

SALAZAR SAYS

DECLARATION ON OVERSEAS POLICY

*BY H. E. PROF. OLIVEIRA SALAZAR, PRIME MINISTER OF PORTUGAL,
BROADCAST ON 12 AUGUST 1963*

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO

LISBON • 1963

531-RP

DECLARATION
OF
OFFICIALS

SECRETARIAÇÃO



SALAZAR SAYS

DECLARATION ON OVERSEAS POLICY

BY H. E. PROF. OLIVEIRA SALAZAR, PRIME MINISTER OF PORTUGAL,
BROADCAST ON 12 AUGUST 1963

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO

LISBON



1963



INCORPORAÇÃO

271
S.N.E.
/INS

DECLARATION ON
OVERSEAS POLICY

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO
LISBOA

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO

LISBOA 1963

This is the sum and substance of what I am going to say: *let us see if we make ourselves understood*. Nobody will question the imperative need of understanding clearly: this need concerns, in the first place, those of us who constitute the Portuguese Nation; next, it applies to the Portuguese State vis-à-vis the African States; finally, it refers to Portugal, not in the face of the world — this would be pretentious — but in the face of the attempt at universal government through the United Nations.

I

We are, in fact, the first to have to clarify our own thought, to have to be conscious of what we are or wish to be as a national aggregate. This is the starting point, given that entire continents are experiencing convulsions in search of peace, of bread, of freedom, while in all those continents we are precisely guaranteeing peace, raising food, showing people how to enjoy freedom in the sufficiency of bread and in the tranquillity of peace.

The developments in Asia and in Africa and specially those affecting the Portuguese territories had perforce to disturb minds and to make for a conscientious revision of

the principles or of the methods of overseas action, independently of impassioned and interested international polemics. The result of my reflexion is as follows:

The Political Constitution defines the Portuguese Nation as a unitary State in the complex of the territories by which it is constituted and of the peoples inhabiting those territories. The constitutional formula, in this regard, is no more than a declaration of a state of conscience which has been stratified in centuries of history and, down these centuries, by the work of the Portuguese and by the Christian humanitarianism which they carried with them.

Evidently, the conscience of the Nation may become clouded in critical moments and even be subverted and the Constitution is a text which formally the national will that defined it may also modify. This has been suggested to us from several quarters with some levity. For the question does not lie there: the question is whether those who are at the helm of affairs may advise the Nation to change her very structure under pressure of reasons which are extraneous to her own being, and if the structural changes, even when accepted by the peoples, will redound to their benefit. What is incumbent on those in charge of government has to be viewed at each moment in the light of the national sentiment and of the interests of our people; by no means as a matter of subjection to designs which are opposed to that sentiment and to those interests.

The concept of Nation is inseparable, in the Portuguese case, from the idea of civilizing mission, far beyond and very different from the introduction of new techniques and of the exploitation of the natural wealth of the territories found. In the case of a collection of peoples of different races, languages and religions and of unequal economic levels, nationalizing action cannot cut itself off from the effort which moulded the populations, turned to good account the useful

elements in the cultures found along the way, sobered down tribal rivalries and divisive tendencies, made all take part in common work and finally awakened a conscience of the *national*, that is, created a fatherland and raised the populations to the level of a higher civilisation. Those who disbelieve this smile disdainfully at us; but this is our way of being in the world, as others have already observed.

It makes no difference to the clarification of the present problem that our big empire of the XVI century was lost in the vicissitudes of history, because, although it was in part taken over and exploited by others, they too have lost it already. But it is worth stressing that wherever the Portuguese were given time by their competitors to instal themselves, cling to the land, live together and mix with the populations and guide them after the Portuguese manner; where and when this was possible, the Portuguese either left an indelible mark of their Lusitanism or purely and simply extended Portugal. And thus it is that we are also, besides other things and with a better title than others, an African nation.

One hears it said outside, loud cries are raised claiming independence for Angola: but Angola is a Portuguese creation and does not exist without Portugal. The only national conscience rooted in the Province is not Angolan, it is Portuguese; even as there are no Angolans but Portuguese of Angola. If Portugal be excluded, there is the NGWIZAKO asking for the reconstitution of the Kingdom of the Congo as a modern State; there are the ethnic groups of the districts of Moxico and Lunda asking us to create a Republic of Mushiko, independent of the rest. If there is no Angola, the Congo will have to break up; the outlet to the sea will have to be closed to Leopoldville and the ex-Belgian Congo will have to be turned into an inland State; there will have to be slicing in the South of the Province or more wisely in Southwest Africa in order to

reconstruct the empire of the Cuanhamas which had its capital among us at Ngiva, today Vila Pereira de Eça.

What has been said is also applicable to Mozambique. Some months ago, the Governor General gave an address to the youth, all of which is and may be summed up in the following proposition: Mozambique is only Mozambique, because she is Portugal, which is the same as to say: if the ties which bind her and make her a part of the Portuguese Nation are destroyed, there will be no more Mozambique either in history or in geography. Those who lived through the events of the last few decades connected with the region and the port of Lourenço Marques; those who have followed the legitimate anxiety of the Rhodesias with regard to their outlets to sea, those who are not unaware of certain ideas or ambitions which are very current in the neighbouring States of Tanganyka and of Nyasaland — they will have an idea of the pressure which is likely to be applied to the redistribution of the territories and values which fundamentally owe their existence to us and are Portuguese by right.

These problems, when we seek to solve them in the light of the principles with which some European powers started colonizing Africa in the XIX century, do not present major complications. Just as capitalist concerns are created, amalgamated, subdivided, liquidated and new managing bodies appointed with increased or restricted powers, even so it may be done in the African territories so long as, in this game, no account is taken of the human element in its anxiety to live, to be civilized and to make progress. When, however, we have before us a task of social uplift, of civilization, initiated, carried on and based on moral principles and with political determinants which are already centuries old, one may not act so lightly.

The leaders of today bear the tremendous responsibility of a crisis in the African continent, which will not improve,

much less heal, in two or three centuries, given the many wars which will be fought there, the pretended geographical or racial readjustments, the annexations, the divisions of some States, regrouping of others, the instability of public authority, the lack of means of progress. For, the command having been lost, neither the concert of powers nor the unity which is being proclaimed and which all feel to be impossible of achievement will be able to solve anything at all. If to these facts of a material order we add the moral shocks inevitable in such a convulsion and successively administered to the populations by the new conquerors — because those peoples also have souls — one can form an idea of the magnitude of the catastrophe.

As for us, the African crisis touched us at a moment when it is still possible to witness revivals of past stages of evolution which have not been fully erased by our nationalizing effort. These revivals, arising naturally in times of convulsion, are being incited by foreign interests but they are not by themselves vigorous enough to counter the unity which has been acquired. Is the language which we teach those peoples superior to their dialects or not? Does the religion preached constitute a nation of civilized expression and world projection by the missionaries surpass fetichism or not? Is it not better to constitute a nation of civilized expression and world projection than to shut up in narrow regionalism without incentives to development, without means of defence and without supports for progress? If our reply to these questions is affirmative, we cannot but conclude that the state of national conscience created by the Portuguese among such divers peoples has been a benefit to all, a benefit which would be wholly lost if we agreed to regress.

The existence of the nationalizing element in the inspiration of this political conception has resulted in all everywhere

being Portuguese; variation in geographical conditions and in climates as also the preponderance of certain ethnic backgrounds make some Europeans, others Africans, others Asiatics. And these differences project themselves in the political and administrative norms by which we are governed and in the way the populations live together. National unity does not require that a distinction should be made between metropolitan and other territories, which distinction may even be regarded as aberrant dualism, but it requires a capital, a government, a policy; the variety of populations calls for juridical equality of all ethnic groups, that is to say, multiracialism in laws and in life. The diversity of territories, of their size and their natural conditions lead to a certain differentiation in the constitution and in the powers of the organs charged with local administration and in the relations of these with the central organs.

In the measure in which territories achieve economic and social progress and local élites become more numerous and capable, centrifugal forces may make their appearance aspiring to the plenitude of power and to the monopoly of situations, and this involves a risk to the unity of the Nation. In the Portuguese case, however, the avenues of access to the highest posts are open and are made increasingly easier — Adrian, born in Spain, could become emperor in Rome; on the other hand, though the populations are almost balanced, there is still a great imbalance in the possibilities available in the European and overseas parts of Portugal and, therefore, if those centrifugal forces exist, they represent the selfish interests of minorities which act against themselves as well as against the collectivity and the general interest. In this direction or tendency, they must be opposed, but at the same time utilised to the maximum and channeled into working for the common welfare.

The multiracialism, which today begins to be mentioned and admitted by those who had practically never accepted it before, may be said to be a Portuguese creation. It derives, on the one hand, from our character and, on the other, from the moral principles of which we were the bearers. Were it not for the fact that conspicuous examples of such mixed — luso-tropical — societies can be shown today, perhaps it would even be denied that we contributed to their historical existence. The black racism which the newly independent African States proclaim and which they declare that they wish to see implanted in that continent is, on this point, a negation of our conceptions, yet it will not be maintained unless those same conceptions are adopted. It is beginning to be seen that the only probability of success for those new States lies in following those same principles of nondiscrimination or of racial equality which we proclaim and have always practised. The big difficulty lies in the fact that a multiracial society is not a juridical construction or a conventional regime of minorities, but above all a way of life and a state of mind which can be maintained in equilibrium and peace only with the support of a long tradition. In this context, it is not we who have to change our course; it is the others who have to take it in their own interest. And those centrifugal minorities to whom I referred above, whatever the ethnic group they belong to, would do well to ponder that they have no future if they ignore these fundamental truths.

National unity, once its essential elements are respected — one capital, one Government, one policy — is perfectly compatible with a maximum of administrative decentralization, in the constitution of local organs and in the definition of their powers. Evidently, the administration has to move within the larger circle that is the national policy and will have to abide by its directives. In order to be coherent, therefore, we ought not to forget, while amplifying administrative decen-

tralization, the part which the various territories play in the constitution and functioning of the higher organs of the Nation and also the need to follow the line of national policy. The development of the territories results in a multiplication of local problems requiring organs to deal with them directly: there has never been any difficulty in recognizing this fact. The difficulty lies in knowing how to harmonize a fully autonomous administration with governmental unity at the national level; in defining the co-ordination of national services with similar provincial services, in organizing the Overseas Ministry both in the sphere of its exclusive competence and as an intermediary between the local organs and the Government. Now all this involves so many and such delicate problems that we cannot be sure that these have always been solved in the best way. But I shall not deal with this subject today.

The Constitution allows administrative decentralization which, being adequate to the social condition of the territories, does not go against or injure national unity. Now we can say that, except for this requirement, the big overseas provinces are, in terms of the legislation in force, true States, administratively autonomous, politically integrated, for whose populations an assimilation of culture is sought.

The Overseas Organic Law has been reformed in accordance with the tendencies or aspirations revealed by the Provinces and with what seemed to be required for the present moment. The points of view of the Provinces were expressed in the Overseas Council, among others, by their direct representatives — the governors and the elected members of the local Legislative Councils and indirectly also by the representatives of economic activities. The main lines of orientation revealed in the discussions which took place in the Overseas Council, in the Corporative Chamber and in the

National Assembly may be, notwithstanding the complexity of the matter, enunciated as follows:

- greater representation in the local organs;
- more powers for these organs in the sphere of local administration;
- greater intervention of the Provinces in the direction of national policy.

The first aspiration has been satisfied by extending the Legislative Councils to all the Provinces, widening their composition and increasing the number of elected members; also, by creating Economic and Social Councils with consultative functions in relation both to the Legislative Council and to the Governor.

The second line of orientation was followed in the enhancement of the law-making powers of the Legislative Councils by entrusting them with everything pertaining to the drawing up and approving of the budget and by transferring to the government of each Province the powers which had been exercised by the Overseas Minister in some important matters of administration, such as organization of services, cadres, and salaries.

Finally, it became clear that the Provinces aspired to a greater intervention in the conduct of national policy and it was apparent from the outset that the first and the most secure source of this intervention would be found in the constitution of the higher organs of the State. Since the Provinces had already been electing Deputies to the National Assembly, it became necessary likewise to assure overseas representation in the Corporative Chamber, in the Overseas Council as well as in all the consultative councils of national scope: the latter are very few at present, but if there be an evolution, as there ought to be, in the sense of multiplying the technical and

specialized councils with competence extending over the whole national territory, the effective representation of all the overseas Provinces will have been guaranteed.

Not so much as a novelty but as a fruit of the development of local life, the revised Organic Law widens and promotes the organization of small and medium local autarchies whose representatives or administrators will be elected. This flowering of the life and administration of local interests is expected to yield — as in the formation of the European part of Portugal whose tradition it is sought to continue overseas — the most fruitful results in the growth of population groups, in meeting the interests of neighbours and in the gradual preparation of the populations for administration.

When one reflects on the guidelines of this reform and compares it with many other political organizations in force the world over, even in States of the federative type, it will be seen how bold and wide is the autonomy which that reform embodies and how in certain matters it exceeds those other organizations. The reform is based above all on confidence in the quality of the peoples who will make it work and on the possibilities of the territories to which it is applicable. Had those peoples and territories by chance claimed more or claimed something different, then indeed they would have also sought something different from what is contained in our point of departure — the unity of the Portuguese Nation.

II

The second chapter of this statement is meant to clarify and to make clear to ourselves the positions of Portugal vis-à-vis the African States and of the African States vis-à-vis Portugal. I shall endeavour not to hurt anybody's feelings,

though I have to stress facts and principles, ignorance of which would cast our intelligence adrift.

During an official visit to Brazzaville, at the beginning of June, the President of the Republic of Guinea, referring to the peoples of Africa who in his opinion are still colonial, declared: «If those peoples do not desire independence, we who are conscious and free are in duty bound to liberate the whole of Africa». It is from this mental position so clearly expressed by one of the African leaders that stem the attitudes taken by the independent States of Africa towards Portugal. These attitudes are based on two postulates: a definition of colonial territory adopted for their own use; the claim of a right to proceed to the «liberation» of «oppressed» peoples, even though the latter, like the Portuguese peoples, have long been free and thus decline being now liberated by others.

Secure in their notion of colonialism and invested with a providential mission, various African countries are engaged in a campaign which has helped them obtain undeniable triumphs in the United Nations and culminated not long ago in the conference of the 32 African heads of State and of Government — almost the totality — in Addis-Ababa. It was decided there to pool efforts together in a very special manner against our territories in Africa and principles and resolutions were voted which have already begun to be applied by some: breaking off diplomatic and consular relations; embargo on trade and on navigation by sea and air; refusal of co-operation to Portugal in the international technical bodies.

As already explained, the rupture of diplomatic relations effected by the few African countries with which we had established such relations, at times at their request, does not in general have anything more than a spectacular character without positive results. Evidently, where we have colonies of Portuguese people, refusal of consular representation, if

also included, may indirectly affect the defence of the legitimate interests which those colonies seek and represent. But as the consequences may indeed be harmful to the very parties that have taken the initiative to break off relations, it may well be that the Addis-Ababa decisions will in some cases come to be weighed against the ill-effects of their implementation.

As for trade with the African continent, excepting that part which is Portugal there as well, such trade is limited enough so that no serious losses will be caused by its suspension. In regard to air navigation, the local agreements are few and restricted in scope; as for the rights to use the air space recognized by international conventions, I think they ought to be respected, at least until they are denounced by the interested countries, but then it will be to the detriment of world traffic.

The fight against the presence of Portugal in international technical organs, where we are by full right, is a fact which does not stand in favour of the Africans and reflects no credit on the Westerners. It was easy for us to avoid the affronts by not appearing at the meetings or by not insisting integrally on our rights. The position which has seemed preferable to us is, however, to force our adversaries by our presence to take openly the path of illegality, and it is in illegality, that is, in clear contempt of the statutory norms of those organs that our adversaries are indeed acting. Our attitude may yield one of these two consequences: either a generalized awareness of the misconduct, leading to a reversal or a recognition that, under such conditions, there can be no functioning of the organs whose greatest benefits, it can be boldly said, go to the countries of recent independence.

Let us make it clear that the African countries would not be strong enough to impose on us their excommunications, had they not been supported by the vote of the communist governments seeking to destroy the West and by the attitude of some countries of the West which should be regarded as

a desertion if it did not mean a desire to win the sympathy of the Africans with a view to furthering what they consider to be their interests. Thus Africa is being used as the field where two worlds are at loggerheads: we are only an occasion and a pretext.

This is the situation which we accept as it presents itself to us. It cannot or ought not to have the slightest influence on Portuguese overseas policy and even on our sentiments towards those who attack us. As we have been in Africa for centuries, it is but natural that we should have established with the neighbouring territories, independently of their juridical status, the best of relations. Our policy has always been to live in friendship with all, to help each other, to strive to promote common interests in so far as it depended on us. Consequently, we have viewed the sovereignties, which have come into being, as facts of the internal life of the States, which need not influence our relations of neighbourliness. Whether or not those sovereignties corresponded to the interests of the respective peoples, we always left it to others to judge. Thus, no African country can reasonably complain against us; but we cannot say the same of all of them.

The countries represented at Addis-Ababa certainly thought that those resolutions were not sufficient — although, as sanctions to be applied against Portugal, they are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations — and accordingly they permitted themselves to go to greater extremes. These, already in execution here and there, are as follows: concession of training camps to revolutionary elements; offer of volunteers or mercenaries; subscription of funds to defray the expenses of terrorist campaigns; supply of arms and technicians for subversive warfare. In this regard, there is an open departure from



the norms which until recently governed the international community. As matters stood very few years ago, this would mean that all these countries, to the extent to which they carried out such decisions, should be regarded as being in a state of war with Portugal. Today, however, it is not so; and this not only by virtue of the facts of the recent past which were passed over in silence or left without a reply but also because the «sacred ambitions» which certain persons and peoples embody in certain instances prevail over all duties and all rights. Those persons and peoples would even be lacking legitimacy to defend themselves.

Within the logic of this position, it does not matter that our territories are relatively more advanced and for that very reason many African States insist obstinately in not having that advancement checked; nor is any importance attached to the real will of the populations which live in peace, enjoying full juridical equality with all others; nor to the bases of their political organization and of their administration; nor to the fact that those territories are integral parts of an independent State and have been so since long before most African States became independent. No importance seems likewise to be given — at least they have not been remembered — to the men, women and children who fell for ever or are being attacked in their homeland by foreign terrorists in absolute violation of the human rights which, on the other hand, are said to be the objective of those who pretend to defend them. We have seen above that the liberation of the peoples of Africa is claimed as *a right against the will of those peoples themselves* to some scandal of those who weary themselves in expressing hopes that liberation may be based on some sort of self-determination.

When matters are taken to these extremes of passion and deviation from human reason, there is no possibility of discussion or of mutual understanding. Either the more res-

possible powers put in an efficacious word calling for a return to good sense or nothing remains for each one but to use his natural right to defend himself and his people. Thus wars begin.

*
* *
*

Though unanimously voted for the world to see, it seems to me that the deliberations of Addis-Ababa cannot represent a unanimity of conscience of the African peoples. Many of these know the value of the norms by which human societies are governed and they should not have been ready to sacrifice the principles of their own life and formation on the altar of somebody else's independence.

But, then, wherefore the fact that we have noted?

In present day Africa one witnesses a double phenomenon: whenever possible, a revolutionary movement is hitched to the process of the independence of the territories. This movement is more pronounced in the countries of the Mediterranean coast but it extends already to the other countries which those seek to dominate or to lead with their extremism fanned as it is to spread to Africa south of the Sahara, under their leadership, new ideas of political and social revolution, not to mention the dreamed of unification of the continent. Currently, one hears suspicious words: neutralism; socialist state; total economic independence; inadaptability of monarchies to new conditions; formation of new social and political structures, regardless whether they are viable in the prevailing sociological conditions. For example, the interest in Angola of Algeria and of UAR — a country that is half African and today half Asiatic — cannot be religious or racial or humanitarian or economic or that of a liberator from any oppression. On the part of those States and of others which are deep in the fight against

us, while trying to disguise the hostility between Arabs and Africans, there can be only one interest — the revolutionary interest; and this interest is far from being shared by all, even because they fear it. But the target has been well chosen, because it is known that we represent, in that sense and in the modesty of our resources, a barrier to be crossed. We only raise a corner of this problem, because we believe that they are labouring under an illusion who think that, through their dubious patronage, they will later lead the newly independent African countries, like meek flocks, into their folds.

*

*

*

But may there not be a mistake also in regard to the very phenomenon of decolonization both on the part of the decolonized as of the colonisers?

In resolution 1541 (XV) of the General Assembly of the United Nations (15th December, 1960), there was a search for a definition of colonial territories and mention is made of territories which are geographically separated and ethnically or culturally distinct from the administering country. It was, however, prudently added that there are other elements to be taken into account — of administrative, political, juridical, economic or historical nature — which seemed fully to cover the Portuguese Overseas Provinces, the more so as in another resolution (1514 (XV) of 14th December 1960), it is stated: «Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations». The Portuguese case clearly fit in here, but the passion which prevails in these matters has not permitted justice to be done to us in accordance with the texts.

In international campaigns and forums demands are made constantly for decolonization: this is said to be the greatest need of the century and the highest work which mankind in our days could undertake. As no care has been taken to define the term, we do not yet have an idea of the precise content of such a complex phenomenon. When, however, one looks carefully on the intimate connection established every now and again between de-colonization and independence, it is seen that the essence of the de-colonization is to be found in the exclusive possession of power or in the transfer of power from the white man, wherever he holds it, to the negro who claims it and is said to have the right to it only because of his numerical superiority. In these circumstances, one should not avoid at least a primary condition — that of the populations being capable of choosing their government and of the élites being sufficiently prepared to make the structures of administration function. But it has already been solemnly proclaimed and voted in the same United Nations that lack of preparation in the political, economic and social domains or in that of instruction should never serve as a pretext to delay the granting of independence (Resolution 1514 (XV)). Independence must be given immediately, whatever happens thereafter.

Even though this is not a matter which concerns us, it is difficult to admit this thesis which considers the independence of peoples as containing in itself all the virtualities so that no account need be taken either of the size of the territories nor of the number and value of the populations nor of the resources at the disposal of the rulers to achieve the common good. The truth is that the territories to which we refer are — and they admit it themselves — underdeveloped, demographically, economically and culturally. It is to no purpose to follow the path of complicated theories which might disclose the causes: we know that many of those theories have been formulated and

developed so as to find arguments to blame the coloniser, as the basis of his responsibilities towards the colonised. But it is essential to remember that the progress considered necessary requires technicians, capital and labour, the latter, at least in part, to be recruited locally, the other factors from outside. Now, however much we may try to shape the interventions of more advanced and richer countries, we shall always find a minimum of conditions attached to such technique and to such capital. They are so to say organic and natural requirements, whether the local economy takes the path of socialism or accepts a greater or lesser degree of economic freedom and of private enterprise. The peoples who, fearing some such external influence, do not choose this course, will have to fall back on others — that of progress going so slow that it cannot be regarded as such or that of a return to lower standards of life.

In this connection we have seen some of the boldest theories being set forth. There are countries which thought they had sufficient means to raise the African continent in their arms and to make it as progressive in a few decades as Europe became after centuries. Soon, however, they realized that the task was excessively heavy and they are now trying to make others share the burden in the form of humanitarian grants, technical co-operation and incentive for the opening and conquest of markets. We have seen other countries bent on speeding up the preparation of leaders, technicians and skilled labour as a means to rapidly filling the local vacuum: *formation of cadres* continues to be an obsession in Africa. To satisfy this obsession, the milieu in which the populations develop, their psychic climate, is left out of account and candidates are hurried to every corner of the world, whence the countries collect back technicians and politicians of the most varied formations. In this task revealing much flurried haste and naïveté, there seems to be a confusion between civilization

and material progress, progress and industrialization, de-tribalization and freedom, freedom and expulsion of white man, and this after seeing how useful is co-operation in the organization of enterprises and in the orientation of labour. And thus, in none of these domains have the aspirations been found to correspond to the realities.

We also find, with regard to self-determination and independence, the same confusion of concepts as in the case of de-colonization. Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations contains no allusion to independence of the territories to which it refers but only to the possibility of self-government, which seems to mean autonomous administration conducted by the local people and compatible with many forms of inclusion in the framework of a State. But when self-determination is linked with independence, as has been done in the various votes taken in respect of Portugal, it is ignored that self-determination means the possibility of divers options and that to indicate or impose independence as its goal is tantamount to restricting it to a single objective, thus partially denying it.

We have another doubt as well and we have found no reply to it either. It is this: if self-determination aims fundamentally at verifying the assent given to the form of State or of Government under which populations live, it is not understood how there can be a single method of achieving this purpose or of determining that assent, the single method being a plebiscite following the illegitimate demands of the United Nations. The entire past, all the interventions in political life and in the organization of public authority would not then have the slightest value, in despite of reason and of history.

These two serious confusions — self-determination equal to independence; self-determination equal to a plebiscite — begin to be noticed and the United States itself seems to have evolved in the last two years in the direction of good sense. The fact is that such anomalous constructions of the United Nations,

made *ad odium* and for certain purposes, end by giving people the impression of independence imposed from outside taking the place of a healthy natural evolution.

From the foregoing I deduce that the hard lessons of experience are going to make the African peoples less ambitious. These lessons are going to ensure that this excitement is followed by states of greater calm in which the living together of races and the co-operation of nations will prevail over the unbridled idealisms of today. It will have to be admitted that, even apart from colonisation characterised by purely economic exploitation, nations and civilisations constantly influence one another according to their relations and the relative degree of their advancement. Thus, in the most independent and free, vestiges can always be found which in modern parlance could be termed colonialism. Let me cite examples.

A century after independence, the United States could still be regarded as an economic colony of Britain. The manifold interventions in our internal life in the XIX century enabled many to regard Portugal of those days, though independent, as almost a political colony of Great-Britain. In January this year, asked about the national characteristics of Brazilian society at the time of independence, the sociologist Gilberto Freyre replied that they had been insignificant from the economic point of view, since Brazil, immediately on ceasing to be a Portuguese colony, became a British colony. But let us not continue, because that is life.

From what I have said and is to be understood from the foregoing, I deduce the following propositions for our conduct vis-à-vis the African peoples:

- the closest and most friendly co-operation, if they find it useful;

- the greatest propriety, if our collaboration is dispensed with;
- defence of the territories which constitute Portugal to the limit of our human and other resources, if they see fit to turn their threats into acts of war and to bring war into our territories.

III

We have now to examine the position vis-à-vis the United Nations or rather vis-à-vis the universal government into which some are seeking to transform the United Nations with a view to furthering the objectives of their national policy.

When that body was set up and for many years thereafter, we abstained from seeking admission, as we were not convinced of the advantages which would derive therefrom. We did so later, at the request of Great-Britain and of the United States, who saw in our admission a means of strengthening the position of the West in the United Nations; but as Russia, whose vote was indispensable, had precisely the same view of the matter, it became necessary to wait until a wider arrangement had been made. Thus, Portugal had plenty of time to examine the negative aspect of the question — that is, if she might not reap disadvantages from her admission in the United Nations.

We thought we should remain tranquil in view of Article 2 (7) of the Charter which prescribes: «Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter». But there was Chapter XI — Articles 73 and 74 — regarding non-self-governing territories and it was prudent to see how the United Nations understood and applied it. Now, when we

were admitted in the Organization, it had been peacefully settled that it was the States responsible for any territories that were competent to declare them and to consider themselves subject or not to the obligation of supplying to the Secretary General statistical or other technical information on the economic, social and educational conditions in the territories for which they were responsible.

The trouble however did not lie in giving information; it lay in the fact that, by giving information under Article 73, one necessarily accepted the orientation defined in the United Nations for certain political solutions which collided or could collide with our constitutional doctrine. These were the only points and reservations: no one could doubt our good faith nor could we doubt the good faith of the other powers, since our interpretation of the Charter was based on its letter and spirit, on the doctrine of commentators, and on the jurisprudence and practice of the Organization.

It happened, however, that two movements arose subsequently; the first tending to affirm the universality of the Organization, which may be held to be in conformity with the Charter; the other, tending to increase the powers of the General Assembly. Members of the Security Council, tired of the Russian veto, were inclined to entrust to the Assembly consideration of problems of the utmost gravity in international life; and, in the supposition that they would continue to hold the majority, entrusted those problems to it under conditions of greatly reduced guarantee. Thus it has come about that the Assembly has not only arrogated to itself a kind of generic capacity to deal with every problem in the world but has begun to regard itself as the exclusive source of its own competence.

The Charter contains provisions for its revision and amendment; but the process prescribed in Articles 108 and 109 has never been utilized. Since the massive entry of the

Afro-Asian members in the organization and once these discovered the weight which they had acquired as a result of the support of the communist countries and even of others of Western formation, the United Nations has come to function as a machine whose connections with the Charter are of the slenderest and just for that very reason to constitute a menace to peace and to the orderly life of Nations. Once the principle is accepted that the doctrine of the Charter is that which the majority chooses to define in each General Assembly and that the United Nations has the competence which is attributed to it on each occasion, the functioning of the institution has become a serious risk to the nations which, not being members of any partisan blocs, belong to the inorganic minorities, do not negotiate solutions, do not trade their votes, do not join in lobby arrangements. The situation has to be studied, if the institution is to be saved, the more so as the big powers deal with their most important problems and discuss their differences outside the Organization and, in case of convenience or necessity, do not even comply with its decisions, as they have themselves declared, without running any risk thereby.

More recently, the United Nations have had as their main and most burning topic the discussion of our overseas policy and the fact that we hold that our overseas territories are and ought to continue to be integral parts of the Portuguese Nation. These campaigns should not cause surprise, given the deification of the institution and the contempt with which the majority formed around the subject regard some of the fundamental principles of the Charter. But it may perhaps be surprising that such a doctrine is adopted by the very nations which had undertaken to defend our overseas territories or declared in the past that it is necessary for the defence of the West that they should be in Portuguese hands. I recall the so-called Declaration of Windsor of 14th October, 1899, and the words which President Roosevelt addressed me in his letter of 8th

July, 1941: «In the opinion of the Government of the United States, the continued exercise of unimpaired and sovereign jurisdiction by the Government of Portugal (over all the overseas territories) offers complete assurance of security to the Western Hemisphere insofar as regions mentioned are concerned... It is, consequently, the consistent desire of the United States that there be no infringement of Portuguese sovereign control over those territories». Since geography has not changed, it is difficult to admit that ideas can have changed.

We have appeared in New York to defend our points of view. These are in conformity with the texts and with the interpretations given them by the United Nations itself. But the debates seem very much like conversations between deaf people. Thus, to be present and to discuss is for us more a question of consideration and mutual respect than of usefulness, because we can ask ourselves what would be the worst that could have happened if we had already abandoned the Organization, as indeed we have had in mind.

I have not felt that the world has worried over the problem, because we have been almost the lone target. But when the General Assembly thinks of dealing with questions concerning the internal life of many other countries, as will inevitably happen, then it will be a different matter. Given the present ideas of the United Nations, there is indeed no reason why it will not eventually think of discussing problems like the incompatibility of monarchies with the requirements of modern times; the economic undesirability of recognizing private ownership of the means of production; unicameral or bicameral parliamentary systems; organic or popular democracy; the structure of public authority. Since the Assembly can at each moment be a law unto itself and define the scope of its own powers, all the vagaries of a thoughtless majority are possible and such vagaries are even regarded as the correct expression of the general will.

We are not converted to such ideas and we continue to think that, in such serious matters as the integrity of nations, non-intervention in their internal life, their constitutional structure, the vital interests of populations. International life cannot be at the mercy of inter-racial collusions, compromise formulas, votes obtained by shady arrangements and manoeuvred by emotional slogans which are neither intelligible nor responsible. This means: as between our constitutional formula, which we consider to be indeed in keeping with the text of the Charter of the United Nations, in harmony with its only valid interpretation, and the resolutions voted by the Assembly or by the Security Council in the contrary sense, we have seen no other possible solution than to defend the doctrine of the Charter and oppose abusive interference of third parties in our life as an independent Nation. This is what we did a few days ago; and no convincing reasons were heard to the contrary.

It is painful to see that so many responsible countries have joined in or have remained aloof by abstention from the votings which affect us, some condemning our attitude, others regarding our refusal to obey the injunctions of the majority as a threat to international peace and security. (Assembly Resolution 1807 and 1742). On 9th June, 1961 the Security Council even went to the extent of deploring «the massive massacres and severe measures of repression in Angola»; and it seemed to the Council that a continuation of that situation should be a threat to the maintainance of international peace and security. On that resolution, which ignored or distorted facts in a manner so offensive to truth and the repercussion which those facts could have on peace and security in the world, only France and England abstained. The rest of the members of the Security Council found the resolution perfectly in order.

We have examined the problem from the juridical point of view, but we may ask what it is that is sought politically. In Resolution 1542 (XV) of 15th December, 1960, the Assembly enumerates all the Portuguese territories from Cape Verde to Timor. We find it impossible to admit that the Assembly did not know their area, population, and level of economic and cultural development. But since by Resolution 1807 (XVII) of 14th December, 1962, it invites the Portuguese Government to recognize immediately the right to independence of the peoples under its administration (including those of S. João Batista de Ajudá — a caretaker and two peons!), we have to conclude that the only purpose is to bring about either a fragmentation of the territories not having a solid foundation or an annexation by others of the Portuguese territories which, being unable to sustain their independence, are maintained by us. This is what happened in Goa, transformed from a flourishing State into a colony of the Indian Union by force of an armed attack forbidden by the Charter and carried out even while the Security Council, paralysed by the Russian veto and by the highly significant declaration of the Indian delegate (Charter or no Charter, right or no right) was taking stock of its helplessness, that is, of its uselessness in defending the rule of Law. These examples make us doubt whether those resolutions are adopted with full knowledge of facts and whether the motives with which they are sought to be forced on us are proper. But some motives which are not these merely apparent ones are at the basis of the United Nations campaign against Portugal.

*

*

*

Communist thinking in relation to Africa is a matter of public knowledge: Lenin divided the process into three phases

— anticolonialism, nationalism, communism; and though the Leninist position was revised in 1960, the general line has been maintained, and it can be said that the first phase, that is, decolonization, has been almost entirely achieved. It would be puerile to think that the most colonialist regime of our time, which imposed its domination on many free States and reduced to colonies territories which ought to have been liberated, it would be puerile to think that in this vast political operation there is a minimum of purpose to liberate African peoples. The fact is that, as Africa constitutes communities of various types together with West European countries, a desintegration of the system would by itself provoke a decline in the respective economic and political potential. The satisfaction with which we are told in some quarters that no communist societies are seen in Africa—this is said to be a proof of Moscow's incapacity to establish itself there — that satisfaction makes us smile, because what Moscow wished to do is being done by the West, while the rest of the programme will be carried out in its own good time. In any case, it is known that Russia is behind all the movements of pseudo-emancipation, sets herself up discreetly everywhere and maintains the necessary economic, political and cultural contacts with the leaders with a view to marking her presence and action without alarm. These contacts will yield fruits which will be gathered but only when they are ripe.

On the other hand, the United States makes no secret of its Africa policy: great significance attaches to the official statements and to the facts of American administration designed to work for and help with all its power set up independent States all over Africa, corresponding to the former colonies or territories integrated in European nations. From this point of view, American and Russian policies may be looked upon as parallel and the fact that the United States aids the so-called emancipation of Africa to keep it free from

Russian or communist influence makes little difference to the essence of things. It matters little that one power starts from the purpose, widely invoked as a national imperative, of giving freedom to all men and peoples, while the other starts from its concept of a world revolution which is supposed to make for the full happiness of Man — the two Nations pursue the same policy, though for apparently different ends.

Beyond this, however, there is a substantial difference: while Russian policy is coherent and logical, American policy involves a serious principle of contradiction. And it is this: while the fundamental principle of the policy of the United States is to help the defence of Europe, for which it has already made sacrifices in two great wars, it begins by provoking a reduction in the potential of its European allies in favour of the potential of its enemy which is communism. The contradiction is so evident and the American position so open to doubts that the African Nations permitted themselves, at the recent Security Council, to throw out a challenge to the United States to make a choice, knowing that it was impossible for the United States to make it without sacrificing beyond repair the defence of Europe and of the West. Even if most of the African States had been inclined to fall in line with the European and pro-American policy, there would be replacement of values of a like kind. But I have already said enough to enable the inference that such is not the situation. And it may indeed be doubted if, in a given moment, Europe would accept to fight for interests which would not then be hers.

Apart from the interests of European defence badly shaken as they are by the Africa policy of the United States, one factor stands out in clear evidence: the African Continent is the big space in which the two most powerful Nations compete — the United States and Russia—or three, for Communist China has also put in her appearance there. The fact that this is

known, that it is evident, has offered the African Nations great possibilities of manoeuvring in all the negotiations and claims which they advance. The political attitudes of those new States being neutralized for the time being — to put it in the most favourable light — the competition will have to go on in economic and technical domains. This phenomenon involves the risk of reaching very close to the goals which have been indicated: to the East, by the strong State economies; to the West, by the big capitalist syndicates — both aiming to capture and control markets. We cannot find it surprising if, as a result, the African Continent begins to witness — and soon enough — the era of neo-colonialism which is so much feared there.

This competition taking place in African space may well lead to an entente such as was formerly designated by definition of zones of influence but may now take another name. To avoid this, it has been suggested that the United Nations may be entrusted with the task of concerting aids, collecting and distributing financial resources and supervising their use in various countries. This is a formula, but not a solution of the problem, because, in addition to keeping out all private enterprise, the lack of agreement among the sources of financial and technical aid and the origin and constitution of the majority set up in the General Assembly do not make for smooth functioning of the system. Nor has it been shown that dependence on a collective body is easier and more unassailable than that which it seeks to replace, particularly when that body is intoxicated with political and racial hatred and is convinced that it has found in the political freedom of some countries the key to all problems.

The very special relations between the Congo and the United States are well known. Consequently, no surprise was

caused when the Congolese Government recognized *de jure* a kind of terrorist association set up at Leopoldville for the purpose of operating in Angola and avowedly supported by funds from Americans (Statement made in Leopoldville on 28th July). On the other coast and outside the national territory, a professor of a United States university appears likewise as the leader of the liberation of Mozambique, but we do not know if he will continue to be paid by that university. These are perhaps simple coincidences, but they are nonetheless unfortunate coincidences which those in responsible positions have by no means tried to clarify; and the misfortune will be even greater when it becomes generally known that Russia also has placed at the disposal of the terrorist association referred to resources to fight for the «liberation» of Angola. This may mean that some countries do not merely defend theoretically the liberation of colonised peoples but also place some favourable pawns in position for possible games in the Portuguese Provinces.

After analysing these problems and entirely discounting the chances of a political collaboration favourable to Europe I am led to this conclusion: we should implore Providence to work the miracle of granting to the African countries, until recently led by France, England, Belgium or Italy, the possibility of finding a formula of close cooperation with those Nations such as would be capable of solving the problems which independence has created for them. That would be the best way of resisting being used as playthings in world competitions which, no matter under which flag they show up, will end by subjecting African States to unpleasant servitudes for the benefit of interests which are foreign to Africa.

*
* *
*

This struggle against Portugal in Africa which has the United Nations for its stage and the African countries for its direct agents is merely a repetition of that which, under various pretexts, we have had to face in the past and particularly in the four decades between 1898 and 1938: now the pretext is openly political — the independence of all the Overseas Provinces; previously, certain agreements arrived at and certain uncompleted negotiations between Powers who were our friends and allies were based on our bad administration and the paucity of our resources for the suitable development of our territories. There were those, it seems, who were ready to provide such resources with liberality and Portugal was too poor and small for her to be spread over such vast areas. And now, with similar objectives, we find the argument once again in circulation.

However, since the agreements I have mentioned were never implemented, one would have thought that Portugal's overseas territories could not but have become a shameful stain of backwardness in the evolution of the African Continent. It is known that this is not so and that those territories stand comparison with the others, in Africa, and, from many points of view, have reached a higher level of development. There are three reasons for this: historically speaking, Portugal has not lived on but for the Overseas Provinces: the development of a territory in which the population is settled is operated in a way that differs from that of territories subject to purely colonial exploitation in which the «colon», once his work has finished, withdraws taking with him all that he brought and all that he has earned. Finally, since the Portuguese Overseas Provinces are not closed to foreign capital investments, these have floated great enterprises there, because private capital

is attracted above all by the stability and honesty of the administration, as reflected, in practice, in security for investments. And we do not speak of the fact that the Development Plans which we have financed or guaranteed have fertilized the territories as would not, in the past, have been thought possible. It is obvious that the result would be greater and more outstanding if the criticisms addressed to us were substituted by the financial aid which we see widely distributed without the guarantees that we give and, in other cases, with very doubtful guarantees.

It is gratifying, although at the same time a little strange, to see the surprise of many of those who visit us in Africa, because, not knowing how the action of the Portuguese among the coloured peoples is processed, they find there a true multiracial society and at the same time a form of civilized and progressive life, of Western type. It is chiefly the loss of this, in the confusion in which these problems are dealt with, that should be feared. And let us hope that at least the more responsible Powers in the UN, recognizing at last our honest and productive effort, will let us continue to work in peace.

IV

I am about to bring my remarks to an end.

I have tried to deal with the three points I indicated in all objectivity and with a little of that experience which life has brought me in long contact with the men and the events of our time. I could not be optimistic nor have I wished to let myself be swamped by the wave of pessimism which may have disturbed others and which is inimical to action. I am in any case quite certain that the moment we are living through is one of very grave difficulties which almost reach

the level of the total resistance of the Nation, but we must neither make them worse nor try to reduce them to our eyes, especially if we have the courage to face them. At bottom, the position may be summarised as follows: as a Nation, we are the trustees of a sacred heritage; we consider that it is our duty, and to the interest of the West, to safeguard it, and we sacrifice ourselves by fulfilling that duty in which many do not believe even though they benefit from it. In spite of this we too will also be recompensed: the great generations of soldiers, administrators, missionaries, settlers of whom we are proud were precisely the product of our occupation, pacification, and civilizing influence overseas, and they brought to Portugal notable enrichment in moral values which have welled forth from their unequalled strivings and sufferings.

Some of us are particularly concerned with the expenses we are called on to bear; others with all the clamour which appears to be universal and which is raised at the United Nations against the Portuguese nation. The expenses have, up to now, been met by our surplus ordinary revenue, which is almost a miracle of our administration, and no one would or will be surprised if for the future things have to be otherwise. The pity of it is that such vast sums should not be devoted to providing material and cultural benefits for the populations instead of their being solely given over to protecting the security and the peace which were theirs and of which circumstances are now endeavouring to deprive them.

I confess that a little courage is needed to listen unperturbed to the clamour that is being raised against Portugal and to the strange judgements of men, some of them eminent and with a heavy load of responsibilities in governing peoples. If, however, we place principles on one side and, on the other, the interests and passions which are all-pervading, we shall find it possible to follow such speeches without feeling that

the reasons which support our case have been shaken or considering that our right has been undermined.

There are in the world two erroneous ideas concerning our cause. Some there are who hold that outbursts of anti-Portuguese nationalism spring from the policy of oppression, which is said to be ours in Africa, as it is here, as it was in Goa, now «liberated» and unhappy in her liberation. We know by heart this theme by which it is sought either to bring about the downfall of the internal framework by throwing away the Portuguese existence of the Overseas Provinces, or to solve the overseas problems expeditiously through recourse to the subversion of the national policy. But no one seems to be able to explain how it is that this policy only yields fruits of terrorism, and even then scant and withered, when the ferment of alien interests is injected into the mass so as to leaven it.

Others believe that Portugal lives mainly on her Overseas Provinces and that their eventual loss will spell total ruin for her. The Norwegian Ambassador at the latest Security Council meeting to be devoted to us went so far as to suggest that the rich countries should contribute towards compensating us for our losses and helping us to place our life on a different basis. When it becomes possible to publish certain papers which I possess, it will be seen that the idea is not original and that this generous compensation has already been offered us in the past. The simple truth, however, is that Portugal overseas may be the victim of attack but is not for sale.

These problems in which the Nation's very existence and identity are at stake are the gravest that can face any government, since the positions taken or to be taken at each moment are decisive for all and final for the future. Some people claim that these positions are by now clear enough for firm opinions to be held about them: it has been precisely

my wish to contribute to this end with the assistance which the Government can and ought to give by means of facts within its knowledge. Not that I have any doubts as to the feelings of the Portuguese people, both here and overseas, concerning the defence of the Nation's integrity: the people who work and fight will not need long discussions in order to decide the course they must take. But I can only see advantage in their pronouncing themselves in a solemn and public act on what they think of the overseas policy which the Government has been following.

The way in which the country has responded to the demands we have made on it is a lesson for us all: without hesitation, without grumbling, naturally as one who lives life, men march to inhospitable climates and distant lands doing their duty in obedience to the dictates of their heart and of the torch of faith and patriotism which lights their path. In the presence of this lesson I feel that we should not mourn the dead. Rather: we will have to mourn the dead if the living are unworthy of them.



BOOKS

S·N·I

LISBON

NB



EFG0000513611

S.N.