

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records*



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

46th meeting

held on

Tuesday, 7 December 1982

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WVRR)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 69: QUESTION OF THE MALAGASY ISLANDS OF GLORIEUSES, JUAN DE NOVA, EUROPA AND BASSAS DA INDIA

AGENDA ITEM 70: QUESTION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE RELEVANT ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

AGENDA ITEM 68: ISRAEL'S DECISION TO BUILD A CANAL LINKING THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA TO THE DEAD SEA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcos Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 69: QUESTION OF THE MALAGASY ISLANDS OF GLORIEUSES, JUAN DE NOVA, EUROPA AND BASSAS DA INDIA

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, following consultations with interested parties, in particular with the representatives of France and Madagascar, it had been decided to request that consideration of the item should be deferred until the next session. Accordingly, he suggested the adoption of a draft decision requesting the General Assembly to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision.
2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 70: QUESTION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE RELEVANT ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

3. The CHAIRMAN said that no delegation had asked to speak on the item. He therefore suggested that the Committee should recommend the General Assembly to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that recommendation.
4. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 68: ISRAEL'S DECISION TO BUILD A CANAL LINKING THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA TO THE DEAD SEA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/37/328 and Corr.1)

5. Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) made a statement.*
6. Mr. HUSSAINI (Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the United Nations experts should have interviewed the Palestinian landowners and farmers in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip whose lands would be affected by the building of the canal. The Israeli decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea was a clear violation of the Camp David Agreements and clearly showed that Israel wanted to go ahead with the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. An article on the canal project which had appeared in the Jerusalem Post of 25 November 1982 had stated that the broad, all-encompassing scope of Herzl's vision offered an historic opportunity to marshal the commitment and personal involvement of all sections of the Jewish people, all branches of the Zionist movement, and all age groups.
7. Water was the most important resource for human survival in the Middle East; it was the source of agricultural development and therefore the basis of life for

* The full text of the statement made by the representative of Jordan will be issued in document A/SPC/37/PV.46.

(Mr. Hussaini)

the inhabitants of the region. The Palestinian people depended on water for survival in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. Consequently, denying them access to their water resources would literally mean killing them. The Begin Government had publicly declared, in contravention of the Camp David Agreements, that it would control all water resources in the occupied territories. The Israeli military authorities had already taken over Palestinian wells and underground water resources and diverted them to the illegal Israeli settlements. Mr. Mattar, a Palestinian expert on the economy of the West Bank, writing in the Jerusalem Post in 1981, had stated that the Israelis had drilled at least 20 wells, using the water for the irrigation of the land seized by the Israeli settlers. A number of those wells had been drilled close to Arab springs, contrary to Jordanian laws regulating the drilling of new wells. The Israelis had not only been developing new wells and thus taking the scarce water resources for their own exclusive use; they had also, since 1967, placed a ban on the drilling of new Arab wells for irrigation purposes. In brief, the occupation forces were not only using a resource that did not belong to them but also preventing the indigenous population from developing its own.

8. Moreover, Mr. Benvenisti, Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, had, in his report on the occupied West Bank, provided documentary proof of the policy of the Israeli Government, which was attempting to take over Palestinian water resources. He had written that in the Jordan Valley plans were being drawn up to supply water to 28 agricultural settlements, three industrial settlements and one urban settlement. In addition, a regional master plan for water was being prepared. The significance of those plans lay in the change of emphasis from the use of existing local water for the settlements to the development of an integrated system, in which the policy of the Israeli was one of rapid development of infrastructure for the Jewish settlements and the integration of the West Bank's water resources with the Israeli national grids.

9. The diversion of those water resources through the implementation of the Israeli project, apart from having grave consequences for the Palestinian population in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza, clearly showed that the Israeli Government did not want to withdraw from those territories. Moreover, the four nuclear reactors which Israel planned to build along the canal would lead to a danger of nuclear pollution. Those reactors would be used for military purposes, since Israel had refused to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The scientist Dr. Edward Teller was at present visiting Israel to give advice in the field of nuclear weapons. That was a most dangerous development. The valuable water resources of the region should be used for economic development and not for the development of nuclear weapons and reactors.

10. The United States Government should take steps to prevent Israel from developing its plans further and curtail the military and financial aid which it gave to Israel, for that aid was being used to sow death and destruction in the Middle East. It was astonishing that the United States Congress had decided to allocate a further \$148 million in aid to Israel. That was tantamount to rewarding

/...

(Mr. Hussaini)

it for its criminal policy in Lebanon and its oppression and occupation of the Arab territories. For the past 60 years, Israeli Zionist policy had been based on theft, just as Israel's existence was based on the destruction of the Palestinian people. Thousands of Palestinian inhabitants would have to leave the West Bank and Gaza to enable Israel to expand its settlements in those areas. It had been stated publicly that in the next five years Israel planned to settle half a million Jewish immigrants in those areas, that is to say, on lands confiscated from the Palestinians.

11. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said that the plan to build the canal was a very serious step which might complicate an already explosive situation. That initiative, whereby Israel would take control of all of the lands and resources of the Arab population, was nothing new, for at the end of the last century and before the Second World War the Zionist movement had already clearly proclaimed its intention to build canals in Palestine and had made a comprehensive survey of the watercourses in the territory. The recent measures taken clearly showed that the Zionists had not abandoned their criminal intentions and that they would shortly start building the canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea, regardless of the consequences which that might have for Arab farmers in the occupied territories and in neighbouring countries, as well as for the peace and security of the region.

12. Implementation of that project was a continuation of the policy which Israel had been pursuing for some time and which consisted of modifying the status of the occupied territories so as to achieve the objective of de-Arabizing those territories and establishing a purely Zionist entity. There was a clear link between the construction of a dam in the north of Palestine in order to allow the waters of the river Jordan to flow out through Galilee, and the construction of a canal feeding into the Dead Sea in order to make up for the water which the river Jordan used to bring before it was diverted from its normal course. The diversion of the waters of the Jordan had had disastrous consequences for Arab farmers who had been compelled to leave their lands. Construction of the canal would accelerate the de-Arabization process still further because of the new industrial Israeli cities which would be created and the flooding of neighbouring Arab lands. The occupation forces had thus succeeded in hastening the departure of Arab peasants and they were entirely free to extend their rule to all the occupied territories. Implementation of that plan affected not only the Arab farmers but also a neighbouring country, Jordan, which would also be threatened by nuclear contamination from the Israeli nuclear plant of DIMONA.

13. After violating the principle of international law which stated that a riverbed was a natural unit - by diverting the waters of the Jordan - the Zionist leaders had taken another step towards effecting the geological, legal and demographic change of the occupied Arab territories by deciding to build a canal which would alter still further the population and economic balance in the region. That act was even more serious if one took into account the fact that, under the international law applicable in wartime, sovereignty over the occupied territories continued to belong to the people which was temporarily unable to exercise that right until it acceded to independence.

(Mr. Baali, Algeria)

14. The General Assembly had repeatedly condemned the Israeli leaders and had urged them to initiate negotiations with a view to arriving at a just and lasting solution, based on the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal of occupation forces. Instead, the occupying Power was continuing to carry out more and more acts designed to achieve the zionisation of the occupied Arab territories. Once again, the United Nations must take steps to ensure that the tyranny and violence in the Middle East was replaced by a force for peace, co-operation and concord.

15. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) requested that, in view of its importance, the statement made by the delegation of Jordan be published in extenso.

16. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Assembly had continued the practice at the present session of allowing the Committee to reproduce some parts of its discussions in extenso; accordingly, the proposal did not involve any additional cost. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed that the statement by the representative of Jordan should be reproduced in extenso.

17. It was so decided.

18. Mr. AMR (Egypt) said that, had it not been for Israel's insistence that the canal it was planning to build should pass through the Gaza Strip and had it not been for the fact that it had taken no account of the interests of Jordan, the project would have been an internal Israeli affair. It was unfortunate that in their study (A/37/328, Annex) the group of experts had not indicated the impact which construction of the canal would have on the environment, the soils and the groundwater nor had they expressed an opinion regarding the technical considerations which made it imperative for the canal to be built inside the Gaza Strip instead of in Israeli territory. Noting that paragraph 5 of the report of the Secretary-General referred to a paper prepared by the Mediterranean-Dead Sea Company Limited, he said that it would have been a good idea for the Committee to have copies of all relevant studies.

19. His country was concerned at Israel's insistence that the starting point should be in the Gaza Strip, bearing in mind the fact that Egypt had been responsible for that region during the historic period from 1948 to 1967. He drew attention to the Fourth Geneva Convention and pointed out that occupation was merely a temporary situation and that no change could be made in the geographic or demographic structure of the territory. Nevertheless, Israel would have to occupy a strip of land eight and-a-half kilometres long in the Gaza Strip and, according to paragraph 69 of the report (A/37/328), part of that area would not be restored to its original state. That was not what the representative of Israel had said in his statement which had been distributed as document A/36/575. If the project was executed as planned permanent changes would be made in the Gaza Strip, not only geographical changes but also demographic changes since it would be necessary to evacuate the population and to bring in technicians and workers from Israel. Furthermore, the leakage of sea water would affect the quality of the groundwater. Israel would have to seize land on which to build the pumping stations, accordingly

/...

(Mr. Amr, Egypt)

the project contradicted General Assembly resolution 36/242. In his view, the problem was similar to that of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories for it violated international law and was a serious obstacle to a peaceful settlement. His delegation had expressed its opinion in a statement distributed under the symbol A/36/187. Could Israel not build a canal in its own territory by starting the works a few kilometres further north? Otherwise, he would be forced to assume that a political decision had been made and that Israel wished to impose a fait accompli. With regard to Jordan, the representative of that country had clearly explained, in his statement, how construction of the canal would damage his country.

20. As the representative of Jordan had pointed out, it was likely that the project would result in a lowering of the level of the Dead Sea, and that the raising of the water level in the evaporation ponds would involve expenditure amounting to \$60 million; likewise, making the necessary changes in the pumping stations, which, if the project were implemented, would be submerged, would require expenditure of \$50 million and a series of operations which were extremely difficult from the architectural and engineering standpoints. In addition, the Israeli project, which would introduce waters from the Mediterranean Sea into the Dead Sea, would change the chemical composition of the waters of the Dead Sea and that would have serious consequences on the extraction of potash. Furthermore, the rise in the level of the Dead Sea would lead to flooding of facilities, lands and some mining projects on the Jordanian side, threatening the exploration for natural gas which Jordan was carrying out on that bank of the Dead Sea. Invaluable archeological sites would also be submerged and, as had been pointed out in paragraph 35 of the report (A/37/328, Annex) the filling of the Dead Sea could trigger an earthquake.

21. Turning to the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Israel, contained in the memorandum of 2 October 1981, he said that although Israel said that it was prepared to co-operate with Jordan in studying the possibility of exploiting the canal project for their mutual benefit, it was concealing a very important element, namely, the real reason for the project, namely, the problem of territories occupied by Israel and Israel's refusal to accept the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Only when an overall and lasting solution was found to that problem could Israel talk of co-operating with Jordan for their mutual benefit.

22. Finally, his delegation appealed to all Member States not to assist Israel directly or indirectly in that project which contravened the principles of international law, international agreements and various United Nations resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolution 36/150, and constituted a further impediment to peace in the Middle East.

23. Mr. MATALKA (Observer for the League of Arab States) said that the Israeli project for linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea was contrary to the principle of international law concerning respect for the territorial sovereignty of States and, more especially, that concerning territories occupied by military force. The Israeli project would in effect change the geography of the region and involve confiscating public and private property, and the canal would encroach on occupied territory which would one day have to be returned to its legitimate owners.

/...

(Mr. Matalka)

24. That interpretation of the facts was confirmed by a number of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. For example, in paragraph 5 of resolution 34/136, adopted by 108 votes in favour, the General Assembly called upon "all States, international organizations, specialized agencies, investments corporations and all other institutions not to recognize ... any measures undertaken by Israel to exploit the resources of the occupied territories or to effect any changes in the demographic composition, geographical character or institutional structure of those territories", among other things.

25. Moreover, numerous Israeli and international experts had shown that the economic benefits of the Israeli project would not compensate for the damage it might cause. In reality, it meant that, under the pretext of those so-called economic objectives, Israel was pursuing strategic objectives of a military and economic nature that would enable it to make irreversible changes in the region, which would affect not only the Palestinian people but also the neighbouring Arab States. At the same time, Israel's decision to use water from the canal for cooling its Dimona nuclear reactors could lead to contamination of the region by radioactive waste, since the Israeli authorities had not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and had refused to co-operate with IAEA in monitoring Israel's nuclear installations. Israel was, in fact, using that and similar projects to consolidate its occupation of the area.

26. With regard to the condemnation of the Israeli project, he recalled that the League of Arab States, in a resolution adopted in March 1980 and reaffirmed in October 1982, had denounced the Israeli project and recommended that the matter should be submitted to the United Nations with a view to preventing Israel from carrying out its plan and persuading the United States authorities not to finance the construction of the canal or give Israel any assistance to that end. It had also been agreed to draw up a black list of engineering, financing and other corporations and organizations which co-operated with Israel in carrying out the project for linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea.

27. The Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic countries had also denounced the Israeli project, which they regarded as a new attack on the natural resources and the national rights of the Palestinian people, and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) had condemned the Israeli project in August 1982 as an act of aggression against the Palestinians and against Jordan. The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, held in Nairobi in 1981, had likewise adopted a resolution condemning the Israeli project and requesting Israel to cease action on it forthwith.

28. He also recalled that King Hussein of Jordan had repeatedly referred to the harmful effects of the Israeli project. In 1982 he had said, among other things, that the project for linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea was an act of aggression by Israel, in contempt of all the decisions of the international community and the Geneva Conventions; that everyone knew that the Dead Sea lay within the historical territory of Jordan and was under Jordanian sovereignty; and that a quarter of that territory corresponded to the West Bank, namely, occupied

/...

(Mr. Matalka)

Palestinian lands. The King of Jordan had also denounced the damage that the project would cause to Jordan's economy, had declared that the project was a threat to international peace and security, and had reaffirmed Jordan's legitimate right to prevent Israel from carrying out such a project.

29. He pointed out that, while it was easy to understand the serious consequences of armed aggression such as that committed by Israel in Lebanon, the effects of building a canal as proposed in the Israeli project were unpredictable, because the canal could cause long-term damage to the Palestinians of the occupied territories, and especially in Jordan. It must not be forgotten that, by acts such as the invasion of Lebanon, Israel was trying to divert attention from its real designs, which included the building of the canal to link the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea.

30. Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Israeli project to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea violated the rules of international law on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force, contravened the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and flouted United Nations decisions such as General Assembly resolution 34/136, which reaffirmed the right of the Palestinians to control their natural resources. The project also constituted a serious danger for the region and would, if carried out, cause irreparable damage to Palestinian and Jordanian rights. In spite of everything, Israel was still intent on carrying out the canal project and it was stated in paragraph 2 of the report of the group of experts submitted by the Secretary-General (A/37/328 and Corr.1) that mapping, geological reconnaissance and other studies were currently in progress. That was a new Israeli challenge to General Assembly resolution 36/150, paragraph 1 of which "demands that Israel cease forthwith the implementation of its project".

31. Although the Israeli authorities had emphasized the economic aspects, it was well known that the project was one of the major engineering works tackled since the creation of Israel and that it was designed not only for purposes of development, but also for military and security reasons. While the adverse effects of the Israeli project were outlined in paragraphs 50, 51, 53, 58 and 61 of the report of the group of experts, no mention was made of the military dangers that the canal project might entail for the Arab countries, especially Jordan. The group of experts made no reference in their report to the security aspects, nor to the violation of Palestinian rights and international law that implementation of the project would entail.

32. Without going into the history of the Israeli project, his delegation found it necessary to emphasize the following aspects: (1) building the canal would enable Israel to construct new nuclear-power stations in the Negev, thus strengthening its current atomic potential and consolidating its expansionist intentions in respect of the Arab States; (2) the project was directly related to the establishment of new Jewish settlements in the central and southern region of occupied Palestine, as part of the policy of annexation and judaization of Palestine; (3) the canal would be a deadly and devastating strategic weapon in the hands of Israel in the event of

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

a war with Jordan, since the Israeli leaders could flood the Valley of the Jordan with water from the Mediterranean Sea when they wished; (4) the canal would be built in occupied Palestinian Arab territories, particularly in the Gaza Strip, as confirmed in paragraph 69 of the report of the Group of Experts; (5) since the Gaza Strip and the West Bank were occupied territories, the project would constitute a violation of international law, and of numerous United Nations resolutions; (6) the Israeli project to build the canal was a gross violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, according to which the military occupation of territories was a passing phenomenon that in no case gave the occupying Power the right to take possession of any part of the territories or to take measures involving demographic, geographical or structural changes; (7) the execution of the Israeli project would aggravate the situation in the region and make it even more explosive, by creating another fait accompli which would further delay peace plans.

33. Israel, by its action, was showing once again that it had no interest in peace based on justice and that its sole aim was to impose its domination on the Palestinian and Arab peoples, with the support of the United States. His delegation appealed to the international community to take steps to prevent Israel from continuing to flout and violate the rules of international law. The Security Council should go further than merely denouncing illegal actions and should impose strong sanctions, in accordance with the Charter, to make Israel comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Syria appealed to all peace-loving countries, the financial institutions and the transnational corporations to suspend all direct or indirect aid which would help Israel to proceed with its objective, the eventual usurpation of the occupied territories.

34. Mr. SUDIRMAN (Indonesia) said that the Secretary-General's report on the Israeli project (A/37/328) showed that the objections raised by a number of Member States with regard to the legal and other implications of the project were well founded. If the project was carried out, it would have detrimental ecological effects for the area of the Dead Sea, and the entire infrastructure for mining, oil and natural gas production as well as agriculture in the area could suffer irreparable damage. The canal project must also be viewed in the overall context of Israel's activities designed to perpetuate its control over the occupied territories and bring about eventual annexation.

35. His delegation felt that Israel must be prevented from carrying out the project and must observe its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibited the Occupying Power, inter alia, from bringing about any changes in the occupied territories. All States should refrain from rendering any assistance to Israel which would allow it to continue the project. Indonesia fully supported the draft resolution on the item.

36. Mr. KINDE (Ethiopia), exercising the right of reply, said that at the previous meeting the representative of Somalia had insulted his country, Government, Head of State and even him personally. He did not wish to respond in the same tone, but wanted to point out that such hostility was unfounded because it had never been the intention of his delegation to make a verbal attack on Somalia or the representative of that country. When he had referred to the violations of the Charter, interference in the internal affairs of States, terrorism and subversion, acts of aggression and expansionist wars, as the main causes of the flows of refugees and displaced persons, he had not been referring to Somalia; it had been the representative of that country who had interpreted his remarks in that manner.

37. When his delegation had raised questions concerning the status, origin and nationality of the so-called refugees in Somalia, the representative of Somalia had accused his delegation of insulting the intelligence of the international community. That had not been the intention of his delegation, which fully shared the reservations and misgivings of the international community with regard to the problem of the refugees in Somalia, although it also had its own views in that regard. Ethiopia had attempted to draw the Committee's attention to the real situation in Somalia and to the motives which had induced its leaders to parade Somali citizens in the camps in the guise of refugees. In trying to support his argument the representative of Somalia had referred to the report of the Special Rapporteur to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, but had conveniently skipped an important observation. The report confirmed that the figures provided by the receiving countries were different from those of the countries of origin and that in some cases it had been found that the real number had differed by tens or even hundreds of thousands of persons.

38. He referred to an article appearing in The Guardian of 8 August 1981 which reported that Somalia's refugee figures must be taken with a grain of salt and that the international agencies had dismissed the figure of 1.3 million estimated by that country and had requested United Nations demographers to carry out a census, but the Somali authorities had so far refused to disclose the results. On 24 August 1981 the same newspaper had reported that large quantities of food sent from Europe and the United States to the refugees in Somalia had ended up in the hands of the Somali army or had been sold in shops in that country.

39. The whole world knew of Somalia's expansionist ambitions. In order to carry out those ambitions Somalia had resorted to all means imaginable, including the ridiculous farce of the so-called refugees, which enabled it to obtain funds and continue its expansionist policy. In that regard, he referred to an article in the Wall Street Journal of 9 September 1980 which had reported that Somalia had very little incentive to resettle the refugees because that would involve abandoning its goal of returning them to the Ogaden, in other words, admitting defeat, renouncing any claim to the Ogaden and losing the opportunity to receive assistance for the refugees.

40. After Somalia had been forced in 1978 to withdraw its invasion army from Ethiopian territory, his Government had set the following conditions for the

(Mr. Kinde, Ethiopia)

normalization of relations between the two countries: Somalia must pay adequate compensation for the damages caused by the war, respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ethiopia, renounce once and for all its expansionist ambitions, and, in the context of the refugees, ratify the 1969 Convention of the Organization of African Unity. Instead of hurling accusations and insults against Ethiopia, Somalia should respond to those constructive proposals.

41. He then referred to the fact that half a million Somalis had left their country to go to the Middle East and 6,000 Somali nationals had recently entered Ethiopia. Furthermore, an article published in the Horn of Africa, vol. 5, No. 1 of 1982, had reported that the National Security Service had arrested and tortured many people and, as a result, the best-educated Somalis had been forced to flee their country. Because of mismanagement and corruption Somalia was facing a serious crisis.

42. Mr. MUSA (Somalia), exercising the right of reply, said that he did not intend to continue the exchange with the representative of Ethiopia, and simply wished to deny the statements made by him. Since Somalia had achieved independence, Ethiopia had never ceased to covet that independence and had done everything possible to suppress the independence, dignity and sovereignty of Somalia. In 1963 and 1964 Ethiopia had attacked Somalia but had miscalculated the determination of the Somali people to defend their liberty, just as it was currently doing, committing the same error. The evidence of that aggression was undeniable. It sufficed to read The New York Times of 11 October 1982 in order to verify the fact that Somali territory had been invaded on 1 July 1982. In spite of the denials of Ethiopia the hard reality was that Ethiopian troops had committed aggression against the territory of Somalia. Evidence of that had been brought to the attention of the diplomatic community and the mass information media and the attempts of Ethiopia to mislead world opinion had failed. The Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union held in Rome in September 1982 had confirmed the aggression committed by Ethiopia against the Somali Democratic Republic and had called for the unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of Somalia. Similarly, the Conference of the Arab Heads of State and Government recently held in Fez, Morocco, had resolved to support Somalia against the attack of the invading Ethiopian forces. All that demonstrated the link between the aggressive behaviour of Addis Ababa and its expansionist history.

43. Furthermore, not content with its territorial expansion after having doubled the territory under its domination, as could be proved by comparing the old maps of Abyssinia with the latest map of imperialist Ethiopia, the imperial Government of Ethiopia had shamelessly affirmed its sovereignty over Eritrea and Somaliland in a memorandum submitted to the Four-Power Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs held in Paris in 1945.

44. Fortunately for Somalia, the imperial Ethiopian Government had not succeeded in its attempt to seize that country. Unfortunately, Ethiopia had succeeded in recolonizing the Ogaden and illegally annexing Eritrea, in violation of all relevant United Nations resolutions. Imperialism and territorial expansion through

/...

(Mr. Musa, Somalia)

aggression were still the policy of the current régime in Addis Ababa. Mengistu Haile Mariam had only formally done away with the title of Emperor and, for that reason, the people of Ethiopia were rebelling against the Government. The New York Times of 11 October 1982 had reported that the junta in Addis Ababa spoke of revolution, but the basic reality of the Ethiopian empire remained unchanged and millions of persons had fled Ethiopia and were currently under the care of the international community.

45. With regard to the denial of the current aggression by Ethiopia against Somalia, it should be recalled that the international community was well aware of that fact. Other facts, therefore, should be pointed out: Ethiopia had collaborated in the nineteenth century with the colonialists in order to carry out its expansionist policy, had committed genocide against African peoples, and was currently a captive country. With regard to the problem of the refugees, one should recall the words of Einstein to the effect that, although the struggle for human rights might not be victorious in the end, halting that struggle would mean the destruction of humanity.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.