the country the people had a solid political organization—that of PAIGC—a developing administrative structure, a judicial structure, a new economy free from all exploitation of the people's labour, a variety of social and cultural services—health, hygiene, education—and other means of affirming their personality and their ability to shape their destiny and direct their own lives. They also had a military organization entirely composed of and led by sons of the people. The national forces, whose task was to attack the colonialist troops systematically wherever they might be, in order to complete the liberation of the country, like the local armed forces which were responsible for the defence and security of the liberated areas, were now stronger than ever, tempered by almost 10 years of struggle. That was proved by the colonialists' inability to recover even the smallest part of the liberated areas, by their increasingly heavy losses and by the people's ability to deal them increasingly heavy blows, even in the main urban centres such as Bissau, the capital, and Bafatá, the country's second largest town.

28. For the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and their national Party, however, the greatest success of their struggle did not lie in the fact that they had fought victoriously against the Portuguese colonialist troops under extremely difficult conditions but rather

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Session, Fourth Committee, 1958th meeting.



in the fact that, while they were fighting, they had begun to create all the aspects of a new life—political, administrative, economic, social and cultural—in the liberated areas. It was, to be sure, still a very hard life, since it called for great effort and sacrifice in the face of a genocidal colonial war, but it was a life full of beauty, for it was one of productive, efficient work, freedom and democracy in which the people had regained their dignity. Nearly 10 years of struggle had not only forged a new, strong African nation but had also created a new man and a new woman, people possessing an awareness of their rights and duties, on the soil of the African fatherland. Indeed, the most important result of the struggle, which was at the same time its greatest strength was the new awareness of the country's men, women and children. The people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde did not take any great pride in the fact that every day, because of circumstances created and imposed by the Government of Portugal, an increasing number of young Portuguese were dying ingloriously before the withering fire of the freedom fighters. What filled them with pride was their ever-increasing national consciousness, their unity—now indestructible—which had been forged in war, the harmonious development and coexistence of the various cultures and ethnic groups, the schools, hospitals and health centres which were operating openly in spite of the bombs and the terrorist attacks of the Portuguese colonialists, the people's stores which were increasingly able to supply the needs of the population, the increase and qualitative improvement in agricultural production, and the beauty, pride and dignity of their children and their women, who were the most exploited human beings in the country. They took pride in the fact that thousands of adults had been taught to read and write, that the rural inhabitants were receiving medicines that had never been available to them before, that no fewer than 497 high- and middle-level civil servants and professional people had been trained, and that 495 young people were studying at higher, secondary and vocational educational establishments in friendly European countries, while 15,000 children were attending 156 primary schools and five secondary boarding schools and semi-boarding schools staffed by 251 teachers. That was the greatest victory of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde over the Portuguese colonialists, for it was a victory over ignorance, fear and disease—evils imposed on the African inhabitants for more than a century by Portuguese colonialism.

29. It was also the clearest proof of the sovereignty enjoyed by the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, who were free and sovereign in the greater part of their national territory. To defend and preserve that sovereignty and expand it throughout the entire national territory, both on the continent and on the islands, the people had not only their armed forces but all the machinery of a State which, under the leadership of the party, was growing stronger and consolidating itself day by day. Indeed, the position of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde had for some time been comparable to that of an independent State part of whose national territory—namely, the urban centres—was occupied by foreign military forces. Proof

of that was the fact that for some years the people had no longer been subject to economic exploitation by the Portuguese colonialists, since the latter were no longer able to exploit them. The people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde were all the more certain of gaining their freedom because of the fact that, both in the urban centres and in the occupied areas, the clandestine organization and political activities of the freedom fighters were more vigorous than ever.

30. There was no force capable of preventing the complete liberation of his people and the attainment of national independence by his country. Nothing could destroy the unity of the African people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and their unshakable determination to free the entire national territory from the Portuguese colonial yoke and military occupation.

31. Confronted with that situation and that determination, what was the attitude of the Portuguese Government? Until the death of Salazar, whose outmoded ways of thinking had made it impossible for him to conceive of granting even fictitious concessions to the Africans, there had been talk only of radicalizing the colonial war. Salazar, who would repeat over and over to anyone willing to listen that "Africa does not exist"—an assertion which clearly reflected an insane racism but which also perfectly summed up the principles and practices which had always characterized Portuguese colonial policy—had at his advanced age been unable to survive the affirmation of Africa's existence: the victorious armed resistance of the African peoples to the Portuguese colonial war. Salazar had been nothing more than a fanatical believer in the doctrine of European superiority and African inferiority. As everyone knew, Africa was the sickness that had killed Salazar. Marcelo Caetano, his successor, was also a theoretician—professor of colonial law at the Lisbon School of Law—and a practical politician—Minister of Colonies for many years. Caetano, who claimed that he "knew the blacks", had decided on a new policy which, in the sphere of social relationships, was to be that of a kind master who held out the hand of friendship to his "boy"; politically speaking, the new policy was in its essence nothing more than the old tactic of force and deceit outwardly making use of the arguments and even the actual words of the adversary in order to confuse him while actually maintaining the same position. That was the difference between the Salazarism of Salazar and the neo-Salazarism of Caetano. The objective remained the same: to perpetuate white domination of the black masses of Guinea and Cape Verde. Caetano's new tactic, which the people referred to as "the policy of smiling and bloodshed", was nothing more than a result and one more success of the struggle being waged by the Africans. That fact had been noted by many who had visited the remaining occupied areas of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, including the American Congressman, Charles Diggs, and it was also understood by the people of the occupied areas, who replied to the colonialists' demagogic concessions with the words "*Djarama*, PAIGC", i.e., "Thank you, PAIGC".

32. In spite of those concessions and the launching of a vast propaganda campaign both in Africa and inter-

nationally, the new policy had failed. The people of the liberated areas were more united than ever around the national Party, while those of the urban centres and the remaining occupied areas were supporting the Party's struggle more strongly every day both in Guinea (Bissau) and in Cape Verde. Hundreds of young people were leaving the urban centres, especially Bissau, to join the fight. There were increasing desertions from the so-called *unidades africanas*, many of whose members were being held prisoner by the colonial authorities. Confronted with that situation, the colonialists were resorting to increased repression in the occupied areas, particularly the cities, and stepping up the bombings and terrorist attacks against the liberated areas. Having been forced to recognize that they could not win the war, they now knew that no stratagem could demoralize the people of those areas and that nothing could halt their advance towards complete liberation and independence. The colonialists were therefore making extensive use of the means available to them and attempting at all costs to destroy as many human lives and as much property as they could. They were making increased use of napalm and were actively preparing to use toxic substances, herbicides and defoliants, of which they had large supplies in Bissau, against the freedom fighters.

33. The Portuguese Government's desperation was all the more understandable because of the fact that the peoples of Angola and Mozambique were succeeding in their struggle and that the people of Portugal were becoming more strongly opposed to the colonial war every day. In spite of appearances, Portugal's economic, political and social position was steadily deteriorating and the population was declining, mainly because of the colonial war. He wished to reaffirm his people's solidarity not only with the fraternal African peoples of Angola and Mozambique but also with the people of Portugal, whom his own people had never equated with Portuguese colonialism. His people were more convinced than ever that the struggle being waged in Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and the complete liberation of that Territory would be in the best interests of the peoples of Portugal, with which it wished to establish and develop the best possible relations on the basis of co-operation, solidarity and friendship in order to promote genuine progress in his country once it won its independence.

34. Although the Portuguese Government had persisted in its absurd, inhuman policy of colonial war for almost 10 years, the United Nations had made a significant moral and political contribution to the progress of his people's liberation struggle. The resolutions proclaiming that it was legitimate to carry on that struggle by any necessary means, the appeal to Member States to extend all possible assistance to the African liberation movements, the recommendations to the specialized agencies to co-operate with those movements through the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the granting of hearings to their representatives at the Security Council meetings in Addis Ababa, the granting of observer status to certain liberation movements and, in his own case, the visit of the Special Mission of the Special Committee to his country and

the recognition of his Party by that Committee as the only legitimate, authentic representative of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde (see A/8723/Add.3, para. 34) represented important assistance to those struggling peoples. He expressed gratitude for the aid received to the Special Committee and its dynamic Chairman, to the Fourth Committee and, through it, the General Assembly, and to all Member States which were sympathetic to his cause.

35. Nevertheless, he did not feel that there was nothing more the United Nations could do to aid his people's struggle. He was convinced that the Organization could and must do more to hasten the end of the colonial war in his country and the complete liberation of his people. He had for that reason submitted specific proposals to the Security Council in Addis Ababa<sup>3</sup>. Because of his confidence in the United Nations and in its ability to take action in the specific case of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, he was now submitting new proposals aimed at the establishment of closer, more effective co-operation between the Organization and the national Party, which was the legitimate representative of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. Before doing so, he would draw attention to some important events that had taken place in his country in recent months.

36. He would not speak about the successes achieved by the freedom fighters during the past year, although they had been significant ones. He would begin by referring to the visit of the United Nations Special Mission to his country, which had been made in April 1972 despite the terrorist aggression launched by the Portuguese colonialists against the liberated south in an effort to prevent the visit from taking place. An historic and unique landmark for the United Nations and the liberation movements, the visit had unquestionably been a great victory for his people but it had also been one for the international Organization and for mankind. It had provided a new stimulus to the courage and determination of his people and their fighters, who had been willing to make sacrifices in order to make it possible. While it was true that the findings of the Special Mission merely added more evidence of the same kind as had been given by many unimpeachably reliable visitors, various professional persons and nationalists, they nevertheless had special value and significance, since they were findings of the United Nations itself, made by an official mission duly authorized by the General Assembly and consisting of respected representatives of three Member States. He emphasized the great importance of the Special Mission's success, expressed his gratitude to the General Assembly for authorizing it and to Ecuador, Sweden and Tunisia for allowing their distinguished representatives, Mr. Horacio Sevilla Borja, Mr. Folke Löfgren and Mr. Kamel Belkhiria, to participate in it and again congratulated all the participants and Secretariat staff members on having performed with exemplary courage, determination and conscientiousness the duties of a historic and profoundly humanitarian assignment in the service of the United Nations and

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year*, 1632nd meeting.

of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde, and hence in the service of mankind.

37. Any action, regardless of its motives, was sterile unless it produced practical and concrete results. The motive of PAIGC in inviting the United Nations to send a Special Mission to its country had not been to prove the sovereignty of the people over vast areas of the country, a fact which was already clear to everyone; instead, it had deliberately tried to give the United Nations another specific basis for taking effective measures against Portuguese colonialism. That basis had been established by the success of the Special Mission; it seemed just and essential to take full advantage of it, since PAIGC, like the Special Mission, was convinced that the political situation of the people of Guinea (Bissau), including their legal situation, could not remain as it had been in the past. In addition, PAIGC was convinced that the United Nations would be able to implement the recommendations of the Special Mission which the Special Committee had endorsed (see A/8723/Add.3, para. 36), and declared its readiness to extend whatever co-operation was needed to that end.

38. Like any important event, the Mission's success involved some amusing sidelights, such as the desperate and preposterous response expressed both orally and in writing by the Lisbon Government. In that connexion, he quoted a proverb current among the people of Guinea (Bissau), "A person who spits at the sun succeeds only in dirtying his own face".

39. Another important event was the establishment of the first National Assembly of the people of Guinea (Bissau). Universal general elections had just been held by secret ballot in all the liberated areas for the purpose of forming regional councils and choosing the 120 representatives to the first National Assembly, 80 elected by the masses of the people and 40 chosen from among the members of the Party. The people of Guinea (Bissau) and PAIGC were firmly resolved to take full advantage of the establishment of their new organs of sovereignty. The National Assembly would proclaim the existence of the State of Guinea (Bissau) and give it an executive authority that would function within the country. In that connexion, PAIGC was sure of the fraternal and active support of the independent African States and felt encouraged by the certainty that not only Africa but also the United Nations and all genuinely anti-colonialist States would fully appreciate the political and legal development of the situation in that African nation. In point of fact, at the present stage of the struggle the Government of Portugal neither could nor should represent the people of Guinea (Bissau) either in the United Nations or in any other international organization or agency, just as it could never represent it in the OAU.

40. For that reason, PAIGC was not raising the question of calling for the expulsion of Portugal from the United Nations or from any other international organization. The real question was whether or not the people of Guinea (Bissau), which held sovereignty over most of its national territory, which had just

formed its first National Assembly and which was going to proclaim the existence of its State, headed by an executive authority, had the right to become a member of the international community within the framework of its organizations, even though part of its country was occupied by foreign military forces. The real question before the people of Guinea, which had to be answered categorically, was whether the United Nations and all the anti-colonialist forces were prepared to strengthen their support and their moral, political and material assistance to that African nation as their specific capabilities permitted.

41. It was true that the war was still ravaging the country and that the people would have to continue making sacrifices to win the liberation of their homeland. That had already happened and was happening in other places, to peoples which had a Government of their own and a standing in international law. But it was also true that, thanks to international solidarity, more and more resources—and more effective ones—were becoming available to the people of Guinea (Bissau), enabling them to deal harder blows to the Portuguese colonial troops, and that the people's determination and the valour and experience of their fighters were increasing day by day. The only reason why PAIGC did not trouble to declare that Portugal ran the risk of military defeat in Guinea (Bissau) was that Portugal had never had any chance of victory, and for that reason too the people of Guinea would continue to maintain their principles: peace, a search for dialogue and negotiation for the solution of their conflict with the Government of Portugal.

42. In the Cape Verde Islands, where hunger again reigned, while the colonialists were intensifying their oppression because of PAIGC's political activity, PAIGC was determined to promote the struggle by all necessary means in order to free the African people completely from the colonial yoke. Above all, PAIGC denounced the despicable efforts of the Government of Portugal to take advantage of the situation in the Islands by exporting workers to Portugal and other colonies in order to sap the people's strength and thus undermine their struggle. It was PAIGC's desire to reaffirm that, by reason of the community of blood, history, interests and struggle between the peoples of Guinea and the Islands, it was determined to make whatever sacrifices were necessary in order to liberate the Cape Verde archipelago from Portuguese domination.

43. He called to the attention of the United Nations, through the Fourth Committee, the following proposals, based on the practical realities of the life of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and on all the considerations he had just discussed:

(1) Representations to the Government of Portugal for the immediate start of negotiations between the representatives of that Government and those of PAIGC. The programme of those negotiations should be based on a search for the most appropriate and effective means for the early attainment of independence by the people of Guinea (Bissau). If the Government of Portugal responded favourably

to that initiative, PAIGC could consider ways of taking into account the interests of Portugal in Guinea (Bissau).

(2) Immediate acceptance of PAIGC delegates, in the capacity of associate members or observers, in all the specialized agencies of the United Nations as the sole legitimate representatives of the people of Guinea (Bissau), as was already true in the case of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA).

(3) Development of practical assistance from the specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), as well as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), to the people of Guinea (Bissau) as a part of that country's national reconstruction. He hoped that any undue legalistic or bureaucratic obstacles in that sphere could be overcome.

(4) Moral and political support by the United Nations for all initiatives that the people of Guinea (Bissau) and PAIGC had decided to adopt with a view to an early end of the Portuguese colonial war and to the achievement of that African country's independence in order that it might soon occupy its rightful place in the international community.

44. In the hope that those proposals would be given serious consideration, he strongly urged all States Members of the United Nations, in particular Portugal's allies, the Latin American countries and especially Brazil, to understand the position of Guinea (Bissau) and support that African people's legitimate aspirations to freedom, independence and progress. The Latin American countries had had to fight for their independence. Portugal often cited the case of Brazil as an example in favour of its position, even though a struggle for independence had taken place in Brazil as well. Portugal itself had gained its freedom through a fratricidal struggle; the people of Guinea (Bissau), however, had no family ties with the people of Portugal.

45. He thanked the African countries, the socialist countries, the Nordic countries and all other countries, and non-governmental organizations, such as the World Council of Churches, the World Church Services and the Rowntree Social Trust, which were helping Guinea (Bissau) in its struggle for liberation. At the same time, he did not believe that the attitude of States giving aid to Portugal reflected the feelings of most of their inhabitants. The people of Guinea (Bissau) were certain of final victory and hoped to establish co-operative and peaceful relations with all peoples. He thanked the Committee for its welcome and reaffirmed that he was at its disposal at any time.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was honoured by the presence of Mr. Cabral, who had temporarily left his place in the fighting line in order to give the United Nations valuable information. Mr.

Cabral could rest assured that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations supported his people in their just struggle. He suggested that, in view of its importance and duly bearing in mind the financial implications, the statement of the representative of PAIGC should be reproduced *in extenso* in the record of the meeting. If there were no objections, he would assume that the Committee agreed to the suggestion.

*It was so decided<sup>4</sup>.*

47. Mr. OULD SIDI BABA (Morocco) observed that Mr. Cabral's statement had been both sensible and forceful and had given the Committee a better idea of the situation prevailing in Guinea (Bissau). On behalf of the King of Morocco, who was at present presiding over the Organization of African Unity, which at its recent Assembly of Heads of State and Government had resolved to give absolute priority to the liberation of the continent from all vestiges of colonialism, he welcomed the decision to reproduce Mr. Cabral's statement *in extenso*.

48. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, said that Mr. Cabral's brilliant statement had proved the wisdom of the decision to invite representatives of the national liberation movements to attend meetings of the Committee as observers and had introduced a new element of realism into the Committee's discussions. The socialist countries supported the national liberation movements as a matter of principle and had always helped PAIGC; they welcomed the decision of the Special Committee to recognize PAIGC as the only and authentic representative of the people of the Territory.

49. Mrs. JIMÉNEZ (Cuba) said that, in the view of her delegation, PAIGC, FRELIMO (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique) and MPLA (Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola) were the sole authentic representatives of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola and were alone authorized to represent them in the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Guinea (Bissau) was now an independent country and the object of aggression by a foreign Power; Cuba supported PAIGC in its just struggle and urged the international community to give it all the support it needed to eliminate colonialism.

50. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) welcomed Mr. Cabral as a true son of the African continent. It was to be hoped that his constructive proposals would be borne in mind, even by countries which had not attended the meeting, and that the situation would finally be resolved at the negotiating table. Africans did not fight because they liked fighting; they wanted to live in peace and only turned to force as a last resort.

51. Mr. PSONČAK (Yugoslavia) stated that Mr. Cabral's historic statement was a source of inspiration for those who were fighting in defence of human dignity. PAIGC's struggle was part of the struggle of all peoples for their freedom and it was to be hoped

<sup>4</sup> See paras. 2 to 45. above.



that the authentic representatives of Guinea (Bissau) would be able to take their seat as fully-fledged Members of the United Nations.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that several members of the Committee had asked him to communicate to the President of the General Assembly their wish that the Assembly should invite Mr. Cabral to address it in connexion with the Assembly's consideration of item 22 of the agenda. If there was no objection, he would assume that the Committee wished him to communicate that wish to the President of the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

53. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America) asked for an explanation of the decision just taken. It was not clear who had expressed the wish that Mr. Cabral should be invited to address a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. He would like to know whether a decision had been taken without prior discussion.

54. The CHAIRMAN replied that several members of the Committee had communicated their wish to him and that he had felt it his duty to inform the Committee.

55. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America) felt that, in that case, one of those members should explain on what basis Mr. Cabral would address a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

56. Mr. OULD SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that the suggestion that the Committee had just approved was within its competence. The Fourth Committee derived from the General Assembly and, since the Committee had given Mr. Cabral the opportunity to address it, it followed that he should also be able to address a plenary meeting of the Assembly. He supported the decision just taken by the Committee.

57. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that, like the representative of the United States, he had doubts about the decision in question. As he had already had occasion to explain (1976th meeting), his delegation had always been prepared to hear representatives of the national liberation movements, had participated in various missions of the Special Committee in Africa and had found the contacts with those movements and with the standing committees of the OAU interesting and useful. Nevertheless, he felt that the Committee should adhere to established procedure in regard to the hearing of individuals or groups. Individuals and representatives of groups could not address the General Assembly. Paragraph 1 of Article 9 of the Charter stated that "The General Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations". The General Assembly was the expression of the principle that the United Nations is an organization of States and only representatives of Member States could address it after duly presenting their credentials.

58. The rules of procedure of the General Assembly made no provision for granting a hearing to persons who did not represent Member States. Since such provision was made in the rules of procedure of other organs—for instance, in rule 39 of the provisional rules

of procedure of the Security Council—it was to be inferred that that kind of hearing was not possible in the General Assembly. According to the established practice, the hearing of petitioners is devolved to subsidiary organs of the General Assembly. Mr. Cabral had just addressed the Fourth Committee, in which all Member States were represented, and his statement was to be reproduced *in extenso* in the records of the meeting. Consequently, he saw no need, in that instance, to depart from the rules of procedure and establish a dangerous precedent.

59. M. URANOVICZ (Hungary) pointed out that the Committee had taken a decision. He wondered whether the statements that had just been made by various representatives were explanations of vote.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that the statements were, indeed, explanations of vote.

61. Mr. PLANCHÓN (Uruguay) felt that the Committee had taken the decision hastily. The decision should be reconsidered in order that it might be examined in detail.

62. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) said that, like the representative of Hungary, he considered that the Committee had already taken a decision. He pointed out that a two-thirds majority would be required in order to reopen the matter. Cuba had agreed with the decision that had been adopted because it firmly supported the numerous General Assembly resolutions and decisions recognizing the right of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde to self-determination and independence. Portugal had no right to usurp the sovereignty of those peoples and to arrogate to itself the right to represent them in the international community. His delegation therefore felt that it was appropriate that Mr. Cabral, the legitimate representative of the people of those Territories, should address a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. By allowing him to speak at a plenary meeting, the General Assembly would be acting in accordance with its anti-colonialist principles and would consider it an honour to receive someone who was fighting for those principles.

63. His delegation moreover, considered that the General Assembly should go further and should recognize the representatives of PAIGC on a firmer and more permanent basis.

64. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) felt that two different things were being discussed. As he had understood it all that had been agreed was that the Chairman of the Fourth Committee would convey to the President of the General Assembly the wish expressed by some delegations that Mr. Cabral should address the General Assembly.

65. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Chairman had merely said that numerous delegations wanted Mr. Cabral to address the General Assembly at a plenary meeting and that he would so inform the President of the General Assembly. That was beyond dispute. Nevertheless, if it was decided

to vote on whether or not Mr. Cabral should be asked to address the General Assembly, he would vote in favour of the proposal.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United Republic of Tanzania had pointed out, it was only a matter of informing the President of the General Assembly of a wish expressed by a majority of the members of the Fourth Committee.

67. Mr. HEARN (Canada) said that at the time the decision had been clear. It was one thing to say that many delegations agreed that Mr. Cabral should address the General Assembly; to say that the majority of the delegations favoured such a step would make it appear that the Committee had taken a decision and that would be a mistake.

68. What had been decided was that the Chairman should inform the President of the General Assembly that some members of the Fourth Committee wished Mr. Cabral to speak before the General Assembly.

69. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) said that his delegation supported the statement made by the Chairman: there had been a decision that the President of the General Assembly should be informed that the Fourth Committee wished Mr. Cabral to be heard in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

70. On the following day the General Assembly would begin the discussion of item 22 of its agenda (Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples). It would be useful if the General Assembly could hear Mr. Cabral, as the Fourth Committee had at the current meeting.

71. He did not wish to enter into arguments of a legal nature since the matter at issue was a political decision. The General Assembly was master of its procedure; it was a sovereign body and could adopt decisions provided that such decisions were not at variance with the Charter or the rules of procedure. There was no rule which could prevent the General Assembly from hearing Mr. Cabral's excellent statement.

72. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America) said that, like the representative of Canada, he would like the point cleared up. If the Chairman did not intend to tell the President of the General Assembly that he was transmitting a decision of the Fourth Committee, there was no problem. If that was not the case, a dangerous precedent would be set.

73. Mr. DAO (Mali) said that the decision had already been taken to request the General Assembly to authorize the Secretary-General of PAIGC to address it. He was surprised that the matter was still being debated, for the Chairman had asked whether there were any objections and no objection had been raised before the gavel had fallen. The fall of the gavel made the decision final and it had therefore acquired the force of law. There was no point in making speeches in an effort to overturn a decision already taken.

Accordingly, the only valid proposal was that put forward by the representative of Uruguay.

74. The Secretary-General of PAIGC would appear before the General Assembly as an observer to speak on a matter concerning his Territory. The Chairman of the Fourth Committee should inform the President of the General Assembly that the Committee had decided to recommend that the Secretary-General of PAIGC should speak before the General Assembly; the delegations which had expressed reservations in that regard should then be named. A bad precedent would be set if a decision already adopted was called into question.

75. Mr. DÍAZ GONZÁLEZ (Venezuela) thanked Mr. Cabral for his splendid statement on Guinea (Bissau) and the liberation movements.

76. He agreed with the representative of Mali, except on one point: the Committee had not taken a vote. The Committee had taken a decision on the proposal of the Chairman, who had said that a group of delegations had requested him to inform the President of the General Assembly of the group's wish that Mr. Cabral should be heard in a plenary meeting in connexion with the discussion of item 22. The fact that the Committee had agreed that that wish should be conveyed to the President of the General Assembly did not mean that it had received the endorsement of the Committee.

77. Mr. HEARN (Canada) said that he agreed with the representative of Venezuela and reserved his delegation's position on the substance of the matter.

78. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America) said that he too had some basic doubts on the substance of the matter. He was trying to establish what the Committee's decision had been.

79. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that, although he had been puzzled initially, the statements made by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela and the United Kingdom had helped to make the matter clear by confirming that the Chairman would convey the suggestion of certain delegations to the President of the General Assembly.

80. Mr. OULD SIDI BABA (Morocco) recalled that the Chairman had referred to the Committee a proposal by certain delegations to the effect that their wish that Mr. Cabral should speak at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly should be made known to the President of that body. On that basis, the Committee had taken a decision. In other words, since the Committee had pronounced itself on the matter, the Chairman would not be conveying a suggestion by some delegations but a suggestion by the Committee.

81. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that, as he saw it, the Committee had made a recommendation to the General Assembly. It would be for the Assembly to take a final decision on the matter. It was surprising that certain delegations were attempting to suppress the voice

of freedom in the United Nations. The voice of Cabral was the voice of embattled Africa, struggling at the same time to find peaceful means to resolve its problems. If the voice of people trying to win their freedom was not heard, they would have no recourse but violence.

82. The least that could have been hoped for was that there should be a consensus in the Committee that Cabral should be allowed to speak at a plenary meeting of the Assembly. Most countries which were now independent had been unable to make themselves heard when they had been fighting for their freedom. It was the Committee's duty to do its utmost to ensure that the people of Guinea (Bissau) could plead their case for the application of peaceful means to the settlement of their problems.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that his earlier statement had been that, if the Committee agreed, he would communicate to the President of the General Assembly the wish of many members that the Assembly should invite Mr. Cabral to make a statement before it in conjunction with its consideration of item 22 of its agenda. That was what the Committee had finally decided.

84. Mr. REFADI (Libya) saluted the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), who were struggling by all the means at their disposal to eradicate totally the evils of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. His delegation reiterated the strong support of the people and Government of his country for the legitimate struggle of those peoples to regain their right to self-determination and independence. Experience had shown that armed struggle was the only effective means for the colonized peoples to liberate themselves and to regain their dignity. Armed struggle was the only language which the colonialist forces understood.

85. At the beginning of the debate at the present session on the item under consideration, the Committee had taken a decision (1975th meeting) which his delegation considered to be of historical significance: the decision to grant the status of observers to representatives of the liberation movements. In his delegation's view, those movements had always been the true representatives of the indigenous populations of the colonial Territories. His delegation had whole-heartedly supported the recommendation of the Special Committee that such representatives should be allowed to participate as observers (A/C.4/744) because, in its view, that was what had to be done at the present important stage in the process of decolonization. Besides being committed as a member of the OAU to struggle against colonialism, his country had to honour its commitment as a non-aligned country. As was known, at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held in Guyana from 8 to 11 August 1972 a decision had been adopted granting the representatives of liberation movements the status of observers; his delegation held that it was the responsibility of non-aligned countries to seek the implementation of that decision in the United Nations. Moreover, the recommendation of the Special Committee was in keeping with the man-

date given to it in General Assembly resolution 2878 (XXVI); thus, the decision taken by the Fourth Committee was in implementation of a United Nations resolution. The decision was particularly opportune, coming at a time when attempts were being made to curb the just struggle of the victims of colonialism, oppression and alien domination and to label it terrorism. Those attempts were designed to offer the Portuguese colonialists and other criminal and racist elements a chance to give their criminal acts a façade of legitimacy under the banner of the United Nations.

86. Besides granting the status of observers to the representatives of liberation movements, the United Nations had taken the important step of sending a Special Mission to visit the liberated areas in Guinea (Bissau), despite the attempts of the Portuguese colonialists to prevent the United Nations from entering the African territories under their domination. That visit was a good answer to those that doubted whether there were any liberated areas in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and had made it more clear than ever that the peoples of those Territories were struggling and would continue to struggle against the Portuguese colonialists to regain their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The Special Mission had also been able to witness the work being done by PAIGC in building up the liberated areas.

87. It was the responsibility of the United Nations to assist the indigenous peoples of the Territories under Portuguese colonial rule in their just struggle—firstly, by offering them its moral and material support in that struggle and, secondly, by helping the liberation movements to develop the liberated areas with the support of its specialized agencies. The Committee should adopt the recommendations of the Special Mission of the Special Committee contained in its report (see A/8723/Add.3, para. 36) and ensure their implementation in order to put an end to colonialism and racism in those Territories.

88. Mr. DESTA (Ethiopia) said that, thanks to the selfless dedication of the members of the Special Mission sent to the liberated areas of Guinea (Bissau) by the Special Committee, the Fourth Committee had before it a testimony in regard to the barbarism of Portuguese oppression in the colony which, unlike the information presented in previous years, was not based on press reports or on communications and statements provided by the freedom fighters in those Territories. The Committee had before it an eye-witness report of the struggle for freedom and the needs of those who had already freed themselves from Portuguese oppression, and it did not matter what the Portuguese propaganda machinery might do in order to falsify United Nations efforts to expose that oppression.

89. Portugal, for some inexplicable reason, clung to the myth of "pluri-continentalism" and continued to believe that it could intimidate into submission the forces of liberation and continue to exploit the Territories which it called its "overseas provinces". The geographic description of the country given by the Portuguese Institute of Higher Military Studies, according

to which Portugal was "a nation with 4.2 per cent of its area and 41 per cent of its population in Europe and 95 per cent of its area and 55 per cent of its population in Africa" (*ibid.*, annex II, sect. A, para. 6), constituted clear proof that the Portuguese position was untenable. In the name of that fiction and in order to protect "Western and Christian civilization", Portugal continued to wage a brutal war of colonial oppression against African nationalists in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). In order to reverse the momentum of the liberation movements in those Territories, Portugal had intensified its military operations, causing death and destruction among the defenceless civilian populations. Its latest ruthless technique of warfare—that of using chemical substances to spray crops and vegetation—indicated the extent to which Portugal was prepared to go in order to maintain its colonial presence in Africa.

90. It had often been stated that Portugal was an under-developed country, needing all its resources for its own development and for raising the low standard of living of the nationals of metropolitan Portugal. Nevertheless, Portugal was able to send more than 150,000 troops with all the paraphernalia of warfare over a distance of thousands of miles in order to prosecute colonial wars that cost it over \$200 million a year. The welfare of its nationals was being sacrificed for what Portugal called a "war of glory"—which in truth was a war of shame and infamy. The same country which acquired arms by virtue of its membership in NATO funnelled those weapons to its colonies to be used in wars of repression. In addition, funds continued to be made available to Portugal by the many foreign economic and other interests operating inside its African colonies to assist it in the conduct of its campaign of terror.

91. For many years the United Nations had repeatedly called on the Government of Portugal to respect the aspirations of the inhabitants of its colonies and to grant them the right to self-determination and independence. However, Portugal had not only ignored those demands and thus challenged the authority of the world Organization; it had also increased its repression. Its open defiance of the United Nations had been underscored by its alliance with the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes. Portugal had actively collaborated with those régimes in order to render ineffective the mandatory sanctions imposed on them by the Security Council. Out of desperation and frustration, Portugal was forced to apply insane policies of violence both inside the Territories which it subjugated and in the contiguous independent African States whose civilian populations were being attacked and bombarded in complete violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

92. In what must surely rank as one of the most pretentious sermons that Portugal had yet to deliver from the rostrum of the General Assembly, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs had attempted to restore the image of his country by portraying it as a model member of the international community that had always scrupulously respected the ideals and principles

of the Charter (2048th meeting). In the face of Portugal's record, he did not feel it was worth while to comment on it; but he wished simply to stress that the position of the Portuguese authorities had been a great disappointment for those optimists who had entertained some faint hope that Portugal might have seen the light of reason.

93. At its fifteenth session, the General Assembly, in its resolution 1514 (XV), had adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as resolution 1542 (XV) by which it considered that the Territories under the administration of Portugal were Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. But despite such paramount decisions taken by the United Nations, the Government of Portugal had continued to refuse to recognize the rights of over 15 million people in its African colonies, and had instead intensified its war of repression against their legitimate demands. He considered that pressure must be exerted on the Government of Portugal to induce it to alter the course of action that it had chosen, but he did not believe that Portugal could be made to co-operate with the United Nations so long as it continued to enjoy the unreserved support of its friends and allies.

94. It was regrettable that, in the past year, some Member States which were friends of Portugal had taken various measures in their bilateral relations that encouraged Portugal in its arrogant defiance of world public opinion, and his delegation hoped that the members of NATO would oppose Portugal's colonial fanaticism and prevail upon it to abandon its anachronistic policy.

95. The United Nations had declared the struggle of colonial peoples to achieve their freedom and independence as being fully legitimate. That important decision paved the way for Member States to render effective assistance to those struggling to achieve their right to self-determination and independence. The findings of the Special Mission to the liberated areas of Guinea (Bissau) had amply demonstrated the colossal efforts being made by PAIGC on two levels: at the battle-front; and in the liberated areas to launch programmes of national reconstruction. The same could be said for Angola and Mozambique.

96. While his delegation was appreciative of the assistance already given to the liberation movements by several Member States, non-governmental organizations—particularly the World Council of Churches—and a few of the specialized agencies, it believed that agencies like WHO, FAO, UNESCO and the International Labour Organisation (ILO), and other international institutions concerned, must introduce greater flexibility in their working procedures in order to be able to give increased moral as well as material assistance to the liberation movements.

97. His delegation applauded the decision taken at the current session to grant observer status to the representatives of the liberation movements to enable



them to participate in the work of the Fourth Committee on matters relating to their respective Territories (1975th meeting). During the Committee's consideration of the question of the legal status of the representatives of the liberation movements, the representative of Portugal had had the audacity to base his objection on the provisions of a resolution which his Government had repeatedly denounced: a classic example of the Devil quoting the Bible for his own ends.

98. Of course, Portugal had not been the only Member State to object to the granting of observer status to the representatives of the liberation movements. Several representatives had explained their objections by saying that the decision had been illegal. Was it necessary to ask what the legal basis was for Portugal's preposterous claim that Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) were its "overseas territories"? What legal ground did Portugal have to wage its brutal wars against peoples whose only crime was the quest for freedom, not in Portugal but in their own lands? Was it legal for Portugal to trample underfoot the principles of the Charter of the United Nations?

99. He also failed to see the "dangerous implications" of that decision. As formulated, it was unambiguous: it referred only to the representatives of the national liberation movements in southern Africa.

100. Finally, his delegation hoped that Portugal would realize the futility of its policy, since throughout the history of man, no people had ever succeeded in enslaving another permanently. Portugal needed the honest counsel of its friends and allies to help it to understand the invincibility of the human quest for freedom and dignity.

101. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt), referring to the statement made in the General Assembly by the representative of Portugal on 2 October 1972 (2048th plenary meeting), said that the entire speech was based on the erroneous theory that words could hide actions. However, the Fourth Committee was concerned with actions and with facts, and his delegation felt that Portugal should comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and allow the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde to exercise their sacred right of self-determination. Instead of making false statements the representative of Portugal should take note of the specific requests which the international community had addressed to his country, such as those set out in paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 2795 (XXVI).

102. Portugal, although a Member of the United Nations, was following its own line of action based on a political concept alien to the spirit and the letter of the Charter. That attitude was endangering the peace and security of the African continent.

103. The decision of the General Assembly set out in resolution 2795 (XXVI) was a historic event in the life of the United Nations. His delegation paid tribute to the members of the Special Committee for their courageous attitude in the face of the attacks launched

by Portugal during their visit to the liberated areas of Guinea (Bissau); those attacks could only have been inspired by disdain and contempt for the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations.

104. Mr. Caetano, Head of the Portuguese Government, had never attempted to hide his true feelings, and on 11 April 1972, on the occasion of the visit of the Special Mission, had declared that there was a mistaken belief in the United Nations that each continent belonged to the indigenous races (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I, appendix III). That then was the real attitude of the Portuguese Government which up to now had applied the ancient notion that colonies, before acceding to independence, had to attain a certain level of political, economic and social development. Paragraph 3 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), was opposed to that idea.

105. The fascist Government of Portugal, by stating its intention to develop the economy of the Territories under its domination, wished to pass itself off as the saviour of Africa, and that was the very argument used by the white minority in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Portugal was using the same methods of repression, exploitation and intimidation that the fascist and racist régimes were employing against the inhabitants of that region of the continent.

106. His delegation congratulated the Chairman of the Special Mission of the Special Committee, Mr. Sevilla Borja of Ecuador, on his detailed report (A/8723/Add.3, annex I) with which he fully agreed; he also congratulated the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Aryubi of Afghanistan, on his excellent report (A/8723/Add.3). By referring to those two reports, he wished to draw special attention to certain important aspects of the problem of the Territories occupied by Portugal which clearly showed that Portugal had been able to maintain its political presence in the colonies, in defiance of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, by the continued co-operation of South Africa and by the continued supply of arms from certain Western countries, members of NATO, and by the economic benefits which Portugal obtained from the administration of its colonies.

107. The international community should not tolerate such a situation, which endangered world peace and security, and must oppose it by all means. Thus it was the sacred duty of the Members of the United Nations to observe strictly the resolutions adopted by its various organs and to denounce the attack launched by the Portuguese forces against a Senegalese outpost; that attack had caused loss of life. His delegation condemned that aggression and supported Senegal.

108. His country wished to see justice done and hoped that the United Nations, with the support of its Members, would be able to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism in all its forms and to implement the resolutions adopted in that regard; that accomplishment

would renew confidence in the international Organization and would help to achieve the objectives set out in the Charter.

109. The statement made by Mr. Cabral, Secretary-General of PAIGC, had made his delegation proud to hear the voice of a true son of Africa, a statesman and a worthy representative of Africa on the march.

110. Portuguese colonialism, like all forms of colonialism, was waging a merciless war against the oppressed peoples and was using the most advanced weapons and napalm, supplied by certain NATO countries. But it was a war lost from the start, for final victory would belong to the resistance, regardless of the duration of the battle.

111. Mr. Cabral had asked for the support of the United Nations as a legitimate right, because the freedom fighters were really the unknown soldiers of the United Nations, who were respecting its Charter and implementing its resolutions.

112. Egypt, which had suffered and was still suffering from imperialist aggression, fully supported the legitimate struggle of PAIGC and that of the other liberation movements.

113. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) said there was no doubt that the world trend was towards freedom and independence because man, having been born free, could not be perpetually kept under servitude and exploitation. Unfortunately, Portugal did not appear to accept that cardinal truth and was continuing to flout the authority of the United Nations and to demonstrate, in one way or another, that it had no intention of complying with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. In that sense, all the efforts of the Organization seemed to have been to no avail. It was disheartening that in an era of hopeful change in international relations, Portugal had chosen to be the exception and to be opposed to the course of fundamental historical developments. Portugal still alleged that the African Territories under its administration were Portuguese provinces; and as such, an integral part of a multiracial nation, and that the United Nations, by its resolutions, was interfering in the domestic affairs of Portugal and impeding the development of that multiracial society.

114. There could be no objection to the establishment of relationships between the metropolitan country and the Territories it had administered, provided that such relationships were freely entered into in accordance with the wishes of the indigenous peoples. Unilateral declarations by the Portuguese Government that the Territories under its administration were part of Portugal did not alter their status of Non-Self-Governing Territories nor would they absolve Portugal of its obligations under Article 73 e of the Charter. Equality, which should be a feature of a multiracial society, did not exist between the inhabitants of the Territories and Portugal; instead, there was oppression, exploitation of the indigenous peoples and denial of fundamental rights. The so-called reforms introduced by the Por-

tuguese Government since 1961 and purporting to grant autonomy and political rights to the indigenous peoples did not deceive anyone and did not satisfy the international community. The liberation struggles which had erupted in all parts of the Portuguese Territories sufficed to demonstrate the unswerving determination of those peoples to achieve freedom and independence. He personally did not doubt that they would finally attain their goals, but he wondered whether the scars inflicted in the bloodshed and strife would heal sufficiently to allow the development of a future friendly relationship between the present colonial Power and the new independent States.

115. Portugal must choose between the orderly transfer of power to the peoples of the Territories and the alternative of ultimately being forced to abandon completely its colonial possessions, because the national liberation movements would not be satisfied with less than a complete Portuguese withdrawal. The Special Mission of the Special Committee had confirmed that substantial areas of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) had already been liberated, and that not only were the indigenous peoples resolved to continue the struggle but they had already begun reconstruction programmes in the liberated areas. The Special Mission's visit was of great importance in that it confirmed the United Nations commitment to the cause of freedom in those Territories. The meetings of the Security Council, which for the first time in the history of the Organization had been held in Africa, and the subsequent meetings of the Special Committee, also held in that continent, demonstrated the fact that the support given by the United Nations to the liberation struggles had entered a new stage of direct involvement. The concern expressed by the churches of the world regarding the situation in South Africa and the decision of the Fourth Committee to grant observer status to the representatives of the liberation movements (1975th meeting) added further moral and political weight to the action of the liberation movements in the Portuguese Territories.

116. The moral and political pressure on Portugal should continue unabated, especially as the latter had given signs that it was not completely insensitive to the criticism of the international community, especially when it emanated from countries with which Portugal maintained friendly relations. No one should be taken in by the legislative changes in respect of the Territories of which the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs had spoken with pride in the General Assembly (see 2048th plenary meeting). The Special Mission of the Special Committee had explained what those so-called reforms really amounted to (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I).

117. His delegation felt that economic and material assistance to the liberation movements should be increased and it accordingly endorsed paragraph 7 of the resolution adopted on 20 April by the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para 35). The eradication of colonialism in those Territories would ultimately depend on the concerted efforts of the world community. The history of many countries showed that, once a people had

manifested its desire to decide its own destiny, there could be no holding back the tide of events. Repression of the just aspirations of a people could only bring violence and bloodshed with repercussions throughout the international community. His country therefore hoped that Portugal would follow the example of those colonial Powers which had recognized the right to independence of the peoples under their administration. The abandonment of the unjust and antiquated colonial policies of the Portuguese Government would definitely benefit all concerned, including Portugal itself.

118. Mr. URANOVICZ (Hungary) said that Hungary's record on the question of Territories under Portuguese administration had been consistent and unambiguous. His country had from the outset supported the struggle of the peoples and liberation movements of those Territories and, indeed, had advocated the liberation of all Africa. It was persuaded that the struggle of the oppressed peoples against their colonial masters represented one of the mainstreams of contemporary history. Ever since the General Assembly had adopted resolution 1514 (XV), it had held the view that Portugal should be condemned for the criminal war which it was waging in Africa. Hungary had scrupulously observed the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) and of other relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Hungarian representatives participating in international meetings had been instructed to do whatever they could to secure assistance for the peoples of the Portuguese Territories in order to alleviate their enormous sufferings.

119. The main questions confronting the Committee were: what should be done to end Portugal's anachronistic colonial rule in its African Territories, and what role could the United Nations usefully play in the process? There were no easy answers, chiefly because the objective situation was complex. The reports of the Special Mission and of the Special Committee and the statements of representatives of the liberation movements had revealed the true nature of the situation and the disturbing trends in modern co-

lonialism. Particularly ominous was the merciless determination with which Portugal was waging its war of aggression against the inhabitants of the colonial territories. All kinds of weapons of destruction were being used against a defenceless people. Such wanton criminality must be stopped and it was to be hoped that the African countries would initiate action to that end in the General Assembly.

120. The most important factor in a complex situation, which no doubt would have dangerous repercussions throughout Africa, was the enlarged membership of the unholy alliance. It had been shown that, in addition to Portugal, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, the unholy alliance now embraced the NATO military machine and multinational corporations. The fact that its war efforts were integrated with the Western European political and economic system made the Portugal of the 1970s a very different colonial Power from the Portugal of the early 1960s. It represented a qualitative as well as a quantitative change in the contemporary pattern of colonialism in Africa. The liberation movements of the Portuguese Territories had now to face not only their oppressor, Portugal, but also the forces of imperialism. To fight those forces, they needed allies and international support. It was therefore encouraging to learn that international opposition to Portugal had strengthened and that manifestations of solidarity with the cause of the peoples in the Portuguese Territories had grown more numerous.

121. His delegation was convinced that the indigenous peoples, fortified by such assistance, would finally triumph. The Security Council and the General Assembly should do their utmost to help them achieve their goal.

122. The CHAIRMAN announced that a film entitled "The Struggle Continues", provided by FRELIMO, would be shown the following day at 10 a.m. The meeting would be held immediately after the end of the film.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*