

100

PORTUGAL

AND HER OVERSEAS PROVINCES

by

*Euripides Cardoso de Menezes*

Delegate to the Brazilian National Assembly

## ON THE OVERSEAS POLICY OF PORTUGAL

DEPUTY EURIPIDES CARDOSO DE MENEZES

*Speech Delivered in the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil  
on October 5th, 1961*

MR. PRESIDENT,  
FELLOW DEPUTIES,

Certain expressions are now in style. Every moment one hears about self-determination for people, non-intervention, surrender, nationalism, reactionism, anti-colonialism, imperialism, etc., etc.

I want to express myself here and now as entirely favorable to the right of self-determination for all people capable of governing themselves, this self-determination being regulated by free and periodic elections.

I am against *surrender* if by this expression is meant the surrender of our natural resources, our strategic minerals to foreign countries, be they friends or enemies.

I am also a *nationalist* (minus quotation marks) without chauvinism or hate for any peoples. The legitimate nationalism, the Christian kind, identified with healthy and intelligent patriotism is a virtue.

The word *reactionary* does not befit me. It is a disparaging word identified with the enemies of progress and the fundamental rights of the human being to whom respect is due. One cannot call reactionary a person who professes the most revolutionary of all social doctrines, which was re-affirmed, explained and brought up to date by Pope John XXIII in his marvelous encyclical *Mater et Magistra*.

I am also against *imperialism*, which means the exploitation of one nation by others and of its people by economic monopoly groups. It is enslavement of man by man. Consequently I am also against capitalism without consideration, whether it is exerted by man or State.

I am *anti-colonialist* as well. When I declare this, I insist on the necessity of defining clearly what colonialism means,

because from one age to the other, from region to region, and even from person to person its definition varies. This is actually what happens today with what we call colonialism. It should *obviously* be distinguished from what might better be called *colonization*.

It is unquestionable that the colonization accomplished through the years by certain nations is, in the words of the eminent Cardinal Mercier, a "gigantic act of charity". This, however, cannot be said if the mercenary occupation of territories whose peoples are considered ethnically inferior, are segregated socially and are kept as underlings who have to pay tribute. They are practically slaves without the hope of ever having the right to democratically elect their own representatives and leaders either by given or conquered independence, or by political integration into the national community.

The worst example today of this colonial slavery is that which is practiced by the very artificial Union of the so-called Socialist Soviet Republics, which by armed force have transformed, not savage tribes of almost unpopulated nations, but many (10) nations, among which are some that are highly civilized, into provinces or miserable colonies.

Just because there is continuity in the territories of the aggressor or imperialistic nation with the nations conquered and enslaved, this does not mean that the last is not a colony and the first a colonist. In a very reproachable sense this is the case in the annexations made *manu militari* by the Soviet Union, as well as by the Indian Union and Communist China.

On the other hand, the physical separation does not mean that a political and administrative union, even a true national union cannot be attained. For example, look at the group island nations like Japan, Indonesia and the Philippines. The fact that the European and Asiatic sides of Turkey are separated by the sea, and that thousands of kilometers separate the original eastern and the western sides of Pakistan does not deny them the right of a political-administrative union.

To many, however, it seems that it is illicit to consolidate a nation because territories are separated by distance, even

if we are in the age of jet planes, on the eve of the interplanetary age, when distances are practically non-existent.

It is true that the cases of Iceland and Greenland are not mentioned, and it is also significant that at the United Nations the United States is not accused of colonialism, although they have, besides Guam and other islands and military bases, temporary or permanent overseas provinces, such as Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which are less American than Madeira, Cape Verde, Mozambique and Angola are Portuguese.

*Angola*, however, is on the agenda at present. Since the terrorists uprising on the Congo frontier was suppressed the clamor against Portuguese colonialism has increased. Although Hawaii is 8,000 kilometers away from Washington and St. Vincent is only 3,000 kilometers away from the Portuguese Metropolis, only the latter is mentioned.

However, Mr. President, I do not see how the United Nations can demand independence for Angola merely on the basis of lack of geographical contiguity between Metropolitan Portugal and her Overseas Provinces. When Portugal joined this Organization, no restrictions were laid down as to Portugal's political system, nor were her territories classified as "non-autonomous".

Following the same line of reasoning, it would seem that we should have the right to demand independence for each island in the island group nations . . . to demand independence for Alaska and other North American States which are separated from the mainland, and even for the Fernando de Noronha Territory, because it has no physical contiguity with Continental Brazil . . .

Since we are invoking the principle of self-determination of nations, let's have, especially, independence for East Germany and for all nations which Russia annexed and the states that the Indian Union maintains by force under its submission. Why discriminate?

However, since those who are fighting for the immediate emancipation of Angola are not justifying their demands, we shall have to try to guess what their reasons are.

Assuming that lack of geographical contiguity is not accepted as a valid argument, we should like to ask whether

the reasons the United Nations has against Portugal's remaining in Africa are the diversity of races and culture in the Overseas Provinces, perhaps. If this is the case, then, it should be demanded that Switzerland be divided into four nations . . . that India be divided into as many races and peoples as form it . . . that Canada, the United States and Brazil be likewise divided . . . why not? Why not, in the name of the sacred principle of "self-determination for the people" and the policy of "non-intervention" give independence to the "Caipós", the "Carajás", the "Nhambiquaras", the "Tapirapés", the "Xerentex", or the "Chavantes", and so many other native tribes not yet assimilated or integrated into the Lusitanian civilization, which is ours. Consistency is what I ask for, Mr. President . . . consistency fellow deputies.

At the same time as the U.N. asks for Angola's emancipation, Prime Minister Nehru, not in the name of cultural unity, but in the name of geographic unity for India, asks that Gôa be given to them, when Gôa has been Lusitanian for centuries. With this philosophy, let us put an end to the Principality of Monaco and the Republics of Andorra and San Marino.

Let us put an end to all ethnic and political enclaves, since it is so easy to transfer entire populations, as Soviet Russia has done in the Baltic countries. (A proverb that is not translatable.)

No matter how deeply I probe into the problem, I cannot understand the reasons for persecuting a certain country and at the same time maintaining silence in relation to others. I don't understand, for instance, why you speak about Angola and say nothing about Mozambique, Madeira, Timor, Macau, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea . . . Is there a substantial difference between one province and all the others? Is it a matter of tactics and not of inconsistency that prompts those interested in the disintegration and destruction of Portugal?

Tactics, certainly: so that not too many fronts be started simultaneously. After Angola, Portuguese Guinea and the other provinces will follow, one after the other.

There is already a "movement for the liberation of

Guinea". It is significant, however, that its headquarters are in Dakar and that it is made up of half a dozen Senegalese and as many French Guinea natives with an office in Conakry . . . "Are these the nationalists of Portuguese Guinea?" . . .

It is a known fact that Portuguese Guinea, because of its small size, population and resources, cannot survive independence from the Metropolis. It would have to be annexed to Senegal or to the Republic of Guinea, or yet, partitioned between the two countries . . . therefore an independent unit could not be formed: it would mean just a transfer of sovereignty, or purely and simply, an annexation, Russian style . . .

Neither would Cape Verde escape, even though it is so typically Portuguese. What would happen to it? Would it be annexed to one of the territories on the African Coast? Because these territories belong to the privileged group of Afro-Asiatics, do they have the right to annex these island groups, even if they are at a great distance and are populated by different peoples? . . .

If Cape Verde does not possess conditions for independence, it has exceptional strategic value for the domination of the South Atlantic and it also has an excellent airport. That it would be valuable material for trading, there is no doubt. Brazil would not be interested in the deal, but the Soviet Union who, through Cuba, is now close to North America would not overlook the great opportunity to come close to South America. Fishing boats, as well as other types of Russian vessels, including submarines, now frequently ply the waters around Cape Verde.

Let us return to the *Angola* case once more, since it is going to be taken up by the U.N. and it seems that it is going to be treated with unfair lightness.

Let us suppose that an Indian tribe from Alaska or the Amazon under the command of such as Lampeao, the famous bandit from the Northeast, or under a leader trained in Moscow, such as the well-known communist, Holden Roberto, should set out to commit the incredible atrocities practiced by the terrorists. It has been proved and admitted that the guerrillas that invaded North Angola

were under Congolese leadership. What would the answer from Washington or Brazilia be to the Security Council of the U. N., were we to receive an admonition not to repress such horrible crimes against an unprotected population? Is that not exactly what has happened in Angola? If Portugal had not suppressed such acts of terrorism, she would be accused of having allowed the murder of the unarmed population and of connivance in such terrible genocide.

It is immature and unforgivable to compare the invasion of Angola with certain political movements that resulted in the independence of other American or European nations. It would be like comparing George Washington with Holden Roberto.

We know what happened in Angola. On the 15th of last March in the early morning at given points and separated from each other by hundreds of miles, the terrorists made simultaneous attacks on cities, villages, hamlets, farms and private properties, destroying roads, bridges and other important public works. These attacks, sudden and well organized, were characterized by extreme violence. The ferocity of the terrorists knew no limits or discrimination: blacks, whites and mixed, even babies only months old were the victims of the barbarous invaders. People were murdered, knifed and even quartered. The leader of the bandits, Holden Roberto, who strangely enough manages to travel in U. N. planes at the expense of the U. N. and, therefore, of Portugal also, confessed in an interview given to the Belgian journalist Pierre de Voss and published in the French newspaper "Monde" that many had been "sawed up" alive and that torture had been used and would continue to be used. Even the "Ghanian Times", inspired by Mr. Nkrumah, admitted in the issue of July 17 that horrible atrocities had been committed by the invaders in Angola.

I have photographic documentation which is the most moving attestation to the fact that so much still remains to be done to civilize, humanize and Christianize these beasts. The reddish press on Moscow's payroll and guided by the Kremlin calls them "patriots", "liberators", and "nationalists"!

For much less reason the illustrious Governor Ney Braga

has recently asked for armed forces to quell a group that was making assaults and causing trouble in the State of Paraná. Lampeao and his gang are angels, compared to Lumumba's terrorists under Holden Roberto.

How was it possible that such things came to pass?

The traditional Portuguese policy of peace and racial harmony—(in Angola the color question existing in Nigeria, Ghana, or the Republic of Guinea does not exist, neither does the white supremacy problem of South Africa or Little Rock)—this policy is not formulated merely in theory, in treaties and in laws; it is actually practiced in regard to respect for the rights of the population, the rights of individuals as human beings, and it does not need military or police intervention to be carried out.

Certain communist and Afro-asiatic groups accused Portugal of maintaining its populations subjugated by force of arms, as is done in the Soviet Union, in Communist China, in Tito's Yugoslavia, and in the unfortunate Cuba of Fidel Castro.

It was claimed that Portugal maintained in Angola an army of 60,000 men. Although they had a right to this and it is not excessive, considering the size of a province of 1,300,000 km<sup>2</sup>, fourteen times the size of the Metropolitan territory, military strength in Angola did not go beyond 8,000 men, of which only 2,500 were whites. The forces Fidel Castro has on his island are much larger and more powerful than that.

It was, in fact, a symbolic army, really a policing force. It was because of this small defense that the terrorists had certain advantages in the first encounters. Their progress, however, did not continue due to the heroic reaction of much of the population under attack. In Mucaba, to cite only one example, twenty whites and blacks resisted for several weeks in a church the attacks of the terrorists. Furthermore, the black Angolans were the ones who most distinguished themselves in the struggle against the invaders.

In the meantime the Security Council of the U. N., at the insistence of Moscow, it seems, called on Portugal to cease

“repressive measures”. In other words, Portugal should consent to the extermination of the population without even trying to defend it?

And who are these terrorists? They are Congolese elements of the “Abako” party, gangs from the extinct army of Lumumba enticed by the terrorist chiefs. And speaking about Lumumba terrorists, just to give an idea regarding the degree of savagery of these people, I want to mention one fact and one fact only. In June of last year in Rome there were more than 200 women of various religious affiliations who had been stationed in the Congo as missionaries and who were tied and raped by these terrorists, awaiting the birth of their babies, the results of these unspeakable outrages . . .

Suppose that a really sizable movement for the independence of Angola existed, or even for its annexation to Brazil: If the people really wished to separate from the Metropolis, why didn't such a movement, an authentic revolution, succeed in the unarmed Province?

Before the first green troops sent by the metropolitan government arrived to reinforce the small contingent of 2,500 white soldiers and 5,500 negroes which constituted the defense of Angola, the movement for independence would have already succeeded and the new African state would have been recognized by the U. N.

These very same Angolan soldiers would have rebelled and adhered to the revolt.

Is this perhaps what happened?

On the contrary, the whole population of Angola, white, black and mixed, rose in a solidarity movement for the Portuguese motherland. Even those who were against the vigorous regime in Portugal joined as one man to defend the national sovereignty. Because, explains the illustrious Professor Nunes Simoes, leader of the opposition, politics means one thing . . . the nation, another. Is it not a fact that even the most rabid anti-communists took up arms to defend Leningrad from the German invaders? The reason for this is that the motherland is above political disagreements. The feelings of the people of Angola are Portuguese and the same can be said of the natives of Cape Verde,

Mozambique, Madeira, Azores, as much as of the folks in continental Portugal in the provinces of Minho, Beira, Lisbon—all Portuguese. Angolans want by their own self-determination to continue integrated in this great multi-racial, pluri-cultural, transcontinental nation created by Lusitanian genius and who, with Brazil, if an adequate formula is found, will yet form the inevitable Luso-Brazilian Community bound not only by sentiment and culture but also politically and economically.

The Portuguese overseas orientation is totally different in its fundamental moral, historic, juridic and political beliefs from other colonist nations. Some of these colonist nations have very reproachable policies, but the Portuguese orientation is notable for its truly Christian racial equality; therefore, discrimination of ethnic and social character are completely absent.

This is why it is asked: If the French, the Belgians and the Dutch left their African territories, why don't the Portuguese want to do so? There are also some who, less impressed with principles than with the actual facts of the situation, think that it is strange that Portugal succeeds where stronger and more powerful nations have failed.

The reason for this is that Belgium, England, France and Holland never had the objectives that guided the Portuguese actions. They never had the intention of doing what Portugal did in Angola, in Brazil and elsewhere . . . that is, establishing societies that are multiracial, pluricultural with parity and equality. Other colonists never integrated with the "colonized" and for this reason some of the "greats" in Europe and America even began to consider the Portuguese as second-class westerners with minor earning rights and on an inferior social scale. Yes, I say "inferior" . . . because the Portuguese identify themselves with the local people, as opposed to other westerners who take advantage of their own so-called racial and cultural superiority.

While the Portuguese consider their overseas territories as an integral part of their nation, subject to the same sovereignty and laws, others just consider their territories as colonies, separate identities to be economically exploited

while it was possible to do so. Their judgment and actions differ.

Lacking a more convincing argument, it is said "the changing wind is blowing all over Asia and Africa". How does Portugal think she is going to stop it?

It is not with such slogans that the course of history is changed. Rather, it can be said that these changing winds have only succeeded as much as the "saci" in Brasilia . . . that is, it only stirred the dust, the dust of confusion. Who fans these winds? Where do they come from? What is their purpose?

If this slogan had any meaning, Portugal could well answer that all these predicted changes had been anticipated by those whose aim is the betterment of humanity and for this reason, recognize racial equality, respect for human rights, guaranty of the fundamental individual rights as well as the progress and development of all peoples. In Africa, as well as in Asia, Portugal has always been the pioneer of these ideals and has applied them to practice.

Beyond this, "the changing winds" would bring us nothing new. Unless Portugal wished to adopt the policy of giving independence as a new form of access to the markets and raw materials or a new definition of spheres of influence . . .

Common sense tells us, however, that the only trouble is the fact that the Soviet Union wants to participate in such a redistribution. Otherwise, the word "colonialism" would not be mentioned so often, at least in regard to Portugal.

These "changing winds", like all winds, will blow away. But if they should be really irresistible, those that fan them either from Europe or America will also be reached and submerged in the great flood. We shall witness then in Asia and in Africa a colonialism the like of which these two continents have never seen.

There is no doubt that Africa, south of the Sahara, is governed by three distinct social and political systems: government and administration founded on negro racism and its exclusive supremacy, as in Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria and Liberia where the effort is to develop a purely negro society, racial and cultural excluding any other element. Then we have the white supremacy in South Africa which predominates exclusively above all others in the dominions.

Then, there is the Lusitanian system.

Portugal, the Christian and missionary nation par excellence, repels all other systems as unacceptable and as lacking in fundamental value of moral, philosophical, religious or even political worth.

The only answer, the only human and Christian solution for the African difficulties, is the Lusitanian system of multi-racial and pluri-cultural integration.

Due to the fact that theoretical conceptions are in its favor, since the absolute superiority of a race or culture has been proven false, Portugal can give historical proof of its beliefs in the examples of Brazil, Cape Verde and Gôa . . . and to sociologists these proofs are most convincing.

From the wise and genial Portuguese policy has come another undeniable consequence revealed in the light of the African situation today. Is there anyone who cannot see that the new African nations, artificially independent, cannot subsist by themselves and without the help from outside? Independence is not enough. Independence alone does not settle human, economic and political problems. The example of Ethiopia is eloquent. It has been independent for 2,000 years; nevertheless, it is the most backward of all African territories. In order that these nations that have been given independence should not regress, there are various systems of aid. Direct help given by rich and highly industrialized nations such as the United States, England and the Soviet Union. The multilateral help through the U. N. and specialized agencies, and lastly, as in the case of the Belgian Congo, the substitution of the local authorities and administration by a collective and corporative junta.

My question is: Aren't these systems only another form of colonialism? Will not the outside financial and technical

help, purely mechanical and administrative, mercenary in nature, end up orienting, controlling and molding the nations assisted? Furthermore, the result will be the implantation of no civilization whatsoever. There is no doubt that the Portuguese policy has advantages over all others. There is no purer form of assistance than that which is given by adhesion, as opposed to that of a mercenary kind.

By proclaiming the integration of the Metropolis and the overseas provinces into one political unity, Portugal surrenders values while, at the same time, adhering to the needs of these provinces. For this reason, the technicians, the civil servants, and even the capital, do not settle in the overseas territories as in a foreign land, but as in their own homeland, identifying their living and destiny with that of the province to which they have been transferred.

This is the basic philosophy that explains to Portugal the inadvisability of adopting a policy like the English, French or Belgian. Otherwise, the overseas territories would be subject to the above-mentioned outside assistance and would fall prey to the fatal communist and anti-western influence.

What is regrettable is that at times two very different realities are confused: the sociological program and the political program. However, one has to abide by the other. The United Kingdom by adopting a political program can even set the date when each territory can become independent. Portugal has preferred the sociological program, which is the building up of a certain something that only the Lusitanian genius can conceive and execute. With love as a basis, as stated by the jurist, Gilberto Freire, it has instituted a local multiracial society which cannot be governed by the calendar. Furthermore, establishing a political program would sacrifice without a doubt the fundamental sociological aspects of the great work which cannot be appreciated by mediocre minds.

Ill will, which denies the evidence, has represented the Portuguese overseas territories as being among the most backward. Angola, for instance, is referred to as if it were the wilderness of the Amazon . . . without roads, schools or hospitals. The truth is that Angola has one of the best sea-

ports in West Africa, splendidly equipped. It has some of the best railroads. The same can be said for Mozambique in East Africa. It has one of the highest percentages in construction, primary schools, technical schools and high schools where there is no race distinction. The health services are well equipped and very efficient. There is considerable industrial and economic development. Among the best authoritative and recent confirmations of what I have said is that of the eminent Brazilian journalist, Dr. Alves Pinheiro, who published in the "Globo" a series of fine reports which show what Brazil may be over the Atlantic is like, materially and culturally speaking.

In Mozambique and Angola, alone, there are about 600,000 students attending lyceums, and the number of negro students in the universities of the Metropolis is over 2,500. In Brazil we don't have even 10 per cent of that number attending courses in our universities.

It is also worth noting the laws governing working conditions through collective contracts in Portuguese territories overseas. Control over salaries is maintained in three ways: through government, employers' and workers' representatives. This functions, as in Brazil, through the Bureau of Labor Arbitration.

All international conventions regarding abolishment of sanctions because of breach of contract, the weekly day of rest, the minimum age limit for minors and discrimination in the type of work have been ratified. Legislation was passed creating a General Director for Health and Assistance and also promoting the acceleration of economic and financial investments. On the international level, the Portuguese Government accepted an inquiry regarding the working conditions in Portuguese Africa and this was done by the O.I.T. (International Work Organization, recently praised by the Pope). Other proposals made by the African Regional Conference, a member of the O.I.T. regarding the freedom for protective organizations and syndicates were also accepted insofar as they concerned you.

Another important step was taken on May 12, 1960, when the system of municipal elections by direct suffrage in all

communities where there are a minimum of 500 voters was established in all overseas provinces.

As a result of the social and economic development in Angola, Guinea and Mozambique, the old system of denizen-ship has now been abolished and the laws regarding voting apply to *all*, whatever their color, race, or origin. The same duties and rights now apply to *all citizens*. Such steps were not taken hastily, however: it is not realistic to give human society more than it can absorb and use. If this is done, the penalty could be anarchy, retrogression or domination by others. Furthermore, in the new rural communities, the chief is now elected by all members of the local community and he is assisted by a council of his own free choosing.

Much more can be said regarding the wise policy followed by the Portuguese Government. The statements made, however, demonstrate the terrible injustice done by those who refer to the Portuguese Overseas Provinces as a "shameless expression of colonization". It will also show the weakness of nations who without further investigation accept the accusations formulated by the Republic of Guinea, by Ghana or by the Soviet block. They surely forget that Guinea is a dictatorship of the Soviet type, that in Ghana civil rights are unknown, and in Ethiopia medieval slavery is an institution protected by the State. In India the most inhuman racism is practiced and the Charter of the United Nations is discounted, whenever it affects their interests. They have no moral right, whatsoever, to make accusations against Portugal.

In the African Continent profoundly affected by the communist propaganda and in great measure already under Moscow's control, Portugal defends as much, or more, than the United States defends in Berlin the interests of the western world.

And why these attacks on Portugal, only? The land of Alfonso Henriques has always been and continues to be the bulwark of the true civilization and is a serious obstacle to the advances of the barbarians of our century.

Without powerful armies, without atomic bombs, apparently incapable of facing and conquering these arrogant

"Goliaths" who have allied themselves with the father of all liars in that infernal conspiracy against reason and justice, Portugal continues its civilizing mission quietly. It continues to send into Angola vast material and human resources, supporting magnificent public works, roads, and dams. Its hydro-electric plants are among the best in the world.

Not to be intimidated by fanatic drug-crazed terrorists, indifferent to the thunderous scoldings of the Anti-Christ from Moscow, confident in the Omnipotent and Merciful God's protection, whose existence the communists deny, but at the same time recognize, since they hate Him so, Portugal will quietly wait for Providence to once more intervene, as It has so many times in her history of eight centuries. She will try to call to reason her unjust enemies or defeat the insolent giant who does not cease to threaten men and defy the Heavens.

We want our brothers to know that in spite of the equivocal and unhappy declarations of some dissenters, some occupying important positions in our administration but up to now guided by Anti-Christian and anti-Brazilian influences—Brazil, the authentic Brazil, the Brazilian Brazil, will stand at the side of Portugal and of that admirable Angola, and like Acre, which did not want to be separated from Brazil, took up arms to remain Lusitanian.

Only we, Luso-Brazilians, have the capacity to understand the Luso-Angolan soul. Those "dolico" blonds who were still savages when Portugal was already throwing itself heroically into the great epic of civilizing the world do not understand how an Angolan of pure African blood can feel Portuguese and be proud of this fact. They should come to Brazil to better understand this extraordinary phenomenon. Here they would see all of us speaking the same tongue as spoken at Lisbon and Luanda, and all perfectly integrated into the same Lusitanian civilization. Not only whites but blacks and mixed, all Brazilians, all brothers. The feeling here is so strong that racial discrimination is a *crime*.

In the defense of the integrity of the Brazilian territory Henrique Dias, Felipe Camarao and Vidal de Negreiros fought side by side. A Portuguese, an Indian, and a negro

against the Dutch invader. Precisely what is happening now in north Angola.

The Brazilian negro as well as the Angolan negro takes pride in the Lusitanian culture which assimilated them and which they have assimilated in an endosmosis that created under the shield of the Portuguese civilization a new humanity.

It is from us the Lusiads of Brazil, from Europe, Asia and Africa, as well as the islands that the world has to learn the great practical lesson of fraternity, racial democracy, respect for the human being, independence of culture, tongue and race. From Lusitanians the world can learn to put spiritual interests above material ones; and right over might, the first of all moral values. To this we owe our largest conquests and for it we shall always fight.

**FROM: Portuguese-American Committee  
on Foreign Affairs  
20 Pemberton Square  
Boston 8, Mass.**

*This is to advise you that the Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs is associated with Selva & Lee, Inc., New York, N. Y., which firm is registered under Title 22, United States Code, Sub-Chapter 2, as public relations counsel for the Overseas Companies of Portugal, Rua do Ataide, 7, Lisbon, Portugal. This is an organization of companies with business interests in Portugal and the Portuguese Overseas Provinces. Copies of this material are being filed with the Library of Congress and the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. A copy of the registration, No. 1454, is on file with the Department of Justice and is available for inspection. Such registration does not reflect approval of the contents of this material by the United States Government.*

Reprinted by

THE PORTUGUESE-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
MARTIN T. CAMACHO, *Chairman*  
20 Pemberton Square  
Boston 8, Massachusetts

0053  
AA-01