



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9: General debate (concluded)	667

President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Yesterday afternoon, at our 33rd meeting, we heard the last speaker in the general debate. We shall now hear those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

2. May I once again remind that the General Assembly that, at its 4th plenary meeting, it was decided that statements in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

3. Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia): Some delegations have referred to East Timor during the general debate; a few have indulged in unfounded allegations that the people of East Timor have been denied their right to self-determination and that the United Nations was not involved in the decolonization process. In its statement before the Fourth Committee last year,¹ my delegation categorically refuted those allegations, and there is therefore no need to repeat that refutation here.

4. The process of decolonization has been carried out in East Timor in full conformity with the provisions of the Charter and of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV), thereby terminating the colonial status of the former Territory. The right to self-determination was exercised freely and democratically by the people of East Timor in a manner of their own choosing and in conformity with their traditional institutions.

5. In the final analysis, it is the people of East Timor—and that people alone—which must decide its own destiny—not Indonesia nor, for that matter, the United Nations. And the people of East Timor, through the elected members of the People's Representative Assembly, decided to become independent through integration with the Republic of Indonesia, which is one of the alternatives provided by resolution 1541 (XV).

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Fourth Committee*, 19th meeting, paras. 4-58, and *ibid.*, *Fourth Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

6. That decision was communicated to the Government of Indonesia, and in accordance with legislative procedures, East Timor was formally integrated into the Republic of Indonesia on 17 July 1976. Since that date, East Timor has been independent as an integral part of Indonesia. It is now Indonesia's twenty-seventh province, with the same rights and obligations as the other provinces.

7. As regards the allegation that the United Nations was not involved in the decolonization process in East Timor, I should like to remind the Assembly that several efforts were made by the people of East Timor, by the then provisional Government of East Timor and by Indonesia itself to involve the United Nations. In fact, several United Nations documents offer adequate proof of cables and invitations being sent to the various organs of the United Nations requesting the despatch of a mission to the Territory which would provide an opportunity to obtain first-hand knowledge of the real situation and of the wishes of the people. For some reason or other, those invitations were not accepted. If the United Nations was not involved, clearly the blame cannot be put either on the people of East Timor or on Indonesia.

8. In the light of what I have said, it should be clear that the role played by Indonesia on the issue of East Timor has been consistent with its commitment to the principle of self-determination. We do not wish to teach other peoples; nor do we want to be lectured on the struggle for self-determination. As a people that has taken the right to self-determination into its own hands and defended it with its life and blood, Indonesia cannot deny that right to others. It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize that, as East Timor has become independent as an integral part of the Republic of Indonesia, any discussion on East Timor before the United Nations can only be considered inappropriate and unwarranted, as it constitutes an interference in the internal affairs of a Member State.

9. As for the allegations that Indonesia has committed massacres or genocide in East Timor, those allegations are so obviously ridiculous and so completely untrue that they deserve only the contempt of the Assembly.

10. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia): The statement made by the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia at the 31st meeting included such a catalogue of inaccuracies, misleading innuendoes, and distortion that my delegation is compelled to offer a few necessary clarifications. In this connexion, I wish to avail myself of the right of rebuttal in order to set some of the record straight.

11. First, there is the question of "expansionism". It is a well-known fact that during the historically recent scramble for Africa, the Ethiopian Empire doubled in area. Through

secret agreements with the European Powers, the Emperor Menelik acquired nominal sovereignty over vast areas of Somali territory. I say "nominal" because many decades had to pass before Ethiopia even tried to send expeditionary forces to the area; and I say "secret" because the Somalis could not know of the existence of those agreements. How can the efforts of a people to assert its right to self-determination and to withstand the effects of naked colonial aggression and collusion on the part of Ethiopia with the scrambling imperial Powers of Europe be termed "expansionist"?

12. The Foreign Minister condemned "open wars of aggression and occupation". But how close can the Ethiopian campaign against Harar at the end of the last century and the Ethiopian occupation of the rest of western Somalia in this century be described? I would remind him of the United Nations Charter, which, in Article 1, asserts the principle of self-determination of peoples and, in Article 73, recognizes the need to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political advancement, their just treatment and their protection against abuses; and to develop self-government, to take account of the political aspirations of the peoples.

13. Indeed, the Charter provides, further, that where a full measure of self-government has yet to be attained the interests of the inhabitants of the territories concerned are paramount. It is likewise the position of the Somali Democratic Republic that Somalis—by whomsoever they have been colonized in historically recent times—are as entitled as any other people to the right defined in the Charter. Why should the western Somalis suffer and be an exception? Why should their liberation be so delayed and their human rights be so continually violated?

14. The Definition of Aggression adopted by the General Assembly [*resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*], and in particular article 7, states:

"Nothing in this Definition, and in particular article 3, could in any way prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence, as derived from the Charter, of peoples forcibly deprived of that right and referred to in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly peoples under colonial and racist régimes or other forms of alien domination; nor the right of these peoples to struggle to that end and to seek and receive support, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and in conformity with the above-mentioned Declaration."

15. The long and arduous struggle of the western Somalis for total liberation, self-determination, freedom and independence will sooner or later be crowned with success—despite the recent recolonization campaign conducted by Ethiopian-Soviet forces and Cuban mercenaries. The continuing struggle in what is sometimes called "the Ogaden", together with the confrontation in southern Africa, where colonialism still persists, must be counted among the longest and most bitterly contested colonial issues of our time.

16. Alienation of land, trampling on human rights and police oppression are the same, be they Abyssinian or Afrikaner. These struggles will one day be described as the last phase in the total liberation of Africa.

17. In this connexion I should like particularly to recall the immortal words of the late Kwame Nkrumah, whom we posthumously honoured two days ago. In his independence address on 6 March 1957 he said:

"No race, no people, no nation can exist freely and be respected at home and abroad without political freedom . . . independence is meaningless unless it is linked to the total liberation of Africa."

18. My Government, far from engaging in "double-talk" as we have been falsely accused of doing, shares the alleged Ethiopian concern for "the full and speedy decolonization of the remaining Territories in Africa and round the globe" [*31st meeting, para. 151*]. We share their interest in the liberation of Zimbabwe, as we support the aspirations for self-determination of the peoples of western Somalia.

19. Harar was first attacked and captured by Ethiopia in 1887. Salisbury was occupied by the so-called "pioneers" in 1890, three years later. Surely the double-talker is he who has different standards in these cases. My Government is quite consistent. Why was the Ethiopian Foreign Minister's assertion of the legitimacy of the aspiration to self-determination of other peoples in other regions suddenly inapplicable when he came to western Somalia? Who is guilty of double-talk?

20. When welcoming Solomon Islands, the Ethiopian Foreign Minister said that he would like to reiterate the hope of his Government "that its independence will give further impetus to the full and speedy decolonization of the remaining Territories in Africa and around the globe" [*ibid.*]. That is also the position of my Government, but we mean all Territories, without any exception—and no double-talk.

21. We were also treated to a tirade against military intervention and open interference in the affairs of others and yet in the next breath we heard of "great contributions" from "certain countries". We all know what those vast contributions consisted of: foreign arms and armour and State-organized mercenaries. We also know the consequences: the blood that flowed and those who died were nearly all African. There is nothing "so-called" about these facts.

22. The position of my Government is less contorted. We oppose foreign intervention in Africa from whatever source. This position is consistent with several resolutions of the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], notably, resolution 85 (XIV) adopted at the fourteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Libreville in July 1977, which specifically calls on all extra-African Powers, particularly the big Powers, to refrain from such interference.²

23. The Foreign Minister's misleading comments notwithstanding, the grave concern of many African and non-

² See document A/32/310, annex II, p. 3.

aligned countries at the extent to which his country has surrendered its independence to foreign generals and armies was expressed both in Khartoum³ and Belgrade.⁴ In Khartoum the OAU in its resolution 641 (XXXI) [see A/33/235 and Corr.1, annex I] strongly condemned foreign military intervention in the affairs of the continent and:

"Solemnly declares that, in all cases, the security of Africa is the concern of Africans only and that no Power or group of Powers outside Africa is to interfere in this respect".

Moreover, this was specifically endorsed by the Belgrade Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries, in the final Declaration [see A/33/206, annex I], despite attempts in some quarters to legitimize intervention in Africa.

24. The question must be asked, Why are so many Soviet, Cuban and other troops essential for Ethiopia to retain control over western Somalia if it is not a colony in revolt? Indeed it is a colony. The Ethiopian claim over that territory is in no way different from that of Portugal to its former African colonial possessions or of France to Algeria. The fact that Ethiopia is an African country and in closer geographical proximity to the territory in question is absolutely irrelevant.

25. On the question of refugees the Ethiopian Foreign Minister stated that in May 1978 my country was sheltering 30,000 refugees but that "the figure was raised to 270,000, and now we are told that there are half a million" [31st meeting, para. 162]. As a matter of record the number that have fled the genocidal policies of his Government is in fact now over 600,000. Interestingly enough, the Minister denied they were Ethiopian and he was quite correct; they are Somalis from western Somalia. In any case the figure on page 7 of an unpublished document of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees issued in May 1978 was not 30,000 but some 300,000, and no amount of "categorical rejection" can lessen that number or minimize their plight. Denied their fundamental human rights, they should be subject to pity, not jokes. Nor did the Minister mention the thousands of refugees in the Republic of Djibouti referred to in the same report. Does he deny their existence too? And what of the thousands of Eritreans who have fled to the Democratic Republic of the Sudan to avoid the air raids and genocidal terrors practised by his Government in that country, the federal status of which, established by this very Organization, has been illegally abrogated by Ethiopia with characteristic contempt.

26. The Ethiopian Foreign Minister spoke of compensation for the undoubted havoc caused by the colonial wars of Ethiopia supported by the Soviet Union and its surrogates, and it is my painful duty to remind the Minister that the long catalogue of ill treatment the western Somalis have received from the Abyssinian colonists is unparalleled in cruelty, torture and bestiality, even in the wicked annals

of colonialism. That is a well-known and much documented fact. The following people's proverb illustrates deep feelings: "When you see an Abyssinian, then the white man looks like a hadji."

27. I should like to conclude by saying that the responsibility for whatever damage has been done in that territory lies with Ethiopia, which should compensate the people and make restitution to them when they become independent.

28. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from French*): It is with regret that I speak this morning in order to reply to this statement made by the Foreign Minister of Chad at the 32nd meeting.

29. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of Chad devoted more than nine pages of his address to attacking Libya and the Government of Libya. These attacks by the régime of Chad against Libya are not new. The Government of Chad has circulated letters to which I have already replied on behalf of my Government.

30. This is regrettable, because this case of Chad is, in the first place, a matter of the domestic policy of Chad. It is an affair between the Government and the people of Chad.

31. Secondly, this case is now in the hands of the OAU.

32. We fail to understand why the Foreign Minister of Chad decided to inject this case in our discussions in the United Nations. We know that the Government of Chad chose this device to divert the attention of international public opinion from the real problem, which is inside the country. It did so also to try to mislead the people of Chad into believing there had been Libyan aggression in order to try to implicate Libya in this problem and in the earlier conflict in Chad. This is mere irresponsibility on the part of Chad. We well know that this is not the first time that the leaders of N'Djamena, and before those of Fort Lamy, have decided to attack, accuse and slander each of their neighbours in turn whenever they encounter difficulties within Chad.

33. I know full well that I have very little time to speak, a mere 10 minutes. A few months ago I replied to the Foreign Minister of Chad in the Security Council, and I hope that our colleagues will seek further details on this question by referring to the record of the meeting of the Security Council held on 17 February 1978.⁵ I will be brief but I should like to stress some points that the Foreign Minister of Chad mentioned in his address. The Minister spoke of the annexationist policy of Libya.

34. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chad spoke of Libya's annexationist policy and said that we had plans to annex more than half of Chad; that is, that Libya wants to annex 600,000 square kilometres of northern Chad. These are groundless, even fantastic, accusations, because no one in this hall can really believe that Libya, which already has too much desert land, needs 600,000 more square kilometres of desert? We do not collect deserts.

³ Thirty-first ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, held at Khartoum from 18 to 22 July 1975.

⁴ Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade from 25 to 30 July 1978.

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, 2060th meeting.*

35. I know that the Western press and mass media exaggerate. They speak of extraordinary riches in that part of the world. We hope that our brothers in Chad will find riches in that region, whether ore, oil, or anything else. But we know that this is exaggeration, to try to justify their accusations against Libya and to persuade the people of Chad that the Libyans have designs on their natural riches.

36. Several years ago when France was in the Fezzan, there was some talk in the French mass media, on the French radio and in the newspapers about oil riches. It was said that the Fezzan contained more oil than the whole of the Middle East, because at the time the French Government wished to persuade the French people to support their policy of staying in the Fezzan and not leaving the south of our country.

37. Now the same European mass media are exaggerating in the same way in order to add fuel to the flames and poison the political life within Chad.

38. The Foreign Minister of Chad mentioned that more than 6,000 Libyan soldiers were stationed in north Chad and said that these 6,000 Libyan soldiers and their allies, who had the most sophisticated heavy weaponry, had just been dispatched to Zouar, Ounianga and Bao to organize their attacks against the territory of Chad.

39. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chad is a military man. I do not know whether he knows these regions or whether he is simply not speaking the truth. Unfortunately, I cannot display a map in front of the Assembly here to show how impossible it would be to dispatch what he says is more than 6,000 soldiers—that is to say, at least two brigades—with their heavy weaponry across desert areas which are among the worst in the world. I would like to add that two brigades, with their heavy weapons, crossing the Sahara could hardly go unnoticed. These are satellites which monitor our deserts, our countries and indeed the whole of Africa. Even the President of a certain Power said that all countries were being spied on by its satellites. Those satellites can photograph camels in the desert. So 6,000 soldiers, or two brigades, with their heavy weapons, dispatched from the north of Libya to the north of Chad and into Chad itself—that is, a distance of 1,000 kilometres between the inhabited regions of Libya in the north and the border, and 800 to 1,000 kilometres within Chad, making altogether 2,000 kilometres across the Sahara—could not go unnoticed.

40. The Foreign Minister of Chad spoke of foreign presence in Libya. I am surprised that he, the representative of a Government and a country which harbours thousands of foreign soldiers and foreign fighter-planes and bases, should accuse us of harbouring foreigners in our country.

41. Libya is not a country in a remote part of the world. We are a Mediterranean country. We have 2,000 kilometres along the Mediterranean and we face Europe. Many people are watching us. They know what we have and what we are doing, and nobody in this hall believes that we have foreign masters in our country. We have friends, we have friendly relations with many countries, but we do not have foreign bases or soldiers, and everybody knows that.

42. The Foreign Minister of Chad said that we had intervened in Chad's internal affairs without being invited to do so. I have no comment on that, but I do wish to read a paragraph of the joint communiqué issued at Tripoli on 18 February 1978 by the delegations of Chad, Libya and the Sudan:

“The delegation of Chad expressed its sentiments of appreciation and acknowledgement for the constructive efforts undertaken by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Sudan in the cause of assisting Chad resolve its internal problems and achieving national reconciliation in Chad. The delegation of Chad also expressed its gratitude for the hospitality with which it was received in the Jamahiriya...”⁶

43. I shall try to be very brief, but certain things must be said and read out here. What I wanted to say is that this case is a domestic matter; it is now before the OAU. I would add that it is not logical that we Libyans would create problems for Chad, because peace and prosperity for Chad means peace and prosperity for us also. We are neighbours, and the Libyan oases throughout history have provided means of communication and contact between the Mediterranean and Africa.

44. Now we are suffering the effects of what has happened in Chad. What happened there was a revolution, an internal matter relating to problems having political, economic, religious and cultural origins.

45. We know that the situation in Chad is very complicated, but I should like to ask our Chad brothers to remember that the African countries which were created in Africa following a partition by the Europeans have all experienced this type of problem. But these countries have managed, thanks to the wisdom of their political leaders, to overcome those problems. In Chad's case, a minority imposed by French colonialism still wishes to cling to its privileges.

46. Unfortunately, I cannot go into this any further because my time is limited, but I hope that I shall be able on another occasion to provide more details on the matter.

47. Mrs. NGUYEN LINH QUY (Viet Nam): In their statement yesterday at the 33rd meeting, the Kampuchean authorities said that the situation in Kampuchea was “excellent”, but the whole world knows it is the contrary. They have no respect for world opinion and have clearly told big lies. Since they dared lie about well-known facts, they could allow themselves to tell other big lies. Their slanders against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam were not new; they have been repeated several times, and my Government has on many occasions rejected them. Out of respect for this Assembly, my delegation refrains from doing so again today.

48. The Vietnamese delegation believes that Viet Nam and Kampuchea, which have gone through many long years of war, should today concentrate all their energies on rebuild-

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1978*, document S/12568, annex I. Quoted in English by the speaker.

ing their respective countries in peace, and two peoples which shared a time-honoured friendship and solidarity and gave each other assistance in their past struggle could and should settle their problems by negotiations. Every day and even every hour the border conflicts are causing suffering and loss of life to the peoples living on the borders of the two countries, threatening peace and stability in South-East Asia.

49. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has made several proposals for a peaceful settlement, in particular the following three-point proposal of 5 February 1978:

"1. An immediate end shall be put to all hostile military activities in the border region; the armed forces of each side shall be stationed within their respective territories five kilometres from the border.

"2. The two sides shall meet at once in Ha Noi or Phnom Penh, or at a place on the border, to discuss and conclude a treaty in which they will undertake to respect each other's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, to refrain from aggression, from the use of force or threats to use force in their relations with each other, from interference in each other's internal affairs, and from subversive activities against each other, to treat each other on an equal footing, and to live in peace and friendship as good neighbours.

"The two sides shall sign a border treaty on the basis of respect for each other's territorial sovereignty within the existing borders.

"3. The two sides shall reach agreement on an appropriate form of international guarantee and supervision."

Regrettably, however, the Kampuchean authorities have flatly rejected these proposals and have stepped up the war.

50. The general debate in the past three weeks in this Assembly made it clear that almost all the Governments which are concerned about the situation in South-East Asia have expressed their anxiety and desire for an early peaceful settlement of the disputes between Viet Nam and Kampuchea, so that the South-East Asian peoples can live in peace, stability and co-operation. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam fully shares that justified anxiety and desire of the international community.

51. The problems concerning the two countries are not impossible of settlement by negotiation on the basis of mutual respect. The only obstacle to a peaceful settlement between the two countries is the policy of a great Power in Asia that has long had ambitions of expansion and hegemony in South-East Asia, setting the three Indo-Chinese countries as well as the South-East Asian peoples against one another so that it may carry out its policy of "divide and rule".

52. The design of that great Power is to fight Viet Nam to the last Kampuchean, just as in the past, as the American press observed, that great Power was determined to fight the United States to the last Vietnamese, and as the British publication *The Economist* pointed out last June, just as

that great Power is determined to fight the Soviet Union to the last Briton and West European.

53. That great Power is trying to throw the whole world into great chaos and to ensure for itself great peace so that it can fish in troubled waters and become the biggest world Power by the end of this century.

54. The Vietnamese delegation urges the Phnom Penh authorities to act not for the benefit of that great Power but for the sake of their own people and in the interest of the peoples of South-East Asia, and to stop the war and to seek, together with the Vietnamese side, a peaceful solution, acceptable to both sides, of the problems concerning the two countries.

55. Mr. MONTIEL ARGÜELLO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia in his statement at the 33rd meeting referred to violations of human rights in Nicaragua and he asked that the institutionalized machinery to ensure those rights be applied.

56. As I have already stated, at the invitation of the Government of Nicaragua the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights is at this very moment in my country investigating those alleged violations. That Commission is presided over by the Venezuelan Ambassador, Andrés Aguilar. My Government is certain that it can prove to that Commission that, while serious violations of human rights may have occurred in Nicaragua, those responsible are not the authorities, who have confined themselves to preserving constitutional rule and the rule of law. Those responsible for the violations are those who have tried to subvert law and order by terrorist violence.

57. To claim now that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights should do the same job would mean only duplication, which would be damaging both to the prestige of this Organization and to the prestige of the Organization of American States.

58. At the San Francisco Conference on International Organization in 1945 the Latin American countries made every effort to see to it that the United Nations Charter would contain a chapter on regional organizations, for it was felt that the inter-American system at that time was the only existing regional system and represented a valuable legacy which should be preserved. Now it would seem that some Latin American countries wish to follow a contrary trend whenever the regional organization does not bow to their will. They have even suggested that that organization should step down. They speak about democracy, but they do not wish to accept a majority vote.

59. I thank the representative of Colombia for the interest he has shown in the subversive movements which have emerged in my country. Such movements have also existed in Colombia, along with all they have entailed in the way of terrorism, kidnappings, assassinations, guerrilla warfare and so on, and the Government of Colombia has put them down firmly without arousing any criticism.

60. On this occasion I shall not dwell at length on questions of universality and regionalism. I shall confine

myself to saying merely that in the case of Nicaragua simultaneous action by the world Organization and the regional organizations would only be damaging to the prestige of both.

61. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): A few days ago, on 9 October, this lofty tribune of the General Assembly was used by one speaker for highly unworthy purposes. Our delegation did not exercise its right of reply earlier for two reasons: first, we did not want to divert the General Assembly from its discussion of extremely important questions during the general debate; secondly, we did not want to reply because the delegation of the country that made that inappropriate statement has been absent for practically all the recent days of the general debate in the General Assembly.

62. Not being able to make any constructive proposals for resolving urgent international problems, among which is the question of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, the representative of that country made some inappropriate comments on human rights in the Soviet Union. He was so shameless as to defend a handful of renegades who were recently convicted in our country, in full accordance with Soviet law, for criminal actions perpetrated by them at the behest of foreign special services.

63. We do not see any particular need to enter into polemics with the representative of that country on the question of human rights. He used this rostrum for hackneyed, malevolent allegations which are daily repeated by imperialist propaganda.

64. The purpose of this is quite clear to us. First of all, he wanted to divert the United Nations from the discussion of important international problems requiring speedy solutions. He wanted to divert the attention of the United Nations from violations of human rights and of the rights of peoples in his own country and other Western countries. He wanted to divert the attention of public opinion from massive and flagrant violations of human rights which pose a threat to peace and security.

65. It is not for the representative of that country to concern himself with the rights of Soviet citizens. The rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens have been fully and clearly enshrined in the new Soviet Constitution. The rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens are strictly observed and will continue to be observed in the future, regardless of what is said or thought about this by leaders of Western countries, including the representatives of that country which on 9 October made use of this rostrum.

66. Our leaders have repeatedly stated that no one can or will be able to interfere in the internal affairs of our country. No one can dictate to the Soviet people how they should live. In 1917 our country chose the path for building a Communist society. We are successfully building that society, and we shall certainly go on building it.

67. We are firmly convinced that genuine human rights--not bogus human rights or people's rights--can be ensured only by the elimination of the exploitation of man by man; that is, when societies are built on the principle that a man must be a friend, a comrade and a brother to another man,

not a wolf to him. Of paramount importance are rights such as freedom from exploitation, the right to live in peace and security, the right to work, the right to leisure, the right to education, housing, social security, free health care and so on. Only by ensuring the exercise of those rights can we ensure the full development and prosperity of democracy, the building of true friendship and mutual assistance between peoples in the interest of the progressive development and increased well-being and culture of all peoples and all citizens in whatever country. It is such a system that exists in our country and in the other socialist countries. Any attempts to distort the real situation cannot change that irrefutable fact and will be vain. Because the representative of that country who tried to cast aspersions on my country in regard to the question of human rights without any grounds whatsoever should not have used this lofty rostrum to make these allegations, I should like to state the following.

68. It would appear that the representative of the country in question was giving us a mirror image of his own country. He was trying to impute the situation in his own country to ours. Was it not his country which created the explosive situation in the Middle East, unleashing four aggressive wars against the Arab peoples in the past 30 years? Was it not his country that deprived the Palestinian Arab people of their homeland, by compelling hundreds of thousands of Palestinians--men, women and children--to flee their country to save their lives from the mass terror and repression of the aggressors? Was it not his country which turned the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank into hostages, people without any rights, second-class citizens without elementary conditions for human existence? Do not the lives of these Palestinians remind us of the lives of the majority of the indigenous population living in bantustans in South Africa? Is it not his country--and that is no accident--which is extending its co-operation with the Fascist racist régime of South Africa? It seems to have borrowed South Africa's racist policies and used them against the Arabs in the Middle East. That co-operation is surely directed against the peoples of Africa also. Was it not his country that annexed and is still occupying the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, Sinai and Jerusalem.

69. If the representative of that country regards those actions as implementation of human rights, and not as gross and flagrant violations of human rights and the rights of entire peoples and a threat to peace and security, one must ask what his understanding of human rights and the rights of peoples is.

70. We therefore have every right to say the following to him. You were wrong to put on the toga of a champion of human rights. Do not abuse this lofty rostrum for such malevolent purposes. Try first to observe human rights in your own country in respect of the Arab peoples. Try to implement the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations calling for withdrawal from all Arab territories. Allow the Palestinians to return to their homelands and to enjoy their right to self-determination and to create their national sovereign State. Learn to live with the Arabs peacefully as equals. Allow peace and security to prevail in the Middle East. Otherwise all your high-flown words about human rights will be false words.

71. The representatives of that country, who flagrantly trample under foot the human rights of the Arab people, will never be able to convince anyone here that they are champions of human rights whatever their methods or whatever the costumes in which they dress themselves. No one can divert our Organization from its great path—that is, the defence of the peace and security of the peoples, the fight for the complete elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* and the struggle against the gross and mass violations of human rights and the rights of peoples which threaten peace and security in general.

72. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It would seem unnecessary to take up the Assembly's time at this stage of the general debate to reply to the ridiculous claims of the representative of the Siad Barre régime regarding the internationalist aid given by Cuba to the fraternal Ethiopian people, the victim of invasion and attack by Somalia.

73. We are replying merely to dot the i's and cross the t's. We wish to say this quite bluntly: the Siad Barre régime—which at one time claimed to be socialist, progressive and anti-imperialist—has now revealed its true expansionist, chauvinist and reactionary colours. The language used by its representative in this Assembly fully proves this: he has repeated almost word for word the arguments put forward by the leaders of the main imperialist Power.

74. Siad Barre has never tried to settle his dispute with Ethiopia peacefully. That is why the Aden meeting failed. On the contrary, what he has tried to do is drag Cuba, in the person of its President, Commander-in-Chief Fidel Castro, into supporting his expansionist and aggressive designs on Ethiopia. We have rejected that outrage, and we shall continue to do so. That is the reason for the hysterical fuss that we are witnessing these days in all international forums.

75. Mr. Siad Barre tried to take advantage of what he regarded as favourable circumstances—a time when the Ethiopian revolution was repulsing the attack of its supplanted feudal lords, when aggression was being committed against it from the north and when it was being threatened by imperialism—to invade Ogaden with the complicity of the reactionaries and the imperialists, a complicity that is confirmed by the silence which all their spokesmen maintained during the aggression.

76. The invasion was repulsed, but the invaders were not pursued into their countries, as so often happens with other countries in other places, because Ethiopia is not after alien territory nor does it have any delusions of grandeur. Then claims were invented and disseminated to the four winds that there were great concentrations of troops along the Somali border. These claims are pure fiction, which even they do not believe.

77. One day, sooner rather than later, the Ethiopian and Somali revolutionaries will peacefully resolve the dispute which was artificially created by Siad Barre in order to satisfy his hunger for power and expansion. Experience shows that all aggressors end in the rubbish pile of history.

78. Finally, we say to the representative of Mr. Siad Barre that in fact the African proverb he quoted urges those who

carry in their hand a flaming torch not to let it fall to the ground, as he timidly recommends, but to brandish it in defence of independence and territorial integrity, in order to free themselves from aggressors and expansionists and to guarantee the strict implementation of the Charters of the United Nations and the OAU, which the régime of Mr. Barre has violated

79. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The nations of the Middle East are at a turning-point in their history. For the first time in 30 years of conflict there is real and tangible progress towards peace. God willing, we shall have the first Arab-Israel peace treaty in the course of the current session of the General Assembly, and it is our fervent hope that all our Arab neighbours will join the negotiations so that we may move our war-torn region rapidly towards a comprehensive peace settlement.

80. The people of the Middle East have had enough of war and suffering, and the time has come to ensure for them a new era of peace and co-operation. It therefore saddened my delegation to note, during the general debate, that certain States appeared determined to undermine the prospects of peace. Apparently fearful of embracing the new spirit of dialogue and negotiation which yielded such positive results at Camp David, those States cling desperately to the rhetoric of the past and, unable to share in the courage, imagination and conciliation demonstrated at Camp David, have sought to deprecate the momentous results achieved there.

81. It is therefore well to recall the words of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. David Owen, before this Assembly, when he said:

“We appear to talk at each other rather than to each other . . .

“ . . .

“Those who condemned the agreements so hastily should look at them again more carefully. They are based upon the principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and upon the international consensus in its favour. A perfect settlement cannot be achieved by exchanging declarations of principle any more than by making speeches at one another.” [*10th meeting, paras. 123 and 132.*]

82. Israel agrees whole-heartedly, and because it is our desire to talk with our neighbours, not at them, I shall refrain from replying to many of the hasty and ill-considered remarks that they made during the general debate.

83. It is for the same reason that our delegation has preferred to be present during the entire general debate. We did not go through the motions of demonstratively walking out on any speaker, as did some delegations, only to stand in the wings and listen to what the Foreign Minister of Israel had to say. There is, if I may say so, something symbolic in the childish behaviour of those who absented themselves. These absentees are precisely those States which have put themselves on the sidelines of the mainstream of real developments affecting the Middle East and

have thus become bystanders—somewhat anxious bystanders—in the current peace negotiations.

84. It is incumbent upon me, however, to draw attention to a regrettable abuse of authority that took place at the beginning of the current session. Speaking less than 48 hours after the conclusion of the Camp David talks, the Temporary President opened the General Assembly with an extraordinarily intemperate and one-sided account of the situation in the Middle East that did not even mention Camp David and the current peace negotiations. Not only did that action constitute a grave violation of the principle of impartiality traditionally associated with the position of the presiding officer, but it was all the more out of place in the light of the official statement by Yugoslavia a few days later in the general debate [7th meeting] that virtually repeated the Temporary President's remarks.

85. The height of hypocrisy was reached at the 27th meeting in this debate by the Deputy Foreign Minister of Syria, who was brazen enough to blame Lebanon's ills on Israel. There can be no one in this hall who has not been appalled and outraged by Syrian excesses in northern Lebanon, especially in Beirut, in recent months. Hundreds, if not thousands, of civilians have been killed and wounded by the indiscriminate Syrian artillery barrages fired into populated areas over the last fortnight. In the process, about half a million innocent men, women and children have once again been made into refugees and forced to flee their homes. Western correspondents have described eastern Beirut as a "moonscape". The city's once tall buildings are gutted and blackened; its shell-cratered streets are cluttered with the rubble of toppled houses, burnt-out cars and rotting bodies.

86. The London publication *The Economist* says in one of its issues this week:

"This coldly cruel type of warfare, involves the application of military power against civilians to achieve non-military objectives. It is intended to cause as much disruption and suffering as possible. Most of the people killed have been civilians. The shelling has taken a toll of hospitals and clinics and, since Syrian gunnery is reasonably accurate, some of these hits must have been deliberate. This holds true of the bombardment of school buildings too."

87. The agony of the Lebanese population is only compounded by the cynicism of the motives of their Syrian assailants. When Syria, under the guise of regional peace-keeping, massacres civilians in order to expand its control over Lebanon, its true character and intentions are revealed. It is a well-known fact that Syria has never established diplomatic relations with Lebanon since this would presumably prejudice its long-standing claim to hegemony over that country. Until the present Syrian leadership is disabused of its belief in its outdated expansionist designs—which, according to official Syrian statements, also include Jordan and Israel—that régime will continue to try to torpedo any movement towards peace in the Middle East.

88. Another statement that had a strange ring to it was that made by the Foreign Minister of Hungary [10th meeting]. After condemning the peace-making process, he

added a passage on Lebanon that did not appear in the prepared text of the speech circulated by his delegation. But so concerned was the Hungarian representative with the situation in Lebanon that his special reference to the subject turned out to be yet another attack on Israel. This was particularly unfortunate, for his country, perhaps more than any other, might have been expected to sympathize with the Lebanese people, who have come under the domination of a foreign and allegedly fraternal army in the guise of a regional peace-keeping force.

89. The Soviet representative, representative a country that has done so much for peace in the Middle East over the past 25 years and for human rights generally all over the world, could not forbear to reply to my delegation, and in the process heaped untruth upon untruth. I shall not reply to him. I prefer to put this rostrum at the disposal of Anatoly Scharansky, whom the Soviet authorities have tried so hard to silence. I can do no better than to quote from Scharansky's words in a Moscow court on 14 July this year, before he was sentenced to 15 years in prison for doing no more than seek his elementary right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. These are his words:

"Five years ago I submitted my application for exit to Israel. Now I am further than ever from my dream. It would seem to be cause for regret. But it is absolutely otherwise. I am happy. I am happy that I lived honestly, in peace with my conscience. I never compromised my soul, even under the threat of death.

"I am happy that I helped people. I am proud that I knew and worked with such honest, brave and courageous people as Sakharov, Orlov and Ginzburg, who are carrying on the traditions of the Russian intelligentsia. I am fortunate to have been witness to the process of the liberation of Jews of the USSR.

"I hope that the absurd accusation against me and the entire Jewish emigration movement will not hinder the liberation of my people. My near ones and friends know how I wanted to exchange activity in the emigration movement for a life with my wife, Avital, in Israel.

"For more than 2,000 years the Jewish people, my people, have been dispersed. But wherever they are, wherever Jews are found, every year they have repeated 'Next year in Jerusalem'. Now, when I am further than ever from my people, from Avital, facing many arduous years of imprisonment, I say, turning to my people, my Avital, 'Next year in Jerusalem'.

"Now I turn to you, the court, who were required to confirm a predetermined sentence. To you I have nothing to say."

This is also my reply to the representative of the Soviet Union.

90. It would be pointless to expose each and every case of hypocritical posturing during this general debate. I wish rather to address an earnest appeal to this Assembly. It is an appeal to rise to the challenge presented by Camp David and to leave behind the worn-out clichés that have marked past debates in this hall. If in the days ahead this Assembly

once again chooses condemnations over negotiations, it will be recorded in history that this session failed to grasp a precious opportunity to assist in creating a more peaceful world order.

91. The current session began less than two days after the Camp David meetings. Yesterday was the first day of the Egyptian-Israeli peace talks in Washington, which are based on the achievements of Camp David. Those who have exploited unrest and conflict in the Middle East in the past, and who cannot now reconcile themselves to the prospect of peace, will certainly try to sabotage the Washington talks. Indeed, we must be warned, for they will also attempt to subvert this body, which is dedicated through the Charter of our Organization to peace and security, and to turn it to their own destructive ends in the days ahead.

92. Realistically speaking, it may be too much to hope that this Assembly will actively support the courageous initiative taken at Camp David and encourage all parties to the Middle East conflict to join in the dialogue and negotiate a comprehensive settlement to end the state of war. But perhaps for once it might refrain from erecting additional barriers to the prospects for peace.

93. If this Assembly cannot actively encourage the peace process, let it at least allow that process to move forward without obstruction. Let us waste no more time on recriminations and accusations. Let us, rather, engage in dialogue and negotiations. Let us forge ahead in the spirit of Camp David—and give peace a chance.

94. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): The representative of Somalia has today again performed what has become a ritual of his delegation at any international gathering. The moment Ethiopian representatives endeavour to acquaint the international community with the simple fact of Somalia's naked aggression and the subsequent deliberate destruction and looting in which its retreating troops engaged, the representatives of Somalia rush to express righteous indignation. Unable to obliterate by pious protestations the stigma of aggression, they invariably revert to diversionary tactics.

95. Such was the case at the last session of this Assembly, the tenth special session, a number of conferences of the OAU, and the last Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Belgrade. I am sure that representatives who attended those meetings will vividly recall the hollowness of Somalia's protestations. Today's performance of Mogadishu's representatives was no different.

96. First and foremost, let me simply point out the representative of Somalia's almost pathological aversion to the essence of the problem. I am, frankly, sorry for him, for my Foreign Minister simply stated [31st meeting] the central issue of the problem. The unprovoked aggression that Mogadishu launched against my country a year ago is a matter of record. The destruction of Ethiopia in which its invading troops engaged was witnessed by members of the international community.

97. Why is it, then, that Somalia, so arrogant and boastful in its initial success, has become so indignant, hurt and

humiliated that the truth should be recounted at all? Somalia's predicament is understandable. Having failed in its misguided adventure and incurred the wrath and displeasure of the international community—except, of course, its new-found allies—Somalia now endeavours to boost its ego with a purposeful and yet distorted presentation of the facts of history. As that is what it is, I need hardly dignify the Somali Government's wild assertions with a reply.

98. To set the record straight, however, let me only indicate the salient features. The sole cause of instability in the Horn of Africa is Somalia's ambitions concerning the territory of its neighbours. It still continues to pursue this ambition, in utter disregard for, and in flagrant violation of, Charter provisions and decisions by the United Nations and the OAU.

99. Thus, although the aggression was repelled, the régime in Mogadishu still continues to infiltrate elements of its armed forces into Ethiopia and to commit wanton acts of sabotage and destruction. Just as in the past, Mogadishu conveniently calls these terrorists and saboteurs the "liberation front", to pave the way, possibly, for yet another round of invasion against Ethiopia. This is a fact, as members of the international community saw during their visits to the war-ravaged regions of eastern Ethiopia.

100. What is more, to cover up the acts of aggression, Somalia sounds false alarms about imaginary Ethiopian troop concentration along the common boundary. But, as the entire world knows, Ethiopia has no interest whatsoever in encroaching upon Somalia's territory. Why, then, the ludicrous accusation that Ethiopia is preparing for an invasion? We did not do so last March—and the representative of Somalia knows that we have the ability to do so.

101. The truth is, as my Government has repeatedly declared, that we desire to live in peace and in mutually beneficial co-operation with all our neighbours, including Somalia. As to Somalia's invocation of the noble principle of self-determination, it is sufficient for me to reiterate what we have already stated in detail on previous occasions: self-determination was never meant to serve as an instrument for notorious expansionists; nor was it meant to be a tool for the bantustanization of an existing nation.

102. And, regarding bantustanization, the Somali representative saw fit to compare my country to South Africa. But let me quote the words of his President in May 1963 in Addis Ababa at the first session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU: "We are all Somalis, not Bantu people, Masai, Kampal and Kikuyu are Bantu. They can live together."

103. What is South Africa saying? It is saying the same thing: namely, that whites and Bantus cannot live together. Therefore, if there is any one nation that qualifies for comparison with South Africa, it is Somalia.

104. Mr. DESSANDE (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Chad wishes, through me, to assure you that we are not going to turn this lofty rostrum of the General Assembly into an unattractive theatrical scene, but we do wish to state the following.

105. In its statement on 10 October 1978 [28th meeting], the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya did not mention the situation in Chad, a country it has always claimed to help and assist in settling its internal difficulties. That delegation knows that it is very ill-qualified to do so, since its Government is right at the epicentre of the tragedy of Chad. But my delegation cannot fail to stress this. We do so out of an abiding concern to keep international opinion fully informed of the firm determination of one Member of our Organization to hound another Member State for unavowed aims.

106. My delegation will not indulge here in a sterile polemic by replying to the false allegations we have just heard from the mouth of my colleague and brother Mr. Kikhia, the Permanent Representative of Libya. We do not want to do so simply out of respect for our Assembly and, in particular, out of deference to the Heads of States and Government of the OAU, especially its current President, General Gaafar Mohamed Numeiri, President of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, who has been appointed by his peers to preside over the *Ad Hoc* Committee established in this connexion at the Khartoum meeting of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU. Indeed, those wise men of Africa have noted the dispute between two brother countries and have resolved to find a solution to it.

107. As the Head of the delegation of Chad said in his statement yesterday [33rd meeting], the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the OAU, which is made up of the neighbouring brother countries of the Sudan, the Niger, the United Republic of Cameroon and Nigeria, is to examine that unfortunate conflict. Consequently, my delegation can only invite Members of our Organization to bear in mind—I stress that—the important information which he just gave them in his statement.

108. Furthermore, my delegation formally rejects all the gross and absolutely groundless allegations made by the Libyan delegation. There is nothing new in what my colleague told us. The Libyan régime has been caught red-handed, and Chad, its Government of National Union and its people want the eminent authorities of that fraternal country to prove their good faith.

109. I wish now to comment briefly on some of the points brought up by my colleague Mr. Kikhia. If Libya does not want to collect deserts, as he says, why is Libya in Aouzou, a Chad base in the middle of the desert, and why has it installed an air and ground base there? That is the question that I raise here.

110. Can Libya deny that it is currently constructing in BET (Borkou-Ennedi-Tibesti), in the northern part of Chad, a whole military infrastructure including aerodromes and roads? The representative of Libya declared that the problem of Chad was an internal affair. We said that in our statement, so why does Libya meddle to the point of preventing hundreds of Chad nationals living in Libya who have refused to be integrated into the Libyan régime from returning to their homeland? Those who have declared their intention of supporting the new Government of National Union have been arrested and thrown into prison. Why?

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): All those originally asked to exercise their right of reply have now spoken, but now there have been requests to exercise the right of reply to some of those replies.

112. With all due respect, I would urge representatives who are replying to statements made in exercise of the right of reply to speak as briefly as possible. In no case will anybody be able to exercise the right of reply more than twice, lest the general debate become interminable. On that understanding I shall now give the floor to those who have put down their names.

113. Mr. THIOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): It is not my intention to reply to the slanders and lies of the representative of Viet Nam. Everything has been said already by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement yesterday evening [33rd meeting]. I should just like to bring certain truths to the attention of the General Assembly.

114. Unlike the Vietnamese, who, after eight years of negotiations in Paris with the United States of America, in the course of which they hatched many manoeuvres against Kampuchea, tore up the Paris agreements within a year, we are straightforward and quite different from the treacherous, hypocritical Vietnamese.

115. First, I should like to say that Viet Nam is doing its utmost frantically to present the problem of its aggression against Kampuchea as a bilateral problem, a mere border issue. In fact though, the war started by Viet Nam and its master the great expansionist Power is part of an expansionist strategy which is both regional and global. That war is becoming almost internationalized. It is already a threat to all the peoples and countries of South-East Asia and Asia and it is beginning to worry the peoples of Africa and Europe.

116. While it may be true that the primary objective of global expansionism is Europe, the fact remains that any success of that global expansionism elsewhere in the world would inevitably have harmful consequences and directly threaten peace not only in Europe but all over the world.

117. Viet Nam and its master are trying desperately to conceal the international nature of the war, with the obvious goal of lulling the vigilance of the peoples of the world.

118. Viet Nam's aggression against Kampuchea is not aimed solely against Kampuchea because as soon as Viet Nam and its master have taken Kampuchea they will not fail to expand their domination throughout all of South-East Asia. But if they cannot seize Kampuchea they will not be able to implement their expansionist designs.

119. Kampuchea is the key obstacle to their ambitions and is a padlock which they are trying desperately to break at the present time.

120. Now that they have failed miserably in their expansionist and aggressive plans, Viet Nam and its master have changed their tactics, but their strategy and their ambition

remain the same. Their present ingratiating diplomatic manoeuvres are all part of that change of tactics, but they serve only to reveal all the better the treachery and hypocrisy of the Vietnamese. In addition to these diplomatic manoeuvres, Viet Nam and its master are once again concentrating their military forces and planning to launch a new, large-scale act of aggression against Kampuchea at the beginning of the next dry season, which begins next month. But the people of Kampuchea and its Revolutionary Army absolutely refuse to be a satellite of Viet Nam. If the people and the Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea have waged this long struggle and have made so many sacrifices to liberate themselves, secure the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their country, and protect their honour and national dignity, it is not in order to become the slaves of the Vietnamese or of any major Power. The people and the Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea, under the wise leadership of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, will always raise high the banner of national independence, honour and dignity, and will always defend and safeguard Democratic Kampuchea and the people of Kampuchea.

121. Secondly, Viet Nam has long been spreading impudent and false propaganda to the effect that it enormously helped Kampuchea to liberate itself. What is the truth? As a matter of fact, everybody knows that ever since 1965, and more particularly since 1970, the Vietnamese have no longer had any of their own territory on which to protect themselves and hide from attacks by the American imperialists and the Saigon cliques. It was the Kampuchean revolution that gave the Vietnamese the sanctuary they ask for on the territory of Kampuchea at their express request, and it was the people of Kampuchea who fed the Vietnamese army which had sought refuge in Kampuchea and got them several hundreds of thousands of tons of rice a year. The hospitals of the Vietnamese army on the territory of Kampuchea took in more than 80,000 wounded Vietnamese soldiers. The Viet Cong army at the time was living off the people of Kampuchea, who fulfilled their international duty. It is clear that if the Viet Cong had not been able to take refuge in Kampuchea they would have been entirely destroyed by the American imperialists.

122. Now that their aggression against Kampuchea has failed miserably, the so-called power of the Vietnamese army and the so-called prestige of the Vietnamese have collapsed like a house of cards, for they were based only on deception, lies and hypocrisy.

123. The successive defeats of the Vietnamese acts of aggression against Kampuchea since the end of 1977 have given the lie to Vietnamese propaganda about so-called Vietnamese assistance to Kampuchea. The legend of the power of the Vietnamese army has also crumbled since the ignominious defeats inflicted on it by the Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea. In the circumstances, it is only natural that the Vietnamese should frenziedly try to blame their defeats on forces other than those of Kampuchea. As a matter of fact, the Vietnamese forces are not worth one thousandth part of the imperialist American forces, and everybody knows what happened to the latter in Kampuchea. How can the Vietnamese say that they are more powerful than the United States of America when they depend on that great expansionist Power for arms and cannot even feed their own people? It is clear that, in spite

of its ignominious defeats, Viet Nam has not yet freed itself from its arrogance, treachery or hypocrisy.

124. Thirdly, certain countries still cherish the false hope that they will be able to take Viet Nam out of the orbit of the big expansionist Power and give it financial, economic and other forms of assistance. In fact, these are but vain hopes because Viet Nam is an integral part of the bloc of the big expansionist Power. In the first place it has an identical ideology. It is a member of the same economic and political alliance and, consequently, a member of a military alliance; the armaments of all kinds which Viet Nam receives from the big expansionist Power prove that.

125. Then, Viet Nam has allowed its master to install big military bases on its territory. And, lastly, Viet Nam stations its troops on foreign soil.

126. All these facts show that Viet Nam is neither an independent country nor a non-aligned country. It took part in the non-aligned movement on the orders of its master in order to sabotage that movement from within and try to bring that movement into the bloc of its master.

127. Certain countries have already learned from the bitter experience of their assistance to Viet Nam and others are reconsidering their assistance to Viet Nam. That assistance only strengthens the big expansionist Power and Viet Nam in their plan later to gobble up the donor countries themselves. To feed expansionist Viet Nam means to feed a crocodile, an animal noted for its ferocious ingratitude.

128. Viet Nam has been pursuing its aggression against Kampuchea and is preparing to launch new, large-scale, aggressive attacks against Kampuchea during the coming dry season.

129. In the first place it is massing about 15 divisions along our border, but as those divisions have been largely decimated and cannot be brought up to strength there is the equivalent of only six or seven divisions at full strength.

130. Secondly, Viet Nam's protector, the expansionist great Power has sent it great quantities of war *matériel* and advisers.

131. Thirdly, to prepare world public opinion, Viet Nam has smilingly been engaging in various diplomatic activities and constantly pursues its policy of hypocrisy and lies against Kampuchea. But peoples that love peace, independence and justice have learned what the true nature of the Vietnamese people is and always remain vigilant.

132. In the face of these preparations on the part of the Vietnamese for further acts of aggression, the people and the Government of Kampuchea are calm and are sure that they will be able to overcome them once again. Why? First, they have already decimated 14 Vietnamese divisions during their aggression towards the end of 1977; secondly, the Vietnamese agents that have been infiltrated into Kampuchea have all been swept away; thirdly, Viet Nam and its patron are no stronger than the American imperialists; and fourthly, the peoples and countries that cherish peace, justice and independence throughout the world are

well aware of the fact that the people of Kampuchea are determined to defend their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, their honour and national dignity.

133. They are raising high the standard of independence, and they know, increasingly, that the present struggle of the people of Kampuchea against Vietnamese aggression and expansionist plans is a struggle which is of concern to all peoples and countries throughout the world, particularly the peoples of Asia and South-East Asia.

134. The people of Kampuchea are aware of the justice of their cause and there can be no doubt that the Vietnamese aggression will again be thrown back.

135. I shall conclude by saying that the people of Kampuchea only wish to live in peace, independence and territorial integrity, with honour and national dignity, and would like to mobilize all their efforts to rebuild the country and improve the living conditions of the people.

136. Kampuchea has conducted about a hundred negotiations with Viet Nam both before and after liberation. In June 1975, Kampuchea proposed to Viet Nam the signing of a treaty of friendship and non-aggression. The negotiations produced no results, because Viet Nam does not wish to abandon its ambitions to "swallow up" Kampuchea.

137. Very recently, on 28 September last, our Prime Minister declared that if Viet Nam were to cease its aggression and show respect, by real deeds, for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea, then Kampuchea would propose once again to Viet Nam the signing of a treaty of friendship and non-aggression, and the leaders of Democratic Kampuchea would go and sign that treaty in Phnom Penh or Hanoi or in the United Nations or any other place.

138. But on 1 October last, Viet Nam once again rejected those reasonable proposals of Democratic Kampuchea. The people and the Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea have no other choice but to remain vigilant and be prepared to inflict even greater defeats on the Vietnamese and their masters.

139. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): We had not intended to exercise our right of reply to answer some heads of delegation who erroneously touched upon what is still wrongly called the question of Western Sahara.

140. Unfortunately, the Foreign Minister of Algeria, in his statement yesterday [33rd meeting] dwelt on a subject which should not have been of primary concern to this Assembly if Algeria had not chosen notoriously to go counter to the decolonization process, which was following its normal course in accordance with international law.

141. But given the horrifying proportions that this campaign of mystification of the international community assumed in yesterday's statement by the Algerian delegation, my delegation feels in duty bound to intervene in order to put things in their true perspective.

142. The Foreign Minister of Algeria, of course, mentioned respect for the principles contained in the Charter of

the United Nations and the Charter of the OAU. We, for our part, also subscribe to those principles, and above all to the principle of self-determination. For some years now Algeria has set itself up as the champion of the implementation of that principle and has mounted this hobby-horse several times in this forum. Do we have to recall that Morocco was one of the sponsors of resolution 1514 (XV), as well as of resolution 1541 (XV), which define how that principle is to be applied? Is there any need to remind it also that the principle of self-determination, as conceived and spelled out in all instruments of our Organization, only applies against colonial Powers.

143. As Morocco has always said, we have been faithful to the principle of self-determination. We are not, as our adversary claimed yesterday, pursuing an annexationist policy in the Sahara. Of course, the Foreign Minister of Algeria blamed Morocco for manipulating facts to demonstrate the opposite of the truth. But I should like to recall, in a simple brotherly manner, that Morocco is in the Sahara in accordance with an international agreement duly registered with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and reaffirmed in a General Assembly resolution. It is following that international agreement and in conformity with it and with that resolution, that Morocco has recovered its Saharan provinces.

144. I do not need to expatiate on that decolonization process.

145. Doubtless, the Foreign Minister of Algeria was referring to what he calls the Saharan people—a strange name in the mouth of the representative of a country which calls itself the champion of liberation, of the anti-colonial struggle and one of the champions of the third-world movement. Indeed, referring only to the last two years, we see that the first time the term was used it was used to serve its cause by the erstwhile colonial Power. It is strange that the representative of a country like Algeria should endorse the terms and the manipulations invented to serve that cause.

146. Also with respect to the Saharan people, we should like to know exactly which people is meant, for the Sahara is a vast territory which extends from Morocco to Egypt. On what basis and by virtue of what principles does the Foreign Minister of Algeria isolate only the Moroccan provinces of the Sahara and treat their people as historically and ethnically distinct from those of the rest of Morocco?

Mr. Vunibobo (Fiji), Vice-President, took the Chair.

147. Clearly the Foreign Minister of Algeria has his own way of explaining the facts. But I should like to ask him to remember quite simply that during the liberation of Algeria, at the time of the Evian negotiations, the Algerian representatives at the time broke off negotiations with France on the pretext that the Sahara was not involved in the decolonization of Algeria.

148. Why should what was good for Algeria then be bad for Morocco now—unless, according to what he said yesterday, but in another perspective, Morocco is only trying to cause further breaches. I think and I am sorry to have to point out to him that it is the present policy of

Algeria that seeks to institutionalize these breaches and, in doing so, seeks to make Algeria the heir of the old colonial Powers of the Berlin pact.

149. It is not for Morocco to go back over erroneous positions which are not in line either with the facts or with history. Furthermore, the Foreign Minister of Algeria spoke at length of the liberation movement of the so-called Saharan people. Here again I did not wish to reply to him on that point, knowing full well Algeria's painful experience of national liberation; but I challenge the Foreign Minister of Algeria to tell us when during the Spanish colonial régime in Morocco anyone heard of that national liberation movement or its struggle against the Spanish military presence in the Territory. That so-called POLISARIO movement⁷ is merely a creation of Algeria's would-be hegemonistic policy in the region. It emerged only at the close of 1974 at a time when—strange coincidence—Morocco wanted to obtain the peaceful decolonization of that Territory in agreement with Spain and in conformity with United Nations resolutions.

150. I do not wish to use the Assembly's time any further, but I wish to remind the Foreign Minister of Algeria of one more thing in respect of his comparison of Morocco with the former Portuguese colonial Power in Africa. I shall not take up that slander against Morocco. I hope that his words do not express his true thoughts, because he knows better than anyone the role that Morocco played with their Algerian brothers in their liberation struggle. He knows better than anyone the sacrifices that the Moroccan people, who had only recently gained their own independence, made for Algeria in the Maghreb Arab solidarity movement. He knows full well the material and political support that Morocco together with its African brothers incessantly gave with respect to the former Portuguese colonies. He knows very well that the Moroccan Royal Army, not only in Africa but also in the Middle East, sacrificed hundreds of lives for the cause of the liberty and independence of the Arab countries. I regret that he spoke those words which quite simply mean that Algerian leaders have become so passionate about the problem that they have no sense of reason any more.

151. We are faced with a situation that is well known to everyone. The Foreign Minister of Algeria alluded yesterday to certain engagements supposedly taking place in that region. He even informed us of certain threats. But I should like from this rostrum to say that Morocco is impervious to any threats from whatever quarter they may come. He knows that we will confront those threats with determination and courage at the proper time.

152. However, there was one omission which I should like to bring up here. He gave the names of some places where manoeuvres have taken place, but he forgot the essential point, that is to say the Amgala battle and with good reason, because Amgala was an engagement between the Royal Moroccan Army and the Algerian Army. I do not need to remind him of the conditions in which the Algerian forces had to retreat into Algeria or in what conditions thousands of Algerian prisoners, both officers and enlisted

men, are now living in Morocco. Let him not try to tell us that Algeria has nothing to do with this and that it is simply the liberation struggle of a so-called phantom people.

153. The Foreign Minister of Algeria said that Morocco was in favour of peace. It has always been. Today we speak of the dynamics of peace; we subscribe to that fully. But that peace must be achieved in dignity and with full respect for the territorial integrity of Member States. Self-determination is a principle that every State Member of this Organization must uphold. The principle must never be used for the balkanization of a country or for the destruction of existing States.

154. For our part, in the context of that peace that we all whole-heartedly desire, we appeal to our Algerian brothers to see reason. Morocco, as we have always said, is fully prepared to engage in a dialogue with them—and I entirely agree with the Algerian Foreign Minister here—on the political problems that are dividing his country and mine. We are open to any suggestion, and we hope that soon reason will prevail and peace will be restored to our region.

Mr. Liévano (Colombia) resumed the Chair.

155. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I shall not insult the distinguished representatives present here by giving them a course in geography about the location of Western Sahara which was under Spanish administration. I hesitated before asking to be allowed to exercise the right of reply and finally I have asked to do so primarily to make one point.

156. The war of liberation being waged by the Saharan people under the Frente POLISARIO is a tangible reality which has won out, thanks to the fighting and sacrifices of that great people which the Moroccan representative has been treating so disdainfully as a phantom people. It is pointless to try to ignore that reality recognized by the international community, which, so long, as it is seized of the question of Western Sahara bears the responsibility for guaranteeing the application of the right of self-determination to that people which the Moroccan representative called a phantom people. And, if any proof has to be given regarding one of the aspects of the war of liberation of the Saharan people, one need only refer to the initiative of the unilateral cease-fire decided on by the Frente POLISARIO over part of its battlefield. That initiative, which the Mauritanian Government did not fail to appreciate, was also welcomed by the African and international communities with great satisfaction. It bears witness both to the maturity and the greatness of the Saharan people, who are not a phantom people but who exist on the land and are determined to oppose aggression and annexation.

157. Mr. KIKHJA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from French*): I shall try to be very brief. I do not want to answer my colleague the Permanent Representative of Chad in the same kind of language as he used because I do not wish to ruffle the serenity of this debate.

158. In his statement of reply to my reply, the representative of Chad mentioned the Aouzou strip. We have always said to our brothers of Chad that this so-called border conflict between Libya and Chad is not serious and that

⁷ Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el Hamra y Río de Oro.

there is nothing to prevent it being settled between us. The communiqué of 24 February 1978 signed at Sebha by Colonel Mu'ammarr Al-Qaddafi of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mr. Félix Malloum, President of the Republic of Chad, Mr. Seyni Kountche, President of the Republic of the Niger, and Aboul Kassim Mohamed Ibrahim, Vice-President of the Sudan, stated:

"The Presidents agreed that the problem of the frontiers between Chad and the Jamahiriya should be discussed in a fraternal manner, in a new spirit of mutual understanding and in the context of bilateral co-operation."⁸

159. We have always said that if there is a border conflict between the two countries we can settle it among ourselves, in a group context and within the OAU.

160. The representative of Chad mentioned building in the border district. We have explained several times that it was only after the revolution of 1 September that we began to be interested in the interior of the country, in building hospitals, schools, administrative centres and police accommodations there. We did this throughout the interior of the country, as well as in the areas near the borders between our country and Chad and between our country and other neighbours. In all those regions we began building roads and creating an infrastructure in the country. As for border questions, we have already said repeatedly in the United Nations that if there is a border problem we are ready to discuss it with Chad.

161. We state that the Aouzou strip is part of our land, whereas Chad says it is part of its land. This is the classic border problem.

162. Furthermore, Libya is accused of occupation and aggression, but anyone can have border problems, especially in such sparsely populated regions.

163. Our brothers from Chad have said that a better atmosphere must be created for discussing all of the problems that have arisen between us. Border disputes are not easy to resolve. Neither Colonel Al-Qaddafi nor anyone else could sign a paper saying that Chad was right; that would be impossible. We know that General Malloum cannot do that for Chad, and this applies to all countries. These are matters which must be studied and discussed.

164. My colleague the Permanent Representative of Chad has said that we are persecuting people from Chad living in Libya. I have already said that we are suffering the consequences of the Chad war. There is therefore no reason for us to create problems in that region. It is we who pay the price. We are giving shelter to refugees. We have not created a problem. We have not come to the United Nations or gone to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees saying, "We have a refugee problem; come and help us." We have been receiving refugees for 20 years; in recent years, fortunately, we have been able to absorb some of them because we need labour and we have made schools available to them.

165. I recall that, shortly before leaving my governmental position, one evening after midnight—this is just an example—I had a telephone call warning me that hundreds of children, 400, 600 or perhaps 800, had just reached an oasis. The members of this Assembly will understand what it means to have a sudden influx of hundreds of children in an oasis community, such as Arknu or Auenat, which are located in the triangle formed between Sudan, Libya and Chad. These communities, which are called oases, generally have only 15 or 20 families, about 60 or 100 people in all. You can easily imagine what happens when refugees, especially children, arrive and when there are wounded among them and people who have been tortured. We welcome them, we try to assist them, and we make humanitarian efforts on their behalf. The nationals of Chad in our country are refugees, but they are not in prison. I formally deny that allegation. On the contrary, it was the Libyan community in Chad that was persecuted and harassed by the Chad authorities. We do not ask people from Chad to remain with us. If they want to go back they are free to do so, but some are political refugees and they do not wish to go back, because they know what awaits them in their own country.

166. We have not wanted to embarrass the Government of Chad or our friends from Chad whether under the old régime or the present régime regarding the refugees from Chad.

167. We shall perhaps be told that all this relates to Tombalbaye, to the past. But, since the people have not laid down their arms and are still fighting, it seems to me that, while Tombalbaye has disappeared, Tombalbayism has not. Indeed, people in Chad say that they have Tombalbayism without Tombalbaye.

168. I would conclude by saying that we are ready to discuss all the problems in good faith with our brothers in Chad. In its most recent resolution, adopted at Khartoum, the OAU put the case in the hands of President Nimeiri, who has been authorized to hold consultations with the countries bordering on Chad, including Libya. We are prepared to continue the dialogue. We are prepared to co-operate, because we want peace and prosperity to prevail in the region, and we want friendship with the people of Chad.

169. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia): I shall be exercising my delegation's right of reply in connexion with remarks made by two delegations that have brought to this rostrum their conspiracy in the Ogaden, namely, the delegations of Cuba and Ethiopia. I hope that the President will take this into account in relation to the amount of time I am given for my reply.

170. The representative of Cuba tried to justify his régime's military adventurism in the Ogaden by alleging that Cuba was defending Ethiopia against reactionary forces. The "reactionary forces" are, of course, the people of that country.

171. Not long ago President Castro said that his soldiers were in Africa for sentimental reasons, because of their African origins. One wonders if the President of the United States could use the same kind of argument and say that he

⁸ Quoted in English by the speaker.

was sending American troops of African origin to Africa for sentimental reasons. The argument that has been used has no relation to the truth. Cuba is unequivocally and absolutely the surrogate of a super-Power. It is conducting a war by proxy in a place where the super-Power does not wish to go. Cuba receives financial aid for this. Everybody knows that. Earlier this year it received \$2 billion, mainly for expenses for employing black people.

172. The representative of Cuba referred to a meeting that had taken place in Aden between my President, his President and the Chairman of the Military Council of Ethiopia. He said that his President had been there to mediate and create peace. That is not true. He was there working for the interests of a super-Power, with the aim of placing the whole region under the hegemony of that super-Power. That is what my President rejected.

173. At the Belgrade Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, Cuba tried to justify its adventurist military behaviour in Ogaden. It tried to legitimize this intervention. But that Conference rejected those attempts—just as the OAU had done at Khartoum—and condemned the intervention in the affairs of the continent.

174. Cuba pictures itself as a friend of Africa, but does not heed the express decision of the organization that represents the continent of Africa.

175. The representative of Cuba spoke of the possibility, indeed the certainty, that the Somalis and the Ethiopians would themselves solve the problem one day. That is our wish also. It is not only a wish: we are convinced that if they had been left alone the Somalis and the Ethiopians would long since have solved their problem.

176. We should like to know what the 20,000 Cuban troops are doing in the Ogaden. Why are they prisoners in the military encampments in Jijiga, Dagabur, Qabridahare and elsewhere? There is one reason: to pose a danger to neighbouring territories, including my own; it is not only the Ogaden.

177. I should like to turn now to the remarks made by the representative of Ethiopia.

178. The representative of Ethiopia spoke of a "ritual" engaged in by the Somalis in forums here and elsewhere. It is true that we go on repeating the same thing—but the issue is the same; it has not changed. We cannot say anything different. We cannot engage in intrigue. We cannot turn to crafty diplomacy. We have to continue stating the truth. And the truth is that Ethiopia acquired a territory colonially.

179. The representative of Ethiopia said that we had a pathological aversion to discussing the real problem. But the real problem is the people of western Somalia. Why should we not discuss that issue? Why should we discuss others? Why should we talk about matters that have no bearing on the real issue?

180. The representative of Ethiopia referred to a resolution of the OAU. Of course, we respect the OAU

resolutions, international law, and United Nations resolutions. But this is a purely colonial issue that has no relation whatever to the question referred to by the representative of Ethiopia. In any case, when that question was raised in Cairo in 1964, it was excluded from discussion because it was agreed that negotiations would start soon between Somalia and Ethiopia. In the words of the author of the resolution, the conclusion was clear—namely, that this question was excluded; it was on the agenda, but it was excluded from discussion. I have before me the verbatim records of the discussion on this point in Cairo.

181. The representative of Ethiopia engaged in another distortion of the facts. He referred to a speech made by my President in Addis Ababa in 1963. What he said was absolutely false. What he said had nothing to do with what my President said. I can produce the text of my President's speech. The representative of Ethiopia alleged that my President had spoken of bantustanization, tribalism, and so forth. I categorically reject these misleading and false remarks.

182. The representative of Ethiopia spoke of a humiliating defeat. But who has been defeated? The people of the Ogaden were conquered a long time ago. If they have been defeated now by the superior machinery of a super-Power and others, they will triumph one day. They will continue their struggle, and we are sure they will be victorious.

183. He spoke of terrorism. Who is the terrorist? And in any case, in whose hands is the Ogaden? Nobody's. There are military garrisons of foreign troops there, but the whole territory is in the hands of the people, the legitimate owners of the land.

184. The representative of Ethiopia spoke also on this question of the destruction allegedly caused by Somali troops. In the first place, in all honesty there was not much in that territory to destroy, but whatever has been destroyed had been clearly reported by my Foreign Minister to the relevant committee of the OAU meeting two months ago in Khartoum, when he said:

"It is a well known fact that the defeated Ethiopian army deliberately committed acts of wanton destruction in their ignoble retreat before the freedom fighters. Anything that could in any way be of use was demolished or put out of service. In any case, all the services were for military purposes."

185. I should like to conclude by saying that the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*] obliges all States to oppose colonialism, neo-colonialism and all forms of aggression, occupation and alien domination, and states in article 16:

"States which practise such coercive policies are economically responsible to the countries, territories and peoples affected for the restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural and all other resources of those countries, territories and peoples. It is the duty of all States to extend assistance to them."

Of course, we shall call upon Ethiopia, when the right time comes for that people, to compensate them.

186. Contrary to the impression that Ethiopia tries to create, the Somali Democratic Republic—and I should like to emphasize this—respects lawful boundaries and the principle of territorial integrity as it accepts the right to self-determination and other relevant rules of international law in the resolution of the problem of western Somalia, which, because of its colonial nature, is in no way related to boundary disputes elsewhere in the continent.

187. Let me conclude by saying that my Government, notwithstanding the fraternal ties with the people of western Somalia, cannot be responsible for their actions nor can it appoint itself their representative. Therefore, Ethiopia's comments on this score are largely uncalled for. Naturally, since those people are the agents of their own destiny, any decision affecting their destiny must be made in consultation with them. My Government, I can assure this Assembly, will be the first to recognize and to respect the free choice of the people of western Somalia, whether or not they opt for independence. For a speedy solution of the problem we call for the withdrawal of foreign troops and we call on Ethiopia to recognize the legitimate rights of that brotherly people, which has suffered for so long.

188. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members that I plan to continue this meeting until we reach the end of the list of speakers. Because it is late and because of the number of names still on the list, I shall have to apply strictly the decision accepted by the Assembly, namely, that statements in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

189. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): What the representative of Israel said was, as usual, made up of lies and allegations, and that fact reveals once again the true nature of Israel's obstinacy and its Zionist expansionist aims. Without going into the details of what was said by the representative of the Zionist entity, I should like, on behalf of my Government, to make the following points.

190. First, our position with regard to Lebanon is based on the legitimate desires of the authorities of that country. Our position has been recognized by the League of Arab States and by the United Nations. If we assume all our responsibilities in Lebanon, it is because we are acting in accordance with the national feelings and the common destiny that binds our two fraternal countries, Syria and Lebanon. We feel that it is appropriate to remind everyone that Syria and Lebanon have not exchanged diplomatic representatives since the independence of the two countries because we have always felt that the fraternal relations between our two countries were special relations that made an exchange of diplomatic missions unnecessary.

191. Secondly, the lack of responsibility and the failure to respect international commitments which have always been typical of the nature of the aggressive Zionist entity are the cause of the tragedy in Lebanon, as everyone in this Organization knows. Since stability and tranquillity in Lebanon would not serve Zionist ambitions, Israel intervenes by creating trouble and disturbances whenever stability is about to be established.

192. Thirdly, the stability my country has been enjoying for many years and the clear and unequivocal position of the people and Government of the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to the questions of the Middle East and of Palestine constitute a source of concern to the Zionist entity.

193. It is strange that the Zionist entity should hold Syria responsible for the results of its own aggression against Lebanon. That entity feigns regret over what has happened in Beirut, but it seems to forget the victims that fell as a result of its attack on west Beirut, its occupation of south Lebanon and its use of fragmentation bombs that are internationally forbidden, and it refuses to implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

194. In response to your appeal, Mr. President, I shall not go into the details of the scandalous violations of human rights committed by the Zionist racist entity in Arab Palestine and in the other occupied Arab territories.

195. Briefly stated, had it not been for the presence of the Zionist entity in the region, these events would never have taken place.

196. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): I asked to speak again, but not really to exercise my delegation's right of reply, because, as the Somali representatives know full well, we exercised our right of reply effectively where it counted. Nor am I here to speak for the Soviet Union or Cuba. The defence of their principled and honourable stand requires nobody's assistance. But, as Somalia continues to repeat the same falsehood in connexion with the all-round assistance that the Soviet Union and Cuba have rendered my country in enabling us to repel the naked Somali aggression, let me make the following observations.

197. The Italian newspaper *La Repubblica* revealed in its 28 February 1978 issue that: "Somalia spends \$2 million a day on the aggressive war unleashed against Ethiopia." As the aggression lasted nearly 10 months, where did the huge sum of \$600 million come from? Who was financing that criminal aggression against Ethiopia? We know Somalia's gross national product. Somalia is one of the least developed of the developing countries. It should be able to explain where that money came from.

198. The international community is also well aware that the invading army was none other than Somalia's army. In this regard I refer to a statement made by an official of the United States Department of State on 15 March this year, who said: "Between 25,000 and 35,000 Somali soldiers" I emphasize "soldiers" "withdrew from the Ogaden on 2 March 1978." I am sure that the Somali representative will not deny that corroboration, particularly when it comes from Somalia's new-found friend—or is it a case of the story of Berbera and the base? That statement attests to Somalia's abundant credibility.

199. Need I remind the General Assembly that Somalia's new aversion to socialist countries is nothing but a reflection of the unprincipled opportunism in which the present rulers of Somalia engage and in which, it appears, no one excels them? In this regard let me refer to a statement by the Head of State of Somalia, as reproduced

in a book entitled *My Country, My People: the Speeches of President Siad Barre 1969-74*. The following is what the President said on 10 July 1971, after becoming an alleged Marxist overnight:

"It has been agreed that anyone who opposed the principles of Marxism, allied himself with foreigners against it, or promoted tribalism should be hanged."

On 19 November 1971 he said:

"The Soviet people have extended disinterested assistance to newly independent countries to enable them to safeguard their sovereignty. This is in line with the immortal principles laid down by the great Lenin. We have always found in the USSR a close and sincere friend. We in Somalia have been engaged in nation-building on the basis of scientific socialism. We are convinced that socialism is the only system which can guarantee to our people human dignity."

200. Yet the same Head of State said in Amman on 23 January 1978:

"The West's attitude will encourage the Soviet Union and its allies to further augment their interventions and enable them to implement their criminal wars, and face the world with a fait accompli. This open Communist plan represents a threat not only to Somalia but to all those countries which have interests in the area, in addition to threatening world peace."

201. Let us compare that statement with the following, made in Mogadishu on 18 October 1971:

"Can the States who are NATO members claim to be friends of Africa? How can we trust them when we fully know that they will do anything within their means to deny the African people the achievement of their independence . . . ?"

202. Now the same Head of State, with the same persuasiveness, if not conviction, lauds the Western countries as champions of international peace and security, human freedom and dignity, and appeals to them not to lose their unique opportunity to use his country as an instrument for the domination of Africa.

203. As regards what the Somali representative described as the liberation movement, let me say that the same people that Somalia told us constituted a liberation movement it now describes as refugees. It has gathered its needy nationals and retreating army into relief camps and declared them refugees from Ethiopia. About a week ago there were 500,000. Today there are 600,000. Tomorrow there will be 1 million.

204. We can understand it if, as one of the least developed of the developing countries, Somalia needs international assistance, but I say to Somalia; "Please do not use the name of Ethiopia in asking for international assistance if you are in need."

205. Secondly, the Somali representative referred to the resolutions of the OAU and the Declaration of the

non-aligned countries, and said that what we had stated here had not been supported. Let me quote from the political part of the Belgrade Declaration of 1978, in which the Foreign Ministers:

"... recall the special significance of the following principles and objectives: ... non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries; non-intervention; inviolability of legally established international boundaries . . .". [See A/33/206, annex I, para. 12.]

This is what the Council of Ministers of the OAU said in resolution 635 (XXXI), of its thirty-first ordinary session, held in Khartoum in July this year:

"Conscious of the inalienable right of every State to take any measures it deems necessary to safeguard its sovereignty, freedom and independence and protect its security . . .". [See A/33/235 and Corr.1, annex I, p. 24.]

Then, paragraph 3 of resolution 641 (XXXI) reads:

"Declares that peace and security of African States are contingent upon strict adherence to the principles of peoples' right to self-determination and independence and of non-interference, territorial integrity, inviolability of frontiers, non-recourse to the use of force and non-recognition of territorial acquisition by use of force . . .". [Ibid., p. 31.]

206. In the light of those clear declarations by the OAU and the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, I need not go further and try to contradict what my friend from Somalia is saying.

207. Mr. MUJEZINOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): We have just witnessed an unprecedented incident, caused by the representative of Israel, who attacked the high office of the President of the General Assembly. He qualified a statement by the Temporary President of the thirty-third session as a "grave violation of the . . . impartiality traditionally associated with" that high office. In the same breath the representative of Israel described the statement by the Deputy Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia as having echoed the same ideas as those in the statement by the Temporary President with regard to the situation in the Middle East.

208. Attacks by representatives of Israel against Yugoslavia are nothing new nor do they surprise us: what else could one expect from representatives of a régime which, through a policy of aggression, occupation and annexation and the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people, has been constantly violating the Charter of the United Nations, the rules of international law, the provisions of the Geneva and The Hague Conventions and the basic principles of humanity for many years, and which totally ignores the demands of the absolute majority of States Members of United Nations with regard to the Middle East crisis and the rights of the Palestinian people.

209. I am sure that all representatives will understand that the provocative attacks of Israeli representative against the high office of the presidency have come as no surprise and are in contravention of the high esteem and respect felt for

the Temporary President of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, whose work and whose conduct of the proceedings have been highly valued by all Members of this noble Organization. I am sure, Mr. President, that you will find the most proper and suitable way to protect the authority of the high office of the presidency from such unfounded and unwarranted attacks.

210. As far as our position towards the Middle East crisis is concerned, there is no need for me to repeat it now, because it is very well known to all representatives. We shall continue actively to work in favour of a comprehensive solution of the Middle East crisis based on the following principle: total Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in the June 1967 war; realization of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation, including the right to establish a State of their own and the right to return to their homes; and, lastly, the right of every country in the region to live in peace and security.

211. Those principles, accepted by the whole international community, were expressed in the speech of the Temporary President of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and by the Deputy Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia. If we are characterized as partial, it is because we adhere to these principles—principles which we shall support in the future until a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis has been found.

212. Mr. DESSANDE (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): I do not know why my colleague and brother, the Permanent Representative of Libya, insists on repeating what he has already said on several other occasions: in the Security Council, and before that in the meeting of the African group of States when I was explaining the situation prevailing in Chad. He repeats it to the point of trying the patience of this Assembly.

213. My delegation wanted to provide international opinion with important information on the turn of events in Chad. In so doing, we invited the Members of our Organization to listen closely to that information, and that was all. We wish to reassure you that we will not present an unseemly spectacle in this Assembly.

214. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Seemingly, the Israeli representative saw fit to involve many countries and to open a debate, on the pretext of coming to this high rostrum to exercise his right of reply. I am therefore compelled to answer his remarks. Although I do not intend to go into detail, I would merely like to say the following.

215. My Foreign Minister stated the well-known and long-known Hungarian position in the general debate this year concerning the issue of the Middle East and a Middle East settlement. Although I have the provisional record of that meeting in front of me, I shall not repeat his words. For the sake of the record, however, I would merely refer representatives to the 10th plenary meeting. His statement may be found in paragraphs 65 to 107.

216. Secondly, I should like to say that, in my view, the Israeli representative was not in order in coming to the rostrum on the pretext of exercising his right of reply this morning, because he merely wanted to open a debate on the Middle East. As far as I know—and he might know this as well, as do most representatives present here—the agenda we have adopted for the plenary meetings contains an appropriate item on the subject, and I am sure there will be ample time, during the consideration of that item, to discuss all the questions referring to the Middle East.

217. Thirdly, I should like to make the point that I am happy and proud that our political position is entirely different from the Israeli position, and I am proud to state that our position, as has been emphasized, has coincided with the positions of many other delegations, on this as on earlier occasions. I am fairly sure that the overwhelming majority of this Assembly will again find it timely to condemn the Israeli aggression in the Middle East and to stand for the right of the Palestinian people, and for unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories which were occupied by Israel in 1967. I am also quite sure that this Assembly will reaffirm its position in favour of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the human rights of the people living in the area.

218. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): That statement concludes the general debate. I should like to emphasize the exceptional importance of the debate in which the largest number of delegations in the history of our Organization has participated, some of them through their Heads of State, Prime Ministers or Ministers for Foreign Affairs. This indicates the high degree of universality achieved by the United Nations. It may be said quite unequivocally that all regions of the earth are represented here—all the different races, cultures, civilizations and philosophical and political systems.

219. In the General Assembly all have had an opportunity to state freely their various positions on the problems which concern the international community.

220. I should like to express appreciation to those who spoke in the general debate for the unquestionably high intellectual level of their remarks on the various items which have occupied and still occupy the attention of the Assembly. Our Organization has thus demonstrated its undoubted political maturity. I hope that this same spirit will prevail throughout our deliberations.

221. I should like to thank personally those speakers who expressed congratulations on my election as President of the General Assembly. I interpret this honour as one conferred on my country's tradition of international policy: on its respect for the self-determination of peoples, its support for the process of decolonization and the struggle against *apartheid*, its defence of human rights and its constant concern for the serious imbalances in the international economic order. I have participated in a modest way in the formulation of this policy and, in accepting the congratulations, I trust that they may augur well for our future collaboration as the work of the Assembly proceeds.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.