

401-Rp

S A L A Z A R S A Y S

NOTES ON THE
INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

*SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER, DR. OLIVEIRA SALAZAR,
ON 30-5-1956, AT THE OPENING MEETING OF THE IVth CONGRESS OF
THE NATIONAL UNION*

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO
L I S B O N • 1 9 5 6

872
-RP



SALAZAR SAYS

NOTES ON THE
INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

*SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER, DR. OLIVEIRA SALAZAR,
ON 30-5-1956, AT THE OPENING MEETING OF THE IVth CONGRESS OF
THE NATIONAL UNION*

SECRETARIADO NACIONAL DA INFORMAÇÃO
L I S B O N • 1 9 5 6



401-Rp

S.N.I.
268

INCORPORAÇÃO

268

NOTES ON THE
INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

THE WORLD OF TODAY
OF WHICH IS THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE
AND WHICH WILL BE THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION
L. S. O. N. * 1938

Gentlemen,

I have been asked to say a few words to open the IVth Congress of the National Union, but I don't know whether they form a very appropriate introduction to it.

The Congress has got to take stock of the work which we have done, analyse the solutions and the deficiencies. It has got to judge the adequacy of the principles for the solution of the problems faced by the Portuguese, as a political society, and as a State. Furthermore it can open up new perspectives for the people's work and future. None of these tasks falls to me today. I am faced with something very different and situated in a completely different plane.

Considering the atmosphere of grave disturbances in which we live — with the world upside down, the foundations of civilization being undermined, the defenders of the city being perplexed and bewildered — some people have asked me whether it would not be a good idea to consider, perhaps even as the basis of our reflections and political attitudes, the risks which all this could involve for us. In other words, would it not be a good idea to examine, in the midst of the general confusion, the reasons why we trust in the future of the Portuguese Nation.

The subject may seem strange, and even daring. If we are going to discuss it properly, we must confront the events and systems which vie for the intelligence of men and the control of the lives of people. I do not consider myself apt to go beyond a summary report of the facts and problems, which we face on the international plane. I shall not discuss any solutions, except those which are of direct interest to us. The others are the responsibility of the great powers who lead the world and, in view of the way that things are going, could affect its destiny.

I.

Generally speaking, the world situation could perhaps be defined as follows:

The West's policy during the second world war made it possible for Russia to take over large tracts of territory in Europe and led to the Communist regime being imposed on several States. Under Russia's direction, they became a zone of security with economic and military reserves.

Several Asiatic Nations have become independent. Others have been drawn away from any European influence. They have vigorously made their presence felt in international society. Generally speaking, they are still profoundly rancouring against, or riddled with hate for Western civilization and the White Man, who generously bore it there. New seats of independence are springing up along the whole of North Africa from the Middle and Near East to the Atlantic shores. Although somewhat hesitant as yet, there seems to be an attempt at trying out a Pan-Arab or Pan-Islamic community which will be defined according to the circumstances.

Thus, the rest of Africa is starting to be unsettled and to burn in the fire of movements which, incapable of being nationalistic and, only with great difficulty, ideological, — are put

forward as being racial, in the broadest sense of the term. As in Asia, they are only too ready to deny the White Man all his civilizing effort and the rights derived therefrom.

America, on the contrary, apart from a few scares of home policy, is seen to have stable frontiers, to love peace and to be instilled with a feeling of collaboration, especially in the Inter-American system. Discordant elements, driven from abroad, have so far been unable to achieve any outstanding results in this system. This is mainly due to the moral structure of those countries. All of them owe the foundations of their formation to Europe.

That is the position of the world.

Meanwhile, working almost in silence, apart from her military intervention in Korea and in Tibet, China is trying out her Communist revolution so that she can then take over control at least to the South and South East of Asia. Meanwhile, Japan which was hard hit by the war, is recovering from the losses suffered in her territory and in political importance. She is feeling out her way amongst the new Asiatic values. Meanwhile the Indian Union is using the seduction of her neutralism to try and obtain one of the top places in the direction and the nations which have recently achieved their independence are organizing themselves and getting together in it — the nerve centre of world policy still lies in Europe. This is not merely because Europe has traditionally governed the destinies of the world, on account of its own strength and wealth, but because it formed the breeding ground for the only universal civilization. This civilization, represented by Europe and the American Nations, has been threatened, and it seems to be their duty to solidly defend it. To this end, Europe and America are the West, and, for that very reason, their problems are problems which still have universal repercussions.

And, in view of the ideological and subversive movements mentioned, and the new structuration of the world, what are the West's guiding principles? I would not dare to say that the

West does not have a basic doctrine — at least the essential principles of its common civilization. But we all feel that the political and economic action, the statements of the leaders, the expressions of opinion, come from mental or emotional attitudes. I would humbly suggest that these attitudes are not proved as being right either by logic and possibly will not even be so by future events. Can I refer to them as fundamental principles, lines of thought? They should, perhaps, be termed as catchwords or slogans, carried over from the games of home policy to international direction, with such vagueness of outlook and juxtaposition of planes, without their even disturbing the calmest and brightest minds either today or tomorrow. I can give you an example by mentioning solely anti-colonialism and the right of peoples to decide for themselves; the economic deficiencies which give rise to communism; European integration; the universal remedy of the United Nations for the solution of international conflicts. We shall have occasion to glimpse at one case, or another on our way and to check up on where there was merely excessive optimism and where they were really cases of mistaken judgement.

But let us return to Europe and to its drama during the last few years — the East-West conflict and its sundry implications: the division of Germany, the semi-free peoples on the other side of the Curtian, the frontiers which are not fixed, the peace which is to be established, the countries which have been cut off from their normal life of relations — these are questions which not even Russia is convinced, have been stabilized or even been afforded a suitable solution.

Russia has become greater and more powerful. But the problems resulting from the enlargement of territorial size, her rise to being a great industrial power, the consequences of a victorious war effort, the expansionist strength of a great empire which makes intelligent use of its opportunities, have become aggravated by the fact that Russia has become a Communist country and an active factor in a world revolution, which could

count on the Communist parties in each country for support. It is quite true that Russia has been a member of the United Nations right from the outset, but since neither her objectives nor her policy appear to coincide with the spirit and methods of the institution, nor to be efficiently restricted by the terms of the Charter, the West had to set up a defensive system with somewhat more realism than usual, in order to stem the movement from the East. This was achieved, because Canada and the United States of America joined in the effort made by almost all the countries of free Europe, to enlarge it.

We, here in the West, are now faced with a series of statements, attitudes and measures coming from the Russian side to reveal changes whose meaning we ignore and whose consequences it is, as yet, difficult to forecast. The events which took place during the last Moscow Communist Congress, the diplomatic visits which preceded and followed it, the extinction of the Cominform, the organ for the coordination of Communist action abroad, the use of other forms of influence, such as economic action, have changed the plan according to which Western policy was being handled and seem to require an adjustment of outlook. However, in order to discover the exact direction of such a change, we must understand the meaning behind the new tactics.

I have followed the different interpretations together with the constructions which have, here and there, been built up on recent information. They are so numerous, that I think nothing could be lost from putting forward yet another.

I think that the whole series of events connected with Russia and Communism stem from the discovery of two realities: one is that the Communist revolution in Russia has lost its virulence; the other is that the Communist parties in different countries are revolutionarily impotent on account of an ideological war, launched by Russia, becoming clearly impossible in the West. Unless I am mistaken, Russia has, for a long time past, done all that she could to destroy and deny, and that a movement for a return to formulas which harmonize better with experience

and the nature of things, is, at present, in operation in the territory and institutions. Even when it is actually put into practise, no revolution can indefinitely maintain either its initial force or the violence with which it burst out. But this has nothing to do with the re-inforcement of military power, the development of industrial capacity, or the strengthening of political strength at home and abroad. This only concerns the institutions in which Communism has proved itself to be anti-natural and would sooner or later have to surrender in the of other forces represented by the very demands of individual or collective life.

The limited projection of the Communist parties in the Northern countries and the stabilization of the forces directed by these parties in the large countries to the centre and South of Europe, have probably led to the recognition of their political sterility and to the consideration of a formula which would allow them to take some action. If Russian filiation and obedience to Moscow clearly prevented them from growing, because they were incompatible with national forces, the extinction, which is however apparent, of this obedience should favour them. Once the communist parties become National, their entry into the normal game of party life would probably be more acceptable and make it easier for them to gain access to the government of the peoples.

We only need to remember two of the many statements which the main Russian leaders are supposed to have made in recent times. One is that Communism can possibly gain a foothold in some countries through democratic channels, and that, even when installed through democratic channels, and revolution can be. . . the revolution. One fully appreciates that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for one of the leading Russians to say anything else without damping the enthusiasm or destroying the hopes of international communism. We are however forced to interpret those statements as being a strategy which would develop in three phases. First phase: The Communist Parties should ally themselves to the other political forces which are more or less similar or with which they have transitory or super-

ficial affinities in order to obtain a share in the power. Second: The Communist Parties and the leaders of the party will occupy the positions and develop the effort required to convert the present minority into a democratic majority. Third phase: Once installed in power, they will bring about the Communist revolution, which is just as real, just as complete and brutal as if Communism had not yet been tried out in the world. Foreign experience has little practical use; each people, each movement wants to gain its own experience against all the lessons of logic and history. And «the revolution is . . . the revolution».

The new tactics have given rise to problems which we can not regard as irrelevant.

The recognition of the fact that a fight between the opposing blocks is impossible and the spectacular abandonment of war for Communist revolutionary expansion, can, in themselves, bring about real benefits. The drop in international tension, an atmosphere of understanding and goodwill, peaceful co-existence, if nothing more be possible, all this will be useful to the peoples who are tired of fighting and hatred and overloaded, in their respective economies, on account of these very hatreds. If we do not permit ourselves to be carried away by some people's optimism, it is because this policy is unfortunately not exempt from difficulties nor devoid of risks.

Peaceful co-existence involves giving up hostile propaganda, non-intervention in the internal affairs of the States, respect for conventions, entire reciprocity in concessions and facilities, the guarantee of rights, giving up plans for domination, and collaborating where such is of common or general interest. Now all this, which is quite normal in the West, demands a sign of reciprocal goodwill, following the total inversion of the Soviet attitudes, and a display of the credit which Russia has laboriously got to win back. This is the great difficulty which must be removed or co-existence will turn out to be a dismal failure for the West.

And there are also dangers. If this improvement for which we all yearn, were to lead to a sort of softening or conformism with the events, whilst the other side was constantly engaged in an active policy with given objectives; if this set of circumstances which have arisen were to lead to the premature disappearance or even make it impossible to maintain the sole barrier which, in spite of its restrictions, incoherence and weakness, has succeeded in standing up in the face of Soviet expansion, we could not be certain of having progressed along the road to peace or towards the defence of civilization.

These were the very thoughts which led me to conclude, some years ago, regarding the advantages of peaceful co-existence with Russia — State or Nation — and the need for carrying on the internal fight against Communism — ideology or party. The first conclusion is obvious; the second stems from the fact that the policy for national communist parties was not thought up to bring about their extermination but in order to mark out the new way in which they could arrive in power and bring about the revolution.

This is where one problem arises: Are the democracies in a position to defend themselves? We have all heard that democracy is the best defence against dictatorship — which has not been properly proved — and that socialist parties are the best weapon against Communism. It is quite true that certain Northern countries with a markedly socialist policy almost ignore the existence of Communism; but in the European Continent, one does not find that the Socialist parties have prevented Communism from taking root and progressing to the point of mobilizing large fractions of the electorate. If Russia is playing with the democratic principles upheld by the West, she is taking a stand against which it seems that it will be difficult to fight within the same principles. Forgive me for not pressing the point, since some regard it as a delicate subject and we ourselves are not faced with this difficulty; nevertheless it is obvious that

here we have an international problem which lays bare the precariousness of certain political principles.

And now let us pass on to another chapter.

II.

The independence of the North African countries is only not a serious European problem, in so far as it is possible to ensure that they will cooperate closely with Europe. This can never be regarded as certain, nor has it effectively been considered as such, except when the large Afro-Mediterranean front could be considered, from any standpoint, as being a friend or an ally. Neither Greece, Italy, France nor Spain, nor even we ourselves can afford to have enemies there. And if the present crisis gives rise to serious difficulties and troublesome friction, nobody imagines that they are not transitory: the definite solution can only stem from the very need for living together and collaborating. The interests set up, the relations established, the deficiencies or delays which still have to be overcome, and the consequent needs for support, point the road to the solution. If there were to be any other, one would have lost sight of the interests of the peoples and a gale of unsound passions would be driving these countries on towards an adventure. Here it is partly the African problem which is in the balance.

We have never tired of saying that Africa is the natural complement of Europe, essential for her life, her defence, and her subsistence. Without Africa, Russia could right away dictate to the West the terms under which she would allow it to live.

If the large human agglomerates are forming a sort of continental outlook and solidarity, such as the American and the Asiatic, the germ or even the plan of an idea for an Africa which is complementary to Asia does not seem reasonable. This idea denies the same possibilities to Europe which discovered the greater part of it, tamed it, peopled it, worked it and has

afforded it her own civilization at the cost of sacrifice of both blood and property. But if this is the case, it is not enough merely to state it; we must face the problems arising out of this reality.

A wind of uprising is blowing in various parts of Africa, fanned by powers who are known to render obedience to certain known interests and ambitions. This wind seems to justify the anti-colonialism which is in vogue, whilst it feeds off it at the same time. Europe also feels responsible, and on account of a sort of collective cowardice, seems to be ashamed of the work which she has done there. Basically, at this time when people, on all sides, are crying out against racial discrimination, the movement which has cropped up is above all racial, one of colour, on a continental scale, and threatens to spread over the globe against the civilization of the West which has unfortunately lost the courage to affirm its superiority.

The principle of self-determination makes the independence of peoples fundamental and legitimate, when the degree of homogeneity, conscience and political maturity enable them to govern themselves for the benefit of the collectivity. But it is unjustifiably invoked, when there is no nor even the vaguest suspicion of any idea of the general interest of a people who are solidly linked to the territory in question. Under such circumstances, self-determination will lead to chaos or to effective sovereignty being replaced, but never to independence or freedom. Frontiers marked out on the map according to zones of influence and occupation, without any idea of economic dependence and with a great deal of ignorance of the peoples who, however, do not usually take much notice of these political demarkations, has served, first and foremost, to restrict work and avoid conflicts, but, in many cases, it is very difficult to know when they can — if they ever will be able to — define the ambit of a nation. The very offhanded manner in which these problems are discussed nowadays, wrapped up in the vague phraseology of propagandas, to fan passionate and irresponsible movements,

shocks those people who stop to reflect and that is the only reason why I risk these words; because, in point of fact, the problem is no concern of ours.

The ideal which inspired the Portuguese discoveries and the work which subsequently followed it, was that of spreading the faith and communicating the principles of civilization to the different peoples. It became possible to integrate these peoples in the unity of the Portuguese Nation through total absence of racial discrimination — an essential feature of our character and the keystone of our collective work — through the very tolerant attitude adopted, and through the creation of the same moral climate. Even with the restrictions of his lack of culture, a native of Angola knows that he is Portuguese and says it just as conscientiously as a educated Goan who has just come down from a European University. This means to say that, instead of a policy of domination or education, even if it be paternal, but all of which is handled with a view to forming an independent and foreign society, the Portuguese, on account of the demands of his very outlook, political foresight or the design of fate, tried to join with, if not to fuse with the people who were discovered and to form with them elements which would become an integral part of the same national unit. This was the way in which this doubtless strange, complex and dispersed Nation grew up in the four corners of the earth; nevertheless when eyes that know how to look, gaze on all these fractions of the Nation, they find the common feeling which, there, is Portugal, in the minds, institutions, and in the habits of the life of the people.

This, nevertheless, leads us to a difficulty — to make people understand, in view of the other cases which have arisen from policies that are indeed different, that in the case of Mozambique and Angola, for example, there is not the slightest question of finding out whether they are or are not autonomous territories, because they are even more than this — they are independent with the independence of the Nation. The different degrees of

administrative and financial autonomy in which they live stem from the needs created by the distances and recommended by the size of the territories, but they do not form any directive, nor even have they any real political significance. In international circles where these problems are catalogued according to very different standards, I do not even want to think of the amazement which people would display on hearing for example that Cape Verde prefers, instead of its Statute as an Overseas Province, with broad autonomy, to have the administrative statute of the adjacent islands with complete integration. But that is the way things are, and that is all there is to it.

Logically, we should not notice, except for the abusive influence or pressure from abroad, to which it would in any case be foolish to turn a blind eye, any disassociative elements in the Overseas Provinces. They have not been felt down through History and this long experience has put the system fully to the test and provided a proof of its solidity. The moral and political unity of the nation has always been seen, even more so in times of crisis than in times of calm, through the solidarity of the members, in the local resistance to the enemy, in their loyalty, with the greatest sacrifices and risks, to the common fatherland. Goa is the most recent and decisive example.

This case of Goa which has caused us so much concern is more a conflict of political notions and moral rules than of interests, both for us and, I suppose, for the Indian Union. Economically speaking, and except for the port of Mormugão, which is better than Bombay and the best on that coast, the integration of Goa would not seem to make any great contribution towards the Indian Union; and from the defensive standpoint not only were we always prepared to give every guarantee, even though no risk could reasonably be feared, since no country can ever eliminate, through integration, all the points from which it would be materially possible to launch an attack. Such a reason as this can not be invoked.

What therefore would appear to be at the root of the conflict with the Indian Union is a dispute of a political and moral nature which could, after all, be summarized as knowing whether a nation can be composed of dispersed and far-off territories and, when such is the case, whether she is entitled to cede or sell them.

There is no need to discuss the first proposition. Countless nations are devoid of territorial unity and are composed of territories which have been aggregated together under the action of the same power by the chance of life or history. Nor has anyone ever tried to put any limit on the distances at which sovereignty is considered to be legitimate; all and every solution would be an arbitrary one and probably anti-natural. Bit by bit, by the force of things, one has been forced not to object to such circumstances as do not in fact interfere with political unity. Thus Pakistan is in the same sub-continent as the Indian Union; thus we have Indonesia spread out over three thousand islands; thus we have the United States, themselves, with Alaska beyond Canada.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Portuguese constitutional dispositions with regard to the cession of fractions of national territory, forbidding same under all circumstances, complies with present day international morals which refute the traffic of territories and their populations. One does not even know the origin of the right of a State to decide the destiny of the peoples which it comprises and to whom it owes protection.

But assuming that both these questions can be settled in the opposite way, one would thereby shake Portugal's position in India; one would not have created any right for the Indian Union. Her claims are put forward based on territorial contiguity, on the interdependence of economies, and on racial affinity, but these circumstances which are, in point of fact, only partially exact have no strength to establish this new right and invalidate a pre-established right which has been historically proved.

Thus, since it is impossible to find a political solution which would fit with greater or lesser ease into the principles of right,

and since it has been proved beyond doubt that colonialism does not exist in Goa, the Indian Union was led to concentrate its maximum effort in order to achieve its supreme objective: wipe out the moral resistance of the Goans and their loyalty to Portugal. The economic blockade, the prohibition of transit on the frontiers, the suspension of cable and phone services, the refusal of transference for savings and deposits, the boycotting of ships and shipping companies, the breakdown of rail communications, the pressure exercised on those who traded with Goa from abroad, arrests, dismissals, violence exercised in Bombay and other parts of the Union against Goans, acts of terrorism, murders, assaults, thefts, sequestrations, sabotage — everything has been tried out and is being coldbloodedly and carefully used according to an established plan.

But we need no better argument to defend our thesis. If so much violence and so much injustice is required to overcome the resistance of the Goans in Goa, in the Indian Union, or abroad, and if this resistance remains and appears more tenacious at every moment, one is led to conclude that some factor intervenes which is superior to the will of Governments, unshakable by the action of power, and intangible with material strength: it stands for four hundred years of presence and history. It is the identity of civilization. It is the dedication to a common fatherland.

I shall not refer to the sacrifices which we have made in order to stand up to this unequal and unjust fight, not only because those who suffer most are those most directly exposed to the violence and the difficulties, but also because it is understood that Goa is worthy of every sacrifice. This is so, first and foremost, because it is part of Portugal, and secondly because of all that it represents in our history and in the history of the civilizing expansion of the West. The Indian Union's behaviour does not appear coherent with the political principles which it defends nor with the philosophy of non-violence which her leaders say they uphold. One was entitled to expect another

attitude and the nobility of another policy from the level to which it rose as an Asiatic power, from its link with the West through the British Commonwealth, through its membership of the United Nations, to say nothing of its obedience to the principles of the Treaty of Tibet which were announced to the world as the code of agreement and good neighbourliness.

I know that several speeches have been prepared for this Congress and that you will have to listen to a great many more. This is a very good reason for me to do my best to relieve you and, without further ado, put an end to my remarks.

I feel that today I have not been as clear as on other occasions. I have left some theses merely in outline; others were perhaps left between the lines. I did not even draw any definite conclusions which concern us: but anyone who wants to do so, can easily deduce them for himself.

We obviously do not agree with many positions and doctrines and we feel that many theses which are accepted thoughtlessly, are leading to confusion. It is furthermore obvious that we are in a position to have a more reliable opinion about our own interests and their defence, than other peoples, because we are bound to have a better grasp of the peculiarities of our own historic formation and political structure. If, beyond our own ground, we express any opinion about that which is common, the reason is the solidarity which binds us to all and can not leave us immune from the consequences of the general policy and behaviour.

Several nations are cropping up in the light of history and appear very zealous for their freedom and independence. That is a good thing, providing that they recognize that other countries as well are entitled to that same notion of nationalism which they invoke, and to the same right to political integrity and unity. There is still room for us all in the world; only hatred

makes it so small that not even the ambitious people alone seem to be able to fit in.

The era of transformation through which the world is passing is pregnant with problems and risks, not only for us but for everyone. It gives rise to concern and demands special care, vigilance and effort, but it does not inevitably need to lead to pessimism. Bad times do not break strong minds. On the contrary, they redouble their energies. As much for nations as for individuals, life is a struggle; those who give up struggling are unworthy of life. But nobody could say this of us.

Therefore precisely at confused moments like the present, I would like to see us maintain our understanding crystal clear, our hearts free, and our will decided and firm. We shall thus be able to clearly see the way ahead, respect our neighbour's interest with kindness and justice, vigorously defend that which is ours, and actively collaborate with others for the common good. That which we demand in this attitude is, after all, nothing more than an example of foresight and realism, confidence in ourselves and in the destinies of the Nation. Do you really think that is too much to ask?

1526

BOOKS

S·N·I

LISBON

NB



EFG0000513210

S.N.I

40