



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2683
24 April 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 24 April 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de KEMOULARIA

(France)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Congo
Denmark
Ghana
Madagascar
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT
Mr. TSVETKOV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. ALLEYNE
Mr. DUBININ
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir John THOMSON
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. AGUILAR

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 15 APRIL 1986 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17991)

LETTER DATED 15 APRIL 1986 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF BURKINA FASO TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17992)

LETTER DATED 15 APRIL 1986 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17993)

LETTER DATED 15 APRIL 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF OMAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17994)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table. I also invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malta, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table;
Mr. Nengraharay (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Siddiky (Bangladesh), Mr. Ogouma (Benin), Mr. Ouedrago (Burkina Faso), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Malmierca Peoli (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia),

Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Hucke (German Democratic Republic),
Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Mr. Bhagat (India), Mr. Damavandi Kamali (Islamic Republic
of Iran), Mr. Somvorachit (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Borg (Malta),
Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mrs. Bellorini Parrales (Nicaragua), Mr. Al-Ansi (Oman),
Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Noworyta (Poland), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar),
Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Irumba (Uganda), Mr. Oudovendo
(Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam and
Mr. Dizdarevic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the
Council Chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place
reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the following documents: S/18026, letter dated 21 April 1986 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/18031, letter dated 23 April 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Democratic Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the Foreign Minister of India, Mr. Bali Ram Bhagat. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BHAGAT (India): May I extend to you, Sir, my felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. Earlier this month the Indian delegation had the opportunity of congratulating you and of expressing our confidence in your well-known ability to guide the deliberations of the Council.

I have the privilege of addressing the Security Council today on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which India is the current Chairman. I thank

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

you and the members of the Council for this courtesy extended to me and my colleagues. For our Movement, the United Nations personifies a charter of faith - faith in ourselves and in our common destiny. The preservation of peace is a critical dimension of this charter. At our last summit Conference held at New Delhi in 1983, the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries stressed the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, in the settlement of international disputes and crises by peaceful means and in the strengthening of international co-operation on the basis of sovereign equality of all nations, as being indispensable to today's world.

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

They voiced their expectation that the Security Council would "fulfil its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security by the prompt and effective implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter". (S/15675, p. 49)

The non-aligned countries look upon the Security Council, a principal organ of the United Nations, with great faith and hope in their effort to preserve and consolidate their hard-won political independence and to ward off dangers of external interference or intervention on one pretext or another.

The group of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, which I have the honour to lead, has sought this meeting of the Security Council in pursuance of the mandate given it by the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries which was recently held in New Delhi. That meeting mandated the Ministers of Congo, Cuba, Ghana, Senegal, Yugoslavia and India to visit Tripoli, and to meet His Excellency Colonel Qaddafi in order to present him with the text of the communiqué and to express the solidarity of the Movement with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. That meeting also mandated the group to visit United Nations Headquarters in New York to meet with the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General. We have done so, and have presented to them the text of that communiqué. We are here today in the Council to reiterate the grave concern of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries over the serious developments in the central Mediterranean, which have grave consequences for peace and security, not only in the region but in the world at large.

For several days, the Security Council has focused attention on those developments, which arose as a result of the bombing of some Libyan cities by United States aircraft. India, along with several other countries, mainly from the Non-Aligned Movement, has voiced its shock and dismay at the turn of events, and has condemned this act of aggression. This action, in contravention of the

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and norms of international law, was undertaken, with the attendant risk of a wider conflagration, against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of a sovereign State. The representative of Libya brought before the Council agonizing details of the death and destruction suffered by the civilian population in the bombed cities. Our expectation was that the Security Council, as the primary organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, would take decisive steps to discharge its responsibility to uphold the Charter, to restore peace and stability and to ensure that there would be no further deterioration in the situation.

On 15 April 1986, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, made the following statement in regard to these developments:

"India, and the entire Non-Aligned Movement, are profoundly shocked, and deplore the United States bombings of some cities of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. It is sought to justify these acts as retaliation for terrorist acts allegedly committed by Libya. The Non-Aligned Movement has strongly condemned all forms of terrorism, whether committed by individuals or organized by States. In these particular cases, Libya has declared that it had no relationship with the claims made by the United States of America linking it to the recent terrorist acts, and has declared itself to be against all terrorist operations, such as the hijacking of aeroplanes and the murder of innocents. In view of this, the United States attacks on the capital of Libya, including the presidential palace in Tripoli, are all the more unjustifiable, and deserve condemnation on the part of all members of the Non-Aligned Movement. As Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, I earnestly call upon the United States and all others to exercise the utmost restraint

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

and not to do anything to aggravate further the already tense situation in the region. The Non-Aligned Movement extends its firm support and solidarity to Libya in this critical hour."

At its seventh summit Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement expressed its determination to resist economic and political pressure that might be exerted by any great Power against small and vulnerable States. Against this background, during the last three months, in response to anxiety expressed about the threat and possible use of force against Libya, the non-aligned Co-ordinating Bureau, in a special meeting, urged that no precipitate steps be taken, as situations of this kind are best resolved through dialogue and not through pressure. Yet, most regrettably, those appeals were ignored.

On the eve of the commencement of the ministerial meeting of the non-aligned Co-ordinating Bureau in New Delhi, shocking news of the aerial bombardment of Libya was received. The Ministers immediately met in emergency session to consider this alarming development. They were of the unanimous view that the aggression against Libya represented a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of that country, and strongly condemned it. They recalled that, at the non-aligned summit meeting in 1983, Heads of State or Government of the Movement had

"noted with concern that policies of intervention and interference, pressure and the threat or use of force continued to be pursued against many non-aligned countries, with dangerous consequences for peace and security"

(Ibid., p. 46)

and that they had called upon all States to abide by the principle that the threat or use of force shall not be used against the territorial integrity or political or economic independence of States.

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

Although the text of the 15 April communiqué has already been read into the record of the Security Council, permit me to quote some extracts which reflect the sense of deep indignation and concern felt by the non-aligned countries:

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation of non-aligned countries ... noted with deep shock and profound indignation the armed attacks by the United States undertaken with support and collaboration by its NATO military ally, the United Kingdom, against the territory of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. They strongly condemned this dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression against a fellow non-aligned country, which constituted a violation of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and endangered international peace and security. This act of aggression by the United States was all the more condemnable since, by virtue of its position as a permanent member of the Security Council, it has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

"The international community has condemned all terrorist activities, whether perpetrated by individuals, groups or States. These attacks by the United States were therefore all the more reprehensible.

"...

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation demanded that the United States of America put an immediate halt to its military operations, which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, endanger peace and security in the Mediterranean region, and pose a grave threat to international peace and security. They also demanded that full and prompt compensation be provided to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the human and material losses that it has suffered.

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation called on the United Nations Security Council to take urgent action to condemn this act of aggression and to prevent the repetition of such acts. They also urged that the Security Council should take steps to ensure that full and prompt compensation be provided to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation affirmed their full support to, and solidarity with, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in safeguarding and in defending its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. They extended their heartfelt sympathies to the authorities and people of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the losses that they have suffered." (S/17996, paras. 1, 2 and 6-8)

The events of last week are fresh in our minds. The non-aligned members of the Council jointly sponsored a balanced draft resolution. That draft resolution

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

would have condemned the armed attack by the United States on Libya, and called upon it to refrain forthwith from any attacks and threats thereof. It would have also condemned all terrorist activities whether perpetrated by individuals, groups or States. Further, it would have called upon all parties to refrain from resorting to force, to exercise restraint and to resolve their differences by peaceful means in keeping with the United Nations Charter. It would have requested the Secretary-General to take all appropriate steps to restore and ensure peace in the central Mediterranean. We regret that owing to the five negative votes, including the triple veto, the Council has lost an opportunity to place on record its commitment to the important concepts included in the draft resolution.

Our ministerial group has come to New York straight from Tripoli, where it saw for itself the nature of the damage to life and property that resulted from the bombing raid. Several buildings in residential locations were destroyed. Entire families were wiped out and several children and adults were killed in their sleep or were severely injured. When the ministerial group met Colonel Qaddafi in Tripoli on 20 April, he spoke more in sorrow than in anger at the havoc caused by the United States action, which he emphasized was nothing less than an act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. He rejected the allegations made by the United States and some of its allies linking Libya with recent terrorist attacks, and disclaimed any Libyan connection with them.

It has been sought to create a cause-and-effect relationship between an admitted attack on a sovereign State and suspected responsibility, which has been denied, for certain acts of terrorism. Nothing can justify the use of massive force or an armed attack against a sovereign State, in contravention of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Bhagat, India)

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries shares the worldwide abhorrence of terrorism. That is reflected in the New Delhi declaration of the non-aligned Co-ordinating Bureau adopted last week, where a specific section details the menace of terrorism and the urgency of the need to combat it. An appropriate reference to this was also included in the draft resolution presented to the Security Council by the non-aligned nations.

Even though the Security Council stands paralysed as a result of the triple veto, its responsibility does not end here. It is imperative that the Security Council, as the primary organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, discharge its responsibilities in this direction.

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and all peace-loving peoples in the world would not like the situation to escalate any further. We come here to voice the demand for peace, for de-escalation and for defusing the situation. We look to the United Nations, to the Security Council and the Secretary-General, to provide the urgently needed initiative that would restore peace and tranquillity.

Contrary to our hopes and expectations, the situation threatens to deteriorate further. There is a growing danger of renewed conflagration and a widening of the conflict. Restraint is the need of the hour. Escalation must be avoided at all costs. The Security Council has the primary responsibility to take preventive action, a responsibility which it cannot shirk. The permanent members have an even greater responsibility, to enable the Council to discharge its functions. In the meantime, we renew our call on the world community to take a firm stand based on the purposes and principles of the Charter. We fervently urge the Secretary-General to use to the utmost the political and moral authority that he has in the cause of peace to persuade the parties concerned to exercise restraint in this critical situation and to resolve differences by peaceful means in keeping with the United Nations Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the Minister for External Affairs of India for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, Mr. Raif Dizdarevic. I welcome him here and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. DIZDAREVIC (Yugoslavia): I thank you, Mr. President, for enabling me to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council, together with other members of the delegation of the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The position of my country, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, regarding the recent attack by United States warplanes on the non-aligned Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is very well known. We have come here to communicate the assessments, views and demands of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries - which make up two thirds of the United Nations membership - that were unanimously and without reservation defined and adopted at the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau in New Delhi. That assignment was best carried out by the head of our delegation, the Minister for External Affairs of India, who presided over our meeting in New Delhi. There is hardly anything that needs to be added to his statement. Nevertheless, I should like to point out some issues.

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

The non-aligned countries stand resolutely against the policy of aggression in international relations; against acts which violate the independence, sovereignty and integrity of any country; against the policy of the threat or use of force, whatever country is carrying it out. The non-aligned countries have unanimously stood up in defence of the independence, sovereignty and integrity of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. They have always defended those principles in international relations, and they are doing so now. By defending them, they are defending both themselves and other countries, because it is only on those principles that world peace and stability and the security of us all can be founded.

The ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries called upon the Security Council to take urgent measures condemning the act of aggression and to prevent the repetition of such acts. We did so deeply convinced that we are facing far-reaching consequences, and that this is the moment when the Security Council should act according to its responsibilities and obligations as laid down by the Charter. Regrettably, however, it has failed to meet its obligations in this case and to condemn and prevent the repetition of the use of force. This has far-reaching implications for international relations.

Violence breeds violence. Problems cannot be solved by force; force only multiplies them. If the practice applied in this case against Libya were tolerated, new acts of aggression against new Libyas would multiply. There would be new aggressors and new victims. The ones who fail to respond in an appropriate manner today will not have the right to do so tomorrow. And can the road to lawlessness in international relations be accepted? Its destruction is well known; it certainly leads to a situation in which force and weapons will be the order of

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

the day. The language of force and arms, even if there are attempts to confine it to limited areas, makes the danger of a general conflagration very real indeed. Has not the attack on Libya brought us closer to it? The Security Council, this organ of the United Nations and the international community, bears a historic responsibility for preventing that. We would like to believe that the Council will do it. The non-aligned countries appeal and demand that the Security Council do so.

We have come here from Tripoli. What we saw there only gives strength to our demands. We saw the moving scenes of death, of wounded and mutilated men, women and children; we saw the ruins of apartment buildings and living quarters, and the suffering of innocent people. We saw that the target of the attack was the residence of the leader of independent Libya, his life and the lives of his family. We witnessed justified indignation. We heard words of condemnation, but not of revenge, neither from the ordinary people, nor at the highest levels.

All this makes the Security Council even more duty-bound to shoulder its responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the Foreign Minister of Cuba, Mr. Isidoro Malmierca Peoli, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MALMIERCA PEOLI (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): We are taking part in this meeting of the Security Council, which is being held to deal with the United States aggression against Libya, in pursuance of a decision of the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries recently held in New Delhi.

In September this year, when it holds its eighth Summit Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

During the quarter of a century since the first summit Conference, held in Belgrade in 1961, our Movement has considered the international situation at various meetings of Heads of State or Government, or of Foreign Ministers, and has stated its position on it.

Since 1961 there have been almost 40 such meetings. We have taken part in more than half, and have followed events at the others, and we can say that never before has the Non-Aligned Movement shown such firm and unanimous solidarity as was given by the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau in dealing with the brutal aggression launched by the United States Government against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

An emergency session of the Ministers and heads of delegation, convened on 15 April, even before the scheduled beginning of the ministerial meeting, adopted without any objections or reservations a communiqué condemning the aggression by the United States against Libya and expressing the solidarity of the Non-Aligned Movement with the people and Government of Libya and their leader, Colonel Mu'Ammar Qaddafi.

When the ministerial meeting began on 16 April, the first speaker, before the start of the general debate, was the Foreign Minister of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Our colleague, Kamil Hassan Mansour, denounced the savage attack on the Libyan people, which had caused the death of women and children and the wounding of hundreds of persons, and declared the determination of the Libyan people not to be frightened by attacks or threats and to defend their independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty at any price.

Later the ministerial meeting of Ministers and heads of delegation was addressed by representatives of almost 100 delegations, all of whom - in different ways and to varying degrees - condemned the United States aggression and expressed

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

their solidarity with the people and Government of Libya.

The ministerial meeting decided that a delegation composed of representatives of India, Yugoslavia, Senegal, Ghana, Congo and Cuba should go to Tripoli, Libya, and then to United Nations Headquarters in New York to report its findings. In doing so, the meeting was expressing the unanimous condemnation by the member countries of the Non-Aligned Movement of the barbaric, savage and brutal aggression by the United States and their feeling of solidarity with the people and Government of Libya.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

This reaction was unprecedented, and it was warranted by the aggression. It was proof of the awareness that actions such as that against Libya were really acts of aggression against the independence, sovereignty and freedom of each and every one of our countries and constituted a precedent and a threat: tomorrow such violations of international law could be carried out against any one of our countries.

It is interesting to compare the unanimity of the nearly 100 countries that met in New Delhi with the results of the vote in the Security Council. Here, only nine of the 15 members voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the members of the Council belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement.

In addition to the self-confessed criminal, the United States, and its accomplice, the United Kingdom, the votes of three other countries expressed an unwillingness to condemn the act of aggression against Libya; they did not express condemnation of manifestations of State terrorism or any other kind of terrorism; and they did not want the United Nations to work to preserve peace and to prevent further violations of the Charter.

Some of those countries proclaimed their interest in strengthening the role of the United Nations and its various bodies. Yet in the face of the arrogant aggression against a small country, they acted as accomplices of the aggressor and undermined the Security Council, its credibility and its ability to contribute to the search for peace and security.

When that vote took place, our delegation was in Tripoli, Libya. We arrived there on Sunday, 20 April, and stayed there until the afternoon of 21 April. As is known, we expressed to Colonel Mu'Ammar Al-Qaddafi the solidarity of the Movement, and we reported to him the results of the meeting held in New Delhi. Colonel Mu'Ammar Al-Qaddafi expressed his people's gratitude for the position of

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

the Non-Aligned Movement and reiterated the Libyan people's determination to fight for its freedom, independence and sovereignty. He expressed its confidence in ultimate victory.

In Tripoli we also saw the results of the aggression carried out by the aircraft of the United States air force. We visited the residential areas that had been bombed. We saw the destroyed French Embassy offices. At the cemetery we expressed our respect for the fallen, and we wished those who had been wounded and were being taken care of in hospitals a speedy recovery.

In the hospitals we saw terrible scenes: children, young people, women and elderly persons who had been mutilated and would spend the rest of their lives as invalids. But even there the wounded who could not speak raised their fists and shook them, thus proclaiming their determination not to surrender, not to be humiliated by the aggressors. Out in the streets, the relatives of the wounded and the victims told us that Reagan was the assassin and that they were not afraid of further acts of aggressions, that they would fight, if that were necessary, until death to defend their independence and their freedom.

What we did not see in Tripoli was fear or vacillation. Nor was there any fear or vacillation at our ministerial meeting in New Delhi. There was determination. There was determination to confront aggression, to support the aggressed-upon and to fight to see to it that there would be no further such acts of aggression.

In their Declaration, in the paragraphs having to do with the Mediterranean, the Ministers meeting in New Delhi stated that the United States act of aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya endangered peace, stability and international security. They reaffirmed their total support for and solidarity with the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jahamiriya in safeguarding its

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of threats and pressure and the possible further use of force. Such solidarity is necessary in the face of threats of further acts of aggression by the United States, which, in statements by President Reagan himself and by some of his closest accomplices, has said that it might repeat its criminal actions. It even wants to present its NATO allies as being prepared to participate in a more widespread act of aggression with a more complex objective: the destruction of the Government headed by Colonel Mu'Ammar Al-Qaddafi.

The cynicism shown by the American imperialists and their allies is truly amazing. They uninhibitedly confess their crimes. They even seem to be proud of their plans to repeat them on a broader scale. The propagandistic campaign that the Reagan Administration has been carrying out for some time - for a number of years now - is aimed at presenting the Libyan Government as the organizer and perpetrator of terrorist actions and therefore deserving of punitive actions. If that is the code of conduct of the imperialists and they are thus obliged to punish terrorists, how can we explain their privileged relations with the South African racists and the Zionists in Tel Aviv?

In the Security Council, on many occasions there have been heard speeches by the representatives of those régimes in which they have admitted, with a cynicism like that of their United States ally and accomplice, the carrying out of terrorist actions against defenceless citizens in the territories of other countries in violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity, demanding the right to act outside international law.

We all know that the United States maintains a "constructive" commitment to the apartheid régime - the régime that in Angolan territory has committed the killings in Kassinga, bombed Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, carried out

(Mr. Maimierca Peoli, Cuba)

commando attacks in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia, and in 1975 invaded Angola, and even now still occupies part of that territory. We all know that the United States maintains a strategic alliance with the Tel Aviv régime, which occupies Arab and Palestinian territories. It invaded Lebanon and encircled Beirut. It bombed Tunis, and only a few days ago it launched new attacks against Palestinian refugees in Lebanese territory.

In reality, it is Washington that the headquarters of international terrorism is to be found, and Mr. Reagan is its undisguised chief. The racists in Pretoria and the Zionists in Tel Aviv are only disciples of their tutors and masters. We can therefore not fail to denounce the fact that Reagan and his allies are preparing new acts of aggression and are trying to create the conditions necessary to carry them out.

In a statement announcing the unleashing of further acts of aggression, a few days ago President Reagan said that in Nicaragua a new Libya was being formed in the backyard of the United States. He did this to take advantage of the present situation and to try to change the attitude of American citizens, the majority of whom have repeatedly expressed their opposition to military aggression by the United States against Nicaragua. To that end Reagan is beginning a campaign to try to portray Nicaragua as Libya and to lay the groundwork for further acts of aggression. Yesterday, 23 April, Mr. Reagan reiterated his threat to commit further acts of aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. He also said that he was prepared to order further acts of military aggression against Syria and the Islamic Republic of Iran, if it was felt they were linked to terrorist actions.

All this truly constitutes an incredible process full of constant gross violations of the most elementary norms of international law. The criminal not

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

only acknowledges his crimes; in addition he warns he will repeat them against his old victims and against new victims.

In trying to drag its European allies into its demented campaign against Libya and to obtain support for its acts of aggression, the United States is talking about "irrefutable proof" of Libya's link with terrorist actions. One day we shall find out who really laid the groundwork for these actions, where the funds to support them came from.

We all remember the alleged Vietnamese act of aggression against the American fleet in the Gulf of Tonkin, which was the pretext used by the United States to justify its invasion of Viet Nam. We all remember too how the United States later recognized that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a bald lie, a provocation prepared to bring about public support for the aggression against Viet Nam.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Those tactics are not new. Just as in the Viet Nam war there was a Gulf of Tonkin, in the Nazi invasion of Poland Hitler fabricated the incident of Vesterplatte. No, those methods are not new. History has taught us that such provocations irrevocably lead to defeat and regrettably result in a tremendous cost in life, bloodshed and destruction.

The imperialists are powerful. They have modern weapons which they do not hesitate to use. But in order to win, they must kill millions of men, women and children. However, just as Hitler was destroyed, eventually they too will be destroyed; they will meet the same fate as they did at Playa Giron and in Viet Nam.

In a statement made on 19 April in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the victory of Playa Giron and the proclamation of the socialist nature of our revolution, President Fidel Castro referred to a recent meeting of the Security Council and to a statement made here by the representative of my country, Ambassador Alberto Velazco, in which he denounced the perpetrators of the brutal act of aggression committed against Libya by the veritable heirs of Hitler.

President Fidel Castro said:

"What difference is there between Reagan's methods and the methods of Hitler?

"Hitler began an undeclared war with surprise bombing raids at all hours of the day and night. Reagan carried out a surprise attack against Grenada and mined the ports of Nicaragua without declarations of war; he treacherously ordered a surprise early-morning bombing raid on Tripoli in order to eliminate the Head of State and his family, in contravention of all norms and laws, including the laws of warfare. He has systematically resorted to lies and

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

invoked every pretext to justify his deeds. This is true of the crimes committed in Grenada, Nicaragua and Tripoli. His methods are the same as Hitler's. They are intended to manipulate world public opinion in support of his policies. His use of the mass media is the same as Hitler's. His constant jingoistic appeals to crass patriotism are Hitlerite methods. His arrogance and overweening pride, his contempt for world public opinion, in particular for the peoples of the third world, which also has a racist connotation - all these are Hitlerite methods."

The world cannot close its eyes to reality. It cannot ignore the fact that the path of imperialist aggression against peoples that do not bend to his dictates will lead to disaster. If we are to believe the words of Mr. Reagan, we can only expect further acts of aggression against Libya or other independent countries.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate our confidence that the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, will fulfil its historic mission, the defence of peace. In this undertaking it may always count on the assistance of the people of Cuba and its revolutionary Government.

To the people and Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, we once again express our firm solidarity and our confidence in their victory. A people determined to defend its independence and freedom can never be defeated.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Sir, my delegation has already expressed its compliments to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. However, I should like this afternoon to add my personal satisfaction and felicitation for the excellent leadership that you have so far demonstrated in the Council. I note that Ghana and France enjoy the friendliest of relations, even

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

though my country is not part of French-speaking Africa. I am happy also to note that the interaction between our two countries has been characterized above all by mutual respect for each other's principles and history. Even though my personal working relationship with you, Sir, spans but a relatively short time here at the United Nations, it is a matter of considerable pride for me that I have come to appreciate your vast and keen diplomatic skills. I have no doubt that the Council will profit immensely from your leadership.

The Ghana delegation has already stated its view in the Security Council on last week's bombing raid on the territory of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I have asked to speak today for two reasons: first, because Ghana was honoured to be included in the ministerial delegation of the non-aligned countries mandated to bring the Movement's message to the Security Council and, secondly, because the pronouncements of certain leaders, since the recent vote on the resolution authored by the non-aligned countries of the Security Council on the matter, make us fear a repetition of the use of force on a fellow member State of the non-aligned group of countries. My intervention, therefore, is a further attempt to contain the explosive situation now existing between the United States and Libya as well as to aid this Council so that it can act along the path of peace.

In this regard, I am instructed to convey the regret of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Ghana to you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council, for his inability to participate personally in today's debate due to other pressing matters of State.

The Chairman of our ministerial delegation, Mr. Balai Ram Bhagat, the Indian Minister of External Affairs, has already informed the Council about the details of the decision taken by the emergency meeting of the Ministers of the Non-Aligned countries on 15 April in New Delhi, and he has been supported by other ministers

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

from non-aligned countries. I shall not repeat what they have said. Let me add, however, that the profound shock and indignation expressed by the ministers at the armed attack on the sovereign territory of Libya is one in which Ghana totally concurs, not only because of the unacceptable use of force by the United States against Libya in contravention of the Charter, but also because the unbridled aggression committed against a fellow non-aligned country was also in violation of international law. The best expression of our condemnation of the illegal and insensitive act was therefore to express solidarity with Libya in the present unfortunate circumstance.

It is important for members of the Council to know that the decision by our movement squarely to blame the United States for its use of armed force against Libya was taken after a lengthy examination of all aspects of the matter, including the claim by the United States that it acted in self-defence and in an effort to halt international terrorism. The ministerial meeting, however, concluded unanimously that the use of force could not be excused in this case since there had been many other peaceful options open to the United States in dealing with the problem.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Furthermore, there was the general feeling that to turn away from the Charter and the norms of international conduct in this particular case would be to set a very dangerous precedent, and the non-aligned countries - most of which are small and militarily insignificant - would in the long run be the victims.

I shall not delve into the legal arguments against the claim of the United States that it acted in self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. My delegation has already done so. Let me however remind members of the Council that non-aligned countries have in the main attained and sustained their respective independence and nationhood through the observance and promotion of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The same principles guarantee our sovereignty as well as individual and collective security. It is our cardinal duty therefore to defend and promote the purposes and principles of the Charter at all times. There can be no selective adherence to the Charter principles, in the circumstance, without a corresponding injury to the security and continued existence of our respective countries. Ghana thus considers it a solemn duty, in the interest of international peace and security and on account of the military vulnerability of all non-aligned States, to join in the open condemnation of the use of armed force by the United States in its dispute with Libya. The Charter and international law generally forbid this course of action, and we intend to continue to support the observance of international law and order.

Our visit to Libya this week enabled my delegation to witness at first hand the traumatic results of the use of force to settle disputes between countries. The victims of the United States so-called surgical bombing of Tripoli were, unhappily, mostly women and children. The inscriptions on the graves in the cemetery on the outskirts of Tripoli showed the victims to be of such tender ages as six, seven and nine. They died in their innocent sleep at two o'clock in the morning of 14 April. The mistakes made by the United States bombers in either

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

identifying their targets or taking accurate aim led to many civilian lives and property being destroyed. The Mishergi family, a wealthy and well-known Libyan family, who live some few hundred meters from the French Embassy in Tripoli, were cruelly murdered in their beds in those early hours of the fateful morning - all eight of them. In the Central Hospital in Tripoli, we saw little children critically injured, some from irreversible brain damage and others merely waiting for what little life was left in them to ebb away and the life-supporting machines switched off. The deadly and delayed characteristic of the especially inhumane bombs used in the armed attack tragically increased the toll of victims beyond the immediate casualty toll because some of the special bombs exploded hours and even days after the raid to kill and maim unsuspecting civilians. So was it that one victim we saw in hospital had lost a forearm and his right eye when two days after the attack he tried, a fraction of a second too late, to save some little children from playing with one such unexploded bomb. I could go on recounting my observations but let me save the Council time and gory details by stating that our shattering experience convinces the Ghana delegation all the more that the use of force should continue to be rejected as a means of settling disputes.

One may rightly ask, as indeed some of the leaders of the United States are reported to have queried, what about the innocent women and children who have fallen victims to the assassin's bullet in Europe and the Middle East. I wish to reiterate without equivocation that Ghana had condemned and will continue to condemn all wanton acts of terrorism, no matter their origin. We lost an innocent national during the so-called storming of the hijacked aircraft on the tarmac in Malta. We deplored the violence then as we do now, whether perpetrated by individuals or States. However, we do not share the view, as many European States have also noted, that international terrorism can be curbed or totally eliminated by the initiation of more violence. History is replete with examples of violence inviting more violence in an unending cycle of violence. Moreover, we believe that

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

States should themselves endeavour not to be the vehicle of terror, since such actions could easily degenerate into war with dire consequences for international peace and security.

In our meeting with the Libyan leader, His Excellency Colonel Mu'Ammar Qaddafi, he repeated the past denials of Libya being responsible for international terrorism. We had no evidence with which to question the Libyan Head of State's disavowal of responsibility for international terrorism. The opponents of Colonel Qaddafi have lately been strident in hurling accusations against him and Libya, but it is also noteworthy that no watertight evidence has been presented to the Security Council to substantiate the accusations. We believe that the matter is so serious that any hard evidence of the complicity of any State in international terrorism should be made available to the Security Council for objective analysis and further action in the interest of peace and security. My delegation is therefore unable to uphold those general and unproven accusations, much less sanction a consequential use of armed force by any Member State against Libya.

Both the United States and the United Kingdom have continued to assure their respective nationals and the international community that last week's bombing raids were directed at military and terrorist facilities. What we saw a few days ago in Tripoli proved to the contrary. The victims of the bombing were mainly civilian. The selective targets showed clearly that the homes of the Libyan leader and some of his colleagues were targeted, hence the concentration of bombing in civilian areas. It is a matter of considerable sorrow to my delegation that the United States and the United Kingdom - two permanent members of the Security Council - should decide not only to use armed force against a fellow Member State of the United Nations but also choose civilian targets for such display of fire-power.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

My delegation has taken the floor today to plead with the Council to live up to its mandate and not be swept away by sentiment nor partisan politics to opt the easy route of expediency.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Charter has been violated, and that violation should not assume legitimacy because a super-Power is involved. The philosophy of might being right when a State can get away with it is an archaic, discredited and dangerous policy the Council should firmly discourage. This is the era of international co-operation and interdependence, and we need, collectively, to ensure that we do not start wars that might very well run out of control.

We have condemned the use of force by a permanent member of the Security Council, but that is not our sole nor primary purpose in this matter. Our aim is to help uphold the ground rules that would reduce tension between the two countries and pave the way for a non-military settlement of the dispute. In this regard, we regret certain statements that have appeared in the press recently to the effect that the use of force would be repeated. We wish to appeal to both sides to act with maximum restraint and, at this stage, to entrust the Secretary-General with a greater role in the search for a solution.

The Ghana delegation is aware that the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned States members of the Council has been rejected by the triple vetoes of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, but we do not consider that the Council's responsibility for ensuring the promotion of peace between the United States and Libya is over. In this endeavour, there is a role that the non-aligned countries could also play and on this occasion we urge the Council, through its President, to consider seriously.

Finally, my delegation would consider its statement today to be incomplete were we to fail to emphasize once again that the Council and the international community should address the root cause of the problem of terrorism with courage and objectivity in order to eliminate the phenomenon of international terrorism. The claim that the root cause of terrorism is "the murderous behaviour of the Government of Libya and its agents" is not only difficult to substantiate - it is

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

to confuse symptoms with causes. All of the members of the Council know, even if they will not publicly admit it, that the cause of international terrorism is the frustration felt by Palestinians and Arabs generally over the failure of the international community, especially the friends of Israel, to ensure that justice is handed down to them and that the inalienable rights of millions of Palestinians to a homeland and life in dignity are guaranteed. The link between the demand for justice, inalienable rights and the phenomenon of terrorism is too clear to be denied. This is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. And so, unless this root cause is addressed, terrorism will continue in spite of Colonel Qaddafi.

This is a solemn and historic occasion, and my delegation would like to call upon the Council, especially the permanent members, to uphold the Charter, for there is no alternative to that responsibility if we must survive and develop in peace and harmony. To sanction indirectly the threat or use of force is to compromise the prestige and authority of the Council to the detriment of our common interests. Let us therefore now move beyond what has already happened and seek new avenues for peace and constructive relations among the parties to the dispute. We certainly stand ready to play any part, however little, in achieving that objective.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Ghana for his particularly kind words addressed to me and to my country.

Mr. ADOUMI (Congo) (interpretation from French): As recently as 18 April the Congo expressed its views on the act of aggression - which it condemns - committed by the United States of America against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Libya. I shall not, therefore, repeat those views, other than to add, briefly, that a super-Power, a member of the Security Council, a State with all the money, the powerful economy, the considerable military strength that we all know,

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

cannot bomb a country member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, despite and in violation of the United Nations Charter and other international instruments, particularly those relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes, without arousing the indignation of the international community. The spontaneity of the thousands of people who have demonstrated against this American act of aggression has spread to all the capitals of the world, including - ironically - Berlin, which is thought to be where that act of aggression had its origin.

The Congo was a member of the ministerial delegation sent by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is thus on that footing that I am making this brief statement on behalf of my Minister, who is unable to be present.

I highly esteem and endorse the important contributions made by the Foreign Ministers who have already spoken, in particular that of the Foreign Minister of India, the Chairman of that delegation.

When a decision as important as that regarding a draft resolution before the Security Council cannot be taken, for various reasons - often even valid ones - there is always the great risk that we are deprived of the ways and means that could lead to action and generate hope.

That applies to certain basic provisions that, had the most recent draft resolution been adopted, could have enabled the United Nations, its Secretary-General or the Security Council to play a role commensurate with the events and the crisis that had justified its being seized of the matter.

That role, if it did not manage to facilitate dialogue between the parties concerned, could at least have encouraged a recourse to the peaceful means of settling disputes in which the international order abounds. The failure to take any measure of that kind could enable those who are most determined to make use of

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

armed violence to regard what we might describe as the Organization's anaesthetized state as a tribute to their policy.

Yet it would appear to be of the greatest importance to international peace and security not to encourage, even by abstension or omission, the development of a right to have recourse to such violence, including on the pretext of self-defence.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Over the course of history, many large conflicts have broken out triggered solely by unilateral decisions taken on the basis of what we can only call a free interpretation of collective provisions. Thus, we must stress the importance in this case of preventive diplomacy. Had the Security Council made it its duty to analyse a universally condemned phenomenon such as terrorism in order to derive from it all the consequences affecting the relationship between that phenomenon and questions of peace and security throughout the world, it would certainly have been doing something useful.

Having said that, the Congo would lay stress upon the problems caused by certain actions - however well meant - by certain Powers, with the avowed intent of battling terrorism. We have no doubt that the international community could easily circumscribe and limit the effects of this phenomenon: on this issue the General Assembly has already taken a consensus position by the adoption of its resolution 40/61. Members will recall that the General Assembly refers there to measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes. That is the crux of the problem. With the clear determination to meet grievances, not create new ones, this Organization can take the matter out of the hands of States or individuals dangerously determined to make violence and the use of force a norm of conduct in international affairs.

This is an appeal for reason and moderation, and for the broadest possible co-operation, excluding no one, for the good of the international community.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers on my list. The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him now.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I do not wish to dignify the personal insults of my Government leaders by the Cuban Foreign Minister. The comparison with Hitlerism is disgusting. Hundreds of thousands of Americans lost their lives fighting Hitler. He does not even know what Hitlerism is. My country has received more than 1 million refugees fleeing from the terror and repression of his country: 10 per cent of the population has fled the terror and repression of his Government, and he presumes to come here and give us lessons about what is terrorism and what is not terrorism.

We have just heard the statements of members of a delegation who participated in the Ministerial-level Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in Delhi last week. I wish to recall that the "non-aligned" issued a communiqué on 15 April which attacked the United States for all manner of wrongs, including a "dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression" (S/17996, annex, para. 1) against Libya.

Non-aligned alignment against the United States is not new, but rarely is it as brazen as it has been in this Chamber this afternoon. A great conflict has been raging between Iran and Iraq for six years; not one word of this appears in the non-aligned communiqué. They are talking about numbers of people infinitely smaller. Why? Why is there such easy unanimity in attacking the United States and nothing to describe a great war which is raging and costing thousands of lives? But perhaps this is non-alignment; I do not know.

Three days ago, the United States, joined by several other members of this Council, voted against a similarly flawed document which unjustifiably condemned United States action in Libya. They should know that my country is deeply

(Mr. Walters, United States)

indignant and will not forget this totally one-sided view of these recent events. I repeat: How many Americans must die before we will be recognized as having the right to take some action?

I ask myself in reading those two documents whether their authors really meant to confuse the criminal with the victim, and whether they are fully aware of the implications of their charges. I am shocked that neither document took any account of Libyan terrorism, which has been repeatedly and amply demonstrated before the entire world. The Governments of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany have both acknowledged that they are in possession of irrefutable evidence of Libyan complicity in this dastardly crime in Berlin. Did they refer to Colonel Qaddafi's numerous threats against the United States, including a call for war on 100 fronts? As I said in this Chamber on 15 April,

"It is hypocrisy to equate the answer to terrorism with terrorism: it is equating crime with those who fight crime". (S/PV.2674, p. 19)

In the face of repeated acts of violence against American citizens and after exercising great restraint, the United States reacted to intolerable actions by Libya. As President Reagan said last week, to have remained passive in the face of Libya's terrorist attacks such as the Berlin bombing would have only encouraged more terrorism in the future.

It has been astonishing for me to hear my country denounced before this Council by some countries which have sought and received active co-operation from the United States in dealing with their own problems involving terrorism and which have not shrunk from using extreme force themselves to deal with that problem.

There is another charge which I have heard during this debate and with which I wish to take issue. It has been said by a number of speakers that the United States action in Libya was condemnable because a big country attacked a small

(Mr. Walters, United States)

country. The references to the size of the two countries may be true, but that was the only element of truth in those accusations. I would ask those who have told us what they saw in Tripoli: Did you see the carnage of men, women and children at Vienna and Rome airports? Did you see those killed and wounded in Berlin? Colonel Qaddafi's agents have left a trail of broken and blasted bodies from Beirut to Berlin. Some choose never to mention these. I wonder why.

References to the size of a nation are irrelevant. What is relevant are the rights of nations large or small, the rights which are recognized in international law and the United Nations Charter. Article 51 of the Charter specifically recognizes the right at issue in this debate: the right of self-defence by Member States; the right to defend themselves and their citizens.

Talk about size misses the point regarding terrorism. In the nether world of terrorism, unfortunately, death comes in small packages. For example, the explosives found in a suitcase at Heathrow Airport last Thursday weighed less than 10 pounds. They would have been powerful enough to destroy an entire passenger aeroplane and all its innocent passengers and crew, who numbered over 300. The explosive which damaged the Trans-World Airways (TWA) passenger plane on 2 April is believed by experts to have weighed less than one pound. Yet its force was strong enough to have ripped a hole in the side of the plane, caused the death of four passengers - one of them a baby, I might add - and endangered the lives of the others on board. The weapons of choice intended for the United States Officers Club in Ankara last Friday were hand grenades. They could have taken a heavy toll of American and Turkish lives if the attempt had not been foiled by the Turkish authorities. And in the most tragic incidents, one American and two British hostages were shot in the head and killed in Lebanon, while another American, a member of the United States Embassy in Khartoum, lies in serious condition in a hospital from a terrorist's bullet.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

It does not take advanced technology or the resources of a large country to spread destruction in civilized society. Terrorism can be attempted by any small group of determined, fanatical and, I should add, demented individuals. It is an even greater danger if it is backed by a State, such as Libya, in flagrant violation of Article 2 (4) of the Charter.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

I should like to make another point.

Many speakers have drawn attention to the civilian casualties in Libya. These casualties were indeed regrettable; but it is important to remember that they were the result of a legitimate United States response to repeated past and planned acts of terrorism by Libya in violation of the Charter. It is also a fact that civilian targets were avoided to the maximum extent possible. That was not the case with the terrorist incidents I have already mentioned.

The issues before the Council are not the size of States or civilian casualties. The chief issue remains the scourge of terrorism and how civilized nations can deal with it.

Never once has Libya been named. Have the European countries pointed at Libya without proof? Fourteen Libyan "diplomats" have been expelled from European countries in the last couple of years for "criminal acts". I wonder how many of the non-aligned noticed that.

On the subject of statements which have been made by earlier speakers in this debate, I cannot fail to raise my personal objections to a particular comment made by the Libyan representative last Monday. He said that the United States actions in Libya were actions "against the entire Arab nation". Such an accusation is patently untrue and amounts to slander against the American people. It is untrue because the United States maintains close and valued relations with most of the countries of the Arab world. As President Reagan said yesterday:

"Let no one mistake this for a conflict between Western democracies and the Arab world. Those who condone making war by cowardly attacks on unarmed third parties, including women and children, are but a tiny minority. We hope and pray the Arab world will join us to eliminate this scourge of terrorism".

The Libyan representative's remarks were slanderous against my country because the United States is, as we all know, a country made up of peoples of many different

(Mr. Walters, United States)

ethnic origins, including people from the Arab world. Arab-Americans are a full part of our American society. They value their ties with the Arab world, and they are an essential element of American-Arab cultural exchange. They share with other Americans our horror over the rise of terrorism and support efforts to combat it.

Allow me to make one final point.

In the last few days, a number of countries, including especially countries in Europe, have taken actions which underscore their concern about Libyan terrorism. These actions have included measures to restrict the personnel and activities of Libyan People's Bureaus and other measures to control and monitor the movement of both official and non-official Libyans. The United States welcomes these actions as part of the response which free societies need to protect themselves. We also welcome Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's denunciation at the non-aligned ministerial meeting of "all sorts of terrorist activities, whether by individuals or by a State". We hope that the wider international community will come to a similar appreciation of the danger that terrorism poses to the entire international community and will adopt the necessary measures to respond to that danger. We hope that these measures will be built upon and expanded in the future so that the fight against Libyan terrorism will one day become effective and ensure the safety of our citizens and societies. The United States, for its part, will not shrink from the struggle against terrorism and those who practise it against us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I do not have very much to add to what has been said by the Minister for External Affairs of India, the head of the non-aligned delegation; or by the Federal

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, the Foreign Minister of Cuba, and the representatives of Congo and Ghana, the other members of the delegation. All of them have, with great clarity, described what they saw as a result of the crimes committed by United States imperialism. They described the effects of the crimes committed by the new Hitler. On behalf of more than 100 countries, indeed on behalf of the entire world, they condemned the wanton, barbaric, imperialistic aggression committed by the United States, by the leader of international terrorism. As the Foreign Minister of Cuba said, Reagan is the leader of the largest terrorist gang in the world. I do not want to add anything to what he said. I must say - and I apologize to the United States representative - that if I were in his shoes I too would feel that I was in a very embarrassing position. It is particularly difficult to defend as serious a crime as the one committed by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. And, by the way, the United States has committed crimes against other small countries, beginning with Viet Nam and going on to Nicaragua, and against the Palestinian people and the Cuban people. The United States chose to perpetrate its aggression against the Libyan people on the very anniversary of its attempt to invade Cuba - what is known as the imperialistic attack on Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. That crime could be repeated at any time.

The United States representative spoke about terrorism. He does not seem to be aware that true terrorism has been practised by his country against small countries. I should like to ask the United States representative this: On behalf of whom and of what civilization were hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese killed? On behalf of whom and of what civilization are Palestinians now being killed? The United States representative spoke about his country's friendship with the Arabs. But I must say that that is untrue. I would defy any Arab to come here and say that the United States is a friend of the Arabs. With whose weapons were the

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

children of Egypt killed? With whose weapons were the children of Lebanon and Syria killed? With whose support are Palestinians being killed? What kind of friendship is that?

Who is helping Israel? Who is encouraging occupation? I would defy the United States representative here to state that his country is against the annexation of Jerusalem. I defy him to express condemnation of the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem. I defy him to do that in the Council. On behalf of whom are Palestinians being killed?

What kind of friendship is being referred to here? There is no friendship between the Arabs and the United States. For the United States is Israel, and Israel is the United States. The United States is and will continue to be enemy No. 1 of the Arab nation. Of course, when I say "the United States", I mean the United States Administration, not the American people. The American people are victims of these misguided terrorist policies.

The relations existing between the Zionist entity and the United States are even closer than those existing between any other State and Washington. The United States spends a great deal of money on Israeli aggression. Indeed, it spends more on supporting Israeli citizens than it spends on American citizens in Alaska and Hawaii.

An Israeli newspaper, Ha'aratz, published the following on 18 April:

"Shortly after the aggression against Libya, Israel received detailed reports about that operation. These reports were distributed instantaneously and simultaneously in Israel and the United States, through military channels. For its part, Israel provided the United States with ultra-secret information about the situation in Libya after the operation, particularly in regard to the extent of the damage caused in the place where Qaddafi was.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

In the near future there will be a joint investigation into the results of the attack, including a detailed study of the weapons and means of communication used and details of the operation."

That, then, is the nature of the friendship between the United States and Israel.

A few days ago I heard the American President say that the United States wanted to be respected, not to be loved. I say to him that respect cannot be imposed by force. When Hitler occupied Europe he was not respected. He was not respected when he tried to impose his Nazi régime on Europe, for there is a limit to arrogance and force. Although we are a small country, we have a long history, and we would refer him to the year 1808, when the United States invasion of Libya ended with the destruction of the American fleet. Is he unaware of the words to the United States Marines hymn, "From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli"? The Libyan people will defend its homeland; it will defend its territory with all its might. Neither aggression nor the means used will intimidate us, for we are determined to defend our country.

Notwithstanding the decision of the Council, the United States terrorist Administration is now repeating that it may commit a further act of aggression. Indeed, it is now collaborating with Israel in its preparation. We warn the Council of the dangers of such an operation.

Finally, we praise the position adopted by the international community, which has condemned the American Administration. It is causing the American Administration to lose face and is placing it in an embarrassing position. However, we do not wish to provoke an escalation. We understand the cost of war, and we want peace. However, no one should underestimate our strength. We are not weak. I wish to tell the United States representative that, if and when necessary, we are determined to fight.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call now on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Sir JOHN THOMSON (United Kingdom): My delegation's position was set out at some length and in a reflective way when we discussed this question on 17 April. I do not want to add to or change what I said then, but we ought to reflect on one or two of the statements we have heard this afternoon, some of which were directed at my Government. Many, however, were directed not at my Government but at the Security Council as a whole.

We heard frequently this afternoon that the Council had failed. The accusers of the Council are five members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and it is a serious charge that they made. But we should stop and consider whether it takes account of all the evidence, whether it is balanced, whether, in fact, it is also helpful in the present delicate international situation.

The five members of the team that visited Tripoli and have now spoken here seem to have been very much influenced by what they saw in Tripoli and by their conversation with Colonel Qaddafi, and they seem, if I understand them correctly, to have assured Colonel Qaddafi that he has the total support of the Non-Aligned Movement. But I did not gather from their statements this afternoon that they had considered all the evidence. At any rate, they did not say so.

For example, although some fairly harrowing details were mentioned, there was no reference to the baby blown out of the TWA aircraft. There was no reference to the dead and wounded in the Berlin discotheque. There was no reference to the admitted attack by the Government of Libya on the Italian island of Lampedusa - admitted. There was no reference to the plan - that was foiled, fortunately - to bomb the queue of people seeking visas in Paris to visit the United States. There was no reference to the carnage at the airports in Rome and Vienna. There was no

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

reference to the murder two years ago in London of policewoman Yvonne Fletcher, shot from the window of the Libyan People's Bureau. Somebody was asking whether there was any evidence of any Libyan terrorism. There was no reference to the murder at the end of last week of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Padfield, whose bodies were found near Beirut with a note attached to them. There was no reference to many other things, despicable acts of that sort, which have built up a long history.

It is surprising, then, that there was a reference in the Non-Aligned Movement communiqué and in the statements we heard today to "unprovoked" acts. Well, I do not know how far one has to go to provoke, but certainly it seems to me that the statements that we have heard repeatedly that violence breeds violence have a truth in them. But where did the violence begin?

The five who spoke this afternoon and who went to Tripoli appeared to me, at least to judge from what they said, not to have listened to, not to have read, Colonel Qaddafi's own statements on the record, supporting State-directed terrorism, inter alia against my country. They did not tell us that in their conversations with Colonel Qaddafi they expressed not only solidarity with Libya but abhorrence of any Libyan-directed terrorism.

The Non-Aligned Movement commands great respect, but respect can be maintained only if there is respect for the evidence, respect for the truth.

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

I would very much hope that the five members of the team that went to Tripoli, and who have spoken this afternoon, can assure us that they brought home to Colonel Qaddafi the position taken unanimously by the Security Council in October last year and again in December, and the position taken by the General Assembly at the fortieth session, on 9 December. These were important statements; they have entered into the corpus of international principle and law. The Security Council statements were adopted by all members of the Council. There was no dissent from the General Assembly resolution.

These therefore represent the views and the conscience of the international community as a whole. And, as I say, I hope that perhaps we can be assured that they were brought clearly to Colonel Qaddafi's attention, as they need to be brought to the attention of others who are contemplating State-directed terrorism.

Reference has been made to the draft resolution voted on in this Council earlier this week. That resolution did not mention Libya. I do not believe that in refusing to accept such a resolution the Security Council, which followed its constitutional procedures, acted foolishly or unfairly. Surely the omission - among other considerations, but this alone was enough - of any reference to the long history of State-directed provocations, State-directed terrorism, was enough to justify the Council in deciding not to adopt the draft resolution.

I can well understand, in the excitement of the moment - the news coming in in New Delhi, a huge meeting of Foreign Ministers and other very distinguished people - the sort of emotion that sweeps a group of that sort. All want to come together; none dare express an individual dissenting opinion. But, having got over the heat of the moment, one really needs to wonder whether the action has discouraged or encouraged State-directed terrorism. It is a question we should all ponder.

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

For my own part, my delegation rather doubts whether Colonel Qaddafi and others who sponsor terrorism will cease, unless it is brought home to them by the members of their own movement, by the members of their own communities, by their friends, by the international community as a whole that the international community does regard State-directed terrorism as criminal, as we said in our Security Council and General Assembly resolutions; that we really do mean it when we say we condemn terrorism in all its forms, wherever and by whomever committed.

Even if it does not stop Colonel Qaddafi, I am sure it will help if members of the Non-Aligned Movement will remind him that when they supported the General Assembly resolution they meant it. Perhaps they could remind him in particular of the first operative paragraph, which unequivocally condemns as criminal

"all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations among States and their security". (General Assembly resolution 40/61, para. 1)

Very precise and relevant words. That resolution goes on to call upon all States "to fulfil their obligations under international law and to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other States, or acquiescing in activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts". (Para. 6)

That is what needs to be brought home. Those are our principles. Those are the principles the whole international community has accepted. We must act on them.

I noted that the Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia said, if I recall correctly, that the Non-Aligned Movement was against the use of force "regardless of which country is carrying it out". That is a good sentiment, a true position of the non-aligned which my delegation greatly respects. Those who hold it have a responsibility to bring this home to the people who sponsor terrorism.

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

There is no one here who denies that terrorism, and indeed State-directed terrorism, has taken place - no one. The Non-Aligned Movement has a responsibility to its members. That responsibility is not restricted to expressing solidarity with them because they are members of the Non-Aligned Movement. It includes bringing home to them the damage they do to the Non-Aligned Movement, and indeed to the whole international community, when they contravene the principles which the whole international community has accepted and on which it must act.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its 2675th meeting under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.

I invite Mr. Maksoud to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement. I certainly do not wish to restrict his right to speak, when we are all so aware of his rhetorical talents. I will not look at the clock too often. We shall certainly be pleased to hear him.

Mr. MAKSOUD: I had no intention of making a further statement to the Security Council today. However, I find that in this debate it is as if we were living in two worlds. We are still in the habit of talking at each other instead of to each other. The rupture in the dialogue, perhaps interrupted by the incidents of violence, has exacerbated the dimension of rhetoric, and that is why I feel it necessary at this moment to bring back, in a reflective way, certain fundamental realities that cannot escape the deliberations of this Council.

(Mr. Maksoud)

But before I do that I should like, on behalf of the Arab States, to express our deep appreciation to the non-aligned delegation and their foreign ministers who have come long distances to express a studied position and not a position resulting from being swept away by the emotions of the moment.

The non-aligned countries that met in New Delhi represent a deep-rooted civilization and they are often inhibited in expressing emotions. Their policies are mostly studied and not hurried. Non-alignment is not an equidistant position between what is right and what is wrong. Non-alignment is an alignment with the forces of peace, progress and human liberation. That is why the argumentative nature of the response to the non-aligned ministers did not take into consideration the inherent wisdom of their considered policies. I want to put this on record because there is surreptitiously a remaining hierarchical attitude taken in many instances by some of our Western friends, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom, that is, that material or historical power gives them a certain inalienable right to establish at times a political or an intellectual hegemony whereby their own definitions and terms of reference constitute the yardstick by which all behaviour should be measured and judged.

I think that when we hear the responses of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom we note a measure of condescension, and that is why in my first statement I said that we seem to be in two different worlds. Therefore, I feel that it is necessary to bring back, perhaps as this debate is closing, the elements of the debate.

This is not a debate on terrorism. All the Arab States condemn terrorism and have participated in the unanimous General Assembly resolution on terrorism. We take United Nations resolutions seriously because we feel that the third world in general, as well as the whole world, are the ultimate beneficiaries of these

(Mr. Maksoud)

resolutions. We are in the forefront of the commitment and dedication to the implementation of all United Nations resolutions, including the one on terrorism. But that was not the issue that led the non-aligned countries to take a position on the violation of the territorial integrity of an independent State. That was the issue and that was the focus. This debate took place because of that, for we must assume that all the Arab States, including Libya, condemn all acts of State, as well as individual, terrorism. Terrorism, as I said in my earlier statement, is an explosion of frustration; it is an abdication of hope; it is an act of desperation. We do not believe in it, despite the immoral, indiscriminate consequences on civilian and innocent targets. We believe in the inevitability of the victory of freedom. We believe in the ultimate dismantling of all occupation. We believe in the ultimate realization of international equality. Therefore, we are optimists, despite the temporary disarray in which we might find ourselves. It is because of this that I hope we shall awaken to a moment of history and treat seriously the pronouncements of the non-aligned countries, which, it is hoped will lead to the revitalization of this moment, given the constructive role the Non-Aligned Movement can play in bridging the gaps and in restoring sobriety to dialogue, in bringing back the rationality that has long eluded us.

As far as we are concerned, we shall take part in any international conference the United Nations might call for combating all forms of terrorism. We hope that this would also stimulate those who have been reluctant to participate in an international conference to deal with all the violence that has emerged in the countries of the Middle East as a consequence of the denial of Palestinian rights and of the continued occupation of Arab territories. We hope that this would bring about a defusion of the level of violence that renders certain individuals hopeless and, in their hopelessness, unaccountable for their behaviour. Give sobriety the

(Mr. Maksoud)

implements to bring about a just peace and then we shall totally isolate not only the terrorists but also the sources of desperation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I have already indicated that there are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will be fixed in consultation with the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.