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Abstract

Cultural misunderstandings can lead to serious problems especially when dealing with the political discourse of iconic leaders, such as Former President Muammar Gaddafi of Libya. Inaccurate rendition for any political speech might influence the lives of millions of people around the world. This thesis examines the strategies adopted in interpreting cultural references. The data collected for the study comes from the interpreting attempts adopted by two professional interpreters, Gaddafi's personal interpreter and a Libyan T.V. channel interpreter, of the famous historical speech delivered by the Former Libyan leader president Muammar Gaddafi on September 23, 2009 at the United Nations in New York. Both interpretations were analyzed in order to identify culture-bound elements. These elements were divided into three main categories: sarcasm, metaphors, and religious references. The examination of the interpreting strategies shows that the adoption of some approaches results in unidiomatic and awkward renditions. The results show that six strategies were applied when rendering culture references namely: error correction, summarizing, transcoding, simplification, reformulation, and omission. Three main strategies were applied by the interpreters of the total strategies of interpreting, namely: reformulation (46.6%), omission (33.3%), and transcoding (53.3%). The most dominant techniques used by the interpreters are reformulation (46.6%) and transcoding (53.3%).
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Chapter One: Introduction

Despite the fact that interpreting is older than translation, as people interpreted spoken language before they translated the written form, interpreting is often confused with translation. However, it can be said that the one who can translate, can also interpret. In a world full of political conflicts between cultures and the rapid spread of globalization, interpreting researchers should widen perceptions to help create a complete picture of cultural understanding. Faiq (2004) says that misunderstanding derives from "incompatibilities in processing of media which carry them: languages. Yet misunderstandings are not only the products of linguistic incompatibilities per se but of cultural ones as well" (p. 1). On the other hand, Aziz (1982) argues that "the vocabulary of a language derives its meaning to a large extent from its culture" (p. 25). This indicates that meaning is an important link between language and culture.

Interpreting for political leaders is considered a challenging career, because any inaccurate or inadequate interpreting may influence the lives of other people around the world. However, translation studies have not given interpreting strategies in simultaneous interpreting enough attention; especially in terms of how to deal with cultural references in interpreting political speeches for powerful political leaders.

The aim of this thesis is to identify common strategies used by two professional interpreters when facing cultural references, particularly: metaphors, religious references, and cultural sarcasm. It focuses on cultural knowledge and how to find equivalence between the Arabic and English languages.

Chapter two discusses the issue of interpreting studies as a field. It introduces different types of interpreting and different approaches to interpreting such as linguistic, cultural and psychological approaches. It also discusses the use simultaneous interpreting equipment in interpreting. Finally, it discusses simultaneous interpreting strategies.

Chapter three discusses interpreting cultural references in general. Then, it discusses culture and translation with general overviews. Finally, it discusses the three main categories of cultural references: sarcasm, metaphor, and religious references.

Chapter four investigates the interpreters' strategies in the political speech of Former Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi at the United Nations on September 23, 2009. First, it defines discourse as a concept, and it discusses interpreting political discourse. Then, it gives
a short biography about the life of the Former Libyan president Muammar Gaddafi. Next, it discusses the methodology used when analyzing the data. The analysis shows what kinds of strategies are used in order to overcome cultural difficulties. Finally, findings reveal the most common strategies used when rendering cultural references in the political speech of the Former Libyan leader president Muammar Gaddafi.

Chapter five summarizes the findings of the results with suggestions on how the selected strategies were relevant and useful when it comes to the interpreting field.
Chapter Two: Interpreting Studies

This chapter presents a general overview of interpreting studies. First, it begins with the definition of interpreting as a profession, which is followed by a discussion on different types of interpreting. The chapter then discusses simultaneous interpreting equipment. Finally, it discusses simultaneous interpreting strategies and the main approaches of interpreting: cultural, linguistic, and psychological.

"Interpreting studies" as a term did not exist until the 1990s. However, it has developed over the years and become a very important field. It was only in the twentieth century that interpreting became recognized as a profession (Pochhacker, 2002, pp. 2-3). Interpreting is defined as interlingual, intercultural, oral, or signed mediation that enables communication between groups or individuals who do not use the same language (Pochhacker, 2002).

It is important to know that there is a remarkable distinction between translators and interpreters, although some interpreters are also translators and vice versa. Each area requires a specific group of skills and strategies. The interpreter translates orally; whereas, the translator decodes written text. Both of them carry an indepth knowledge of knowing more than one language.

2.1 Interpreting

Jones (2002) did not set up a standard definition of interpreting, he stated only that interpreting is "immediate oral translation" (p. 5). The interpreter listens to the speaker in one language to get the content of what is being said in order to re-express verbally his or her understanding of the intended meaning in the other language. However, Jones (2002) claims that his definition does not define what interpreting is all about. Linguistic barriers are not the only difficulty that can face the interpreter; in fact, cultural difficulties can also be an obstacle. Jones (2002) argues that cultural difficulties "can manifest themselves both explicitly and implicitly" (p.5). An implicit manifestation is that the interpreter must understand the intention of the speaker and what lies behind the intended meaning of the words. Whereas, explicit manifestations indicate that the interpreter has to understand a cultural reference that has no direct equivalent in the target language.

On the other hand, Baker (2001) defines interpreting as "the oral translation of the oral discourse" (p. 40). Any person who interprets in any language is called an "interpreter."
Interpreting occurs when there are two groups or more of different languages involved in a communication process.

### 2.2 Interpreting Types

There are three major types of interpreting: court interpreting, conference interpreting, and community interpreting. The mode of interpreting is further subdivided into simultaneous and consecutive. The central focus in this thesis is on simultaneous interpreting, which will be discussed later in further details.

#### 2.2.1 Court Interpreting

Court interpreting is a term which refers to all legal interpretation. Interpreters need to have a solid knowledge of various cultural backgrounds and sufficient vocabulary. Also, court interpreting has to be accurate because any wrong rendition can affect the lives of people.

Court interpreting mostly uses the consecutive mode because interpreters have to interpret questions and answers. Also, interpreters need to use note-taking skills if the statements are long, in order to help them remember what is being said. He/she can use other skills such as whispered simultaneous interpreting to interpret testimonies, and can also use sight translation skills to translate any documents related to the case.

#### 2.2.2 Community Interpreting

Community interpreting takes interpreters into the private spheres of human life. This type of interpreting occurs in intimate settings where important issues in the lives of individuals are revealed. For example, the settings where community interpreters work include locations such as: a doctor's surgery, a lawyer's office, a social worker's office, or a police station.

It is often extremely difficult for people to allow an interpreter, who is most likely a stranger, into such difficult and intimate situations. In these cases, the interpreter has to follow a strict code of ethics to ensure accuracy and confidentiality. According to Garber (2000) "the circumstances in which community interpreters practise carry even more risk and more responsibility than conference interpreting" (p. 19). The interpreter must follow a code of ethics to avoid such problems in the professional field.

Recently, the interest in community interpreting has increased as a new type of interpreting. It can even be practiced by interpreters who are not entirely fluent in the second language of the other country they live in.
2.2.3 Conference Interpreting

In conference interpreting, the interpreter must produce the exact meaning of the original speech. Any additional information can be allowed only if it is indispensable for bridging cultural gaps. The interpreter cannot add his point of view about what is being said by the speaker.

Conference interpreting can be of two types: consecutive or simultaneous interpretation. The interpreter in consecutive interpreting speaks after the source-language speaker has finished speaking. On the other hand, the interpreter in simultaneous interpreting translates the speaker’s words while the speaker is still speaking. The advantage of simultaneous interpreting is that it takes less time than consecutive.

2.3 Simultaneous Interpreting

According to Hatim and Mason (1997) there are three modes of interpreting: consecutive, simultaneous, and liaison (p. 36). Each of these modes place different demands on the interpreter. This thesis focuses solely on simultaneous interpreting.

Simultaneous interpreting is considered the hardest mode because it requires the interpreter to interpret continuously from the source language into the target language while the source speaker is speaking. It renders the interpretation continuously at the same time as the speaker. According to Hatim and Mason (1997) texture comes to the fore in simultaneous interpreting. Texture refers to various linguistic devices that are applied in the text with the purpose of building a flow of sense and to make the sequence of a sentence operational. The interpreter in simultaneous interpreting must interact and react from one utterance to another where overlapping between different elements of a sequence is unavoidable (p. 45).

On the other hand, Seleskovitch (1978) argues that simultaneous interpreting is a multitask assignment which requires a high level of concentration. The author describes simultaneous interpretation as follows:

In simultaneous interpretation the interpreter is isolated in a booth. He speaks at the same time as the speaker and therefore has no need to memorize or jot down what is said. Moreover, the processes of analysis-comprehension and of reconstruction-expression are telescoped. The interpreter works on the message bit by bit, giving the portion he has understood while analyzing and assimilating the next idea. (p. 125)
Simultaneous interpreting can be used in many situations and settings. For example, telephone interpreting, sight translation, sign language interpreting, whispered interpreting and television interpreting. The following section will expand upon these situational types.

2.3.1 Types of Simultaneous Interpreting

**Telephone Interpreting.** This is the type of liaison interpreting which can be done over the phone. It can be used in certain situations during business meetings and community interpreting. Telephone interpreting is quite useful as it can be offered in many different languages from anywhere and at any time.

**Sight Translation.** There are some situations which require interpreters to translate documents aloud. This type of translation is considered special because interpreters must read and translate documents at the same time and on the spot; without having the opportunity to search for different resources as is possible for regular translation.

**Sign Language Interpreting.** Sign language is recognized as a language that uses body and hand gestures; it also has different dialects. It is used by deaf people, who cannot hear the original speech of any language. The interpreter's role in these cases is to provide simultaneous interpreting to help these people understand a speech. In this case, interpreters are visible to the audience.

**Whispered Interpreting.** Whispered interpreting happens in situations and settings where one or two people do not understand the source language. The interpreter's role here is to render the interpretation to the listeners simultaneously in a lower voice. This kind of interpreting can also be called "chuchotage."

**Television Interpreting.** This kind of interpreting is very common in Europe. It provides simultaneous interpreting for the foreign guests who appear on television programs. Interpreters are provided with fully equipped booths where they can see the speakers. In television interpreting, the convention is for male interpreters to interpret for male speakers, and female interpreters to interpret for female speakers. Interpreters must be confident in this kind of interpreting.

2.4 Equipment in Simultaneous Interpreting

Jones (2002) recommends that interpreters maintain eye contact with the delegates, and very carefully watch their body language to comprehend the delegates' non-verbal information, since they are isolated in a booth and cut-off physically from the communication
setting. Also, interpreters must make sure that everything in the booth is working properly to prevent any technical difficulties during the process of interpretation (p. 66).

In simultaneous interpreting, there are two main devices that can be used by interpreters: a microphone and headphones. When using the headphones, interpreters should wear them in a way that allows them to clearly hear the speakers. As for the microphones, interpreters must sit directly in front of them and avoid moving around. Also, interpreters must speak in a normal conversational voice so that it does not hurt the audience's ears.

Jones (2002) further believes that simultaneous interpreters will do much better in their profession if they follow the "Golden Rules." Jones (2002) summarizes these rules as follows:

- Remember that Interpreting is an act of communication.
- Make the best possible use of the technical facilities.
- Ensure that they can hear both the speaker and themselves clearly.
- Never attempt to interpret something they have not heard or acoustically understood.
- Maximize concentration.
- Not be distracted by focusing attention on individual problematic words.
- Cultivate split attention, with active, analytical listening to the speaker and critical monitoring of their own output.
- Use, where possible, short, simple sentences.
- Be grammatical.
- Make sense in every single sentence.
- Always finish their sentence. (p. 72)

2.5 Simultaneous Interpreting Strategies

Strategies are intentional and goal-oriented procedures, they aim to solve problems that result from the interpreter's processing capacity limitations or knowledge gap, or to facilitate the interpreter’s task and prevent potential problems. Most studies on strategies are concerned with simultaneous interpreting rather than consecutive interpreting strategies.

Interpreting strategies are strategies which are used to assist an interpreter in reproducing the closest equivalent rendition from the source language into target the language. Those techniques are specifically explained by Jones (2002) as follows: reformulation, the salami technique, simplification, generalization, omission, summarizing,
anticipation, error correction techniques and metaphors and sayings techniques. Each strategy will be discussed in detail below.

2.5.1 Reformulation

Reformulation is considered one of the most useful and powerful tools the simultaneous interpreter has. Reformulation means that the interpreter has to reformulate the wording of the original sentence. Complicated and long sentences should be broken down into a series of easier and shorter ones. The interpreter's goal in reformulation is to convey the speaker's meaning as much as s/he can. Also, s/he must use this technique to overcome any difficulties while being faithful to the true meaning. The interpreter does not have to copy the exact words of the speaker; rather s/he should deliver the meaning. For example:

"بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم والصلاة والسلام على أشرف المرسلين سيدنا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه أجمعين"

Arabic sentences tend to be very long, so when the interpreter wants to interpret this sentence, s/he can just say:

"In the name of Allah, the most graceful, the most compassionate and peace be upon his prophet, his kin and kith."

Reformulation can help interpreters to recognize the original information and enable them to deal with words that they do not know. Using reformulation is a good sign that the interpreters are doing their work properly. Also, reformulation is kind of second nature to interpreters as they listen to ideas and then express them freely in their own words. Consequently, interpreters must respect the target language structure in order to produce a natural interpretation and maximize understanding.

Jones (2002) argues that sometimes interpreters may face difficulties with words or concepts that do not exist in the target language. Therefore, interpreters must, therefore, seize upon reformulation as a tool that will enable them to deal with all kinds of difficulties while remaining as true as possible to the speaker.

2.5.2 The Salami Technique

Jones (2002) suggests that interpreters should use this technique when dealing with languages that have the tendency to use long and complicated sentences. The Salami technique, referred to as chunking, breaks apart or slices up a sentence. It is used when long and complicated sentences need to be divided into simple, shorter sentences without losing the meaning of the whole sentence. Gile (1995), on the other hand, defines chunking as a
strategy that “can save short-term memory capacity requirements by unloading information from memory faster” (p. 196).

### 2.5.3 Simplification

It some instances it is necessary for interpreters to simplify a speech, especially when they deal with highly technical material. Jones (2002) argues that there are two reasons why interpreters should simplify a speech. First, it may be that the speech is extremely technical. In this case, interpreters must try to save the essentials by applying a simplification strategy. Second, the speaker may be talking over the heads of his audience. In this case, the faithful rendering would just leave the audience confused (p. 98). For example, if a group of young teenagers is being provided information about agricultural policy, they will need to understand the explanations they receive. The interpreter must explain the terms first for them and simplify the sentences to the audience.

Some may question how interpreters can simplify if they do not know what they are simplifying. However, Jones (2002) argues that "an interpreter can identify the essence of a statement or a question, and convey it, without understanding all the details expressed by a speaker" (p. 99). Simplification can be used for any instance where an expert addresses a lay audience in the wrong register.

### 2.5.4 Generalization

In order to save time when interpreters deal with fast speakers, Jones (2002) suggests that "a number of specific items mentioned can be expressed in one generic term" (p. 101). However, interpreters should not use generalization when each specific item mentioned in the speech is significant.

Jones (2002) further elaborates that generalization should only be used where appropriate. For example, if the speaker provides a list where the elements are significant, interpreters should reproduce the list. He gives an example of a speaker saying, 'people take it for granted now to have a fridge and a freezer, the dishwasher and the washing machine with a spin dryer, a cooker and a vacuum cleaner'. In this case, interpreters can use a generic form and say, 'people take it for granted now to have all household electrical appliances'.

### 2.5.5 Omission

Jones (2002) argues that sometimes interpreters deal with situations where they cannot use generalization or simplification. In these particular cases, interpreters have to omit things (p. 102). Jones continues by saying that interpreters in such cases should carry on by making
their analysis to keep the essential elements and only leave out what is illustrative. In order to make this analysis, interpreters should give themselves the time and to have intellectual distance from the speaker.

Jones (2002) distinguishes between two types of omission: "omission under duress and omission from choice" (p. 125). In the first instance, interpreters cut out certain elements so that they can preserve the essential message as best as they can. In the second type, interpreters omit certain elements deliberately so that they achieve an economic and simple interpretation which assures a high level of communication between the speaker and the audience.

### 2.5.6 Summarizing and Recapitulation

According to Jones (2002), summarizing or recapitulation is a technique to "cover up for the interpreter's own shortcomings" and to "clarify what is unclear because of the speaker" (p. 104). The interpreter's role is to clarify the speaker's ideas to the audience when the ideas require some explanation. It is only possible to use this technique if the interpreter has the time to do so to clarify what is unclear.

### 2.5.7 Anticipation

Interpreters should know how to predict what the speaker is going to say next with their knowledge, experience and language ability. According to Jones (2002), anticipation "can be a precious tool" when used in conjunction with reformulation. He added that it can improve the interpreter's expressions significantly and can also save their time (p. 107).

Jones (2002) argues that interpreters must know how to anticipate their speakers; there are several ways they can do this. First, it is possible for the interpreters to anticipate the broad structure and the general thrust of the speech. Second, the interpreter must identify speech types and rhetorical structures of the source language in order to be able to anticipate the speaker. Third, interpreters can anticipate certain phrases or words in the sentence when they have an idea of how the sentence will end.

### 2.5.8 Correction

Sometimes interpreters can make mistakes while interpreting, this can occur for several reasons. These mistakes can be from misunderstanding a word or a phrase, mishearing a word, not hearing a word at all, or misconstruing a speaker's logic. Jones (2002) argues that there are some solutions for such mistakes. First, if the interpreters make a mistake that is insignificant, they should carry on interpreting without wasting their time trying to fix the
Jones believes that error correction is unnecessary for two reasons. First, it will distract the audience from concentrating on the message they want to hear. In addition, it will prevent interpreters from concentrating on the speaker's subsequent words.

2.5.9 Metaphors and Sayings
Jones (2002) suggests some techniques for the rendition of metaphors and sayings:

- Finding the exact equivalence that exists in the target language;
- Finding an equivalence that has the same meaning but with different wording;
- Explaining the meaning by reducing the statement to sense;
- If the interpreters do not understand the meaning, and think that it is a very important metaphor or saying, then they have to render it as literally as possible;
- If the interpreters do not understand the meaning and think that the metaphor or saying is not important, then they can drop it (p. 113).

According to Jones (2002), it is really important for interpreters to have rich vocabularies to aid in their interpretations of speeches. It is also good to have wide range of expressions that can help avoid any inaccuracies while hearing the speech (p. 114).

2.5.10 Intonation, Stress and Pause
Communication occurs not only through words, it can also be through intonation. According to Jones (2002), there are a number of constraints in simultaneous interpreting that prevent interpreters from using intonation, stress, and pauses correctly. First, interpreters are in a sound-proof booth, behind double-glazing, and that can lead to interpreters feeling cut off from the proceedings (p. 115). In addition, there is the risk of being under pressure to keep the flow of the sound in the booth, and the fear of missing some parts of the speech. Jones (2002), also argues that a third error that interpreters need to be wary of is not to fall into "an overreaction to being under pressure, which manifests itself by an exaggerated attempt to sound cool and calm" (p. 116). This can lead to failure in communication and furthermore cause the interpreters to sound bored. Another problem can be that some speakers provide too much stress and too much emphasis on their words. This issue may cause interpreters to feel
that they have to compensate for the lack of real content. Finally, Jones (2002) points to a fifth difficulty that is technical in nature. This situation occurs when interpreters do not know how the speaker is going to proceed; therefore, the interpreters’ intonations may indicate some expectation. When this happens the interpreters will end up using a rising intonation, and it will be difficult for the audience to understand where the sentences begin and end.

Jones (2002) suggests for the fifth problem that the interpreters finish their sentences, even though they may not know how to finish them. If they do not want to complete the sentences, then they have to signal to their audience that the sentence is continuing and they must use the right intonation.

2.5.11 Code-switching

Code switching is a very important strategy that is used mostly by Arab leaders. According to Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002), code-switching is a strategy that refers to a "style shift from standard to informal colloquial Arabic" (p. 617). Both of them believe that interpreters use this strategy when they deal with time pressures, especially when the speakers talk very fast.

2.5.12 Transcoding

Transcoding is a word-for-word rendition according to Bartlomiejczyk (2006). In these instances, interpreters rely on the surface structure of the source text. Furthermore, interpreters are very faithful to the source text because they do not understand, either partially or completely, what the speaker meant.

On the other hand, Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002) argue that this strategy is a literal interpretation because interpreters use a target language equivalent to the source language word "irrespective of contextual adequacy" (p. 617).

2.6 Interpreting Approaches

The field of interpreting studies is shaped by conceptual and methodological approaches. It was only in the 1990s that approaches to translation started to be explored in the interpreting field. Yet, interpreting studies have benefited somewhat from translation studies. This section provides a brief overview of various theoretical approaches to translation.
2.6.1 Psychological Approaches

The psychological approach, which is involved in the interpreting process, has been the center of interpreting studies for years. The most prominent field in translation studies is the psychological field. Diriker (2004) argues that:

The scholarly interest in interpreting seems to have followed a hierarchy of its own, with most scholarly attention being devoted to the most salient types and features of interpreting (i.e., conference interpreting as the most salient type and cognitive aspects of the task as the most salient feature). (p. 1)

Many different kinds of process models were developed in simultaneous interpreting in order to investigate the mental processes of interpreting. For example, Gerver (1971, cited in Pochhacker, 2004, p.100) developed the first psychological processing model for simultaneous interpreting. Moreover, he built a flow-chart model of mental structures regarding the interpreter's memory use, output monitoring, and time lag.

2.6.2 The Linguistic Approach

The debate on whether a translator should be faithful to the original text "literal" (word-for-word) orientation or "free" (sense-for-sense) orientation can be traced back over 2000 years ago. The discussion continued until the 20th century when systematic analysis emerged and the role of the language-learning activity focused on the theory of translation in the new linguistic approach. The linguistic approach focuses on issues like meaning, equivalence and shifts. Christoffels and De Groot (2005) argue that:

Theoretically, two interpreting strategies have been distinguished: a meaning-based strategy and a transcoding strategy. … [in the meaning–based strategy] interpreting involves full comprehension of the source language in a way similar to common comprehension of speech. From representation of the inferred meaning, production takes place in the target language. The transcoding strategy involves the literal transposition of words or multiword units. The interpreter supposedly translates the smallest possible meaningful units of source language that have an equivalent in the target language. (p. 459)

In the meaning-based strategy of simultaneous interpreting, the source language is totally deverbalized, and the linguistic forms of the source language text totally disappear in the target language and only the meaning of the message only remains. This point of view has been discussed by Seleskovitch (1978), and it is referred to as the "theory of sense." According to him, the job of the interpreter is to understand the meaning of the message itself.
and not to find linguistic equivalences of the source language in the target language. Seleskovitch (1978) continues his argument by adding "it is to the interpreter's advantage to immediately forget the original wording used since that is not what he will reconstruct, and to clearly retain only the full meaning of the message with all its nuances" (p.36). Although Seleskovitch's notion makes a reasonable sense, many interpreters succeed in rendering messages and materials that they did not understand fully.

2.6.3 The Cultural Approach

Some theorists have approached interpreting from different points of view, such as gender studies, studies of ideology, and postcolonialism. These kinds of perspectives are viewed in interpreting studies as a cultural practice. One of the first scholars who emphasized the importance of the social situation in which the interpreting task occurs was Anderson (1976). He argues that "interpreting occurs in social-situations amenable to sociological analysis" (p.209). According to Anderson, these situations will definitely influence the performance of the interpreter.

Shlesinger is one of the scholars who extended some concepts which occupy an important role in translation studies. He discusses the possibility of extending the theory of "norms" which was first introduced to the field of translation studies by Toury in the 1980s. On the other hand, Schjoldager (1995) discusses the theory of "norms" by stating that "as a behavioral activity, interpreting must also be governed by norms" (p. 302). The concept of "norms" to her is worth the attention of the interpreting studies scholars.

Cronin (2002) is another scholar who looks at interpreting as a cultural practice. Cronin believes that a "cultural turn" in interpreting studies has been developed in translation studies and that "would encourage scholars to explicitly address questions of power and issues such as class, gender, and race in interpreting situations" (p. 387). Cronin (2013) also argues that interpreters are "those that cross linguistic and cultural boundaries; depending on the identity of the interpreter and the nature of the context, interpreters cross boundaries of gender, class, nationality, or ethnicity" (p.391). He explains that interpreting scholars did not give enough attention to the theoretical developments in translation studies.

This chapter discussed interpreting studies in general. It defined interpreting and discussed its types. Also, it discussed equipment and strategies in interpreting. Finally, it discussed interpreting approaches.
Chapter Three: Interpreting Cultural References

This chapter discusses culture and translation, and it will deliberate different theorists who defined and discussed culture. Then, it will discuss the three cultural categories found in interpreting: sarcasm, metaphor, and religious references.

3.1 Culture and Translation

Culture plays a significant role in determining behavior and influences our beliefs, morals, and knowledge. According to Samovar and Porter (2003), culture is defined as:

the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, social hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relationships, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving. (p. 8)

Despite the fact that culture is at the base of all human interactions, cultural aspects of translation have received relatively little attention. Translation theorists have found many obstacles in relation to intercultural translation. As a result, theorists have examined the cultural differences among languages and simplified the development of the translation process in order to overcome such difficulties. Also, theorists realize that culture is a very complicated issue because "all human groups are cultured, though in vastly different manners and grades of complexity" (Sapir, 1949, p. 80). In addition, it has been noted that such complications lie in the fact that what is regarded as culturally acceptable to one group of people can be considered as completely bizarre and vague to another.

Hofstede (1980) argues that there are subcultures within cultures which are "shared only by others of the same educational level, socio-economic status, occupation, sex or age group" (p. 38). This means that culture can be shared among a number of different levels, and people can share subcultures with groups of people.

On the other hand, culture and language cannot be separated as Faiq (2008) argues, "language and culture represent the two sides of the same coin" (p. 35). He also maintains that culture and language are important components in translation; in fact, the act of intercultural communication can be done through translation.

Newmark (2000) also discusses the issue of culture by saying that culture is "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" (p. 94). Culture in this sense is a system of beliefs, morals, habits,
law, religion, behavior, and customs. Furthermore, he argues that if culture focus occurs, then there will be a translation problem because of the cultural gap between the source languages and the target languages.

Newmark (2000) gives translators examples of cultural objects that may cause difficulties including:

- Ecology: animals, plants, winds, mountains, etc.
- Material culture: food, clothes, houses, and transportation.
- Social culture: work and leisure.
- Political, religious, and artistic organizations, customs, concepts.
- Gestures and habits.

The above objects show the differences between cultures. They also challenge interpreters or translators to obtain knowledge in such areas so that they can avoid failure in communication.

3.2 Interpreting Cultural References

This thesis discusses and analyzes the three cultural categories and the difficulties encountered when rendering it in live simultaneous interpreting. Prior to that, each category will be discussed in detail.

3.2.1 Sarcasm References

Sarcasm is a very sophisticated form of communication in which the speaker conveys his or her message in an indirect form. It is defined in the Merriam-Webster dictionary (2017) as the use of words that mean the opposite of what one would really want to say in order to insult someone, to be funny, or to show irritation. The knowledge about the speaker’s intention is necessary in order to understand and be able to interpret sarcasm.

It is important to know the differences between irony and sarcasm. Haiman (1998) stated that "situations may be ironic, but only people can be sarcastic. Second, people may be unintentionally ironic, but sarcasm requires intention." He continued the argument by saying:

What is essential to sarcasm is that it is overt irony intentionally used by the speaker as a form of verbal aggression, and it may thus be contrasted with other aggressive speech acts, among them the put-on, direct insults, curses, vituperation, nagging, and condescension. (p. 20)

On the other hand, sarcasm correlates with some other kinds of sophistication and it is far from universal among human beings. Haiman (1998) argued:
If language is what defines humanity, then irony and sarcasm may conceivably define a "higher" or "more decadent" type of culture or personality or at least a geographically and temporally restricted use of language to perform verbal aggression or other kinds of work. (p. 12)

Since sarcasm is an indirect form of speech, its interpretation may be difficult and challenging for certain interpreters. This thesis discusses the interpretation of sarcastic utterances carried out by two professional interpreters. It will debate the idea of how the interpreters capture the meaning behind the original sarcastic utterances.

3.2.2 Interpreting Metaphor

Metaphor for Beekman and Callow (1974) is "an implicit comparison in which one item of the comparison (the image) carries a number of components of meaning of which usually only one is contextually relevant to and shared by the second item (the topic)" (p. 127). The purpose of metaphor according to Newmark (1982) is to "describe an entity, event or quality more comprehensively and concisely and in a more complex way than is possible by using literal language" (p. 84).

Interpreting metaphor is a very hard task, but it is an important problem in the language itself. The way to address this task is by finding an equivalent paraphrase that can replace the metaphorically used word or sentences in a given context.

3.2.2.1 Metaphor in Political Discourse

Since this thesis discusses the issue of metaphors in a political speech, it is necessary to discuss metaphors and their relationship to political discourse. The concepts of metaphor and politics have been an important subject in research in the last decades. However, there has been no attention into examining the role of metaphors in politics and the methodology used to investigate how to deal with it. Beard (2000) argues that by knowing how to use metaphorical language in an effective way, a politician could either gain power or keep power.

Metaphors are considered to be effective persuasive tools, because their rhetorical effects can be very powerful. Politicians use metaphors in order to construct a persuasive version of reality in which they can adjust their style of speaking. Furthermore, they turn to metaphors in order to arouse emotions that guide what people think and how they think. Using metaphors is a great ideology which plays an important role in influencing people’s minds.
3.2.3 Interpreting Religious References

Hatim and Mason (1997) argued that the form and content in the translation of sacred and religious texts causes great stress on the part of the translator due to the sensitive nature of the text and his/her responsibility to render the communicative aspect accurately and honestly. For them, as mediators or communicator, the translator treats with components of meaning lies above the level of propositional content and beyond the level of the sentence. So, translation requires a great and comprehensive understanding of textuality. The textual level is one which is recognized in the rhetoric of a number of languages and which essentially involves a reference switch or shift from one 'normal' (i.e. expected) syntactic, semantic, or rhetorical mode to another. Within syntax, the switch may include one of numerous linguistic systems, including pronominal reference, tense, definiteness, number, and gender. In addition, the rules regulating patterns of convention may be systematically defied for rhetorical or communicative effect, and when this occurs, a translation problem invariably takes place.

Simms (1997) argues that the translator's interpretation is like the psychoanalyst's interpretation, in fact, it is a work of culture. The translator should acknowledge cultural sensitivities (i.e., religious books), and one way to do so is by intertextuality according to Basil Hatim (1997). The advantage of intertextuality is that it is not tied to chronological direction; rather, it is what texts share in common with other texts which succeed them.

On the other hand, Aziz (1982) argued that "religion plays an important role in shaping the language and life of a society" (p. 29). In fact, Islam and the Quran have a great influence on Arabs' lives and language. Aziz further notes that saying that Islam and Christianity have many common features, such as they both believe in one God, life after death, Heaven and Hell, and they both preach moral virtues. But they also differ in a few basic points such as the concept of original sin and redemption, which cannot be found in Islam.

Aziz (1982) also discusses religious cultural problems by saying that it is not confined to the content of the message, but they also involve lexical items. For example, the word "bigamy" is usually rendered into Arabic as "تعدد الزوجات"، but both words are equivalent in their meaning. Aziz also discusses another problem which is posed by lexical items referring to objects which are forbidden in the target language. For example, the lexical items referring to different types of pig's meat, which is forbidden in Islam. Words such as ham, bacon, and pork cannot be rendered into Arabic, and only the generic term "لحم الخنزير" can have an
understandable meaning for Muslim readers. So, Aziz (1982) suggests the safest way to translate such problems is by utilizing generalization strategy.

Since language derives its meaning from its culture, the translator or interpreter should acknowledge and be acquainted with the basic cultural features of both the source and the target languages so that serious pitfalls can be avoided.

This chapter discussed culture and translation, and deliberated different theorists who defined and discussed culture. It discussed also the three cultural categories found in interpreting: sarcasm, metaphor, and religious references.
This chapter discusses interpreting political discourse. It first offers a brief biography about the Former Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi. It then goes on to investigate interpreters' strategies in a live simultaneous interpreting task of Gaddafi's speech to the United Nations. It analyzes the culturally-bound interpreting units, which can cause difficulties for the interpreters. Moreover, it analyzes the interpreters’ rendition from Arabic to English in order to identify the strategies that have been used while interpreting the political speech.

4.1 Interpreting Political Discourse

4.1.1 Discourse Definition

Before dealing with political discourse, it is important to discuss the definition of "discourse" as it is considered an important term in translation studies. There are several definitions for the term "discourse" presented by many scholars.

According to Hatim and Mason (1997) discourses are "modes of speaking and writing which involve social groups in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio cultural activity" (p. 216). This means that language and texts are considered to be realizations of socio-cultural power relations and messages. When we examine discourse from a cultural linguistic perspective, we will see that it focuses on the discourse scenario, like the notion of verbal interaction and the context where the verbal interactions are embedded.

Other scholars define discourse as public and organized ways of speaking about constituted subjects (i.e., medicine, politics, society, science) in a particular historical period (Wilson, 1995, cited in Ihalainen, 1999).

4.1.2 Political Discourse

The definition of politics varies depending on situation or purpose. Chilton (2004) discusses political discourse by claiming that there are two broad strands for this concept. The first strand views politics as a struggle for power between those who want to keep their power and those who want to resist it. The second strand views politics as cooperation and as the practices that a society has to resolve such as clashes of interest over influence, money, and liberty.
Political discourse may overlap with other discourses such as religious discourses. It is clear, for example, that Islamic discourse is very important in the cultural and political life of the Arab world. Holt (2004) argues that Islamic discourse is "becoming increasingly important in political and cultural life in the Arab world. Both oppositions and ruling regimes often articulate and legitimise their positions through Islam" (p. 63).

4.2 The speaker

According to Asser (2011), Muammar Mohammed Abu Minyar Gaddafi, better known as Colonel Gaddafi, was a Libyan revolutionary, politician, and political theorist. Gaddafi governed Libya as the Revolutionary Chairman of the Libyan Arab Republic from 1969-1977, after that he governed as the "Brotherly Leader" of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya from 1977-2011. Gaddafi was ideologically committed to Arab nationalism and Arab socialism. Later he ruled under his own Third Universal Theory.

Muammar Gaddafi was born to nomadic Bedouin parents. He was an intelligent and resourceful man, which he did not receive through education. He developed his political philosophy in the early 1970s, which he called the Third Universal Theory in his famous Green Book. This theory claims to solve the contradictions inherent in communism and capitalism in order to put the world on a path of economic, social and political revolution and to set oppressed peoples free everywhere. Gaddafi was known for his long atypical speeches which cannot always be described as following diplomatic etiquette.

4.3 Data Analysis

4.3.1 Data

The source text used for this analysis is a political speech delivered by the Former Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi to the United Nations. The speech was delivered on September 23, 2009 in the US city of New York. The speech is full of cultural references, which can cause difficulties during the interpreting process. For the purpose of this thesis, segments of his speech, with cultural references, which can cause difficulties for the interpreters, are identified and selected for the analysis.

The analysis is based on the output of two interpreters. One of them worked for the Former Libyan President and the other one worked for the Libyan State T.V. channel. The analysis is based on three categories: cultural sarcasm, metaphors, and religious references. Each category includes five examples which are analyzed and discussed. The audio
recordings were transcribed and analyzed in order to identify the strategies used by the two interpreters.

4.3.2 Methodology

1- The source text is analyzed and culture-bound data are identified for analysis.

2- The data examples are divided into three categories: sarcasm, metaphors, and religious references.

3- Two renditions of two different interpreters are transcribed as heard with their grammatical mistakes, and analyzed to see how these interpreters dealt with 15 examples of culture references.

4- The strategies used by the interpreters are identified to focus on finding the strategies that have been used while interpreting these units.

4.3.3 Analysis

Table 1 below shows the two renditions of cultural sarcasm of the source. Specifically, it shows the interpretation of the two interpreters of cultural sarcasm.

Table 1 The Two Renditions of Cultural Sarcasm of the Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The interpreting unit</th>
<th>Gaddafi's interpreter</th>
<th>Libyan State T.V. interpreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>أنتم عاملينكم ديكور</td>
<td>We are just like décor, you are made like décor.</td>
<td>We are mere decoration, without any real substance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>أنتم هايد بارك</td>
<td>You are like a Hyde park</td>
<td>We are like speaker's corner in London's Hyde Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>أتقدم بالتهنئة لإبننا الرئيس &quot;أوباما&quot;</td>
<td>My son Obama</td>
<td>Our son Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>نقول لأمريكا شكرنا...</td>
<td>We should thank America and we say to America thank for all the trouble that incurred upon itself. And we say thank you to America.</td>
<td>We should thank America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>وباسم الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة التي ترأسها ليبيا</td>
<td>And in the name of the General Assembly that is</td>
<td>In the name of the General Assembly at its</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presided by Libya now, in the name of the African Union, and in the name of 1,000 traditional African kingdoms in your own name

sixty-fourth session, presided over by Libya, of the African Union, of one thousand traditional African kingdoms and in my own name

Analyzing unit 1: "أنتم عاملينكم ديكور"

Gaddafi’s interpreter used the error correction technique according to Jones' (2002) strategies. He interpreted the sentence, "We are just like décor," and it was incorrect because the speaker said (نحن) not (أنتم). Then the interpreter corrected his mistake quickly by saying, "you are made like décor." Also, this sentence is considered to be a metaphor of sarcasm in Arabic; it means that when comparing someone to an inanimate objects it means that s/he has no role or function in real life. Jones (2002) suggested a technique to interpret metaphors, which is by using a word-for-word equivalent in the target language, and this is really what Gaddafi’s interpreter did.

On the other hand the Libyan State T.V interpreter used a summarizing technique. At first he interpreted the sentence as it is, "أنتم هايد بارك" he said, "We are mere decoration," then he introduced a short explanation to clarify the meaning by saying "without any real substance." The interpreter made a clear mistake by saying "we" not "you." Jones (2002) introduces a technique that can be used if the interpreter makes such a mistake, it involves using error correction. Because this particular mistake is made about an important point of the speech, then the interpreter must fix it; whereas the Libyan T.V. channel interpreter chose not to use the error correction for an unknown reason.

Analyzing unit 2: "أنتم هايد بارك"

Gaddafi’s interpreter used transcoding, but he did not rely on Jones strategies, he interpreted word-for-word typically as it is "أنتم هايد بارك". He said "You are like a Hyde park," maybe because he wanted to be faithful to the source language or maybe the interpreter did not completely or partially understand what the speaker meant. Here the interpreter had to introduce a small explanation, but it seemed that he did not need it because the interpreting message was addressed to the General Assembly members, who are well-versed in politics and know what the reference to Hyde Park means. The sarcasm in comparing someone to Hyde Park means that your role in life is just like those people who come to Hyde Park and
speak for their rights and no one listens to them; in fact, they lack any important role that would allow them to take any action to solve the problem.

On the other hand, the Libyan State T.V. interpreter used simplification; he simplified the sentence and explained its meaning to avoid confusion and misunderstanding by saying, "We are like speaker's corner in London's Hyde Park." But here the interpreter repeated the same previous mistake by saying, "we" instead of "you," and he should have use error correction to fix this mistake, but he did not do that.

**Analyzing unit 3:** "ابننا أوباما"

Gaddafi's interpreter has committed an error by saying, "My son." He wanted to use a transcoding strategy, but it seems that he got the meaning of "ابننا" wrong. He needed to use an error correction technique to correct his mistake quickly, because his interpretation did not give the correct meaning, but he ignored it. The Libyan State T.V. interpreter, on the other hand, used transcoding, he interpreted word-for-word as it is "ابننا أوباما", he said, "Our son Obama."

Both of the interpreters should have used summarizing in this reference. When Gaddafi spoke about Obama, he used the words "our son Obama." This expression is intended by Gaddafi to mean that Obama is younger and newer to political life than he is, in fact, that he has more experience than Obama in politics, like the difference between a father and his son in age and experiences. Gaddafi is insinuating that Obama is a young and inexperienced person, and he is in the position of a "father" who can offer him more knowledge about politics. Accordingly, both of the interpreters needed to explain it quickly in small sentences.

**Analyzing unit 4:** "أمريكا شكرًا"

Gaddafi's interpreter used reformulation and summarizing techniques for this particular sentence. He used reformulation by saying, "We should thank America" and he did not interpret word-for-word. Then he used a summarizing technique, "and we say to America thank you for all the trouble that incurred upon itself. And we say thank you to America." Here he introduced explanation to the meaning in order to clarify it. Alternatively, the Libyan State T.V. interpreter used only reformulation by saying, "We should thank America," and he did not interpret word-for-word. Here, the interpreter should also have used summarizing because the audience will not comprehend the meaning of this kind of Arab cultural sarcasm. The audience will misunderstand the meaning of "thank you" here whether it is a good connotation or a bad connotation.
Analyzing unit 5: "واسم ألف مملكة تقليدية إفريقية"

Both interpreters used transcoding; they interpreted word by word as it is, "ألف مملكة تقليدية إفريقية" by saying "of one thousand traditional African kingdoms." Both interpreters perceived the meaning (the sense) of the utterance to convey its message. Table 2 below shows the two renditions of cultural idioms of the source.

Table 2 The Two Renditions of Cultural Idioms of the Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The interpreting unit</th>
<th>Gaddafi's interpreter</th>
<th>Libyan State T.V. interpreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>زيادة المقاعد &quot;يزيد الطين بلة&quot; بالإنجليزي &quot;to add insult to injury&quot;</td>
<td>I don’t know how this will be translated but if we add more water, it will be more muddy. This is a typical expression to add insult to injury.</td>
<td>The security council reform we need is not an increase in the number of members, which would only make things worse… to use a common expression, if you add more water, you get more mud. It would add insult to injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>أخشى أن تعود حليمه الى عادتها القديمة</td>
<td>No rendition</td>
<td>I am afraid that we may then go back to square one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>الساكت عن الحق شيطان أخرس</td>
<td>Those who keep silent regarding what is right, is like a silent devil. We won't be silent devils.</td>
<td>Why are we silent? We must never be war devils; anyone who does not speak the truth is a silent devil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>نلبس هذا الثوب الذي فصلته هذه الأمم الثلاث</td>
<td>And the United Nations was tailored according to these countries and wanted from us to wear the clothes</td>
<td>The United Nations was shaped in line with those 3 countries and wanted us to step into the shoes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or the suit that was tailored against Germany.

10. نحن لسنا بحيوانات في زريبة يذبحون فيها في العيد كما يشاؤن
We are not animals in the livestock or in that we slaughter

11. أنا لو أني بقرر في أصدقائي الأمريكي والإنجليز ممكن مانقول هذا الكلام بل يتشجعهم ونقول لهم استمروا وابعثوا الفوات في أفغانستان وزيدوا...بيغرقوا بحمام الدم
If I want to deceive my friends from America and British would not tell them this. But I would encourage them and tell them go on, send more troops to Afghanistan and send further troops until they drown in a blood bath.

If I truly to deceive my American and British friends, I would encourage them to send more troops and I would encourage them to persist in this bloodbath.

Analyzing unit 6: "زيادة المقاعد "يزيد الطين بلة"

Gaddafi's interpreter used transcoding in this instance. He interpreted word-word as it is, "زيادة المقاعد "يزيد الطين بلة"... هذا مثل صعب ترجمته بالإنجليزي" "he said "but if we add more water, it will be more muddy." This is a typical expression meaning "to add insult to injury." Jones (2002) suggests techniques for rendering metaphors, and even for this exact metaphor. The interpreter should use a rendering that is equivalent in meaning, but has different wording. However, it seems that the interpreter was not familiar with that expression until he heard it from the speaker when using code-switching technique.

The Libyan State T.V. interpreter conversely, used simplification. He simplified the sentence and explained its meaning to avoid confusion and any misunderstanding by saying, "The security council reform we need is not an increase in the number of members, which would only make things worse..." Then, he continues by saying, "to use a common expression, if you add more water, you get more mud. It would add insult to injury," which shows that the interpreter is confused. It would have been better if he had stuck to one translation by using the same expression in English which is "if you add insult to injury" to avoid the audience misunderstanding. Both interpreters succeeded in interpreting the metaphor, and they used very good techniques to deliver the intended message.
Gaddafi's interpreter used omission technique. This may have been for several reasons: 1- that the speaker was speaking very fast; 2- or the interpreter did not know how to interpret this metaphor; 3- or because the interpreter cut out this metaphor to preserve as much of the essential message as possible. Jones (2002) argues that if an interpreter does not understand the meaning of a metaphor, and yet s/he believes that the metaphor is important, then s/he should attempt to render it as literally as possible. However, the Libyan State T.V. interpreter used reformulation, he said, "I am afraid that we may then go back to square one," and he did not interpret word-for-word. By using reformulation, the interpreter found an equivalent in meaning, but used different wording, which is the best way to render metaphors according to Jones (2002).

**Analyzing unit 8:** 
"الساكت عن الحق شيطان أخرس"

Gaddafi's interpreter used reformulation; he said, "Those who keep silent regarding what is right is like a silent devil. We won't be silent devils;" and he did not interpret word-for-word. By doing this, the interpreter found an equivalent in meaning, but with different wording. Also, by using Jones' (2002) strategy, he conveyed the speaker's message as faithfully as possible.

The Libyan State T.V. interpreter used simplification; he simplified the sentence and explained its meaning to avoid confusion and misunderstanding by saying, "Why are we silent? We must never be war devils; anyone who does not speak the truth is a silent devil." This interpreter succeeded in finding an equivalent to this metaphor by simplifying the metaphor, since simplification is used to deal with highly technical materials.

**Analyzing unit 9:**
"نلبس هذا الثوب الذي قصلته هذه الأمم الثلاث" 

Gaddafi's interpreter used transcoding to interpret this metaphor. He used word-for-word rendition when he said, "wanted from us to wear the clothes or the suit that was tailored..." Using a word-for-word rendition for this particular metaphor can leave the audience confused. This will occur because there is no such expression that can be found in the target language. Instead, the interpreter should find an equivalent to obtain a closer meaning for this metaphor.

The Libyan State T.V. interpreter used reformulation by saying, "The United Nations was shaped in line with those three countries and wanted us to step into the shoes originally designed against Germany." The interpreter here tried to reformulate the long, complicated
sentence into a shorter and easier one. He succeeded in delivering the meaning of this metaphor by using reformulation.

Analyzing unit 10: "نحن لسنا بحيوانات في زريبة يذبحون فينا في العيد كما يشاؤن"

Gaddafi's interpreter used reformulation, he said, "We are not animals in the livestock or in that we slaughter." He did not interpret word-for-word. But it seems that he forgot to mention the word "Eid" in the interpretation. The speaker was talking about an important specific cultural reference that happens in the Islamic world which is the "Eid." By forgetting this small word, the metaphor will lose the whole image of what happens during the "Eid."

Although the Libyan State T.V. interpreter used transcoding; he interpreted word-for-word as it is, "نحن لسنا بحيوانات في زريبة يذبحون فينا في العيد كما يشاؤن." He said, "We are not livestock or animals like those that are slaughtered for the Eid." By using transcoding, the interpreter managed to describe the image of this cultural reference that takes place in the Islamic world.

Analyzing unit 11: "بيغرقوا بحمام الدم"

Gaddafi's interpreter adopted a transcoding strategy, which seems to be effective in this case. But he got the tense wrong by saying, "They drown in a bloodbath." Instead, he should have said, "they will drown in the bloodbath" if they continue with this war and this is exactly what the speaker meant.

The Libyan State T.V. interpreter wanted to use reformulation, but he got it all wrong by saying, "I would encourage them to persist in this bloodbath." By using "I would encourage," the interpreter made a big mistake because the speaker did not mention that, and this erroneous interpretation can cause serious problems in terms of the audience's understanding. The speaker meant that if he encouraged them to send more troops to this war, they would definitely drown in the bloodbath. Both interpreters failed to deliver an important message to the audience by making obvious grammatical mistakes. These types of large mistakes will lead to enormous misunderstandings. Table 3 below shows the two renditions of religious references of the source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The interpreting unit</th>
<th>Gaddafi's interpreter</th>
<th>Libyan State T.V. interpreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>حرب العراق أم الكبائر</td>
<td>Then we come to the Iraqi war, the mother of all evils</td>
<td>Then we have the war in Iraq; the mother of all evils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. كما قال لوط لقومه: مسابق عليهم أحد من العالمين. No one has done this before in previous wars, sodomy, and this is unprecedented. It was unprecedented sin, never before committed by past aggressors or invaders.

14. قضية سجن أبو غريب. The Abu Ghraib decisions, the prisoners of war who were prosecuted there and who were badly treated, and dogs were used on them... And no one has done this before in previous wars, sodomy, and this is unprecedented. No one no previous aggressions, or no or aggressors and prisoners of war. Prisoners of war held in Abu Ghraib prison were torturers; dogs were set on them... This is unprecedented in the history of war. It was sodomy, and it was an unprecedented sin, never before committed by past aggressors or invaders.

15. لايمكن هذه الجرائم أن نسكت عليها. لا نبدو نحن كنا قرابين كل عام. منا حيوانات مربوطين كقربان. We can't keep silent about these crimes. Otherwise we will all become victims and sacrifices and every year it would be the turn of someone. We are not animals and we are not sacrifices. Those are crimes, and we cannot keep silent. Otherwise, we will look alike sacrificial beasts. We are not animals. Year after year, we are attacked.

Analyzing unit 12: "حرب العراق أم الكبائر"

Both the interpreters erred by rendering "الكبائر" as "evils." Both interpreters render it as "the mother of all evils." This expression was originally coined by the Former President of Iraq, Saddam Hussain, during the war with Iran. The original expression was "أم المعارك." This expression was miscalqued into English as "Mother of all battles." In his US speech, Gaddafi used the concept, but instead of using the word "معارك"، he used "كبائر" with the historical load that goes with it.

By referring to this war as "أم الكبائر", Gaddafi meant that what happened during it was like committing one of those sins that are forbidden by God. The following rendition: "the mother of all sins," would be more faithful to the original.
Analyzing unit 13: "كما قال لوط لقومه ماسبق عليهم أحد من العالمين"

Both of the interpreters did not understand that this expression is a religious expression. Neither seems to have found the direct quote from the Quran. This may be understood in two ways. Either they do not have enough knowledge about the Quran, or it might also be a conscious choice to override the religious reference for the sake of the audience, who might not be familiar with this religious context.

Both Gaddafi's interpreter and the Libyan State T.V. interpreter used an omission strategy. It seems that they faced difficulties in rendering this religious reference. The speaker made a significant religious reference about the prophet Lot when he was talking to his people about their sins. Neither interpreter made an effective choice, because it was a very powerful comparison between what happened in the past and what is happening nowadays. They should have rendered this powerful image either by paraphrasing or reformulation.

Analyzing unit 14: "حتى الشيطان مايعمل هذا"

Gaddafi used code-switching in his sentence; he shifted his style from standard to informal colloquial Arabic. Both interpreters adopted omission for this religious reference. It seems they chose omission deliberately so that they could achieve a simple interpretation to assure a high level of understanding between the speaker and the audience.

Analyzing unit 15: "ولا نبدو نحن كنا قرابيين كل عام يجي علينا واحد"

Animal sacrifice is a religious ritual called "Qurban." It is the sacrifice of a livestock animal during Eid al-Adha. The word "Qurban" appears in the Quran to refer to animal sacrifice. In this instance, Gaddafi mentioned this reference to emphasize the fact that the lives of people are not like "Quraban" to kill them and sacrifice them.

Gaddafi's interpreter adopted a summarizing strategy by saying, "Otherwise we will all become victims and sacrifices and every year it would be the turn of someone." By using summarizing, the interpreter did not capture the beautiful image that lies in this sentence. Instead, he should have adopted a transcoding strategy to be faithful to the source text.

The Libyan State T.V. interpreter adopted a reformulation strategy by saying "Otherwise, we will look alike sacrificial beasts. We are not animals. Year after year, we are attacked." He too made a wrong rendition by rendering the word "قربان" into "sacrificial beasts," and the correct rendition would be "sacrificing animals." Table 4 below shows the interpreting strategies used in the rendition of the source.
Table 4 The Interpreting Strategies Used in the Rendition of the Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreting unit #</th>
<th>Gaddafi's interpreter</th>
<th>Libyan State T.V. interpreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Error correction</td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>Simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wrong rendition</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reformulation/Summarizing</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>Simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>Simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>Wrong rendition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wrong rendition</td>
<td>Wrong rendition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Discussion of the Results

Table 5 below shows the frequency of interpreting strategy. The results of the analysis show that reformulation and transcoding strategies are the most frequently used strategies.

Table 5 The Frequency of Interpreting Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Gaddafi's interpreter</th>
<th>Libyan State T.V. interpreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error correction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcoding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following chart shows the frequency of interpreting strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong rendition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting of the General Assembly on that day was for a specific selection of non-permanent members of the Security Council. The Former Libyan President gave a long and unique speech, which placed extra stress on the interpreters. The interpreters were interpreting simultaneously live on international and national television channels, which meant that they were going to be heard by millions of people around the world. All these factors put the interpreters under extreme stress and pressure, which then encourages them to use literal translations.

The examination of the interpreting strategies shows that the adoption of some strategies resulted in unidiomatic and awkward renditions, such as using omission (33.3%) and incorrect rendition (26.6%). The results show that six strategies were applied when
rendering cultural references namely: error correction, summarizing, transcoding, simplification, reformulation, and omission. Four examples were rendered incorrectly. In this thesis, the total strategies that were applied in this analysis reveal the following: error correction was used (6.6%) of the time, summarizing (20%), transcoding (53.3%), simplification (20%), incorrect rendition (26.6%), reformulation (46.6%), and omission (33.3%). The three main strategies applied by the interpreters were: reformulation (46.6%), omission (33.3%), and transcoding (53.3%). The most dominant techniques used by these two interpreters were: reformulation (46.6%) and transcoding (53.3%).

The analysis of this thesis is based on three categories. The first category is cultural sarcasm. Sarcasm is aimed at specific audiences, and interpreting is determined by the elements of time and space. Differences will always exist between two cultures and languages, some obvious examples include: political and cultural differences. This particular category was very difficult for the interpreters to render correctly, as the Arab culture is full of sarcasm. A good interpreter must master this important category in order to produce a successful rendition.

The second category reviewed by this thesis covers metaphors and sayings. The Arab culture is known for its passion and the use of metaphors and sayings. The extensive use of metaphors in the communication styles of Arabs relates to the fact that the Arab culture is an oral culture. Metaphors might sound strange to the English listener, but it is highly effective for Arab listeners. This category is an important one because understanding metaphors and sayings is necessary for conveying messages. The most difficult situation in this category occurs when the speaker uses a metaphor that has no meaning in the culture of the foreign language. In this case, there is a solution. The interpreter should find an acceptable equivalent from the local culture or something universally known, or explain the metaphor that the speaker just said and put it in context. The most important thing is to make sure that the interpreter facilitates communication without altering the intended message.

The third and the last category is religious references. This category is especially important for Arab interpreters. Interpreters should broaden their knowledge about religious references. Religious references can pose serious challenges for interpreters because of the difficulty of transmitting Arabic terminology or religious values into English.

Muammar Gaddafi's speech was long and full of cultural sarcasm, which placed obvious stress on the interpreters when rendering cultural sarcasm. Both interpreters were
confused about the best strategy to use in order to render sarcasm correctly. This was very clear particularly when they used omission, error correction, and they even made grammatical mistakes, as in example 2, "أنتم هايد بارك", which was rendered as "we are like speaker's corner in London's Hyde Park." The most dominant strategy used in this category was transcoding. Perhaps the best way to handle sarcasm in simultaneous interpreting is by using a summarizing and recapitulation strategy for this category. By using these strategies, the interpreter will have to clarify what is unclear because of the speaker, and clarify the speaker's ideas to the audience when it requires some explanation.

When it comes to metaphors and sayings, both interpreters showed hesitation when rendering culturally common metaphors. As we can see in example 12, both interpreters gave more than one rendition of the metaphor "يزيد الطين بلة", which revealed their lack of knowledge in this area. The most commonly used strategies in rendering metaphors in this study were transcoding and reformulation, which seem to be effective in some cases because there are expressions that have no equivalence in the English language. By using reformulation, the interpreter will convey the speaker's meaning and be faithful to the true meaning at the same time. By using transcoding, interpreters will use literal interpretation and use a target language equivalent for the source language word.

In rendering religious references, both interpreters showed their lack of knowledge in this area. The Libyan State T.V. interpreter is a foreign interpreter which makes him under another kind of stress. One would not expect him to perform more effectively because he faced many problems when rendering information that relates to the Arab/Islamic culture. On the other hand, one would not expect Gaddafi's interpreter to face the same problems that faced the Libyan State T.V. interpreter. Gaddafi's interpreter is an Arab interpreter, and he is interpreting from his mother tongue, one would expect him to perform better and more effectively because he is rendering information that relates to his Arab/Islamic culture. An interpreter should have total mastery of his/her mother tongue, which means that they should have the ability to express themselves grammatically, fluently, and precisely, with extensive and accurate vocabulary (Jones, 2002).

The most adopted strategy in this category was omission. Three examples were rendered erroneously either because the interpreters did not understand that the expression was a religious expression, or it might have been a conscious choice to override the religious reference for the sake of the audience, who might not have been familiar with this religious
context. The best suggest for dealing with religious references is using transcoding and reformulation.

Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002) argued that "familiar subject matter such as that found in religious texts produced a high quality of interpretation in the dominant language (a good language control), but this was not the case in political or economic subject matters (poor language control)" (p. 622). In this case, interpreters are expected to produce professional renditions when interpreting familiar subjects. The analysis of the religious references in the speech shows that both interpreters did not produce the expected results. One would expect from Gaddafi's interpreter to know how to introduce a verse from the Holy Quran, such as in example 20, because he is most probably a Muslim. However, he opted for omission of the original, rather than giving culturally acceptable renditions for this verse. In addition, both interpreters showed poor language control, which manifested itself in incorrect word choices and in the inaccurate renditions such as in the examples:

1. أتقدم بالتهنئة لإبننا الرئيس "أوباما"
   My son Obama

2. ببغرقوا بحمام الدم
   "They drown in a bloodbath"

The interpreters' wrong choices and poor linguistic performance were obvious on many occasions. There could have been several reasons for this including: lack of knowledge of the subject matter, interpreters' skill, or the speaker's speed.

This chapter discussed interpreting political discourse. It offered a brief biography about the Former Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi. It investigated also interpreters' strategies in a live simultaneous interpreting task of Gaddafi's speech to the United Nations. Then, it analyzed the culturally-bound interpreting units. Finally, it analyzed the interpreters' rendition from Arabic to English and identified the strategies that have been used while interpreting the political speech.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

The East and the West have always been in a push-and-pull relationship, politically, economically, and most importantly culturally. The role of interpreting serves as a link between the two cultures. The more knowledgeable an interpreter is about the culture of both the source and target language as well as of the interpreting field itself, the more capable s/he would be to provide a high-quality interpreting service, and deliver the message as faithfully as possible.

There are a few strategies in the field of interpreting which make it difficult for the interpreters to choose the most suitable one in each context. Interpreting for political leaders in particular, can put interpreters under high levels of stress, and may influence their choice of strategies, thereby affecting their performance.

The aim of this thesis is to study and analyze the interpreters' choice of strategies in a highly sensitive context. The Former Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi's speech was analyzed and fifteen examples were chosen and divided into three categories: sarcasm, metaphors, and religious references. The selected examples posed cultural difficulties for two interpreters.

The thesis finds that reformulation and transcoding are the most widely used strategies. Adopting these two strategies, in most of the examples, led to an unidiomatic rendition that was not acceptable to the audience. In addition, analysis of the fifteen examples shows that the two interpreters lack the needed cultural background knowledge. Finally, the thesis finds that the two interpreters showed poor linguistic performance, which was clear from their wrong word choices, and inaccurate rendition of the meaning.

The findings of this thesis suggest that political interpreting needs more attention, because it plays an important role in the mutual understanding between any two cultures and countries. In addition, the interpreters must pay more attention to dealing with culturally-bound expressions in Arabic and choosing the best strategy in rendering them to the target language. One aspect that this study may have shed some light on is how to train interpreters to become more aware of culturally-bound expressions. This study has shown the importance of the interpreters’ cultural background and suggests that more attention be given in this area.

In terms of limitations of the study, the most challenging issue that faced the researcher was the unavailability of more renditions of the data for the analysis. Only two
renditions of the speech were found. More renditions for this speech would have provided more data for the analysis, thereby leading to better results. Also, more political speeches by the same leader would have helped the analysis of this thesis, but due to the lack of time, the researcher could not analyze more than one speech.

Finally, it is hoped that this thesis can contribute to the body of research on this challenging subject, which is clearly under-studied. This thesis does not offer conclusive findings on the interpreters' strategies in political discourse, given the lack of recent studies in this area, but it provides a small contribution which may help others in the field.
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APPENDIX A

Arabic Samples of Muammar Gaddafi's speech

بسم الله.

حضرات السادة أعضاء الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة:

أهيبكم باسم الاتحاد الإفريقي، وأدعو أن يكون هذا الإنعقاد تاريخياً في حياة العالم.

وباسم الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة التي ترأسها ليبيا، وباسم الاتحاد الإفريقي، وباسم مملكة تكريمية إفريقية، وباسمكم جميعاً. أقدم بالتهنئة لإبننا الرئيس "أوياما" لأنه لأول مرة يحضر معنا إجتماع الجمعية العامة يوصفه رئيس الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية، ونبيه لأنه هو الدولة المضيفة.

يأتي هذا الإنعقاد في قمة جملة من التحديات التي تواجهنا جميعاً، والتي ينبغي على العالم أن يتحد ويتكاتف بجهود جادة لكي يهزم هذه التحديات التي تشكل العدو المشترك:

تحديات المناخ، والأزمة المالية أو إنهيار الاقتصادي الرأسمالي، وأزمة الغذاء والماء، والتصحر، والإرهاب، والهجرة، وإنتشار الأمراض المخاطئة من الإنسان وغير المخلوق، لأن بعض الفيروسات صنعتها أجهزة حربية كسلاح، وفقدت السيطرة عليها. وقد تكون أفلونزا "ألف الطائر الخنازير"، هي من ضمن الفيروسات التي لم تتم السيطرة عليها، وهي مخلقة في المعامل كسلاح حربي. وكذلك الإنفلونزا المزمنة، إلى جانب الإرهاب الآخر، وإنتشار الفيروسات والكفر، وانتشار الأخلاق وسياق المادة. هذا كله يشكل عدوًا مشتركًا لنا جميعاً.

أيها السادة:

تعلمون أن الأمم المتحدة تكوّنت في الأساس من ثلاث دول أو أربع إتحاد ضد ألمانيا. هذه هي الأمم المتحدة، وليس منظمة الأمم المتحدة. منظمة الأمم المتحدة التي هي نحن الآن، شيء آخر، أما الأمم المتحدة فهي الأمم التي إتحدت ضد ألمانيا في الحرب العالمية الثانية، وهذه الدول شكلت مجلس سنته مجلس الأمم، وأعطت لنفسها مقاعد دائمة، وأعطت لنفسها الفيتو. نحن لم نكن حاضرين، وقنا صنعت الأم المتحدة عليها، وطلبت منا نحن أن ننبذ هذا الثوب الذي فضتله هذه الأمم الثلاث أو الأربع التي إتحدت ضد ألمانيا. أنها هي الحقيقة، وهذا هو أساس هذه المنظمة الدولية. حصل ذلك في غياب "165" شاب وخمس وستين أمة موجودة الآن، يعني نسبة "1" إلى "8"، كان حاضرا واحد وغباث ثمانية. وهم الذين صنعوا المنطقي الذي تعلمن من قراءته - وميثاق الأمم المتحدة معه - أن ديبيته شيء، ومواده شيء آخر. كيف حصل هذا؟!

إن الذين حضروا سان فرانسيسكو في عام 45، اشتركوا في صناعة الدبابة، وتركوا المواد الأخرى بما فيها اللوائح الداخلية لما يسمى مجلس الأمن، للخبراء والفتيين وساعة الدول المهتمة بهذا الموضوع، وهي الدول التي صنعت مجلس الأمن، والدول التي إتحدت ضد ألمانيا. الدبابة مغيرة جداً ولا اعتراض عليها، ولكن كل ما جاء بعد ذلك متناقض تماماً مع الدبابة، وهذا هو الذي نحن الآن أمامه، وتحت عليه ونرفضه، ولا يمكن أن ننسبه له لأن هذا إنتهاء وقته في الحرب العالمية الثانية. الدبابة تقول إن الأمم متساوية كبيرها وصغيرها. هل المقاعد الدائمة، نحن متساوون فيها؟ أبداً، نحن غير
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الديباجة تقول "الأمم الكبيرة والصغيرة، متساوية في الحقوق ". هذه الديباجة، وهذه هي التي وافقنا عليها. إن هذه الديباجة ضد الميثاق، والمقايض الدائمة ضد الميثاق، وهذه نحن لا نعرف بها ولا نقبلها. يقوم الميثاق في الديباجة "النظام" أن لا تستخدم القوة المسلحة في غير المؤقتة المشتركة ". هذه هي الديباجة التي نحن رحبنا بها، ووضعنا عليها، وإنضمنت للأمم المتحدة بناءً عليها، تقول إن القوة المسلحة لا تستعمل إلا في المؤقتة المشتركة لكل الأمم. لكن وقعت بعد ذلك 65 حرب.

بعد قيام الأمم المتحدة وبعد قيام مجلس الأمن بكييفته الحالية وبعد هذا التعهد، ضحتي الملايين أكثر من الحرب العالمية.

هل هذه الحروب وقعت والعدوان الذي وقع والقوة التي استخدمت في 65 حرباً، هي للمؤقتة المشتركة!؟ أبداً. هي لمؤقتة دولة معينة أو دولتين أو ثلاثة دول - ونأتي لهذه الحروب لنرى هل هي قامت للمؤقتة المشتركة أو لمؤسسة دولة معينة. هذا تناقض صارخ مع ديباجة الميثاق الذي نحن نعتقدهما به، وإنضمننا لهذه المؤقتة. وإذا كان الأمر لا يمشي حسب الديباجة التي نحن وافقنا عليها، فهنا نحن وودينا في المؤقتة لا يمشي اعتباراً من الآن.

نحن لا نجمل، ولا نقول كلاماً دبلوماسياً، ولا نسلنا خائفين، ولا نستطبع أن نجمل في مصير العالم. نحن الآن نتحدث عن مصير العالم، عن مصير الكومنا الطبيعي، عن مصير الجنس البشري، فماعش مجامله ولايالفق في هذه القضية المعمودية للميثاق، لأن هذا التهاون والخوف والخوف أدأ إلى وقوع 65 حرباً بعد قيام الأمم المتحدة.

وتقول الديباجة " وإذا قام إستعمال القوة يجب أن تكون قوة أممية، قوة مشتركة ". الأمم المتحدة هي جمهورية أركن الحرب هي التي تستخدم القوة، وليس دولة أو دولتان ولا ثلاث. الأمم المتحدة كلها تقرر إستعمال القوة حفظاً للسلام العالمي.

وإذا وقع عدوان من دولة على أخرى بعد عام 1945 بعد قيام هذه المؤقتة، فإن الأمم المتحدة مجتمعة تقوم برفع هذا العدوان. يعني إذا اعتدت ليبيا على فرنسا مثلاً يجب أن تقوم الأمم المتحدة برفع العدوان الليبي، لأن فرنسا دولة مستقلة وعضو في الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة، وذات سيادة. نحن ملتزمون أن ندافع عن سيادة الأمم جماعياً، لكن وقعت 65 حرباً بعد ناجحون دون أن تقوم الأمم المتحدة برفعها، وقامت بها - ثماني حرباً طاغية كبرى ضخماًها بالملائيين، قامت بها الدول صاحبة المعقد الدائم في مجلس الأمن جماعياً القفو. الدول التي نحن نطمئن إليها، ونعتقد أنها هي التي تستحمي الأمم وتحمي استقلال الشعوب، هي التي هددت إستقلال الشعوب واستخدمت القوة الغاشمة.

كنا نعتقد أنها هي التي ستترد العدوان وتحمي الشعوب وتحمي الشعوب، وهي تتمتع بمغام دائم في مجلس الأممن، وتعمل بما أطلعته نفسها من حق فيو. وليس في هذا الميثاق، ما يوجب للأمم المتحدة أن تتدخل في الشؤون التي تكون من مصلحة السكان الداخلي لدولة ما. يعني أن نظام الحكم شأن داخلي لدولة ما لا يحق لأحد أن يتدخل فيه، فإن تعمل نظامك ديكاتوريّاً أو ديمقراطياً أو إمبراطورياً أو رأسماليّاً أو رجعياً أو تقدمياً، فهذا المسؤولية المجتمع ذاته، شأن داخلي.

لقد صوتت روما في يوم ما " يوليوس قيصر " أن يكون ديكاتوري حيث أعاد مجلس الشيوخ تنفيضاً لأن يكون ديكاتوريًا، لأنهم يرون أن الديمقراطية في ذلك الوقت بديلة لروما. هذا شأن داخلي، من يقول لروما لماذا عملت " يوليوس قيصر ديكاتوري "؟!
الدبيجة هذا هو الشيء الذي إنفدها عليه، أما مجيء الفيتو بعد ذلك فهو غير مذكور في الميثاق. ولن قالوا لنا إن الفيتو موجود لما إنضمنا إلى الأمم المتحدة، فلن نضمنا لأننا متساوون في الحقوق. لإن تظهر بعد ذلك دولة عنها حق الإعتراف على كل قراراتنا وعندها مقعد دان، فإن أعضاء المقعد الدان؟ هذه الدول الأربع أعطت نفسها المقعد الدائم. ولدولة الوحيدة التي صوتنا في هذه الجمعية لمعفيدها الدائنا، هي الصين، فالسين أعطيناها أصواتنا لكي يكون لها مقعد دائم في مجلس الأمن. وهذه الدولة فقط وجودها وجود ديمقراطي، أما المقاعد الأربعة الأخرى فوجودها غير ديمقراطي، بل ديمقراطي مفروض علينا، ولا نعترف به ولا نفتش عليه.

اصلاح الأمم المتحدة - أبها السادة - ليس بالتوجه نحو زيادة المقاعد.

زيادة المقاعد "زيد الطين بلة" - "أنا لا أعرف كيف تترجم المنتج هذا المثل، "الطين بلة".
"to add insult to injury". هذا مثل تصف ترجمته بالإنجليزية، ولكن أساسك فيه: هي "زيد الطين بلة" يعني زيده السوء سوءا، يزيد الكيل كيلين - كيف؟ لأن منضاف دول كبرى إلى الدول الكبرى الأولى التي تعاني منها، وتراجع كفة الدول الكبرى أكثر و أكثر. إن لم نحن نرفض زيادة المقاعد بهذه الكيفية.

الحل ليس زيادة المقاعد، وأخطر شيء أن نزيد مقاعد دول كبرى إلى الدول الكبرى الأولى. هذا يضمن شعب العالم الثالث، يضمن كل الشعب الصغرى التي تتشكل الان فيما يسمى "100.g". هناك "100" دولة صغيرة متجمة في "FSS" "forum of small states". "100.states" "g."

منبر إسمه "g."

هذا ستطنحها المقاعد الجديدة، لأن دول كبرى جديدة تضاف إلى الدول الكبرى السابقة. هذا مرفوع، ويجب أن يقفل بابه، ونعارضه بشدة، إذا الحل هو تحقيق الديمقراطية على مستوى الكونغرس العالمي الذي هو الجمعية العامة، وهناك نقل صلاحيات مجلس الأمن إلى الجمعية العامة، ودمج مجلس الأمناداء تنفيذ قرارات الجمعية العامة فقط الجمعية العامة هي برمان العالم. هي كونغرس العالم، هي المشرع وهي التي تكون قراراتها مزمنة ومجلس الأمن يضع للجمعية العامة ولا يعط عليها ابدا وتنهضه إذا على عليها من الآن. هذه هي السلطة التشريعية. هؤلاء هم المشرعون للجمعية العامة. ثم إن فتح باب زيادة مقاعد مجلس الأمن، سرعان الغبن والجور، ويزيد حدة التوتر عالميا، ويزيد التنافس على مقاعد مجلس الأمن، ونسكن في تنافس بين مجموعة مهمة جدا من الدول.

وسوف تكون هناك منافسة بين إيطاليا، ألمانيا، إندونيسيا، الهند، باكستان، الفلبين، اليابان، البرازيل، الأرجنتين، نيجريا، الجزائر، ليبيا، مصر، كوبا، جنوب إفريقيا، تنزانيا، تركيا، إيران، اليونان، أوكانانيا. كل هذه الدول بعد ذلك ستطلب بأن يكون لها مقعد في مجلس الأمن، وفي هذه الحالة سيستمر التنافس حتى يصل عدد أعضاء مجلس الأمن بعدد أعضاء هذه الجمعية، وهذا غير عملي.

إذن ما هو الحل؟

الحل المطروح الآن على الجمعية العامة بقيادة "علي التركي" والذي ستتخذ فيه قرارا بالتصويت، والقرار الملزم هو قرار الأغلبية في الجمعية العامة دون النظر لأي جهة أخرى، هو أن يقفل باب عضوية الدول، ويقفل باب زيادة المقاعد في مجلس الأمن - هذا معروض على الجمعية العامة، الأمم العلامة، والتركي، ويلج محلها عضوية الإتحادات، وتحقيق الديمقراطية بالمساواة بين الدول الأعضاء، ونقل صلاحيات مجلس الأمن إلى الجمعية العامة. تكون الوضعية للإتحادات وليس للدول، لأن إذا فتحنا باب عضوية مجلس الأمن كما هو مطروح الآن للدول، فإن هذا سيؤدي إلى أن كل الدول تريد
أن يكون لها مقعد في مجلس الأمن، وهذا من حقها لأنها حسب هذه الديوانية هي متساوية. فكيف نقولها؟ من الذي له الحق من الذي له الحق أن يوقف هذه الدول أن تطالب؟!

من الذي له الحق أن يقول لإيطاليا لا تطالب بمقدع إذا أعطي مقعد إلى ألمانيا؟. إيطاليا أولى، تقول أنا التي اندضمت للحلفاء وخرجت من المحور، أما ألمانيا فهي التي كانت معتددة، وهي التي هزت مثلاً - ليست ألمانيا الحالية، بل ألمانيا السابقة النازية.

إذا الهند مثلًا أعطيت مقعداً ونقول إنها تستحقه، سوف تحتاج إلى تشكيل. هذه دولة ذرية، وهذه دولة ذرية، وهذا في حالة حريره، هذا شيء خطر. وإذا أعطي اليابان، لماذا لا أعطي إندونيسيا أكبر دولة إسلامية في العالم؟! ثم ما الذي ستوله لتركيا وإيران وأوكرانيا والبرازيل والأرجنتين، ولليبيا التي أعطت برنامج السلاح النووي فيآي أيضاً تستحق مقعداً في مجلس الأمن لأنها خدمت الأمن العالمي؟! وتأتي مصر، وتأتي نيجيرياً، وتأتي الجزائر، والكونغو، وجنوب أفريقيا، وتونس، وهذه كلها دول مهمة. هذا الباب يجب أن يغلق، فقط تتوسع مجلس الأمن، هذا عبادة هذه خدعة مضحوحة، إذ كيف سنصلح الأمور المتحدة وتأتي بدول كبرى جديدة وتنضموا في كفة الدول الكبرى الأولى التي نعالي منها؟!

إذا الحلف هو تحقيق الديمقراطية على مستوى كونغرس العالم الذي هو الجمعية العامة. وهو نقل صلاحيات مجلس الأمن إلى الجمعية العامة، ويصبح مجلس الأمن أداة تنفيذ قرارات الجمعية العامة فقط. الجمعية العامة هي برلمان العالم، هي كونغرس العالم، هي المشترع، وهي التي تتصرفها ملزمة، وهذه هي الديمقراطية، وأن يخضع مجلس الأمن للجمعية العامة ولا يعول عليها أبداً، ونرفضه إذا هو على إعلانها اعتبار من الآن. هذه هي السلطة التشريعية. هؤلاء هم المشرعون للجمعية العامة. مكتب إن "الجمعية العامة تعمل كذا وكذا بناءً على توصية مجلس الأمن"، هذا غلط وصحيح هو العكس، هو أن مجلس الأمن يعمل كذا وكذا بناءً على أواخر الجمعية العامة. هاي 190 أمي. هذه هي الأمور المتحدة مع بعضها، وليس مجلس الأمن الذي في القاعة المجاورة، عشرة أشخاص، أي ديمقراطيا هذه؟ أي أم؟ كيف يطمئن على السلام العالمي إذا كان مصريناً بيده ميلاء وسائلها عليها دوله واحدة بعد ذلك... هذه هي الأمور هؤلاء ال 190 أمم متبحة مع بعضها وليس مجلس الأمن في القاعة هذه عشرة أنوار أي ديمقراطيا هذه؟ أي أم؟ كيف يطمئن على السلام العالمي إذا كان مصريناً بيده ميلاء وسائلها عليها دوله واحدة بعد ذلك، ونحن 190 أمة موجودون هنا مثل حديث "هادي بارك". ديكور؟!!.

أتمع عامليكم ديكوراً، أتمع "هادي بارك". أتمع عامليكم لا قيمة لكم. منفر للخطابة فقط، مثلا تخطب في حديقة "هادي بارك"، ينكذب وتمشي، هذا أتمع. هذا أنتوا. مكتب الأمين سلطة تنفيذية فقط لقرارات الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة، وفي هذه الحالة لن يكون هناك تنافس على مقاعد مجلس الأمين عندما يصبح مجلس الأمين مجرد منفذ لقرارات الجمعية العامة. أن يكون مجلس الأمن مثال لكل الأمم ولكن ليس بالدوله. أن الأمين الأول يصبح من الأن يتكون من اتحادات. هذا هو العدل والديمقراطية وتنبيه من حكايء أن مجلس الأمن تحتله دوله، وحدهو تمثل القائمة الذاره، وحدهو تمثل القوة الاقتصادية، وحدهو تمثل التقنية، هذا أرهابه هذا، في مجلس الأمين مسيطرين عليهم القوة الساحقة، هذا أرهابه. إذا تبنا عالم عيش متحد ومسالم في أمان وسلام عمل هذا. إذا ليس في الإرهاب فليكون كذلك. تعيش في الصراع إلى يوم القيامة، السياسة عند الأمم عند ال 190 أمة موجودة هنا، هذا تكون كل الأمم موجودة بالتساوي في مجلس الأمن، كما هي موجودة في الجمعية العامة، نحن هنا بالجمعية العامة أصواتنا متساوية لابد أن تكون متساويين في الغرفة إلى جانبنا التي هي مجلس
الأمن. الدولة في عدنها الفيتور والدولة التي ماعنها الفيتور ودولة عدتها مقعد دائم ودولة ماعنها مقعد دائم في مجلس الأمن.

هذا لم يعترَب من الأكن، ولا مخوف له ولا عنصر له شعور بالأمن، هناك هنالك مختصين، كنا تحت الوصاية استقلالي الآن، ونريد أن نقر مصير العالم بالطريقة الديمقراطية تحفظ السلامة والأمن لكل الشعوب. تتساوى الأمم كبيرها وصغيرها، يد人家مة مش إرهاب القاعدة فقط، هذا ونرى صرحاً كبيراً من إرهاب القاعدة، لكنه لا يمكننا أن نكره عليه.

الإرهاب ينطلق من النزاعات، والنزاعات تنشأ من عدم التفاهم في العالم. إننا نعيش في عالم متشابه، هذا العالم الذي نعيش فيه، هم يعيشون مثلنا. إننا نعيش في عالم متشابه، هذا العالم الذي نعيش فيه، هم يعيشون مثلنا.

هذا هو قرار كلمتنا العليا للأمم المتحدة. أما الآن، فهناك الأمان مسؤولها عن إقصائية، إipcية سياسية لاصحاب المقاعد الدائم، بحريهم ويستخدمنه صدنا، وبالتالي لايمكننا مجلس أم. ينتمي مجلس يدبع، يتجه هذ الباطنية. أنت شافين يا إخواننا في حياتنا السياسية. هذا كان مجلس الأمن يستخدمنه ضدنا للتنجح في كل هذه الأم و هذه الأمه المسكون، إذا كاناهم يحكمونه ضعف ذلك، يحملونه ضعف المال، فإذا كاناهم يحكمونه ضعف ذلك، يحملونه ضعف المال.

الدول الكبرى واحدة مصالح مشتركة في العالم، وготовونا الفيتور واستخدمنا قوة الأمم المتحدة لحلفائها مشاركاً، هذا أعراب العالم الثالث. العالم الثالث مره، الآن، يعيش تحت الإرهاب، مجلس الأمن منذ قيامه عام 45 حتى الآن لم يوفر لنا الأمن. بل وفر لنا العقبات والوقوع. يستخدمنا ضعف له، لنجعلهم ضعف المثبتة، لمراجعته في حالة استخدمها ضداً لنفسه.

في الجمعية العامة ستستند على هذه الحلفاء الخائبة، وبعدها إذا أن نستند معاً في أم واحد، وما نقسم قسمين: أم متساوية لها جمعياتها و لها مجلس أم مسؤول بها متساوية فيه أيضاً، ويفقون الكبار أصحاب المجالس المقاعد الدائمة. وأصحاب الفيتور يبقون في مجالسهم أربعة أو خمسة أو ثلاثة كما يريدون ونحن لنساهم فعلهم عليه أن يطبقوا الفيتور ضد بعضهم البعض لا يهمنا أن يبقوا داميين والعالم، بل يبقى هذه المقاعد إليها، لكن لنعمتنا اعتباراً من الآن نبني تحت سيطرة الدائمين ونبني تحت سيطرة الفيتور الذي أعطوه نفسهم. لو حكمين نعطي الفيتور لهم، فلجدنا مفتاح لجعلي الفيتور لمجموعة دول وتفعيلها مقاعد دائمة وتعترف الأمم الثلاثة أخرى حفيرة ودولة وتنقّل مدع دائم وليس لها حق الفيتور، ليس نحن الأم، إننا مأجورة هنا، هذه الأمه معظمها ومصرح، هذه الأمه هي هذه 190 أم. أنت تعرف تعرف بأنه ابتداءً من الآن سوف نتجاهل قرارات مجلس الأمن يعد ماذا نكتنا أن نظام وسيلة ضعفنا ضعف الكبار. ومجلس الأمن لايمكن أن يستخدم ضد أصحاب المقاعد الدائمة في أصحاب الفيتور لايمكن أن يضمنون حقهم.

ويمكن أن يستخدم ضد أصحاب المقاعد الدائمة في أصحاب الفيتور لايمكن أن يضمنون حقهم، إذا هو مصحيح مضاعف ضدنا نحن، وبالتالي نستند إلى القرارات التي تصدرها يتم الضحك عليها وتعطيلها، وهذه أصبحت مهيئة للأمم المتحدة أصبع العالم خارج الأمم المتحدة عدوانا وحروب احتيال حدود الدول المستقلة وتدوير سياساتها واستقرار جرائم الحرب والإبادة الجماعية خرقًا للميثاق، وإن لم يوجد في مجلس الأمم، غير مهتمين بمجلس الأمن، وبعد ذلك الأعمال، بدأ مجموعات دولية تتشكل في مجلس الأمم تعرض عليها مشاكلها وقضاياها ويشكلون فيها صبيحة مجلس الأمن يتركونه هذه.

يصبح مزعول.

نحن غير ملزمين بإطاعة مجلس الأمن بتعكيرته الحالية، ولن نشارك بها لأنها تشككية ديناروية ونحضوراً في مجلس الأمن ولا أحد يستطيع إجبارنا على البقاء في مجلس الأمن هذا وإطاعة أواخره.
فوقัน يتمكبرا حرب عن أو يأتيون. قررت بيا، أمريكا اصفة عليكم. إبننا أوباما الأمريكي لحافلة الأمريكية عية بف. ليم. كان جماعية أمريكا ي. لأنا. أرسلها أوباما السابقين كانوا يقولون: سنرسل عملياً الصحراء والرعد المتداول ونبعث كم الورد السالم لأطفال ليبيا كما حدث في عام 86. هكذا كانوا يخطوونا ويربون العالم. سنبعث لكم الرعد المتداول كما حدث في فيتنام. سنرسل عليكم الرعد الزاحف كما أرسلت على فيتنام. وسنرسل عليكم عاصفة الصحراء كما أرسلتها للعراق. وسنرسل عليكم عملية الغاز، الدورادو التي أرسلها إليها ريفان على أطفال ليبيا تخيلوا رئيسي دولة كبيرة تطمئن إليها مندات في مجلس الأمن وتحظف استقلالنا وتحممنا من العدوان تقول قررت إرسال الورد السالم لأطفال ليبيا اللي يشيها يموت. والورد السالم هو التحلي الذرية. محمل عليه 11-45، هذا كان هو المنطقة. والآن الكلام الذي تفضل به أبنا أوباما كلام مختلف تماماً يدعو إلى التخلص من السلاح النووي بجدية وهذا شيء نصفنا له.

أوباما البلد المضيف يتحمل في أعاب تأمين مقر الأمم المتحدة وتأمين البعثات الدائمة وأعشار الرؤساء الذين يأتون من كل دول العالم إلى هذا المكان. وأمن مشدد ومصرودات وتكتاليف واستعابض عليها أوباما. نشر في واشنطن وعليكم تلتئملي عليكم. أوباما أطمغنا مش راح نتحملي عملية حماية الرؤساء إلى جانبنا. أفرضا أحد يبغي طائرة رئيس أو سيارة رئيس يجي إرهابي، وعبد هذا المبني لمعلم مستهدف من القاعدة. وكيف يوم 9/11 ماضروبوه فهذا شيء خارج عن إرادتهم. ينبغي نخلص أوباما من هذا الفلق وتقول لأمريكا شكرنا، احنا بنساعدوك في مكان ما هو مستهدف.

 الحرب بيا أم الكبار، يتحزب فيها الأمم المتحدة، الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة ترسانة على التريكي يتحزب في حرب العراق. الحرب العراق بتحزب أربع قضايا مهمة جداً: أوباما العراق بعد ذاته خلقاً لميثاقة بدون بمرر يقع من دول كبرى تحت مقعد دائم في مجلس الأمن، والعراق دوله مستقلة عضو في الجمعية العامة، كيف يتم إعداد عليها وكيف لم يتم قمع العدوان. الأمم المتحدة تمنع العدوان.

- أوباما يحب التحزب في الإيداذ الجماعية في غزو العراق، أكثر من مليون ونصف عراقي تم قتله، إبدا جماعية. ورنا المحكمة الدولية الجنائية الذين مارسوا الإيداذ الجماعية ضد الشعب العراقي.... والي يمارس الإيداذ الجماعية في العراق ماشي إلى المحكمة الدولية؟ إنهم المحكمة سلمية علينا اهتنا، هذه المحاكم نفرضها ولايتعويف بها. أما إن نخضع لها كنا أو نعترف بها. كل واحد صغيرنا وكبيرنا لازم نخضع للمحكمة الجنائية الدولية. إذا ارتقينا نفس الفعل يحل إلى هذه المحكمة. نحن لنسا بيحوار ازديادنا في العيد كما يشاؤن. احنا أبدا لم لها الحق أن تعيش بجدارة فوق الأرض وتحت الشمس مستعدة أن تقتل وتموت وتتقى ولا تعيش تحت هذا الوضع.
- القضية الثالثة في حرب العراق، يُسجن أبو غريب الذي يُنزل له حب الإنسانيات، علناً عارفاً أن أمريكا تحقق في هذه القضية. الفاضحة بحكومتها وسلطاتها، لكن الأمم المتحدة ما زالت ترتدي هذه القضية. الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة تحقق بهذه القضية.

قضية سجن أبو غريب الذي فيه أسرى الحرب الذين تم التعذيب بهم والتعذيب بهم ونهض الكباب وهم أحياء ثم اغتصاب الرجال في أسرى الحرب ماسبكم عليه أحد من المحتلين. كما قال لوط قومه ماسبكم عليه أحد من العالمين. حتى أتم ماسبكم عليه أحد من المحتلين والمحتلين. حتى الشيطان ما يعمل هذا. رجال أسرى الحرب يتم اغتصابهم في سجن أبو غريب في دولة عضو في الأمم المتحدة. ونقوم بهذا دولة صاحبة مفعود دائم في الأمم المتحدة. أي مجلس أمم هذا؟ هذه قضية إنسانية لا يمكن السكوت عليها أبداً ولازم يتم التحقق فيها لعشرها.

وبعد ذلك الحرب في أفغانستان. لماذا يتحذى أفراد أفغانستان أو طالبان من هي طالبان؟ طالبان هي التي كانت تريد أن

تعمل أفغانستان دولة دينية فتعمها دولة دينية ومالنا ومالها؟ هل الفاتيكان نشأت خطر علينا؟ دولة دينية مسماة جداً. حتى

الأفغاني يبغا يعملوا دولتهم إمرة إسلامية. لتبقى زي الفاتيكان، من قال أن الطالبان إله ويجيش الجيوش عمان نضبها،

هل بن لادن أفغاني؟ هل بن بن لادن طالبان؟ أبداً. بن لادن لا هو طالبان ولا أفغاني. هل الإرهابيين الذين ضربوا نيويورك

التي فيها نحن الآن هل هو أفغاني؟ هل هو طالبان؟ أبداً ليسوا أفغان وليسوا طالبان. إذا لمدنا العراق ولنما أفغانستان؟ أنت

إني بنقرر بأصدقائي الأمريكيين والإيلجيز ممكن مانقول هذا الكلام، بل بنيشهم ونقول لهم استمروا وباعقوا القوا في

أفغانستان وزيدوا، ببغرقوا بحمام الدم، لأنهم لن يصلوا إلى أي نتيجة في أفغانستان ولا في العراق. شفتوا العراق شو

صار له وبالرغم من أن العراق صحراء وأرض مفتوحة، فماك الكل ب أفغانستان الجبال هذه إلى يوم القيامة مايقلد أحد

يلزمها. واحد ينطف في الجبل. لكن أنا أبغي أنقذهم أنقذ أبناء الشعوب المسلمين أمريكا والدول الأخرى التي تحارب في

أفغانستان والتي تحارب في العراق، ونقول لهم اتراكوا أفغانستان للفانغستانيين واتركوا العراق للمعرقين وخلوهم بقانون

بعضهم أحرار، مش كان في حرب في أمريكا من تدخل فيها؟ وكانت حرب أهليه في أسبانيا وفي الصين؟ وبن في عالم

ماكان فيه حرب أهليه؟ خل العراقيين يحاربون بعضهم أحرار وخل الأفغانين يحاربون بعض، معاً إنا قا إذا الأفغان

حكمو أفغانستان تصبح خطيرة؟ هل هذه الطالبات التي ضربت نيويورك هذا المكان؟ هل اسقفت من أفغانستان؟ ولا من

العراق؟ انطلقت من هنا من مطار كينيدي في نيويورك. وكيف بعد نضرب أفغانستان؟ لا هو أفغان ولا هو طالبان ولاهم

عراقيين، كيف هذه الأشياء نسكت عليها؟ السكوت عن الحق شيطان أخرس ونحن لن تكون شباطين خرساء.

- لقد تكلمنا عن الإعداء عن غرناطة، وقنا غرناطة تم الإعداء عليها 7000 جندي و15 سفينة حربية وعشرات الطائرات

المقتبلة. وقتل رئيسها يشوب وهو عضو في هذه الجمعية. لا يمكن هذه الجرائم أن تسكت عليها إلا لا بد نحن كنا قرابين

كل عام يجي عليه واحد، أهنا لنا حيوانات مروحيتين كقاربنا، أهنا بدائع على وجودا، من أنفسنا، عن أبناءنا عن أفغاندا.

اهنا منا خائفين، أهنا عندما حق في الحياة على الكرة الأرضية فهي ليست مصنوعة للدول الأخرى فقط.
Gaddafi's Interpreter rendition of Muammar Gaddafi's Speech

Gaddafi's Interpreter

Distinguished members of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in the name of the African Union, I would like to welcome you. This gathering will be an historic one in the world and the history of the world. And in the name of the General Assembly that is presided by Libya now, in the name of the African Union, and in the name of 1,000 traditional African kingdoms in your own name, I would like to seize this opportunity to present congratulations to our son, Obama, because this is the first time that he is attending the General Assembly in this capacity as the president of the United States, and we greet him because it is the hosting country of this gathering.

This meeting comes at the corner at the of so many challenges that face us, and that the whole world should come together and unite and should put all efforts together. Serious efforts should be put together by the world so that the world will defeat these challenges which constitute the main common enemy to all of us, challenges of climate, challenges of international crises, or the economic capitalist deterioration, and the food crisis.

Perhaps this swine virus may be one of those viruses that was created in the laboratory and it got out of control because it was meant in the beginning to be used as a military weapon, as well as the military, the nuclear proliferations, as well as the hypocrisy, the deteriorations, and the control of money.

Dear brothers, as you know, the United Nations was established and founded by 3 countries where against the Germans at the time. The United Nations that we have today is different today. But the United Nations it is the countries or the nations that would come together against Germany during the Second World War. These countries constituted and give members seats its own members. And granted we were not present at the time. And the United Nations was tailored according to these countries and wanted from us to wear the clothes or the suit that was tailored against Germany. That is the real substance and context of the United Nations as it was founded 40 years or 60 years ago.

This happened during the absence of over 165 countries where the ratio was one of eight. And one was present and eight were absent. Those they created or they made the charter, and you know I have the charter, a copy of it. And one should read the charter of the United Nations.
The preamble of the United Nations is different from the provisions and the articles. How this came to existence, those who attended in San Francisco in 1945, they all participated in the preamble, but they left articles and the provisions and the procedures the internal procedures. They left it to the job of the experts and the countries who are interested, which are the countries who created the Security Council, which countries came together united against Germany. The preamble is very tempting, and no one is objecting to the preamble, but everything that came after that is completely in contradiction with the preamble. This is what we have now this is what we are rejecting, and we should never continue. This came to an end during the Second World War. The preamble says that the nations are equal whether they are small or big. Are we equal in the permanent seats. No. We are not equals. And the preamble says that all nations are equal whether they are small nations or whether they are big nations as far as rights. Do we have rights of a veto. Are we equals?

The preamble says that we are equals in our rights whether we are big or small. This is what is stated, and this is what we have agreed in the preamble. So, the veto is against the charter. The permanent seats are against the charter. We do not accept it and we do not acknowledge it, neither do we recognize it. The charter states that we in the preamble, I mean that we should not resort to military force unless it is a common interest. This is the preamble which we were happy and we signed, and we joined the United Nations because we wanted the charter to be like that. It says that the armed forces only use it when it is a common interest to all nations. But after that, what happened? Sixty five wars broke out after the establishment of the United Nations and after the establishment of the Security Council, and after this establishment. Sixty five and the victims are millions more than victims of the Second World War. Are these wars and the aggressions and the force that was used, and the power in the 65 wars, in the common interest of all of us? No. It was the interest of one country or three countries or four countries or one country. But it was not in the interest of all the nations.

And we shall come and discuss about the wars, whether these wars broke out was in the interest of one country or were in the whole nations. This is in full contradictions and full intervention of the United Nation charters, and we signed that. And unless we do things in the charter of the United Nations, according to which we agreed, otherwise we don't speak diplomatically, we are not afraid. We don't and we were not being nice to anybody.

Now we are talking about the future of the… . There is no hypocrisy, no diplomacy, because it is a decisive and important matter. (inaudible) of understanding and hypocrisy created to 65 wars after the establishment of the United Nations. The preamble states also that if there
is a use of force, then there must be… then it must be the United Nations force, or the United Nations military interventions, according to the joint ventures of the United Nations, not country, or one, two country, or three country, using the force or the military power. The United Nations, all of it, will decide to go to war to maintain peace and world security. And if there’s any aggression by one country against another after the 45 after the establishment of this United Nations, if there is any aggression against any country, the United Nations, all together, should deter and stop this aggression, and should check this aggression. I mean, if a country, any country, Libya, for instance, makes an attack or an aggression against France, then the whole United Nations should check the Libyan aggression against France, because France is a member state, an independent state in the United General Assembly that is a sovereign country, a member state of the United Nations. And all of us, we have to protect the sovereignty of all nations collectively. But 65 wars, aggressive wars, took place without any actions from the United Nations to stop and check these wars. And eight fierce, big wars and victims of these wars among 2 million made or initiated by the countries who have member states and veto. Those countries who are believed that they would maintain the sovereignty and independence of the people, these countries actually use aggressive force against people.

We wanted to believe that these countries will make peace and security in the world and protect the people. These countries actually resorted to aggressive wars and style of wars. And as a matter of fact, they enjoyed the veto that was given to them by themselves and enjoyed the member states of the Security Council. But in the meantime, they actually initiated the war which amounted to millions of victims.

So, in this charter, there is nothing that the United Nations will interfere which will be the pure business of the internal affairs I mean, the government. It is the internal affairs of a certain government. No country has the right to interfere in this affair, the sort of government whether it is a dictatorial, socialist, capitalist system, or whether it is a reactionary progressive. This is the responsibility of the society. It is an internal matter of the people concerned of a certain country. Rome one day the senators of Rome they gave him the amendment to be a dictator, because at the time it was good for Rome. No one can say to Rome at the time that you give Caesar this veto. The veto is not mentioned in the charter.

We joined the United Nations because we thought we are equals. And then there is one country that can object to all of the decisions that we make, and it has a member seat. And who has given this country this member state? These four countries, they have given
themselves member states. The only country that we have voted in this General Assembly is China. China, we have voted to give China a member state in the Security Council. This was done democratically, but the other member seats was not Democratic, was imposed upon us. This should not be accepted by us, and it was a dictatorial procedure that was done against our will. United ... reform is not increasing of the member states. It is just making things worse. I don't know how this will be translated, but if we add more water, it will be more muddy. This is a typical expression to add insult to injury. I mean, to make things worse, and to make things even worse by how? Because many big countries will be added further to the former big countries that we already have, and like this it will be (inaudible). So we'll have more superpowers. Then from here we reject having any more seats done in this way. The solution is not in having more seats. And the most dangerous one, if we have more superpowers already, the superpowers that we already have this will crash down the peoples of all small peoples of third-world countries which now are coming together in what may be called the G100. There are 100 small countries coming together in a forum that is called a FSS forum of small states. These countries will be crushed by superpowers, because further superpowers, further big countries will be added to already (inaudible). This door should be closed, and we reject that strongly and categorically.

Then you open the door to have more seats in the Security Council. This will add more poverty, more injustice, more tension at the world level, and more competition and the level of the Security Council. And then we shall have there will be high competition between certain countries between Italy, Germany, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Japan, Brazil, Nigeria, Argentina, Brazil, Nigeria, Libya, Egypt, Congo, South Africa, Tanzania, Turkey, Iran, Greece, Ukraine. All of these countries will ask to have a seat at the Security Council. And like this, we shall have a raise of competitions, then it will be impractical. So, what is the solution? The solution is that for the solution presided for the General Assembly by Dr. Treki, which will be a binding resolution taken by the General Assembly, which will not (inaudible) any other quarter. The solution is that we shall close the admission of the member states and we don't have anymore member states. This is an item that is provided for the General Assembly, presided by Dr. Thratcher right now. And in place of that will be the achievement of the democracy based on equality between member states. There should be equality between member states and instrumentation of the powers and demanded of the Security Council, the General Assembly. And the membership will be for the associations, not for countries, because if we open the door for more members and more memberships for the countries because this will give the right to any country to have a member seat in the
country. And the preamble allowed that. No country can say for Italy, for instance, you don't have a seat in the Security Council if a seat is given to Germany. Italy will Germany, maybe for the argument of Italy, will say it was not Germany was an aggressive country, was (inaudible), and was defeated in the Second World War. And if we give India a seat, then Pakistan will say we are a nuclear country and we are at war, and then Pakistan that would be a danger thing. If we give it to Japan, then we should give Indonesia, being the biggest Muslim country in the world. And then Turkey or Kenya will have the same rights. What can we say to them? Argentina, Brazil, Libya. Libya, that has discarded the WMD program, because it will deserve a member state because then it then has done service to security by discarded this program. And South Africa will do the same and Tanzania will do the same. All these countries are important, and Ukryanya should asked this door should be, This door should be this is falsehood, and this is a trick, and if we went to reform the United Nations, and then we bring more superpowers, more countries, and then we add more to the already big superpowers which did quite a lot of suffering to us. And then the solution is to achieve democracy at the level of the general congress of the world, which is the General Assembly, which is transformation of the Security Council power to the General Assembly. And the Security Council will be just an instrument to implement the decisions taken by the General Assembly. It will be the parliament of the world and the legislative assembly of the world, and this is democracy, and the Security Council should be responsible before the General Assembly, and we should not accept it. These are the legislators which are the members of the General Assembly and the resolution should be binding. It is said that the General Assembly should do this and this at the recommendation of the Security Council. On the contrary, the Security Council should do this and that according to the rules and the orders of the United Nations. These are the United Nations, who are including all the members of the world, not the Security Council, which include only 10 member states. How can we be happy about the world peace and security if the four countries or 10 countries are controlled the whole world?

We are 190 nations and countries, and we are like the (inaudible). I mean, we just speak and nobody is implementing our decisions. We are just like decor. You are made like decor. You are like a Hyde Park. You were I mean, without any real substance. It's just according to speaker like the speakers of the Hyde Park corner. No more, no less. You just make a speech and then disappear. This is who you are right now.
The Security Council is an executive body for the resolution taken by the General Assembly only. And in this case, there will be no competition for the Security Council member states, because once the Security Council becomes a tool to implement the resolution taken by the General Assembly, there will be no need for any competition.

The Security Council should just be a representative for all nations, but not by a state this is what is submitted now to the General Assembly but a permanent seat for all space, for all union, I mean… Twenty-seven countries for European Union. They should have a permanent seat at the Security Council.

The African Union should have a member seat in the Security Council, 53 countries. And Latin Americans should have a permanent seat and the Asians should have a permanent seat. And the Asians plus two or countries, should have a permanent seat. The Russian federation should have a permanent seat. The United States of America, which is 50 states, it has already a permanent member seat at the Security Council. (inaudible), once it is established or is about to be established should have a member state. (inaudible) should have a member seat, 22 countries are oblique. The Islamic Conference, 45 countries, should have also a member seat. Then (inaudible) should have a permanent member seat in the Security Council.

Then we have the G 100. Then we think about that perhaps all small countries, the forum (ph) of small countries, perhaps they would have a permanent member seat also. If there are countries outside of the associations that I mentioned, maybe we can assign a permanent seat will be given to them by rotation every six months. Japan, Australia, may be outside any union, or Australia, or in other countries. Perhaps they would not join the Asians or the Russian Federation, or not a member in the European Union or the Latin American Union, or in the African Union. Perhaps any country will be given this is the solution, that now this is meant for a vote for the Security Council for the General Assembly to take a vote. This is a vital, important issue. And I mentioned, the General Assembly is the congress of the world, the parliament of the world, the master of the world, and no one should object. No one should we are the nations. Anyone outside this General Assembly we do not recognize. Dr. Treki and Ban Ki moon, his Excellency, the secretary general of the United Nations, will make the draft, the legal draft, and set up the necessary committees to submit this for voting. The Security Council from now will be made of unions. This is justice. This is democracy. And then we put an end to the Security Council will be occupied by the countries which one has nuclear weapons, which one has technology. This is terrorism. We cannot have the Security Council and the countries which have the superpowers. This is terrorism in itself. If you went
a world that lives in peace, united, we should do that. If we want a world, then it's up to you. Then we have conflict, and then we should continue fighting each other, or conflict until doomsday or until the end of the world.

These members which have a veto or they don't have a veto. All the Security Council, they should have the right of the veto. All these unions belonging to the seats. Or we should cancel the whole veto with the new formation. This is the real Security Council. And anyhow, the new Security Council that is submitted to the new proposals, submitted to the General Assembly for voting, will be an executive council which will be under the control of the General Assembly. The General Assembly, which will have the real power and the real making lose, like all countries will be equal in the Security Council in the same way they are equal in the General Assembly. We are in the General Assembly. We have equal votes. We should also be equals in the next door, which is the Security Council. A country has a veto, a country doesn't have a veto, a country has a member seat, and then a country should not have a member seat, we should not accept it and it should be a mandate from now. And we should not be subjected to it, and we should not accept any resolution taken by the Security Council according to the composition right now. We were trust ship. We are independent. And now we are here to decide the future of the world in a democratic way that will maintain world and peace security. All people, small and big, are equals. This is terrorism unless, like the terrorism of the Al Qaida. This is terrorism. Terrorism is not just Al Qaida, but it can be also in other forms. We should resort to the maturity of the votes of the General Assembly alone, and we should not vote. If the General Assembly takes a vote, then it should be implemented and should be taken, and taken into decision. And it should be enforced. And no one should say I am above and higher than the General Assembly. Anyone who says that I'm higher than or above the General Assembly should leave the United Nations and be alone. Democracy is not for the rich or for the the richer or for the one who terrorizes. So, for the one who is more powerful than us, (inaudible) democracy? No.

The higher (inaudible) should be their own nations at equal footing. Now the Security Council is security feudalism, political feudalism for those who have permanent seats protected by them. And they are used against us. It should not be called the Security Council. It should be called the "Terror Council." You see, my brothers, that in our life, in our political life, that if the Security Council is used against us, then they go to the Security Council, they resort to the Security Council. If they have no need to use it against us, then they ignore the Security Council. If the charter, they have interests, an ax to grind to use against us, they respect the
charter. They look for the seven chapters of the Security charter to be used against these poor nations. But if they want to violate the charter, they would ignore the charter as if it doesn't exist at all. If the veto on the permanent seat is given to the one who has the power is injustice and terrorism that will not be accepted by us, and we should not live under the shadow of this injustice and this terror. Superpowers have interests, complicating interests, and they use the interests, they use the Security Council, they use the power of the United Nations to protect their interests. And these terrorized and intimidated the Third World. The Third World is terrified and being terrorized and living under the fear of terror. The Security Council ever since it was established in 1949 did not provide us with security, but provided us, on the contrary, terror and sanctions. It is used against us only. For this reason, we are not committed to adhere to the Security Council resolutions after this speech of the fortieth anniversary. Sixty-four wars took place broke out against the war against the world, against small world. That it is fighting between small countries or aggression in wars against by superpowers against countries, big countries against us. And United Nations or the Security Council did not take any actions to stop these wars and aggressions in violation of the charter of the United Nations against small nations and small peoples. And the General Assembly will vote for these historic resolutions. Either we continue together in one nations or we go into break into two equal nations, have its own general assembly, its own security council belonging to it, where they have equal footing, standing on equal footing or and the big countries who have the permanent seats, who have their rights, will stay in their own councils, whether there are four or three, as they wish, we are not with them. And they should exercise veto against themselves, and this is not of our interest. And if they want to stay in permanent seats, OK, that's OK, but the permanent is a threat for (inaudible) but we shall never stay under the supervision or the control of the veto and the right of veto to given countries. We are not fool to give we are not fool to give the right of a veto to big powers to use us, and we are treated like second class and like despised nations. We have not decided that these are big nations, sacred nations, respected nations. These are the nations of the world which represent 190 countries.

We know that now ignoring the resolutions of the Security Council is now though it is injustice, and it is only used against us. It is not used against the big countries who have the permanent seats or those countries who have the right of veto. They never use any resolution against them. In the countries, it is used against us. So, any resolutions taken against us, it has become a travesty of the United Nations, and it has become wars and violations of independent states authorities, and committing war crimes and genocides. And these are all
in violation of the Security Council, even though there is a Security Council, and nobody
cares about the Security Council and even though now each now, each country has each
(inaudible) community have become security councils, establishing its own security councils
and with the security councils in its own formation. Now it has the Security Council which is
next to us has become isolated. The African Union has already established MASS, which is
the peace and security for Africa, and the European Union has already established the security
council. The (inaudible) already establishing its own security councils. America will have its
own concerns, non-alignment. One hundred twenty countries will have its own peace and
Security Council. This means that we have already lost the trust in the Security Council, which
have not provided us with security. And now that's why we are creating regional peace
securities or regional security councils. We are not committed to obey the rules or the
resolutions of the security councils in this formation because it is undemocratic, unjust, and
no one can force us to be a member of the security councils and to obey or adhere to
resolutions or all of this given by Security Council in its composition as it is right now.

Now, brothers, there is no respect to the United Nations. No regard to the General Assembly,
which constitutes the actually the real substantive (inaudible), and which it has no decisions
that is abiding. The International Court of Justice, it is a judicial international body, and
resolutions only implemented against the small countries, the small nations. And big countries
are rejected to be implemented against the big countries. There are resolutions or court orders
taken against these big countries, but they have been refused to be implemented against them.
The International the IAEA, an important one in the United Nations, are not big countries are
not responsible for it, or are not under control. And we have discovered that this is only used
against us. It is a (inaudible) against us. You told us, this is an international one, so if it is an
international one, then all the countries of the world should be under jurisdictions of this one.
If it's not international, then we close the door and arrive from this now, from this speech, we
shall close the door, and we should not accept it. And adopt a Mr. Treki the president of the
General Assembly. He will talk to the director of the Baradei (ph) or the (inaudible). They
will ask him; do you inspect the nuclear supplies of all? Do you supervise the increase of this
nuclear storage? Then if he says, yes, then OK, then we accept that we'll be under control.
But if he says that we cannot go to these countries who have the nuclear powers, and I cannot
have any jurisdiction, then we should close the door, and we not accept it to be under its
control. For your information, I told Baradei when we had the problem the Libyan nuclear
bomb and predecessor, I called them and I told them, Mr. Baradei, the agreements to increase
to decrease the nuclear supplies between the superpowers, is it under control? Is there any
provisions that if it's in a country increased its nuclear heads, are you aware of that? He said
to me, no. These big powers I cannot go so close to it. I cannot ask them. I cannot.... so, you
are only coming to us???. I said that this is not an international organization. So, it is meant
only for us. Security Council against us. International IAEA against us. International Court
of Justice against us. And they (world powers) are free. This is not justice. This is not United
Nations. This is rejected totally. As regards Africa, Dr. Ali Treki, if you want to reform
whether they reform the United Nations or not, and even before you take any historic
decisions or vote against Africa, a need is now for now a permanent member seat in the
Security Council because this is outstanding. Even if we are not talking about the United
Nations reform, Africa was colonized, was isolated, was persecuted, was usurped, was treated
like animals, was treated like slaves, was treated colonies, was colonized, was put under the
trusteeship. These countries, the African Union deserves a permanent seat for the past. It's an
outstanding bill to be paid, like China. And it has nothing to do with the United Nation
reforms. This is a priority and high on the agenda for the General Assembly, and no one can
say that the African Union does not deserve a permanent seat. Who has the argument? Anyone
can talk to me even right now or argue with me. Any proof that the African Union does not
deserve a permanent seat or that the African continent does not deserve a permanent seat. No
one can argue, or no one can refute what I am saying.

It is also for voting for the General Assembly for compensation to countries who were
colonized. And why? So that no more repetition of colonizations and no more usurpation and
stealing of the wealth of the people.

And why the Africans should go to Europe?
Why do Africans go to Europe?
Why do Asians go to Europe?
Why do Latin American people go to Europe?
Because Europe was colonized by they took the mines, the wealth, all the resources of Africa,
of Asia, of Latin America. And they took all the oil, the fruit, the vegetables and the stock
and the people, and they used them. Now, the new generation, the African generations
whether it is Asian, whether it is Latin America or it is in Africa, now they are looking for
these ones which have been usurped and stolen. Now, when I stop one African (inaudible)
going to Europe (inaudible), I told them where are you going? They told me, I'm going to take
my usurped wealth. If you bring my reserved wealth, then I don't go. I stop. Who can bring
back the wealth that was taken to me? Make a decision to bring all these resources and wealth
so that no more immigration from the Philippines to Latin America, to Mauritius, to India.
Let us have the wealth that was taken from us and looted from us. Africa deserves compensation trillion, $7.77 trillion. That's the compensation Africa deserves from the countries who colonized Africa. Africa will call for that. And if you don't give us this amount, 7.77, the Africans will go to where you have taken these trillions. They have the right. They have to follow. Bring the money back. No Libyan immigration to Italy, even though Libya's so (inaudible). Why there is no Libyan immigration to Italy? Because Italy (inaudible) compensation for the Libyan people (inaudible) and accepted the compensations and signed the (inaudible), a treaty, an agreement with the Italian with Libyan, and it was endorsed by the Italian parliament, and accepted that the colonization was wrong, and we should not be repeated again. And Italy would not accept to be attacked whether by air, sea against the Libyan people and that Libya will compensate for the next 20 years, will pay a quarter of billions and will build hospitals for the Libyans who are lost their members of their hands or their fingers because of the mines during the Second World War when the mines were laid upon the Libyan land. Italy made apology and was sorry and said that it will never be a country will occupy other country, the territories of other countries. And it was Italy when it was a kingdom and it was Italy during the fascist regime. And Italy has done a glorified thing and a civilized thing and should be commended during the Berlusconi and even the predecessor to Berlusconi did their own contribution until we achieved this result. The Third World calls for compensation, why? So that we don't have any more colonizations, so we don't have a repeat of colonizations. And so that no country will be big and will covet to colonize another country. So that this country will know that there will be compensation, and will not go on colonization. Colonization should be eliminated, and countries should pay compensations who have done damage to the peoples during the colonization area, and they should be compensated for the damage and the suffering that they have inflicted during their colonial power. The other point I would hope that we have to face patiently but before I say this point, it is rather sensitive to a certain extent. There are sentences between two brackets I would like to shed some light upon and mention. We as a matter of fact that we Africans are happy, proud, that one son of Africans governs the United States of America, of Africa. This is a historic event. One day that the black doesn't go where the white go and cannot be in a bus where the white is. Now, the American people, the black African Kenyan, young voted for him and made him a president. This is a great thing, and we are proud of that. You are the beginning of a change. He did go for a change. But as far as I'm concerned, Obama is a glimpse in the dark for the four years or the next eight years, and I'm afraid that we may go back to square one. How can you guarantee America after Obama? Can you guarantee after
Obama how America will be governed? No one can guarantee America. We are content and happy if Obama can stay forever as the president of the United States of America. The speech made by Obama just before me, it is completely different when an American president that we have witnessed or that we have lived with or the former Americans, they used to say, and I quote, they say, We shall send you the all the weapons. We shall send you the road clusters and the sandstorms and the rolling thunder, and we shall send you the poisonous roses to the Libyan children. This was the logic. The American presidents used to say to us, they shall terrorize us. We shall send you the like rolling thunder like the one was sent to Vietnam. We shall send you rolling thunder the same way that was sent to Vietnam, and the sandstorm like it was sent to Iraq. We shall send you the knight as it was sent to Egypt in 1956 even though America was against the night operations. And we shall send you the poisonous rose that Reagan sent to the Libyan children.

Can you imagine the president of a permanent country, a big country has a permanent seat at the Security Council, has a right to veto? We thought that America will protect us and send us peace. What is it? These are lesser-guided bombs sent to us according to the carried on the F-1 airplanes. This was the logic. And we shall lead the world, and we shall punish anyone who anyone whether they like it or not. We shall punish anyone who will be against us. Now, what our son Obama said is completely different today. He's calling for the seriously, for discardment or the deproliferation of nuclear weapons, and we should applaud that. America cannot solve the problem alone, and the whole world should come together. And he said that the position we are at now, we should not continue. Now we are meet and making a speech it should not be like that. We accept it. We applaud it. And then the United Nations also we come here to United Nations to talk against each other. It's true that we come here, we should have equal footing and equal unions and equal associations, and he says that democracy we should not be imposed from outside. So, the reason there is the American president who recently says that we should impose democracy against Iraq and against so on, so on, so on. He did say that this is an eternal a fairness of everybody. This was lost words, and what we hear right now is the true sense of the word when he said that democracy cannot be imposed from outside. So, we have to be cautious, and before I just say my sensitive remark or the whole the whole world has so many problems. Shh, whole world, shh, listen, listen. World of so many problems. Should be like that, should we have so many problems? Can't we nations on equal footing? Can't we let's have an answer. Anyone have an answer that it is better to have a world of so many polarities? Why can't we have equal standing? Should we have a
patriarch? Should we have bombs? Should we have guns? Is it and this is why should we have a world of so many polarity?

We reject. We accept. We don't. We do not accept that a world living not equal, big and small. The other point that is sensitive, the quarters of the United Nations. Please, can I have your attention? Please, can I have your attention? All of you came across the Atlantic, crossing the Atlantic oceans, the Asian continent or the African continent to reach this place. Why? Is this the Jerusalem? Is this the Vatican? Is this Mecca? All of you are tired, having jet lag, suffering from jet lag, tired, had sleepless night, and very tired and physically speaking, you are very low. One just arrived now, flying 20 hours, and then you want him to make a speech and talk about this. All of you are asleep. All of you are tired. It is clear that all of you are lacking the energy because of having to travel a long journey. Why do that? Your country now, some of our countries are in nighttime, and they are asleep, and now you should be asleep because your biological hour or your biological mind is accustomed to be asleep at this time. I wake up 4:00 at New York time, before dawn, because in Libya it is 11:00 in the morning. Because when I wake up at 11:00, I am supposed to be daytime. At 4:00 I'm awake. Why do you think? Why do you think, why? Think about it. If this was put in 1945, should we keep it up to now? Why can't we think about a place that is in the comfortable? The other point, America, the hosting country, that bears the consequences the expenses and the looking after the headquarters and the looking after the peace and security of heads of state who come here, very strict, and they spend a lot of money and New York and all of America being very tired. I want to relieve America from this hardship. We should thank America, and we say to America, thank you for all the trouble that incurred upon itself. And we say thank you to America. We want to help America. We want to make America secure and New York secure, and we should not have the responsibility of looking after the security. Perhaps somebody would do any terrorists will make an explosion or a bomb of an aircraft or a president or an American, and then this place is a target by targeted by the Al Qaida. This very same place, the same building. And if it was and why? Because on the 11th of September, it did not hit it. That was beyond their power. And the next target, that would be and I'm not saying this out of the record that we have tens of members of Al Qaida being detained in the Libyan prisons and (inaudible), very scary. And this makes America lives in under tension, and perhaps you never know what will happen.

Perhaps America will be targeted again by a rocket, or by perhaps tens of heads of state will die. We want America, to relieve America from this worry, and we shall take the place to a
place where it is not targeted. Now, after 50 years, should be taken to another part of the hemisphere. Fifty years in the western hemisphere. Now for the next 50 years should be in the eastern hemisphere or in the middle hemisphere, like this by rotation. Now 64 years now, now we have extra 14 years over the 50 years that the quarters should have been taken from this. This is not any insult to America. This is a service to America. We should thank America. This was possible in 1945, but we should not accept it now. And, of course, this is also put for vote in the General Assembly. Only in the General Assembly, because Article 23 of the agreement 64, it says that (inaudible). America after the America has the right to make any tight securities because America is targeted by the terrorists and by Al Qaida. As the right to be to take all the security measures. We are not blaming America for that. But we don't tolerate these measures. We don't have to come to New York. And we don't have to be submitted to all these measures. One president told me that your copilot should not come to America because there is restrictions. He said, how can I come, how can I cross the Atlantic without a copilot? Why, why? He doesn't have to. He doesn't have to come here. When another president complained that his guard cannot his honor guard cannot come because there is some misunderstanding in his name and granting him a visa. He came one other president came and said, my own doctor, he couldn't get a visa, and he could not come to America because he was not granted an entry visa. You see the security measures very strict. And, of course, if there is any problem that a country has with America, then they will put restrictions for the movement of the member delegations like in Guantanamo. Is this a member state of the United Nations or he is a prisoner in the Guantanamo camp that he cannot allow free movement? So, this is what is submitted for voting for the United for the General Assemblies. The transformation or the moving of the headquarters. If 51 percent say, then we come to the second vote. To the middle of the globe or to the eastern part of the globe. If we say that we have to take the headquarters, then certain the place is (inaudible). Whether the middle whether the center hemisphere. Why don't we go to (inaudible). If you go to 1,000 (inaudible), and no one can blame you? And no you can come even without a visa.

Once you come with a president, it's a secure country. We are not going to restrict you to 100 or 500 meters, and Libya has no hostile actions against anybody. And again, I think we'll be in the same positions. And if the vote, it say that we shall have to take the vote to the eastern part, then it will be Delhi or Beijing in China, the capital of China or the capital city of India. And this is logic, I believe, my brothers. And I don't think there will be any objection to that. And then you will play you will say that thank you will thank me for this proposal for eliminating the suffering and the trouble of flying over 20 hours and 15 hours to come to this
place, and no one can blame America, can say that America will reduce its contribution to the United Nations. No, nobody should have this bad thought. America, I'm sure, will be committed to its international obligations, and America will not be angry, and America will thank you for alleviating the hardship of America. And America should thank us for taking all the hardship and all the restrictions for this, plus even though this place is targeted by terrorists. Then we come to the issues that will be taken by the General Assembly. Either we have to try ourselves. Either we do the right thing, or whether we have a new meeting. This is not a normal meeting. This is not a normal gathering. This is even my son, Obama said that. He said that this is a historical one. This is not a normal gathering. This is not a normal one.

Now, the wars that took place after the establishment of the Second World War, why did it happen?

Where was the Security Council?
Where was the charter?
Where was the United Nations?
There should be investigations, and there should be court orders. And why there was massacres?

We start with the Korean War. This was taken after the establishment of the United Nations. How a war broke out and millions of people fell victims, and perhaps there was even a nuclear a nuclear the world was about the world was about to witness a nuclear war. And those who are responsible and those who caused the war should be tried and should pay the consequence. Then we come to the Suez Canal war in 1956. The file should be opened. Why three countries who have permanent seats in the Security Councils enjoyed the right, the veto of the Security Council's attack, a member state in this General Assembly? A country that is Egypt in this case, that was a sovereign state, was attacked and the army was destroyed. And thousands of Egyptian people were killed, and towns, villages were destroyed. How could such a thing happen during the era of the United Nations? And how can we guarantee that such a thing will not be repeated unless we redeem the past? And this is a very dangerous thing. The Suez Canal war, the Korean War, we should open the files. And then we come to the Vietnam War. Three million victims of the Vietnam War. During 11 days, bombs were used more than the bombs used during the whole war. And during the Second World War, all the shells and the bombs that were used, or bombed during the four years of the war, the bombs that were used in the 12 days were more than. This was a fierce war. And this war took place after the establishment of the United Nations. And we decided that there would be no wars. This is the future of the mankind, and we cannot keep quiet.
How can we be how can we be safe?
How can we feel accomplished?
How can we feel complacent, I mean.

This is the future of the world and this is the General Assembly of the world, and we have to make sure that such wars will not be repeated in the future. Then Panama was attacked, even though it was an independent state, a member state of the General Assembly, of the United Nations. And 4,000 peoples were killed, and the president of this country was taken as a prisoner and was taken put in prison. And Noriega should be released, and we should open the file. And how we give the right to a country that is a member state of the United Nations to go and wage a war against a country and take the president of such a country and take him as a criminal and put him in prison? Who would accept that?

This may be repeated. And we should not be quiet, and we should make investigations, and we should each one of us may face the same destiny. Each member state of us may face the same, especially if this aggression is made by a member state that is has a member seat in the Security Council and supposed to look and maintain the world peace security. Then we have the Grenada war. This country was attacked, was invaded even though it was a member state, by 7,000 - 5,000 warships and using 7,000 troops. It is the smallest country in the world. And after the establishment of the Security Council, after the establishment of the United Nations, and the (inaudible). And the president of this country, Maurice Bishop, was assassinated. How this can be done with impunity? This is a tragedy. And then how can we guarantee that the United Nations is good or not, that the Security Council is good enough?

Can we be safe and happy about our future or not?
Can we trust the Security Council or not? Can we trust the United Nations or not?
Then we have to check and investigate the bombing of Somalia.

Somalia was a member state of the United Nations. It is an independent country. And (inaudible).

Why? Who allowed that? Who gave the green light for such a country to attack to be attacked?
Then the Yugoslav war. No country that is peaceful country like Yugoslavia, that was built that was built step by step, piece by piece, after it was destroyed by Hitler. We destroy it as if we are doing the same job like Hitler. After the death of Tito and he built this country step by step and brick by brick, and then we come and dismember it for imperialist personal interests.

How can we be satisfied?
How can we be happy?
If a peaceful country like Yugoslavia faced this tragedy, the General Assembly should make investigations and the General Assembly should decide who should be tried for the ISISI. Then we come to the Iraqi war, the mother of all evils. The United Nations also should investigate. The General Assembly presided by Dr. Treki should be investigated by the General Assembly, the invasion of Iraq itself. This was in violation of the United Nations charter without any justifications made by several countries who have member seats in the Security Council. Iraq is an independent country, member in this General Assembly. How this country is attacked and how this country how we have already read in the general in the in the charter that the United Nations should have interfered and stopped. We have come to General Assembly, and we have resorted to the General Assembly. We said that we should go to the General Assembly and use the charter for the checking. We were against this invasion of Kuwait, but Arab countries fought with foreign countries in the name of the General Assembly with foreign countries. In the first place, the U.N. charter was respected. And the second time we wanted to use it to stop the war against Iraq, no one used the U.N. charter. And it was discarded in the dustbin.

Why? General Assembly should investigate. Why? Why there was any reason to invade Iraq? Because it is mysterious, ambiguous, and we may face the same destiny. Why did we invade Iraq?

The invasion in itself is a serious violation of the U.N. charter. I mean, the invasion itself, per se, is wrong. Then, the total massacre or the genocide. More than 1.5 million Iraqi people were killed. We want to take this file and we want to those who have committed the general mass murder against the Iraqi people should be tried. Yes. Make it easy for (inaudible) to go to be tried, or Bashir to be tried. Or it is easy for (inaudible) to be tried, or Noriega to be tried. That is an easy job to do. OK. What about those who have committed mass murder against Iraqis? Cannot be tried? Cannot go to the… we should not accept it. Either it is meant for all of us, big or small, or we should not accept it and refuse it. If anyone who commits a crime and can be tried, we are not animals in the livestock, or in that we slaughter we have the right. We are ready to fight. We are ready to defend ourselves. And we have the right to live dignified under the sun, on the Earth, and they have already tested us, and we can put up to test.

The other thing, how come that prisoners of war of Iraq can be sentenced to death? Then when Iraq was invaded and the president of the Iraqi war was caught, it was made as a prisoner of
war. He should not be tried. He should not be hanged. And after the end of war, he should be released. So, we want to know why the prisoner of war have been tried or should have been tried.

Who sentenced to death the president of Iraq? Is there an answer to that? We know who tried who tried him, the name of the judge, the identity of the judge. Who put on the sacrifice day the rope around the neck and killed or hanged the president? People we don't know, they have a mask over their face. If this is a civilized war, these are prisoners of war under civilized countries, under the international law. How a member of a government and the president of a country should be sentenced to death and hanged, do they have the right? Are they legal people? Are they a member of a judicial system?

Do you know what other people say or what the people say? People say that the American president and the president the British president are wearing the masks, and they have already put to death the president of Iraq. This is why don't they uncover their face?

Why don't we know their ranks?

Why don't we know, is he an officer or a judge, a doctor?

Who is he?

How come a president of a country, a member state, is sentenced to death and killed? We don't know the identity. Those countries, the implementation the United Nations has the duty to answer these questions. Who have exercised or implemented the death sentence? Those foreigners, they should have the legal status, and they should have the legal status, and we should know the identity of the presence of the doctor, and all the legal procedures should be, even for a layman, let alone as the president of a country, a member state in the United Nations to be sentenced in such a way and put to death in such a way. This is the Iraqi war. Point number three in the Iraqi war is the Abu Ghraib situation, which is a disgrace to mankind. I know America made the investigations for this scandal, or the authorities under the Americans, but the United Nations also should not forget it. The United Nations should the General Assembly of the United Nations should investigate and look into this matter.

The Abu Ghraib decisions, the prisoners of war who were prosecuted there and who were badly treated, and dogs were used on them, and men were made love to. And no one has done this before in previous wars, sodomy, and this is unprecedented. No one no previous aggressions, or no or aggressors and prisoners of war, there are there are soldiers, and they are raped in prisons. Then by a member state of the Security Council, this Security Council,
this is against civilization. And this is a humane kind, and we should not keep quiet. We should know the facts. And up to now, a quarter of a million prisoners are still men and women are in Abu Ghraib. They are badly treated and persecuted and raped. We should never forget, and we should open an investigation for that. Then Afghanistan. Then we have the Afghani war. There should also be an investigation for the Afghani war. Why are we against Taliban? Why are we against Afghanistan? Who's Taliban? If Taliban wants to make a religious state, OK, like the Vatican. Does the Vatican pose any threat to us? No it is a very peaceful, religious state. If the Afghans want to establish an Islamic emirate let it be like the Vatican. Who said the Taliban are the enemy and has to be struck by the armies? Is bin Laden an Afghan. Is he a Taliban. Bin Laden is not from the Taliban and not from Afghanistan. Those terrorists who struck New York? Are they Afghans? Are they from the Taliban? No they are not Afghani and they are not from the Taliban. So why were Iraq and Afghanistan targeted?

If I want to deceive my friends from America and British would not tell them this. But I would encourage them and tell them go on, send more troops to Afghanistan and send further troops until they drown in a blood bath because they will achieve no result in Afghanistan or in Iraq. You have seen what happened in Iraq. That took place even though Iraq is a wide open desert. Then what do you think of Afghanistan with these mighty mountains. No one could defeat it till the hereafter. They are just hitting the rock. They will scratch it but they will not demolish it. Continue the war in Afghanistan in Iraq. But I want to save them. I want to say these hapless nations. America and the other countries that fight in Afghanistan and Iraq. We are saying you have to leave Afghanistan for the Afghans. You have leave Iraq for the Iraqis. Leave them even if they fight each other. They are free to do so. The civil war took place even in the U.S.A nobody interfered. The civil war also took place in Spain and in China and in many parts of the world and nobody interfered. If it is a civil war let it go on. Leave it for the Iraqis and for the Afghans to fight each other, they are free. Who says that if the Taliban rule Afghanistan they will become a threat? Do the Taliban have any intercontinental missiles? The airliner that hit New York. Did it come from Afghanistan or Iraq. These airliners took off from Kennedy airport in New York. So why do we go and strike Afghanistan. They are not Afghans, not Taliban, nor Iraqis. Why should we keep silent about these things. Those who keep silent regarding what is right is like a silent devil. We won't be silent devils. It is our right because we are keen on world peace. We are keen on the destiny of the world. We do not want to undermine humanity in this manner. Then after that Mr Ali Tereki, the general assembly has to launch investigations of the assassinations. You have to launch an
investigation once again on the assassination of Patrice Lumumba. We want this recorded in our African history. We want to know how an African leader, an African liberator was assassinated. We want to establish who killed him and to record that for history so that our sons will learn history and they will known why Patrice Lumumba the hero of African-Congolese liberation was killed. Even after 50 years. And that act has to be denounced and those responsible have to be held accountable. This file has to be opened and we have to go back to the old documents. Then we would like to know who killed the UN Secretary General Hamashold. Who bombed his aircraft in 1961, the same year in which Lumumba was killed. We want to know who bombed the plane of the UN Secretary General.

We want to know who bombed it and who had an interest in that. Then we come to Kennedy's assassination in 1963. The UN General Assembly has to open the file of Kennedy's assassination. We want to know why he was killed. He was killed by someone called Lee Harvey and someone called Jack Rubbi killed Lee Harvey, the assassin of Kennedy. We want to know why this Jack Rubbi, the Israeli, killed the assassin of Kennedy. And Jack Rubbi himself, the killer of Kennedy's killer also died in vague circumstances before his trial. We have to open the files and we have to know. What I know and what the world knows and what we studied in history is that Kennedy decided to inspect the Israeli Dimona reactor to see whether it has nuclear bombs. That is the reason he was got rid of. As long as the case in international in this manner and it concerns world peace and weapons of mass destruction we have to open investigations into the reason why Kennedy was killed. You should also open the file of Martin Luther King. This vicar who was a black activist and human rights campaigner and his assassination was a polt. This file has to opened to establish who killed him and prosecute him. And then who killed Khalil Al Wazir the Palestinian Abu Jihad. He was attacked in a sovereign country, a member of this assembly. That is Tunisia where he stayed in its captial. But there was an attack by four warships, two submarines and two helicopters. The independence of that state was not respected as is clear from the assassination of Khalil Al Wazir. How could we keep silent about such matters. If we keep silent there could be submarines coming to our countries and we could see warships coming to our coasts and pick up anyone they like without being held accountable. Then we have the death of Abu Ayad. He was killed in very ambiguous circumstances. Then we have operations such as Al Fardan Operation and the Youth Spring Operation where Kamal Nasser was killed and where Kamal Udwan and Abu Yousif Al Najar were killed. These three Palestinians were killed in Lebanon which is a sovereign state and member of the UN General Assembly. They were lived and sleep peacefully and they were attacked. We should know who killed them. These
violations of mankind should not be repeated. You would like to know as well why Maurice Bishop the head of Grenada was killed. We have tackled how Grenada was attacked, with how many war ships and troops. We said they launched an attack on Grenada with 7,000 soldiers, 15 war ships and scores of fighter planes. The president of this member state of the general assembly Maurice Bishop was killed. We can't keep silent about these crimes. Otherwise we will all become victims and sacrifices and every year it would be the turn of someone. We are not animals and we are not sacrifices. We are defending our existence; we are defending ourselves our sons and our grandsons. We are not afraid. We have the right to live. And the global and the earth is not only for the super powers it is meant for all of us. We should never live in humiliation. The last file is the evil massacres of Sabra and Shhatila which claimed 3,000 human victims. This area was under the Israeli protection of the occupying Israeli army. Then a massacre was carried out of Palestinian men, women and children. Most of them were Palestinians. How could we keep silent. Lebanon is an independent state and a member of this assembly. The area of Sabra and Shatila was occupied and 3,000 were slaughtered. Then there is the massacre of Gaza in 2008. And for your information there were a thousand women killed an injured. And 2,200 children. It means that there were 3,200 between children and women were massacred. Fifty associations belonging to the UN were destroyed. Thirty non-governmental organizations were demolished including international relief organizations. Fifty clinics were destroyed. Forty doctors and nurses were killed while they were exercising their humanitarian activity and job. That was the outcome the Gaza massacre in December 2008. The culprits are still living. They have to be prosecuted in the international criminal court. But if the International Criminal Court is only targeting the smaller states and Third World countries this is not right. Those culprits have to be tried in the court unless it was not international. Then we would not recognize it. If it is international everybody is subjected to it. As long as the International Court of Justice is not respected and its rulings not implemented and as long as the International Atomic Energy Agency does not include all countries and the general assembly is doing nothing and the Security Council is monopolized then the United Nations is nothing. There is no United Nations. Then we come to piracy. This phenomenon may spread to all the seas. It could become a threat like terrorism. Let us tackle Somali piracy. I am telling you the Somalis are not pirates. We are the pirates because we took their fishes. We took their wealth. All the ships of the world, whether from Libya, India, Japan or America, we all pirates. After the Somali state collapsed we came to pick up the remnants. Then they have become pirates because they have to defend their food and the food of their children. They are not pirates.
They only defend their livelihood. And now you are handling it in the wrong way. You are saying let us send warships to the pirates who attacked and took the economics of Somali. No. warships should go to strike the pirates who undermined the Somali wealth and resources. You have to strike the foreign fishing boats. Anyhow I held a meeting with the pirates. I told them I would make an agreement between them and the world, that the whole world has to respect the Somali economy zone that is 200 l miles according to the law of the seas because it belongs to the Somalis. The world has to respect this economic area. This is first. Then second, all the countries should abstain from dumping hazardous waste in the Somali economic area of the Somali coast and in return the Somalis will abstain from attacking ships. We shall pose this agreement and we will present it to the UN General Assembly. That is the solution. The solution is not more strikes against the Somalis. What is worse is that their warships are preventing the Somalis from going into the sea for fishing. This is the wrong handling, this is the wrong approach. Our way of tackling terrorism is wrong. Our handling of matters is actually wrong. Today we have swine flu maybe tomorrow we have fish flue. This is trade. They make a virus and they spread it across the world so that capitalist companies gain money from selling vaccines. This is really shameful. The vaccines are not to be sold. Medicines are not to be sold. Read the Green Book. Medicines should not be sold. If we say the medicines are free and the vaccines are free and no viruses are spread because it is they who produce these viruses in order to produce vaccines. That is how capitalist companies work. This is the wrong approach. You should make a declaration that medicines are free and not for sale. It should be given free for children. Why don’t we make it free of charge why we don’t make it free.

All these items are put in the Agenda of the UN General Assembly. And the General Assembly has this only duty to exercise. Then the Ottowa agreement which bans the production, the shipment or sale of mines etc. This is wrong. The mines is an offensive weapons. They are defensive. The mines do not move. They do not attack. It remains wherever it is planted. That means you went to it. Why did you go to it? I would like to plant mines on the borders of my country because you are aggressing my country. Let your hand or leg be amputated. I urge you to review this Ottowa agreement. This appeal could be seen in the internet, in the website Al Qadhafi talks. This treaty should be modified or amended. They want to deprive us even from the mines which are anti-personnel. If I want to plant a mine in front of my home or farm then this is my way of defense. It is not offensive. You may cancel the atomic weapons the missiles and inter-continental missiles. As regards for the Palestinian cause the two-state solution is impossible. I urge you not to speak about it. The
only solution is one democratic state for Jews and for Muslims for Palestinians and Christians and all others like Lebanon. The two state-solution is not practical and impossible. There can be no two neighboring states which are too much overlapping. Any division will inevitably fail. Firstly the two states are not neighbors but are overlapping from, population, geography and so forth. There are no states. You can't establish a dividing because it doesn't exist. The West Bank has half a million Israeli settlers. The so-called Israel has a million Palestinian. The ideas of Arafat and Sharon. These generations are over, we need a democratic state. We need a generation where everybody have to live in peace. Look at the Palestinian youth. Look at Israeli youth. They both want peace. They want to live in one state. This conflict poisons the world. This White Book actually has the solution for Israel. Arabs has no hostility for Israel. We want to live in peace, the refugee should go back. You are the one who burned us, we gave them safe haven during the Roman and during Andulsia, you are the one who aligned them not us. We provided them with protection. Let see the truth, we are not hostile, we are not enemies of the Jews and the Jewswill one day needs the Arabs. At that point Arabs will give them protection to save them. Look at everybody else did to the Jews. Hitler is an example; he is the one who hit the Jews not us. In brief, Kashmir should be an independent state and the Pakistani should end this conflict to buffer between India and Pakistan. Darfur I really hope that the assistance provided by international organizations would become a development project for agricultural, for irrigations. You are the one who make it crises and you wanted to sacrifice Darfur. You've turned the Hariri problem to the United Nations, why? You sell the body of Hariri to settle scores with Syria. Lebanon is an independent state, it has court, it has judiciary and police. What they really wanted is to settle scores with Syria; they are not for justice for Al Hariri.

Khalil Al Wazir, Lumumba, Kennedy, Hammershold it could be turned to the United State as well like Al Hariri and should be transferred to the United Nations. The General Assembly is now under the presidency of Libya and this is our right. Hope that you will assist the world to move from one stage to another, from a world that is scattered, that is full of crisis and tension to a world where humanity is prevailed and tolerance is prevailed. And I will personally follow up on this issue with the General Assembly and with Mr. Treki with the Secretary General. It is t part of our courtesy and habit to compromise when it comes to the destiny of humanity, the struggle of the Third World, the struggle of small nations that should live in peace to the end. Our God peace be with you.
APPENDIX C
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In the name of the African Union, I would like to greet the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and I hope that this meeting will be among the most historic in the history of the world. In the name of the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session, presided over by Libya, of the African Union, of one thousand traditional African kingdoms and in my own name, I would like to take this opportunity, as President of the African Union, to congratulate our son Obama because he is attending the General Assembly, and we welcome him as his country is hosting this meeting. This session is taking place in the midst of so many challenges facing us, and the whole world should come together and unite its efforts to defeat the challenges that are our principal common enemy; those of climate change and international crises such as the capitalist economic decline, the food and water crises, desertification, terrorism, immigration, piracy, man-made and natural epidemics and nuclear proliferation. Perhaps influenza H1N1 was a virus created in a laboratory that got out of control, originally being meant as a military weapon. Such challenges also include hypocrisy, poverty, fear, materialism and immorality. As is known, the United Nations was founded by three or four against Germany at the time. The United Nations was formed by the nations that joined together against Germany in the Second World War. Those countries formed a body called the Security Council, made its own countries permanent members and granted them the power of Veto. We were not present at that time. The United Nations was shaped in line with those three countries and wanted us to step into shoes originally designed against Germany. That is the real substance of the United Nations when it was founded over 60 years ago. That happened in the absence of some 165 countries, at a ratio of one to eight; that is, one was present and eight were absent. They created the Charter, of which I have a copy. If one reads the Charter of the United Nations, one finds that the Preamble of the Charter differs from its Articles. How did it come into existence? All those who attended the San Francisco Conference in 1945 participated in creating the Preamble, but they left the Articles and internal rules of procedures of the so-called Security Council to experts, specialists and interested countries, which were those countries that had established the Security Council and had united against Germany. The Preamble is very appealing, and no one objects to it, but all
the provisions that follow it completely contradict the Preamble. We reject such provisions, and we will never uphold them; they ended with the Second World War. The Preamble says that all nations, small or large, are equal. Are we equal when it comes to the permanent seats? No, we are not equal. The Preamble states in writing that all nations are equal whether they are small or large. Do we have the right of Veto? Are we equal? The Preamble says that we have equal rights, whether we are large or small. That is what is stated and what we agreed in the Preamble. So the Veto contradicts the Charter. The permanent seats contradict the Charter. We neither accept nor recognize the Veto. The Preamble of the Charter states that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest. That is the Preamble that we agreed to and signed, and we joined the United Nations because we wanted the Charter to reflect that. It says that armed force shall only be used in the common interest of all nations, but what has happened since then? Sixty-five wars have broken out since the establishment of the United Nations and the Security Council, 65 since creation, with millions more victims than in the Second World War. Are those wars, and the aggression and force that were used in those 65 wars, in the common interest of us all? No, they were in the interest of one or three or four countries, but not of all nations. We will talk about whether those wars were in the interest of one country or all nations. That flagrantly contradicts the Charter of the United Nations that we signed, and unless we act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to which we agreed, we will reject it and not be afraid not to speak diplomatically to anyone. Now we are talking about the future of the United Nations. There should be no hypocrisy or diplomacy because it concerns the important and vital issue of the future of the world. It was hypocrisy that brought about 65 wars since the establishment of the United Nations. The Preamble also states that if armed force is used, it must be a United Nations force. Thus, military intervention by the United Nations, with the joint agreement of the United Nations, not one or two or three countries using armed force. The entire United Nations will decide to go to war to maintain international peace and security. Since the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, if there is an act of aggression by one country against another, the entire United Nations should deter and stop that act. If a country, Libya for instance, were to exhibit aggression against France, then the entire organization would respond because France is a sovereign State Member of the United Nations and we all share the collective responsibility to protect the sovereignty of all nations. However, 65 aggressive wars have taken place without any United Nations action prevents them. Eight other massive, fierce wars, whose victims number some 2 million, have been waged by Member States that enjoy Veto powers. Those countries that would have us believe they seek to maintain the Sovereignty and independent of peoples
actually use aggressive force against peoples. While we would like to believe that these countries want to work for peace and security in the world and protect peoples. They have instead resorted to aggressive wars and hostile behavior. Enjoying the Veto they granted themselves as permanent members of the Security Council, they have initiated wars that have claimed millions of victims. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. No country, therefore, has the right to interfere in the affairs of any government, be it democratic or dictatorial, socialist or capitalist, reactionary or progressive. This is the responsibility of each society; it is an internal matter for the people of the country concerned. The senators of Rome once appointed their leader, Julius Caesar, as dictator because it was good for Rome at that time. No one can say of Rome at that time that it gave Caesar the Veto. The Veto is not mentioned in the Charter. We joined the United Nations because we thought we were equals, only to find that one country can object to all the decisions we make. Who gave the permanent members their status in the Security Council? Four of them granted this status to themselves. The only country that we in this Assembly elected to permanent member status in the Security Council is China. This was done democratically, but the other seats were imposed upon us undemocratically, through a dictatorial procedure carried out against our will, and we should not accept it. The Security Council reform we need is not an increase in the number of members, which would only make things worse. To use a common expression, if you add more water, you get more mud. It would add insult to injury. It would make things worse simply by adding more large countries to those that already enjoy membership of the Council. It would merely perpetuate the proliferation of super-powers. We therefore reject the addition of any more permanent seats. The solution is not to have more permanent seats, which would be very dangerous. Adding more super-powers would crush the peoples of small, vulnerable and third world countries. Which are coming together in what has been called the Group of 100. 100 small countries banding together in a forum that one member has called the Forum of Small States. These countries would be crushed by super-powers were additional large countries to be granted membership in the Security Council. This door must be closed; we reject it strongly and categorically. Adding more seats to the Security Council would increase poverty, injustice and tension at the world level, as well as great competition between certain countries such as Italy, Germany, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Japan, Brazil, Nigeria, Argentina, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa, Tanzania, Turkey, Iran, Ukraine and Greece. All these countries would seek a seat on the Security Council, making its membership almost as large as that of the General Assembly and resulting
in an impractical competition. What solution can there be? The solution is for the General Assembly to adopt a binding resolution under the leadership of Mr. Treki based on the majority will of Assembly members and taking into account the considerations of no other body. The solution is to close Security Council membership to the admission of further States. This item is on the agenda of the General Assembly during the present session presided over by Mr. Treki. Membership through Unions and the transference of mandates should supersede other proposals. We should focus on the achievement of democracy based on the equality of Member States. There should be equality among Member States and the powers and mandates of the Security Council should be transferred to the General Assembly. Membership should be for Unions, not for States. Increasing the number of States Members would give the right to all countries to a seat, in accordance with the spirit of the Preamble of the Charter. No country could deny a seat in the Council to Italy, for instance, if a seat were given to Germany, for the sake of argument, Italy might say that Germany was an aggressive country and was defeated in the Second World War. If we gave India a seat, Pakistan would say that it, too, is a nuclear country and deserve a seat, and those two countries are at war. This would be a dangerous situation. If we gave a seat to Japan, then we should have to give one to Indonesia, the largest Muslim country (in the world). Then Turkey, Iran and Ukraine would make the same claim. What could we say to Argentina or Brazil? Libya deserves a seat for its efforts in the service of world security, by discarding its weapons of mass destruction (programme). Then South Africa, Tanzania and Ukraine would demand the same all of these countries are important. The door to Security Council membership should be closed. This approach is a falsehood, a trick that has been exposed. If we want to reform the United Nations, bringing in more super-powers is not the way; the solution is to foster democracy at the level of the general congress of the world, the General Assembly, to which the powers of the Security Council should be transferred. The Security Council would become merely an instrument for implementing the decisions taken by the General Assembly, which would be the parliament, the legislative assembly, of the world. This Assembly is our democratic forum and the Security Council should be responsible before it; we should not accept the current situation. These are the legislators of the Members of the United Nations, and their resolutions should be binding. It is said that the General Assembly should do whatever the Security Council recommends. On the contrary, the Security Council should do whatever the General Assembly decides. This is the United Nations; the Assembly that includes 192 countries. It is not the Security Council, which includes only 15 of the Member States. How can we be happy about global peace and security if the whole world is controlled by only five countries? We
are 192 nations and countries, and we are like Speakers' Corner in London's Hyde Park. We just speak and nobody implements our decisions. We are mere decoration, without any real substance. We are Speakers' Corner, no more, no less. We just make speeches and then disappear. This is who you are right now. Once the Security Council becomes only an executive body for resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, there will be no competition for membership of the Council. Once the Security Council becomes a tool to implement General Assembly resolutions, there will be no need for any competition. The Security Council should, quite simply, represent all nations. In accordance with the proposal submitted to the General Assembly, there would be permanent seats on the Security Council for all Unions and groups of countries. The 27 countries of the European Union should have a permanent seat on the Security Council. The Latin American and ASEAN countries should have permanent seats. The Russian Federation and the United States of America are already permanent members of the Security Council. The Southern African Development Community (SADC), once it is fully established, should have a permanent seat. The 22 countries of the Arab League should have a permanent seat. The 57 countries of the Islamic Conference should have a permanent seat. The 118 countries of the Non-Aligned Movement should have a permanent seat. Then there is the G-100; perhaps the small countries should also have a permanent seat. Countries not included in the Unions that I have mentioned could perhaps be assigned a permanent seat, to be occupied by them in rotation every six or twelve months. I am thinking of countries like Japan and Australia that are outside such organizations as ASEAN or like Russian Federation that is not a member of the European or Latin American or African Unions. This would be a solution for them if the General Assembly votes in favor of it. The issue is a vitally important one. As has already been mentioned, the General Assembly is the Congress and Parliament of the world, the leader of the world. We are the nations, and anyone outside this General Assembly will not be recognized. The President of the Assembly, Mr. Ali Abdussalam Treki, and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon will produce the legal draft and set up the necessary committees to submit this proposal to a vote; that from now on, the Security Council will be made up of unions of nations. In this way, we will have justice and democracy, and we will no longer have a Security Council consisting of countries which have been chosen because they have nuclear weapons, large economies or advanced technology. That is terrorism. We cannot allow the Security Council to be run by super-powers that is terrorism in and of itself. If we want a world that is united, safe and peaceful, this is what we should do. If we want to remain in a world at war, that is up to you. We will continue to have conflict and to fight until doomsday or the end of the world. All Security
Council members should have the right to exercise the Veto, or else we should eliminate the whole concept of the Veto with this new formation of the Council. This would be a real Security Council. According to the new proposals submitted to the General Assembly, it will be executive council under the control of the General Assembly, which will have the real power and make all the rules. In this way, all countries will be on an equal footing in the Security Council just as they are in the General Assembly. In the General Assembly we are all treated equally when it comes to membership and voting. It should be the same in the Security Council. Currently, one country has a Veto; another country does not have a Veto; one country has a permanent seat; another country does not have a permanent seat. We should not accept this, nor should we accept any resolution adopted by the Security Council in its current composition. We were under trusteeship; we were colonized; and now we are independent. We are here today to decide the future of the world in a democratic way that will maintain the peace and security of all nations, large and small, as equals. Otherwise, it is terrorism, for terrorism is not just Al Qaeda but can also take other forms. We should be guided by the majority of the votes in the General Assembly alone. If the General Assembly takes a decision by voting, then its wishes should be obeyed and its decision should be enforced. No one is above the General Assembly; anyone who says he is above the Assembly should leave the United Nations and be on his own. Democracy is not just for the rich or the most powerful or for those who practice terrorism. All nations should be and should be seen to be on an equal footing. At present, the Security Council is security feudalism, political feudalism for those with permanent seats, protected by them and used against us. It should be called, not the Security Council, but the Terror Council. In our political life, if they need to use the Security Council against us, they turn to the Security Council. If they have no need to use it against us, they ignore the Security Council. If they have an interest to promote, an axe to grind, they respect and glorify the Charter of the United Nations; they turn to Chapter VII of the Charter and use it against poor nations. If, however, they wished to violate the Charter, they would ignore it as if it did not exist at all. If the Veto of the permanent members of the Security Council is given to those who have the power, this is injustice and terrorism and should not be tolerated by us. We should not live in the shadow of this injustice and terror. Super-powers have complicated global interest, and they use the Veto to protect those interests. For example, in the Security Council, they use the power of the United Nations to protect their interests and to terrorize and intimidate the Third World, causing it to live under the shadow of terror. From the beginning, since it was established in 1945, the Security Council has failed to provide security. On the contrary, it has provided terror and sanctions.
It is only used against us. For this reason, we will no longer be committed to implementing Security Council resolutions after this speech, which marks the 40th anniversary. Sixty-five wars have broken out; either fighting among small countries or wars of aggression waged against us by super-powers. The Security Council, in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations, failed to take action to stop these wars or acts of aggressions against small nations and peoples. The General Assembly will vote on a number of historic proposals. Either we act as one or we fragment. If each nation were to have its own version of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the various instruments and each were to have an equal footing, the powers that currently fill the permanent seats would be confined to use of their own sovereign bodies, whether there be three or four of them, and would have to exercise their rights against themselves. This is of no concern to us. If they want to keep their permanent seats, that is fine; permanent seats will be of no concern to us. We shall never submit to their control or to their exercise of the Veto that was given to them. We are not so foolish as to give the right of Veto to the super-powers to use so they can treat us as second-class citizens and as outcast nations. It is not we who decide that those countries are the super-powers and respected nations with the power to act on behalf of 192 countries. You should be fully aware that we are ignoring the Security Council resolutions because those resolutions are used solely against us and not against the super-powers which have the permanent seats and the right of Veto. Those powers never use any resolutions against themselves. They are, however, used against us. Such use has turned the United Nations into a travesty of itself and has generated wars and violations of the sovereignty of independent States. It has led to war crimes and genocides. All of this is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Since no one pays attention to the Security Council of the United Nations, each country and community has established its own security council, and the Security Council here has become isolated. The African Union has already established its own Peace and Security Council, the European Union has already established a security council, and Asian countries have already established their own security council. Soon, Latin America will have its own Security Council as will the 120 non-aligned nations. This means that we have already lost confidence in the United Nations Security Council, which has not provided us with security, and that is why we now are creating new regional security councils. We are not committed to obeying the rules or the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council in its present form because it is undemocratic dictatorial and unjust. No one can force us to join the Security Council or to obey or comply with resolutions or orders given by the Security Council in its present composition. Furthermore, there is no respect for the United Nations and no regard
for the General Assembly, which is actually the true United Nations, but whose resolutions are non-binding. The decisions of the International Court of Justice, the international judicial body, take aim only at small countries and Third World nations. Powerful countries escape the notice of the Court. Or, if judicial decisions are taken against these powerful countries, they are not enforced. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is an important agency within the United Nations. Powerful countries, however, are not accountable to it or under its jurisdiction. We have discovered that the IAEA is used only against us. We are told that it is an international organization, but, if that is the case, then all the countries of the world should be under its jurisdiction. If it is not truly international, then right after this speech we should no longer accept it and should close it down. Mr. Treki, in his capacity as President of the General Assembly, should talk to the Director General of the IAEA, Mr. ElBaradei, and should ask him if he is prepared to verify nuclear energy storage in all countries and inspect all suspected increases. If he says yes, then we accept the Agency's jurisdiction. But, if he says that he cannot go into certain countries that have nuclear power and that he does not have any jurisdiction over them, then we should close the Agency down and not submit to its jurisdiction. For your information, I called Mr. ElBaradei when we had the problem of the Libyan nuclear bomb. I called Mr. ElBaradei and asked him if the agreements by the super-powers to reduce nuclear supplies were subject to Agency control and under inspection, and whether he was aware of any increase in their activity. He told me that he was not in a position to ask the super-powers to be inspected. So, is the Agency only inspecting us? If so, it does not qualify as an international organization since it is selective, just like the Security Council and the International Court of Justice. This is not equitable nor is it the United Nations. We totally reject this situation. Regarding Africa, Mr. President, whether the United Nations is reformed or not, and even before a vote is taken on any proposals of a historic nature, Africa should be given a permanent seat on the Security Council now, having already waited too long. Leaving aside United Nations reform, we can certainly say that Africa was colonized, isolate and persecuted and its rights usurped. Its people were enslaved and treated like animals, and its territory was colonized and placed under trusteeship. The countries of the African Union deserve a permanent seat. This is a debt from the past that has to be paid and has nothing to do with United Nations reform. It is a priority matter and is high on the agenda of the General Assembly. No one can say that the African Union does not deserve a permanent seat. Who can argue with this proposal? I challenge anyone to make a case against it. Where is the proof that the African Union or the African continent does not deserve a permanent seat? No one can possibly deny this. Another matter that should be voted on in the
General Assembly is that of compensation for countries that were colonized, so as to prevent the colonization of a continent, the usurpation of its rights and the pillaging of its wealth from happening again. Why are Africans going to Europe? Why are Asians going to Europe? Why are Latin Americans going to Europe? It is because Europe colonized those peoples and stole the material and human resources of Africa, Asia and Latin America: the oil, the minerals, the uranium, the gold, the diamonds, the fruit, the vegetables, the livestock and the people; and used them. Now, new generations of Asians, Latin Americans and Africans are seeking to reclaim that stolen wealth, as they have the right to do. At the Libyan border, I recently stopped 1,000 African migrants headed for Europe, I asked them why they were going there. They told me it was to take back their stolen wealth; that they would not be leaving otherwise. Who can restore the wealth that was taken from us? If you decide to restore all of this wealth, there will be no more immigration from the Philippines, Latin America, Mauritius and India. Let us have the wealth that was stolen from us. Africa deserves $777 trillion in compensation from the countries that colonized it. They have the right to do so. They have to follow that money and to bring it back. Why is there no Libyan immigration to Italy, even though Libya is so close by? Italy owed compensation to the Libyan people. It accepted that fact and signed an agreement with Libya, which was adopted by both the Italian and Libyan Parliaments. Italy admitted that its colonization of Libya was wrong and should never be repeated, and it promised not attack the Libyan people by land, air or sea. Italy also agreed to provide Libya with $250 million a year in compensation over the next 20 years and to build a hospital for Libyans maimed as a result of the mines planted in Libyan territory during the Second World War. Italy apologized and promised that it would never again occupy the territory of another country. Italy, which was a kingdom during the Fascist regime and has made rich contribution to civilization, should be commended for this achievement, together with Prime Minister Berlusconi and his predecessor, who made their own contributions in that regard. Why is the Third World demanding compensation? So that there will be no more colonization; so that large and powerful countries will not colonize, knowing that they will have to pay compensation. Colonization should be punished. The countries that harmed other peoples during the colonial era should pay compensation for the damage and suffering inflicted under their colonial rule. There is another point that I would like to make. However, before doing so and addressing a somewhat sensitive issue - I should like to make an aside. We Africans are happy and proud indeed that a son of Africa is now President of the United States of America. That is a historic event. Now, in a country where blacks once could not mingle with whites, in cafes or restaurants, or sit next to them on a bus, the American people have elected
as their President a young black man, Mr. Obama, of Kenyan heritage. That is a wonderful thing, and we are proud. It marks the beginning of a change. However, as far as I am concerned, Obama is a temporary relief for the next four or eight years. I am afraid that we may then go back to square one. No one can guarantee how America will be governed after Obama. We would be content if Obama could remain President of the United States of America forever. The statement that he just made shows that he is completely different from any American President that we have seen. American Presidents used to threaten us with all manner of weapons, saying that they would send us Desert Storm, Grapes of Wrath, Rolling Thunder and poisonous roses for Libyan children. That was their approach. American Presidents used to threaten us with operations such as Rolling Thunder, sent to Vietnam, Desert Storm, sent to Iraq; Musketeer, sent to Egypt in 1956, even though America opposed it. And the poisonous roses visited upon Libyan children by Reagan. Can you imagine? One would have thought that Presidents of a large country with a permanent seat on the Security Council and the right of Veto would have protected us and sent us peace. And what did we get instead? Laser-guided bombs carried to us on F-111 aircraft. This was their approach; we will lead the world, whether you like it or not, and will punish anyone who opposes us. What our son Obama said today is completely different. He made a serious appeal for nuclear disarmament, which we applaud. He also said that America alone could not solve the problems facing us and that the entire world should come together to do so. He said that we must do more than we are doing now, which is making speeches. We agree with that and applaud it. He said that we had come to the United Nations to talk against one another. It is true that when we come here, we should communicate with one another on an equal footing. And he said that democracy should not be imposed from outside. Until recently, America Presidents have said that democracy should be imposed on Iraq and other countries. He said that this was an internal affair. He spoke truly when he said that democracy cannot be imposed from outside. So we have to be cautious. Before I make these sensitive remarks I note that the whole world has so many polarities. Listen: should we have a world of so many polarities? Can we not have nations on an equal footing? Let us have an answer. Does anyone have an answer as to whether it is better to have a world of so many polarities? Why can we not have equal standing? Should we have patriarchs? Should we have Popes? Should we have Gods? Why should we have a world of so many polarities? We reject such a world and call for a world where big and small are equal. The other sensitive point is the Headquarters of the United Nations. Can I have your attention, please? All of you came across the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, crossing the Asian continent or the African continent to reach this place.
Why? Is this Jerusalem? Is this the Vatican? Is this Mecca? All of you are tired, have jet lag, and have sleepless nights. You are very tired, very low, physically. Somebody just arrived now, flying 20 hours. Then we want him to make a speech and talk about this. All of you are sleep, all of you are tired. It is clear that all of you are lacking energy because of having to make such a long journey. Who do we do that? Some of our countries are in nighttime and people are asleep. Now you should be asleep, because your biological clock, your biological mind is accustomed to be asleep at this time. I wake up at 4 o'clock New York time, before dawn, because in Libya it is 11 in the morning. When I wake up at 11 o'clock it is supposed to be daytime; at 4 o'clock I am awake. Why? Think about it. If this was decided in 1945, should we still retain it? Why can we not think about a place that is in the middle, that is comfortable? Another important point is that America, the host country, bears the expenses and looks after the Headquarters and diplomatic missions and looks after the peace and security of the heads of State who come here. They are very strict; they spend a lot of money, New York and all of America being very tight. I want to relieve America of this hardship. We should thank America; we say to America, thank you for all the trouble that you have taken on yourself. We say thank you to America. We want to help reassure America and New York and keep them calm. They should not have the responsibility of looking after security. Perhaps someday a terrorist could cause an explosion or bomb a president. This place is targeted by Al-Qaeda, this very building. Why was it not hit on 11 September? It was beyond their power. The next target would be this place. I am not saying this in an offhand manner. We have tens of members of Al-Qaeda detained in Libyan prisons. Their confessions are very scary. That makes America live under tension. One never knows what will happen. Perhaps America or this place will be targeted again by a rocket. Perhaps tens of heads of State will die. We want to relieve America from this worry. We shall take the place to where it is not targeted. Now after 50 years, the United Nations Headquarters should be taken to another part of the hemisphere. After 50 years in the western hemisphere, for the next 50 years it should be in the eastern hemisphere or in the middle hemisphere, by rotation. Now, with 64 years we have an extra 14 years over the 50 that Headquarters should have been moved to somewhere else. This is not an insult to America. We should thank America. This was possible in 1945, and we should not accept it now. Of course this should be put to the vote in the General Assembly; only in the Assembly, because in section 23 of the Headquarters Agreement it says that the United Nations Headquarters can be moved to another location only by a resolution of the General Assembly. If 51 per cent of the Assembly approves relocation of Headquarters, then it can be moved. America has the right to make security tight because it is targeted by terrorists
and by Al-Qaeda. America has the right to take all security measures; we are not blaming America for that. However, we do not tolerate these measures. We do not have to come to New York and be subjected to all these measures. One president told me that he was told that his co-pilot could not come to America because there are restrictions. He asked how he could cross the Atlantic without a co-pilot. Why? He does not have to come here. Another President complained that his honor guard could not come because there was some misunderstanding regarding his name when it came to granting a visa. Another president said his own doctor could not get a visa and could not come to America. The security measures are very strict. If a country has any problem with America, they will set up restrictions on the movements of member delegations, as if one is in Guantanamo. Is this a Member State of the United Nations? Or is it a prisoner in the Guantanamo camp that cannot be allowed free movement? This is what is submitted to the General Assembly for a vote; moving the Headquarters. If 51 percent agree, then we come to the second vote; to the middle of the globe, or to the eastern part. If we say that we must move the Headquarters to the middle of the hemisphere, why do we not move to Sirte of Vienna? One can come even without a visa. Once you come as a president, Libya is a secure country. We are not going to restrict you to 100 or 500 meters. Libya has no hostile actions against anybody. I think the same holds true of Vienna. If the vote says we should move Headquarters to the eastern part, then it will be Delhi or Beijing, the capital of China or the capital of India. That is logical, my brothers. I do not think there will be any objection to that. Then you will thank me for this proposal, for eliminating the suffering and the trouble of flying 14, 15 or 20 hours to come here. No one can blame America or say that America will reduce its contributions to the United Nations. No one should have that bad thought. America, I am sure, is committed to its international obligations. America will not be angry; it will thank you for alleviating its hardship, for taking on all that hardship and all the restrictions, even though this place is targeted by terrorists. We come now to the issues that will be considered by the General Assembly. We are about to put the United Nations on trial; the old organization will be finished and a new one will emerge. This is not a normal gathering. Even son Obama said that this is not a normal gathering. It is a historic meeting. The wars that took place after the establishment of the United Nations: why did they occur? Where was the Security Council, where was the Charter, where was the United Nations? There should be investigations and judicial intervention. Why have there been massacres? We can start with the Korean War because it took place after the establishment of the United Nations. How did a war break out and cause millions of victims? Nuclear weapons could have been used in that war. Those who are responsible for causing the war should be
tried and should pay compensation and damages. Then we come to the Suez Canal war of 1956. That file should be opened wide. Three countries with permanent seats on the Security Council and with the right of Veto in the Council attacked a member State of this General Assembly. A country that was a sovereign State, Egypt, was attacked, its army was destroyed, thousands of Egyptians were killed and many Egyptian towns and entities were destroyed, all because Egypt wanted to nationalize the Suez Canal. How could such a thing have happened during the era of the United Nations and its Charter? How is it possible to guarantee that such a thing will not be repeated unless we make amends for past wrongs? Those were dangerous events and the Suez Canal and Korean War files should be re-opened. Next we come to the Vietnam War. There were 3 million victims of that war. During 12 days, more bombs were dropped than during four years of the Second World War. It was a fiercer war, and it took place after the establishment of the United Nations and after we had decided that there would be no more wars. The future of humankind is at stake. We cannot stay silent. How can we feel safe? How can we be complacent? This is the future of the world, and we who are in the General Assembly of the United Nations must make sure that such wars are not repeated in the future. Then Panama was attacked, even though it was an independent member State of the General Assembly. Four thousand people were killed, and the President of that country was taken prisoner and put in prison. Noriega should be released; we should open that file. How can we entitle a country that is a United Nations Member State to wage war against another country and capture its president, treat his as a criminal and put him in prison? Who would accept that? It could be repeated. We should not stay quiet. We should have an investigation. Any one of us Member States could face the same situation, especially if such aggression is by a Member State with a permanent seat on the Security Council and with the responsibility to maintain peace and security worldwide. Then there was the war in Grenada. That country was invaded even though it was a Member State. It was attacked by 5,000 war ships, 7,000 troops and dozens of military aircraft, and it is the smallest country in the world. This occurred after the establishment of the United Nations and of the Security Council and its Veto. And the President of Grenada, Mr. Maurice Bishop, was assassinated. How could that have happened with impunity? It is a tragedy. How can we guarantee that the United Nations is good or not, that a certain country is good or not? Can we be safe or happy about our future or not? Can we trust the Security Council or not? Can we trust the United Nations or not? We must look into and investigate the bombing of Somalia. Somalia is a United Nations Member State. It is an independent country under the rule of Aidid. We want an investigation. Why did that happen? Who allowed it to happen? Who gave the green light for
that country to be attacked? Then there is the former Yugoslavia. No country was as peaceful as Yugoslavia, constructed step by step and piece by piece after being destroyed by Hitler. We destroyed it, as if we were doing the same job as Hitler. Tito built that peaceful country step by step and brick by brick and then we arrived and broke it apart for imperialistic and personal interests. How can we be complacent about that? Why can we not be satisfied? If a peaceful country like Yugoslavia faced such a tragedy, like General Assembly should have an investigation and should decide who should be tried before the International Criminal Court. Then we have the war in Iraq; the mother of all evils. The United Nations should also investigate that. The General Assembly, presided over by Mr. Treki, should investigate that. The invasion of Iraq was a violation of the United Nations Charter. It was done without any justification by super-powers with permanent seats on the Security Council. Iraq is an independent country and a member State of the General Assembly. How could those countries attack Iraq? As provided for in the Charter, the United Nations should have intervened and stopped the attack. We spoke in the General Assembly and urged it to use the Charter to stop that attack. We were against the invasion of Kuwait, and the Arab countries fought Iraq alongside foreign countries in the name of the United Nations Charter. In the first instance, the Charter was respected. The second time when we wanted to use the Charter to stop the war in Iraq, no one used it and that document was ignored. Why did that occur? Mr. Treki and the General Assembly should investigate to determine whether there was any reason at all to invade Iraq, because the reasons for that attack remain mysterious and ambiguous, and we might face the same destiny. Why was Iraq invaded? The invasion itself was a serious violation of the United Nations Charter, and it was wrong. There was also a total massacre or genocide. More than 1.5 million Iraqis were killed. We want to bring the Iraqi file before the International Criminal Court (ICC), and we want those who committed mass murder against the Iraqi people to be tried. It is easy for Charles Taylor to be tried, or for Bashir to be tried, or for Noriega to be tried. It is all easy for them. But what about those who have committed mass murder against the Iraqis? They cannot be tried? They cannot go before the ICC? If the Court is unable to accommodate us, then we should not accept it. Either it is meant for all of us, large or small, or we should not accept it and should reject it. Anyone who commits a war crime can be tried, but we are not livestock or animal like those that are slaughtered for the Eid. We have the right to live, and we are ready to fight and to defend ourselves. We have the right to live in dignity, under the sun and on earth; they have already tested us and we have withstood the test. There are other things as well. Why is it that Iraqi prisoners of war can be sentenced to death? When Iraq was invaded and the President of Iraq was taken he was a
prisoner of war. He should not have been tried; he should not have been hanged. When the war was over, he should have been released. We want to know why a prisoner of war should have been tried. Who sentenced the President of Iraq to death? Is there an answer to that question? We know the identity of the judge who tried him. As to who tied the noose around the President's neck on the day of sacrifice and hanged him, those people wore masks. How could this have happened in a civilized world? These were prisoners of war of civilized countries under international law. How could government ministers and a head of State be sentenced to death and hanged? Were those who tried them lawyers or members of a judicial system? Do you know what people are saying? They are saying that the faces behind the masks were those of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and that it was they who put the President of Iraq to death. Why did the executioners not unmask their faces? Why do we not know their ranks? Why do we not know whether they were officers, judges, soldiers or doctors? How does it come that the President of a State Member of the United Nations was sentenced to death and killed? We do not the identity of the executioners. The United Nations is duty-bound to answer these questions: who carried out the death sentence? They must have legal status and official responsibilities, we should know their identities and we should know about the presence of a physician and the nature of all the legal proceedings. That would be true for an ordinary citizen, let alone for the President of a State Member of the United Nations who was put to death in this manner. My third point on the Iraq war relates to Abu Ghraib. This was a disgrace to humankind. I know that the United States authorities will investigate this scandal, but the United Nations must not ignore it either. The General Assembly should investigate this matter. Prisoners of war held in Abu Ghraib prison were torturers; dogs were set on them, men were raped. This is unprecedented in the history of war. It was sodomy, and it was an unprecedented sin, never before committed by past aggressors or invaders. Prisoners of war are soldiers, but these were raped in prison by a State, a permanent member of the Security Council. This goes against civilization and humankind. We must not keep silent; we must know the facts. Even today, a quarter of a million Iraqi prisoners men and women alike, remain in Abu Ghraib. They are being maltreated, persecuted and raped. There must be an investigation. Turning to the war in Afghanistan, this too must be investigated. Why are we against the Taliban? Why are we against Afghanistan? Who are the Taliban? If the Taliban want a religious State, that is fine. Think of the Vatican. Does the Vatican pose a threat to us? No, it is a religious, very peaceful State. If the Taliban want to create an Islamic Emirate, who says that this makes them an enemy? Is anyone claiming that Bin Laden is of the Taliban or that he is Afghan? Is Bin Laden
of the Taliban? No, he is of the Taliban and he is not Afghan. Were the terrorists who hit New
York City of the Taliban? Were they from Afghanistan? They were neither Taliban nor
Afghan. Then, what was the reason for the wars in Iraq and in Afghanistan? If I truly to
deceive my American and British friends, I would encourage them to send more troops and I
would encourage them to persist in this bloodbath. But they will never succeed in Iraq or
Afghanistan. Look what happened to them in Iraq, which is desert. It is even worse in
mountainous Afghanistan. If I wanted to deceive them I would tell them to continue the wars
in Iraq and Afghanistan. But no, I want to save the citizens of the United States, the United
Kingdom and other countries who are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. So I tell them: leave
Afghanistan to the Afghans; leave Iraq to the Iraqis. If they want to fight each other, they are
free to do so. America had its Civil War, and no one interfered in it. There were civil wars in
Spain, China and countries all over the world; no place on earth has been free of civil wars.
Let there be a civil war in Iraq. If the Iraqis want to have a civil war and fight each other, that
is fine who says that if the Taliban form a Government they would possess intercontinental
missiles or the kind of airplanes that hit New York? Did those airplanes take off from
Afghanistan or Iraq? No; they took off from American airports. So why is Afghanistan being
struck? The terrorists were not Afghan or Taliban or Iraqis. Why are we silent? We must
never be war devils: anyone who does not speak the truth is a silent devil. We are committed
to international peace and security. We do not wish to scorn or ridicule humankind. We want
to save humanity. As President of the General Assembly, Mr. Treki should open an
investigation of the assassinations file; in addition to the war files. Who killed Patrice
Lumumba, and why? We merely want to record it in the annals of African history; we want
to know how an African leader, a liberator, came to be assassinated. Who killed him? We
want our sons to be able to read the history of how Patrice Lumumba, the hero of Congo's
liberation struggle, was assassinated. We want to know the facts, even 50 years on. That is
one file that should be reopened. And who killed Secretary-General Hammarskjold? Who
fired on his aero plane in 1961, and why? Then, there is the assassination of United States
President Kennedy in 1963. We want to know who killed him and why. There was somebody
called Lee Harvey Oswald, who was then killed by one Jack Ruby. Why did he kill him? Jack
Ruby, an Israeli, killed Lee Harvey, Oswald, who killed Kennedy. Why did this Israeli kill
Kennedy's killer? Then Jack Ruby, the killer of the killer of Kennedy, died in mysterious
circumstances before he could be tried. We must open files. The whole world knows that
Kennedy wanted to investigate the Israeli Dimona nuclear reactor. This involves international
peace and security and weapons of mass destruction. That is why we should open this file.
Then there is the assassination of Martin Luther King, the black reverend and human rights activist. His assassination was a plot, and we should know why he was killed and who killed him. Then Khalil Wazir, or Abu Jihad, a Palestinian, was attacked. He was living peacefully in Tunisia, a Member State, and that country's sovereignty was not respected. We cannot keep silent. Even though sub marines and ships were detected along the coast of Tunisia, where he was killed, no one was accused or tried. Abu Iyad was also killed, and we should know how he was killed. He was killed in ambiguous circumstances. In Operation Spring of Youth, Kamal Nasser, a poet, Kamal Adwan and Abu Youssef al Najjar, three Palestinians, were killed in Lebanon, a country that is a free, sovereign State Member of the General Assembly. They were attacked and killed while sleeping peacefully. We should know who killed them, and he should be tried so that those crimes against humanity are not repeated. We have already talked about the size of the force used in the invasion of Grenada, 7,000 troops, 1.5 battleships and dozens of bombers; and President Bishop was killed even though Grenada was a Member State. Those are crimes, and we cannot keep silent. Otherwise, we will look alike sacrificial beasts. We are not animals. Year after year, we are attacked. We defend ourselves, our sons and our children, and we are not afraid. We have the right to live, and the earth is not destined for violence, but for us all. We can never live on this earth in such humiliation. So those are the wars. The last file is that of the massacres. In the Sabra and Shatila massacre, 3,000 people were killed. That area was under the protection of the occupying Israeli army, and was the site of a huge and calamitous massacre in which 3,000 Palestinian men, women and children were killed. How can we keep quit? Lebanon is a sovereign State Member of the General Assembly (and) was occupied, Sabra and Shatila were under Israeli control, and then the massacre took place. Then there was the 2008 massacre in Gaza. There were 1,000 women and 2,200 children among the victims killed in the massacre in Gaza in 2008. Sixty United Nations facilities and another 30 belonging to non-governmental organizations were damaged. Fifty clinics were destroyed. Forty doctors and nurses were killed while carrying out humanitarian activities. This took place in Gaza in December 2008. The perpetrators are still alive, and they should be tried by the International Criminal Court (ICC). Should we try only the underdogs, the weak and the poor of third-world countries, and not important and protected figures? Under international law, they should all face trial for the consequences of the crimes that they have committed. Otherwise, the role of the ICC will never be recognized. If the decisions of the ICC are not respected or implemented, if the General Assembly and the Security Council mean nothing, and if the International Atomic Energy Agency serves only certain countries and organizations, then what is the United Nations? It would mean that
the United Nations is nothing and is insignificant. Where is it? There is no United Nations. Then, while piracy may be a phenomenon of the high seas, a form of terrorism, we talk about the piracy in Somalia. Somalis are not pirates. We are the pirates. We went there and usurped their economic zones, their fishing and their wealth. Libya, India, Japan and America, any country in the world, we are all pirates. We all entered the territorial waters and economic zones of Somalia and stole. The Somalis are protecting their own fish, their sustenance. They have become pirates because they are defending their children’s food. Now, we seek to address that matter in the wrong way. Should we send warships to Somalia? We should send warships to the pirates who have attacked and seized the economic zones and wealth of the Somalis and the food of their children. I met the pirates, and I told them that I would negotiate an agreement between them and the international community that respects the 200-mile exclusive economic zone under the law of the sea, that protects all marine resources belonging to the Somali people, and that stops all countries from disposing of toxic waste on (along) the Somali coast. In return, the Somalis would no longer attack ships. We will propose and draft such an international treaty and submit it to the General Assembly. That is the solution. The solution does not lie in sending more military ships to fight the Somalis. That is not the solution. We are addressing the phenomena of piracy and terrorism in the wrong way. Today there is swine flu. Perhaps tomorrow there will be fish flue, because sometimes we produce viruses by controlling them. It is a commercial business. Capitalist companies produce viruses so that they can generate and sell vaccinations. This is very shameful and poor ethics. Vaccinations and medicine should not be sold. In The Green Book, I maintain that medicines should not be sold or subject to commercialization. Medicines should be free of charge and vaccinations given free to children. But capitalist companies produce the viruses and vaccinations and want to make a profit. Why are they not free of charge? We should give them free of charge, and not sell them. The entire world should strive to protect our people, create and manufacture vaccinations and give them free to children and women, and not profit by them. All those items are on the agenda of the General Assembly, which has only to exercise that duty. The Ottawa Convention on Landmines forbids that production of landmines. That is wrong. Landmines are defensive weapons. If I place them along the border of my country and someone wants to invade me, they may be killed. That is all right, because they are invading me. The Convention should be reconsidered. I am not taking that defensive weapon to another country. The enemy is coming to me. On the Al-Qadhafi website, I call for that treaty to be modified or annulled. This treaty should be modified or annulled. I want to use anti-personnel mines to defend my home against invasion. Eliminate weapons of mass
destruction, not landmines, which are defensive weapons. With regard to the Palestinian situation, the two-state solution is impossible; it is not practical. Currently, these two States completely overlap. Partition is doomed to failure. These two States are not neighbors; they are coextensive, in terms of both population and geography. A buffer zone cannot be created between the two States because there are half a million Israeli settlers in the West Bank and a million Arab Palestinians in the territory known as Israel. The solution is therefore a democratic State without religious fanaticism or ethnicity. The generation of Sharon and Arafat is over. We need a new generation, in which everyone can live in peace. Look at Palestinian and Israeli youth; they both want peace and democracy, and they want to live under one State. This conflict poisons the world. The White Book actually has the solution; I hold it here. The solution is Isratine. Arabs should have no hostility or animosity towards Israel. We are cousins and of the same race. We want to live in peace. The refugees should go back. You are the ones who brought the Holocaust upon the Jews. You, not we, are the ones who burned them. We gave them refuge. We gave them safe haven during the Roman era and the Arab reign in Andalusia and during the rule of Hitler. You are the ones who poisoned them; you are the ones who annihilated them. We provided them with protection. You expelled them. Let us see the truth. We are not hostile; we are not enemies of the Jews. And one day the Jews will need the Arabs. At that point, Arabs will be the ones to give them protection, to save them, as we have done in the past. Look at what everybody else did to the Jews. Hitler is an example. You are the ones who hate the Jews, not us. In brief, Kashmir should be an independent State, neither Indian nor Pakistani. We must end that conflict. Kashmir should be a buffer State between India and Pakistan. With regard to Darfur, I truly hope that the assistance provided by international organizations can be used for development projects, for agriculture, for industry and for irrigation. You are the ones who made it a crisis; you put it on the altar; you wanted to sacrifice Darfur so that you could interfere in its internal affairs. You have turned the Hariri problem into a United Nations problem. You are selling Hariri’s corpse. You just want to settle scores with Syria. Lebanon is an independent State; it has law, courts, a judiciary and police. At this stage, it is no longer the perpetrators that are being sought; the real wish is to settle scores with Syria, not ensure justice for Hariri. The cases of Khalil al Wazir, Lumumba, Kennedy, and Hammarskjold should also have been turned over to the United Nations, if the Hariri case merits such attention. The General Assembly is now under the presidency of Libya. This is our right. Libya hopes that you will assist in making the transition from a world fraught with crises and tension to a world in which humanity, peace and tolerance prevail. I will personally follow up on this issue with the
General Assembly, President Treki and the Secretary-General. It is not our habit to compromise when it comes to the destiny of humanity, and the struggle of the third world and the 100 small nations, which should live in peace always.
Vita
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