

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2152nd MEETING: 21 JUNE 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2152)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letters dated 13 June 1979 and 15 June 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13394 and S/13397)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2152nd MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 21 June 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2152)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letters dated 13 June 1979 and 15 June 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13394 and S/13397)

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letters dated 13 June 1979 and 15 June 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13394 and S/13397)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2151st meeting, I invite the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table and the representative of Algeria, Benin and Madagascar to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Filali (Morocco) took a place at the Council table and Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Houngavou (Benin) and Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Mauritania and Zaire in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Taya (Mauritania) and Mr. Buketi Bukayi (Zaire) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

4. Mr. BEDJAOU (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me on behalf of the delegation of Algeria to congratulate you most warmly on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. It is for us a matter of satisfaction to note that with your guidance the Council has already successfully concluded debates on such important problems as the situation in Cyprus and the deterioration of the situation in Southern Lebanon as a result of the repeated acts of aggression of Israel. Despite the number of problems that remain in the agenda for June, and in particular the question of Namibia, whose resolution more than ever remains linked to the long-awaited decision on sanctions to be instituted by the Council against the illegal occupation régime of South Africa, we are confident that you will guide the Council debates with the same prudence and wisdom, the same experience, that of an eminent and respected diplomat, and the same authority in the promotion of the ideals of justice, peace and progress with which our Organization has been concerned since it came into being.

5. The Algerian delegation also wishes to congratulate your predecessor as President of the Council, Mr. Futscher Pereira, the Permanent Representative of Portugal. Mr. Futscher Pereira had to preside over the meetings of the month of May, and he did so with all the more competence and skill inasmuch as the informal consultations, which were as numerous as they were difficult, on the question of Namibia required of him endurance, ability and skill in conducting a dialogue that earned him the respect and esteem of all the Members of the Organization. Moreover, we cannot forget that he represents a country that had the courage and the merit of breaking with a very ancient colonial tradition and which has presented to the international community an attractive picture of realism and of new relations among nations, on the basis, in particular, of strict respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

6. I should like at the very outset to express the Algerian delegation's satisfaction that I have been given this opportunity to address the Council and to express Algeria's feelings about a question which, at least since 1966, has been of concern not only to my country but also to the United

Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned movement. I must say that, thanks to the efforts of the countries of the north-western region of Africa—efforts which at that time were united and convergent—this question, that is, the question of the decolonization of Western Sahara, seemed to be a natural part of the application of a peaceful process. That was so because it is a fact that all the countries concerned, linked by relations of brotherhood and co-operation, had ensured that higher interests, in conformity with the nature of peoples and the ideals of the Charters of the United Nations and OAU, would prevail. That lofty view of matters was based on the constant recognition by everyone of this principle: the right to self-determination of a neighbouring country in regard to which there had been a spontaneous manifestation of brotherly solidarity, forged in a common culture and a common experience of sacrifice and struggle. Unfortunately, through an about-face rarely equalled in history, covetousness took the upper hand over obligations that had been undertaken, to the point that, regrettably, our region has been drawn into an adventure that has created tensions and fratricidal confrontations of which the Saharan people have been the primary victims.

7. That is the focal point of the problem, but the desire today is to make us consider only the fall-out from that problem—a fall-out which is certainly explosive but which, examined outside the context, could divert the Council's attention from its responsibility of guaranteeing international peace and security. And in this specific case, that responsibility includes the effective exercise of the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination, a right it has been recognized as having by the Organization and which only Morocco continues to ignore, thereby provoking constant tension in the region.

8. All the delegations have been conjecturing about the real meaning of Morocco's initiative in the Council. No one finds it justified by the recent fighting within Moroccan territory because, on the one hand, this is not the first time that such operations have taken place and, on the other and above all, everyone knows that they are the inevitable result of a Moroccan policy of military occupation of the territory of the people of Western Sahara.

9. This Moroccan initiative has seemed even more surprising to a number of delegations because in two days there will be a meeting of the OAU *Ad Hoc* Committee and in two weeks the summit conference of OAU will take place at Monrovia—and, decidedly, Morocco seems to pay only lip service to the recognition that those bodies will demonstrate the wisdom necessary to solve the explosive problem Morocco has created in the region through the occupation and partition of Western Sahara.

10. All the delegations, and principally those of the Arab and African Groups, tried to dissuade Morocco from bringing this matter before the Council. In that respect, it is a secret to no one that the African Group, in particular, made more than praiseworthy efforts to obtain Morocco's agreement not to take this action, which entailed the risk of offering the astonishing paradox of the Moroccan aggressor

against the Saharan people being turned into the alleged victim of aggression today.

11. The situation is clear. The Security Council adopted three resolutions in 1975 on this very matter of Western Sahara. In one of them, resolution 380 (1975), it deplored Morocco's invasion of Western Sahara and, it will be remembered, called upon Morocco to withdraw immediately from that Territory. Having heeded neither the requests nor the orders of the Council, Morocco comes back here four years later, as though justice demanded this. But it is not here to admit the tragic errors of a policy of annexation which the Council had already, in 1975, known was doomed to failure; it is here to ask the Council to follow it in its vain search for a scapegoat. An aggressor claiming to be the victim of aggression, it wishes to add one more error to that of 1975—and it is hard to say which is the more tragic of the two—an error which in any case can bring chaos to the entire region. The international community is profoundly concerned at this repetition of political and military errors and this persistence in a disaster-seeking policy for which the Moroccan people and all the peoples of the region are made to pay.

12. I have too much respect for the exalted mission of the Council to be led into a debate which has nothing to do with the substance of the problem which the delegation of Morocco has sought to cast aside. It is nothing more than a problem of decolonization concerning a specific and geographically well-defined territory, the Western Sahara, and a clearly identified people, the Saharan people.

13. All that was said yesterday to take the problem out of this context seems to me to have been a regrettable waste of time. There was a wild rush to mask the failure of an adventurous policy of expansionism and a vain quest for a scapegoat to make others responsible for the political and military deadlock in which Morocco unhappily finds itself as a result of its occupation of a territory which is totally alien to it. All that was heard yesterday can in no way alter the obstinate fact that Morocco remains an illegitimate military occupier which is stifling the voice of a martyr people fighting for its national independence.

14. The most elementary analysis, furthermore, requires that we should place the occupation of Western Sahara within the framework of a broader, planned scheme of regional expansionism that as such is all the more disquieting and intolerable. Moroccan expansionism since 1956 has never taken the trouble to disguise itself. It is now revealed with all the political actions of the expansionists. Who does not recall the diplomatic battles and military skirmishes of the 1960s over the Moroccan claim to incorporate Mauritania itself? Who can forget the notorious maps of "Greater Morocco" annexing part of Algeria, all of Western Sahara, which was then under Spanish occupation, the entire territory of Mauritania, part of Mali and a part of Senegal itself?

15. Our concern is therefore legitimately increased by reason of the annexationist greed and the expansionist ambitions already achieved in some places and on the way to achievement elsewhere, thus creating a grave situation of

conflict on the borders of Algeria which is dangerous for the peace and stability of the entire region.

16. Any State Member of the United Nations certainly has the right to request a meeting of the Security Council and it is not in any way the intention of the Algerian delegation to deny that right to anyone. But the Moroccan delegation, which bases its action on what it claims is aggression by Algeria, while no material proof has been produced in support of that accusation, does not have the right either to waste the valuable time of the Council with an unfounded request or to attempt to divert the attention of the international community from the true facts of the question of Western Sahara.

17. For in point of fact, as is well known, a diversionary scheme has been devised here at great expense to distract us from the problem of the decolonization of Western Sahara. Thus, Algeria has been accused of militarily intervening in this affair in which occupiers and occupied are pitted against each other. Algeria cannot allow itself to be accused so lightly and inconsistently and the United Nations—and the Security Council in particular—cannot allow itself to be diverted by such a tactic which strives to bring it into a pernicious debate and to cause it to lose sight of the substance of the problem, which is and remains that of the decolonization of a Territory and the self-determination of its people.

18. Mr. President, the Government of Morocco felt it necessary to address two letters to you which claim to report acts of war within the territory of Morocco and it is trying to place the blame on my country. The representative of Algeria, in his letter of 16 June [S/13399], clearly and energetically refuted those gratuitous accusations. In its statement yesterday [2151st meeting], as was to be expected, the delegation of Morocco was not able to support any of those claims. How then can one refrain from being indignant at such a shocking attempt to divert the attention of the international community from the true facts of the problem and thus blame my country for the tragic consequences of acts of a policy of annexation and expansion?

19. The delegation of Morocco, which knows full well that the Algerian army has never crossed the Algerian-Moroccan border, has mistaken its opponents, which it sometimes describes as “mercenaries” and sometimes as “armed bands” so as not to have to name the fighters of the POLISARIO Front, whose mastery in the field, military initiative and methods of combat enable them to extend the area of fighting into the very territory of the aggressor. Perhaps we should recall that it was from that same town of Tantan that Morocco’s aggressive expedition against the Saharan people set out in 1975. So who can, in good faith, reproach or blame men who are denied an internationally recognized right and who are the victims of a permanent aggression for seeking to destroy the rearguard bases of their adversaries and to weaken their logistical support?

20. Rather, we should see in these deeds proof that POLISARIO broadly controls the Territory of Western Sahara, an important part of which it has effectively liberated and in which it has installed its own fighting bases. The acts of war

reported by the Moroccan delegation, whose mere listing curiously suffices in their eyes to implicate Algeria, are but tangible manifestations of the struggle for liberation of the people of Western Sahara.

21. If there have been acts of aggression in the Western Sahara affair, they occurred when Morocco invaded the territory of the Saharan people, occupied it militarily and partitioned it. Now, the Declaration contained in resolution 2625 (XXV), to which the Moroccan delegation referred yesterday, specifies that

“The territory of a colony or other Non-Self-Governing Territory has, under the Charter, a status separate and distinct . . . [which] shall exist until the people of the colony or Non-Self-Governing Territory have exercised their right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter, and particularly its purposes and principles.”

Thus violating this statute, which can be invoked against all comers so long as the people of Sahara have not freely acceded to self-determination, the Moroccan Government invaded the Territory. In so doing, it clearly contravened resolution 2625 (XXV), which the representative of Morocco very rashly quoted yesterday and which further specifies that

“Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples . . . of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence.”

22. Unfortunately for the Moroccan delegation, it could cite in support of its thesis only the texts of resolutions which incriminate rather than absolve the Moroccan Government. Resolution 2635 (XXV) was followed by resolution 3314 (XXIX), on the definition of aggression, which Morocco cited but which, again, condemns it. Not only does Morocco practise a policy of expansionism which it has vainly sought to have endorsed; what is more, it poses as the victim of aggression, whereas it obstinately persists in refusing to allow the people of Western Sahara to exercise its right to an independent existence. Indeed, ever since the very first day it assumed a grave responsibility by invading the territory of the Saharan people, Morocco could not be considered as anything but an aggressor State, with all the legal consequences of such a qualification, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations. In particular, resolution 3314 (XXIX) considers as a case of flagrant aggression the use of armed force to deprive peoples, such as the people of Western Sahara, of their right to self-determination and independence. That same resolution 3314 (XXIX), echoing resolution 2625 (XXV), emphasizes the legitimacy of the support given to peoples which, like the people of Western Sahara, are fighting in such circumstances to win their right to self-determination against armies of invasion. “. . . Such peoples [affirms resolution 2625 (XXV)] are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter”.

23. Hence the Saharan people have the right to turn to the Security Council and to call on it for support in order to repulse its aggressors and to achieve its independence. Now,

what does Morocco do? In a demonstration of astounding blindness, it describes that people and its legitimate and exclusive representative, the POLISARIO, as "mercenaries" armed by Algeria. And at the same time, by absurdly and ineffectively lumping everything together, Morocco believes, on the one hand, that it can rid itself of the question of the decolonization of Western Sahara, whose territory it has annexed and whose people it is muzzling, denying the existence of its legitimate representatives, and, on the other hand, that it can blame Algeria for the desperately grave situation into which it has plunged the region as a result of the mistakes of a sinister policy doomed by history to failure.

24. And yet Morocco seeks to buttress its position by citing resolutions 2625 (XXV) and 3314 (XXIX), which clearly point out to it the limits beyond which it cannot go without becoming an aggressor State. The Security Council, in November 1975, called on Morocco to withdraw from the Western Sahara. Seven months later, in June 1976, the Organization of African Unity, in turn, taking up where the Council had left off, by the resolution adopted by the Council of African Ministers at its session at Port-Louis, demanded

"the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces of occupation and respect for the territorial integrity of the Western Sahara and for the national sovereignty of the Saharan people" [*S/12141 of 14 July 1976, annex I*].

25. In its statement yesterday, the Moroccan delegation, with consummate scorn, reduced the Saharan people and its legitimate and exclusive representative, the POLISARIO, to "mercenaries". Have the international community, the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned countries thus made a gross mistake in recognizing the right to self-determination of Western Sahara, its territory and its people and representatives? By thus insulting that people and its representatives, has not the Moroccan delegation impugned the honour of the international community, which only yesterday at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, vigorously reaffirmed the right of the people of Western Sahara to independence and welcomed the cease-fire unilaterally decreed by POLISARIO so as to start a peace process in the region? Did not a Moroccan magazine closely associated with the USFP [*Union socialiste des forces populaires*], *Lamalif*, in its issue No. 103 of last January, just after the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, characterize these results as a total failure of Moroccan policy?

26. The Council has taken the decision to hear Mr. Madjid Abdallah, the representative of POLISARIO in New York. He is one of those described by the delegation of Morocco as "mercenaries". I leave it to members to judge the esteem the delegation of Morocco has for the Council.

27. From what I have set forth before the Council since the beginning of my statement, it is clear that Morocco, which does not stop at demonstrating the existence of facts for which it falsely blames Algeria, is deliberately mixing up different things. The goal it seeks is clear. By invoking what it claims is a legitimate right of self-defence without previously demonstrating the existence of an attack on the part

of Algeria, Morocco is trying to justify in advance an act of aggression it is preparing against my country. Taking refuge behind Article 51 of the Charter, which manifestly does not apply in this case, Morocco is preparing to commit armed aggression against Algeria, thus violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country, adding to the aggression committed against the Saharan people since 1975 a further aggression against a neighbouring State and assuming the historical responsibility for unleashing a conflict with incalculable consequences for the security and stability of a large part of the African continent.

28. Invoking Article 51 of the Charter, which permits the exercise of the right of legitimate self-defence, is here as inappropriate and unjustified as the so-called "right of pursuit" with which Morocco is threatening Algeria. The right of pursuit, which cannot be dissociated from colonialism, is directly linked in its manifestations to the pouncings of occupying forces in reaction to national liberation struggles. It is one of the intolerable semblances of legality which colonialism tries to impose, conferring legal validity on all forms of violence in opposition to the emancipation movement of peoples. Having been rejected along with other errors of the past, the right to pursuit is now being resurrected and therefore given another lease of life, thanks, unfortunately, to Morocco. A favourite weapon of the colonial forces of the past, and now a preferred instrument of violence for Israel and the racist Pretoria and Salisbury régimes against the peoples of Lebanon, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Angola, the right of pursuit is a prime example of an act of "unqualified and premeditated armed aggression", in the words of Mr. Mongi Slim to the Council on 2 June 1958 [*819th meeting*]. The right of pursuit, a dusty argument of the colonial Powers which Morocco has pulled out of the imperialist legal scrap-heap to invoke against Algeria, recalls to us the horrors of the massacre of thousands of innocent civilians in southern Africa, victims of haughty white racist power.

29. Morocco is seeking no more and no less than to have the Council legitimize and legalize this deadly right of pursuit. In so doing, it is striving to liquidate Saharan resistance and at the same time trying to provide South Africa and Rhodesia with a legal precedent to allow them to attack front-line countries such as Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Botswana and to permit Israel to attack the PLO with impunity in Lebanon.

30. What Morocco threatens to unleash against my country is nothing but an attempt to justify the extermination of any national liberation movement wherever it is, while at the same time seeking to destabilize the countries which offer asylum and assistance to these national liberation movements. In behaving in this manner, Morocco, whether voluntarily or not, is joining the camp of the aggressor régimes in southern Africa, which regularly undertake the same kind of reprisals against the front-line countries of Africa, particularly, I repeat, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Angola, which are also accused of coming to the assistance of national liberation movements.

31. By coming to justify in advance its aggression against my country, Morocco is at the same time giving an addi-

tional argument to these régimes of southern Africa, just as it is providing additional satisfaction to Israel, in their respective actions of reprisals against the Patriotic Front, SWAPO and PLO. My delegation wishes to declare this here before the Security Council, which has already had on several occasions to consider complaints of countries such as Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Lebanon, the victims of aggression.

32. The step taken by Morocco is part and parcel of the logic of rushing to escape one's responsibilities, and this is serious. In his message of 4 October 1978 addressed to the Moroccan head of State, a copy of which was addressed to the Secretary-General, the head of the Algerian State declared:

"... I can assure Your Majesty, in the name of the indissoluble bonds which will always exist between our two peoples, that no Algerian soldier has ever crossed the national frontiers, particularly those which we agreed upon together in 1972. Moreover, only a few months ago, I solemnly declared before the People's National Assembly that the Algerian armed forces would not in any case intervene beyond our frontiers and that, vigilant guardians of our national sovereignty and territorial integrity, they would stand by to repel any attack against our country. This policy remains unchanged."¹

33. In the circumstances, Algeria places on the authorities of Morocco total responsibility for the inevitable consequences which would flow from the violation of our frontiers, just as the President of the Republic of Algeria recalled once more in his message of 9 June last to the President of the Sudan, current President of OAU. It is in these circumstances also that on the same day, 9 June, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria addressed, in the same spirit, a message to the Secretary-General. In addition to the order given by the King of Morocco to his armed forces to exercise their so-called right of pursuit, there are now the letters of 13 and 15 June 1979 [S/13394 and S/13397] in which Morocco brings before the Council its complaint of an alleged aggression, thus clearly revealing the Moroccan plan which casts threats of exceptional gravity over Algeria and the region.

34. It is really quite easy to unmask what we must call the Moroccan manoeuvre of which they have tried to make the Security Council itself a witness. The proof which the representative of Morocco has attempted to set before us is really a rather thin veil through which we can clearly perceive the true problem of Western Sahara, a problem of decolonization frustrated, the struggle for freedom of the Saharan people, which the Moroccan authorities find it increasingly difficult to conceal from their own people and in which the royal army suffers with increasing hardship.

35. So blatantly to attack Algeria and accuse it of aggression is a means as deplorable as it is vain of falsifying the facts and making another country bear the responsibility for the original crime of which Morocco is guilty in invading Western Sahara in 1975—thus defying the Security Council—occupying and partitioning its territory and then

annexing it in defiance of all the relevant decisions of the international community and of all the principles on which our action, our work and the existence of our Organization are based.

36. Morocco is now claiming to be the defender of principles of international law. As I recalled earlier, we have also heard them refer to certain important texts which the Organization has drafted for the benefit of peoples and of which it can be justly proud. But the delegation of Morocco was a little too selective in its reading of those texts. Allow me, in the context of what concerns us, to put before the Moroccan delegation for further consideration a paragraph of one of the declarations which it quoted. Following is paragraph 18 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], which

"Calls upon all states to desist from any forcible or other action which deprives peoples, in particular those still under colonial or any other form of external domination, of their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence and to refrain from military and repressive measures aimed at preventing the attainment of independence by all dependent peoples in accordance with the Charter and in furtherance of the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, and render assistance to the United Nations and, in accordance with the Charter, to the oppressed peoples in their legitimate struggle in order to bring about the speedy elimination of colonialism or any other form of external domination."

37. Likewise, resolution 3314 (XXIX), which the delegation of Morocco recalled and to which I too have referred, and which contains the definition of aggression, deserves more thorough consideration by the delegation of Morocco, particularly the provision on the duty of States not to resort to the use of armed force to deprive peoples of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence, to say nothing of the resolutions which recognize the right of peoples subject to colonial and racist régimes and other forms of foreign domination to seek support in their struggle.

38. The Minister of the Cherifian Kingdom also referred to the resolution by which the United Nations marked and celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization, that is, resolution 2625 (XXV), mentioned earlier, which contains the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. I would remind the Council of the most relevant provisions which have bearing on the problem of the decolonization of Western Sahara, which is at the core of the crisis from which the region has been suffering for four years. The Declaration provides that "the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a major obstacle to the promotion of international peace and security". Thus the relationship between foreign domination and threats to international peace and security is clearly perceived. Thus one can also remind Morocco that the primary cause of the tension in the region is the military occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco.

¹ See A/33/289, annex.

39. That same resolution recalls that the right of peoples to self-determination is a fundamental principle which is not to be breached and that "its effective application is of paramount importance for the promotion of friendly relations among States". Various resolutions of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned countries have called on Morocco to implement that provision and finally allow the Saharan people to exercise their right to self-determination. It is the act that for four years Morocco has not budged and has refused to recognize that the Saharan people has that right in accordance with the terms of the resolution that I have quoted and which Morocco too has quoted, which hinders the promotion of friendly relations among States in the region and constitutes the "major obstacle" to the attainment of peace and security in north-west Africa. It is also the same resolution that specifies, for the benefit of Morocco which unfortunately has forgotten it, that "every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples . . . of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence", as has happened today in the case of the people of Western Sahara.

40. We could go on with this exercise for a long time and in greater detail regarding all the texts quoted by Morocco. It would prove its rather bizarre reading and selective understanding of such important documents. Yet I have no doubt that the members of this body, having been to the highest degree involved in their drafting, are fully aware of the significance and meaning of the texts and therefore cannot be imposed upon.

41. Algeria has never committed any of the acts of which it has been so lightly accused by Morocco and there is no proof of the deeds of which we have been accused because they did not take place. Indeed, Algeria has no reason to embark on so irresponsible an adventure against a neighbouring State. Since 1975 and the military occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania, Algeria has maintained its composure and kept calm even when the threats and provocations which replaced the invective brought forth by political frustration, became clearer. But Algeria wishes to reaffirm once again that it has never departed from its duty to provide support, assistance to and solidarity with the peoples that are struggling for their national rights, and we deeply regret seeing that our erstwhile brothers in arms are turning their backs on the heritage of a common struggle to take up where the aggressors left off and to deny the existence of another brother people whom we were all hastening to welcome into the Maghreb family.

42. Algeria worked tirelessly in order that Morocco should recognize the official existence of Mauritania that for many long years it denied, and we might be right in not despairing of that same Morocco's one day recognizing, elsewhere than on the battlefield, the existence of the Saharan people.

43. In this respect, the attitude of the new leaders of Mauritania provides for us—at least, we hope—a reason to believe in the future of our region, provided that their example is clearly understood. And when there is talk of the

fraternal feeling among the peoples of the Maghreb—as there was yesterday—it should be of a brotherhood that had its roots in history and that must always be based on respect for the independence of each people whatever may be the size of its territory or of its population. In no way can recalling history serve to justify annexation and occupation.

44. Morocco has consistently opposed and considered null and void all United Nations initiatives and decisions aimed at guaranteeing to the people of Western Sahara satisfaction of their national fundamental rights. Thus, for example, the mission entrusted by the United Nations to Ambassador Rydbeck could not be successfully concluded because of Rabat's refusal to receive the representative of the Secretary-General.

45. It would thus seem to us that the Security Council could usefully examine the consequences for peace and security in the region flowing from the persistent refusal of Morocco—in contrast to Mauritania, it would seem—to implement the decisions of the United Nations and of OAU regarding the self-determination of the Saharan people.

46. Morocco pretends that it wants to refer the matter of Western Sahara to the *Ad Hoc* Committee of OAU, according to what its representative said. According to the terms of the resolution adopted at Khartoum last July by the African heads of state, the Committee must consider "all the data on the question of Western Sahara" including "the exercise of the right of the people of this Territory to self-determination", in order to allow the convening of "an extraordinary summit meeting devoted to the question of Western Sahara". It seems that Morocco has suddenly discovered the virtues of the wisdom of OAU and its organs. And yet it is Morocco which has always systematically obstructed any action on the part of OAU. It is Morocco which left the room at the African summit held at Port-Louis in 1976 when the heads of State decided to convene an extraordinary summit meeting devoted to the question of Western Sahara. It was Morocco again which sought in vain to prevent the General Assembly in the course of its last two sessions from debating the question of Western Sahara. And it was Morocco which, last year at Belgrade and recently at Colombo, in the non-aligned movement, tried to delete that item from the agenda of our debates, claiming that the *Ad Hoc* Committee was seized of the matter, but without doing anything to facilitate the task of OAU for almost four years or that of the *Ad Hoc* Committee for a year. From conference to conference, it is Morocco which has been practising a policy of obstruction, so as not to have to give an accounting of its illegal occupation of the Saharan territory and the extermination of its people. It is Morocco, finally, which despite pressing appeals made by the African Group for several days here, has refused—as I have mentioned earlier—to drop its submission of the matter to the Security Council.

47. Thus, despite the statements dictated by political opportunism in favour of the efforts of OAU the "closed-file" argument that is always invoked by Morocco is tantamount to a refusal to seek any solution apart from annexation and partition.

48. Yesterday it affirmed that it had submitted a request concerning "a specific time and place". By limiting its request to that specific time and place, Morocco was trying artificially to isolate from their context the most recent manifestations of the struggle waged by the POLISARIO Front since the Moroccan troops invaded the Territory of Western Sahara. According to that approach, the Council was supposed to concentrate on the events that have taken place within the internationally recognized borders of Morocco. Indeed, the representative of Morocco specified that he was referring to localities "completely outside Western Sahara". Even though Morocco persists in considering a part of the Territory it occupies by force a "Saharan province", it is worth pointing out that it itself makes a distinction between what I would call the "metropolis" and the "colony", thus following a logic familiar to us all: the logic of colonial Powers.

49. Nevertheless, one State that was a party to that partition now recognizes that the tension in the region has as its real cause the violation of the principle of self-determination and the policy of military fait accompli. This healthy awareness and the willingness proclaimed by Mauritania to begin by dialogue and negotiation to make up for the damage caused to the people of Western Sahara thus provide a response to the initiative for a cease-fire taken by the POLISARIO Front in July 1978.

50. We must also point out at the same time the clearer and more consistent attitude adopted by the former administering Power which, by recognizing the POLISARIO Front as the legitimate representative of the Saharan people, has recalled the urgent need to ensure for that people the exercise of its right to self-determination.

51. In this context, which is favourable to the search for a peaceful solution, OAU has also been able to regain the initiative to undertake its mission, through the *Ad Hoc* Committee set up at the Khartoum summit, to guarantee

the application of the principle of self-determination for the benefit of the people of Western Sahara.

52. Algeria wishes to emphasize that the problem of Western Sahara is a political problem that calls for a political solution. That solution has been the subject of thorough debates both regionally and internationally, debates in which it was clearly established that the only basis for a solution are serious guarantees of the effective implementation of the fundamental right to self-determination by means of a free and authentic referendum.

53. Algeria makes a solemn and urgent appeal to the Security Council to exercise all its authority, power and prestige so as to make a decisive contribution to the multiple efforts to bring back peace to north-west Africa, a peace based on the right of the Western Saharan people to self-determination and independence.

54. To safeguard peace and security in our region, the Council must also seriously warn Morocco against any new attempt to have the international community as a whole set the Saharan question aside. Morocco must be warned of the dangerous and dramatic consequences of its declarations and threats against Algeria.

55. Algeria has always adamantly defended its sovereignty, its security and the integrity of its territory. Accordingly, we shall take all measures that may be required by any situation, and we shall meet any aggression.

56. While this is a particularly grave time, Algeria will maintain that calm that arises from its sense of responsibility and its faith in the common destiny of the peoples of the region. We wish members of the Council to witness our message.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经营处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
