

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2418th MEETING: 23 FEBRUARY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2418)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)	1

S/PV.2418

NOTE

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

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

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

2418th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 23 February 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

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

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2418)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at previous meetings [2415th and 2417th meetings], I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Benin, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Racz (Hungary), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, Cuba and Ethiopia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite those representatives to take part in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Tsveikov (Bulgaria), Mr. Roa Kourt (Cuba), and Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 23 February from the representative of Togo [S/15621], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Ike F. Mafole, the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled: 'Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council' (S/15615)."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

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

5. Mr. RACZ (Hungary): Comrade President, first of all I should like to express my sincere thanks to you and, through you, to the members of the Council for inviting my delegation to participate in the Council's deliberations and for giving me the opportunity to express our view with regard to the important issue on the agenda.

6. At the same time, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Comrade President, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. It is my

firm conviction that the guidance of a highly qualified and respected diplomat from a country to which my country is connected by bonds of friendship and close co-operation will greatly help the Council contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this year, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity to greet the new members; I wish the delegations of Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Zimbabwe much success in their highly responsible assignment.

8. This series of urgent meetings of the Council has been called to consider yet another act that could further aggravate the generally tense international situation. The recent attempts to intimidate the people and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya give us cause for concern. The dispatch of AWACS aircraft to one of the neighbouring countries and the deployment of the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* in close proximity to the Libyan coast, the latest manifestations of a series of anti-Libyan manoeuvres, constitute acts of provocation and amount to a military threat. This unprovoked step of the United States Administration and the hysteria that accompanied it clearly demonstrate that some of the influential factors of international politics still keep on stubbornly ignoring the genuine interests of mankind and the corresponding wish of world public opinion to alleviate international tension and promote the spirit of mutual understanding among nations, and that, instead, they repeatedly resort to provocations. By doing so, these circles deliberately poison the international atmosphere.

9. The contradictions in the various statements that have been made to try to justify the unjustifiable—contradictions which are all too well known to all of us here—shed even more light on the real nature and purposes of these manoeuvres. These prevarications have obviously failed to make anyone believe in the alleged danger and in the necessity of the so-called deterrent measures.

10. Thanks to the patience and self-restraint exercised by the Libyan Government, the provocation has not resulted in an open conflict in this particular case. But the danger has always been there. And no one can lose sight of the possibility that such provocations might lead to unpredictable consequences, might jeopardize the stability of the region in question and threaten international peace and security as a whole. It must be clear to everyone that once this happens, he who has provoked the act should bear all the responsibility for its consequences.

11. The international community should deplore all kinds of provocation and must resolutely stand up against them. This kind of muscle-flexing should not be allowed to be repeated. The provisions of the Charter of the United Nations should be respected and the fundamental principles of international law and other norms of the international code of conduct should prevail in international relations.

12. Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): I wish first of all to avail myself of this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to our newest colleague on the Council, Mr. Abdul-lah Salah, the representative of Jordan, a country with which Pakistan enjoys close, brotherly relations. Mr. Salah brings with him a wealth of experience in the diplomatic field. We are confident that his wisdom and skills will be a great asset to the Council in its deliberations on the important issues that will come before it. We look forward to his contributions to the work of the Council and are ready to co-operate with him in our collective endeavours to strengthen the role of the Security Council in the promotion of international peace and security.

13. We have given careful consideration to the letter, dated 19 February, which the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed to the President of the Council asking the Council to consider "the deteriorating situation near the Libyan shores". This letter and the earlier related communication from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, dated 18 February [S/15614], draw attention to "the grave situation" resulting from the movement of the United States aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, with some other naval vessels, close to the Libyan coast, and the dispatch of AWACS aircraft to a neighbouring country. It has been further stated that flights by United States reconnaissance aircraft and the use of jamming devices have created a dangerous situation and disrupted civil communications inside the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. At the same time, an assurance has been given that the Jamahiriya does not have any intention of interfering in any country, whether a neighbour or a non-neighbour.

14. We have also studied carefully the letter, dated 22 February, addressed to the President of the Council by the representative of the United States [S/15617], rejecting Libyan charges and in turn making the allegation that Libya is interfering in the affairs of its neighbours, thus threatening the security of the region.

15. Yesterday [2416th meeting], the representative of the Sudan complained of interference by Libya in his country's internal affairs, interference aimed at overthrowing the legitimate Government of the country. He also considered the recent United States air and naval deployment as having been necessary.

16. The variety of the positions taken and the vehemence with which these have been advanced by the parties concerned are bewildering and render the task of the Council difficult. Nevertheless, all these statements deserve the Council's full attention.

17. Pakistan has consistently upheld the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, both as a member and a non-member of the Council, has extended full support to it in the discharge of its heavy responsibilities. We earnestly believe that the maintenance of international peace and security imposes an inescapable obligation on all countries to adhere strictly to the principles of the Charter and, in particular, to refrain from interference in the affairs of other States and from the threat or use of

force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Any deviation from these principles, whether by a major Power or by a small country, cannot but have serious consequences for international peace and stability.

18. Our approach to the issue before the Council is guided by these considerations. It is also clear from the statements of the speakers who have participated in the debate that there is an overwhelming sentiment against all acts of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and against resort to the threat or use of force aimed at intimidating smaller countries.

19. The air and naval activities in the eastern Mediterranean have served to create fears concerning their impact on the security of States of the region. It is clear from the statements made by a number of countries from the region that such fears are shared by them. Pakistan is bound to take note of the expression of these fears.

20. We are deeply disturbed at the sequence of events which has culminated in the need for the Council to meet to consider the resulting situation, in which the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya feels a threat to its security. We earnestly hope that the consideration which the issues involved have received in the Council's debate will help defuse the situation and bring about a lessening of the tension that has been generated.

21. It is our hope that States Members of the United Nations will feel encouraged to have recourse to the Council whenever they perceive a threat to their security, instead of resorting to the threat or use of force to achieve their objectives. Only in this way will the Council be enabled to function as an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, as it is intended to be in accordance with the role assigned to it by the Charter: an aspect to which the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization submitted to the General Assembly at its most recent session¹ draws particular attention. This role will be denied to the United Nations if countries decide to arrogate to themselves the role which properly belongs to the Security Council.

22. We appeal to all the parties concerned to cooperate in taking steps to reduce tension in the region and to avoid any precipitate action which might endanger international peace and security. In this respect, we welcome the reassuring statements made yesterday by the representatives of Libya and the United States [2415th meeting]. We find in these statements a reaffirmation of their commitment to the principles of the Charter, particularly the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

23. In view of these statements and of the latest developments in the area, we are hopeful that the situation in the region will soon revert to normalcy. We also hope that the present debate in the Council will contribute to the achievement of that desirable goal and will inhibit the

recurrence of situations like the one now being considered by the Council.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

25. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Comrade President, at the very outset I should like to thank you, as well as all the members of the Council, for giving me the opportunity to state the position of my Government concerning the item on the agenda.

26. I should like to say at once, Comrade President, how pleased we are to see you presiding over the work of the Council during the month of February. I am particularly pleased since you represent a great country with which the People's Republic of Bulgaria enjoys the closest, most fraternal, relations. The fact that your country pursues, in a most consistent manner, a policy of peace and progress, and the fact that you have such political wisdom and diplomatic skill, which are recognized by all, will help see to it that the Council can fulfil its responsibilities.

27. I should like to pay a tribute also to the representative of Togo for the outstanding way in which he presided over the work of the Council during January.

28. The events which recently took place in the region of the Mediterranean Sea have again shown that the explosive situation prevailing there is by no means the result of some sort of historical or geopolitical predetermination. It is the result of a well-thought-out strategy which seeks to paralyse progressive change in the Middle East, perpetuate the exploitation of the natural riches of that region by capitalist monopolies and impose the military and strategic supremacy of imperialism in that geographical area, situated at the crossroads of the three continents of the Old World.

29. The provocative manoeuvres against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya are evidence of the extremes to which the United States Government has gone in its ambition to point the unfolding of events in the region in a direction which would favour its imperialist interests.

30. The People's Republic of Bulgaria resolutely condemns that act of aggression and believes that it constitutes an attempt to impose the Camp David deals by brute force, to deepen the scission in the Arab world and to compel it to capitulate to the hegemonistic designs of imperialism and Zionist reaction. We cannot fail to point out that the perpetrators of that act of provocation seek to create a smoke-screen to conceal the continued expansionist manoeuvres of Tel Aviv and to distract world public opinion from the Sabra and Shatila crimes.

31. The latest anti-Libyan venture is significant in that it shows the existence of a new plan to destabilize the region and to dismantle the national liberation movement in that part of the world.

32. The ambitions of a large State wilfully to assume the role of arbiter of the security of a region thousands of kilometres away from it have caused particularly grave concern within the international community. The worst examples in history, both recent and remote, attest to the fact that that State arrogates to itself the right to survey and sanction the sovereign acts of States as well as their domestic and foreign policies. The obstinacy with which it pursues that policy reveals a total disregard for the realities of our time and a blind attachment to the instruments of force and destruction. There is no need to dwell in detail on where such aspirations could lead.

33. The danger is particularly great given the deliberate intention to raise the level of confrontation in a region that is particularly sensitive, both politically and militarily. The blackmail carried out against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is an open defiance of the attempts being made to arrive at a peaceful and just solution to the differences that exist in the region. It also constitutes a further step towards a universalization of the Middle East crisis. The action was undertaken within the context of massive military and psychological pressure brought to bear against all the progressive forces in the world. Indeed, it represents a restoration of the grimly familiar 1950s policy of brinkmanship.

34. I should like to stress that the events that have just occurred in the region around Libya bring out once again the urgent need to arrive at a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East problem. The unhappy experience of many military conflicts has shown that such problems cannot be resolved by *diktat*, armed confrontation and acts of aggression. Nor can such a solution be achieved through separate deals, by pitting the Arab countries against each other. The solution can be reached only through the collective efforts of all the parties concerned. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with the other socialist countries, has always favoured the convening at the earliest possible date of a broad, international representative forum to that end.

35. There is no doubt that all States are duty-bound to abide, both in their policies in the Mediterranean region and in their international relations in general, by the principles of non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, equality of rights and the right of peoples to decide their own future.

36. Accordingly, while reaffirming our total support for the just cause of the Libyan people and condemning imperialist aggression against it, my country expresses its willingness to co-operate with all those who sincerely desire the establishment of lasting peace and security in the region of the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

37. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council as the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, I should like to begin by personally extending to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the current month.

38. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and gratitude for the warm welcome that you and other members of the Council have extended to me. I need not emphasize my personal pleasure at representing my country in this august body. I look forward to good relations of co-operation and fruitful endeavour with all of my colleagues, and I pledge my personal co-operation and that of my delegation.

39. I need not emphasize Jordan's concern at the developments that have taken place during the last few days in the Mediterranean area and North Africa and that have led to the submission by the fraternal country of Libya of its complaint to the Council. Those developments have clearly created a situation of tension and danger in that region, tension and danger that have spread beyond the regional level to the international level. Our concern and interest with regard to those developments are based on the existence of mutual relations between Jordan and the countries concerned in the present crisis. Jordan is linked to Libya and the Sudan by Pan Arabist commitments and common destiny, belonging as we do to the same regional group, the League of Arab States. We have a clear sense of our Pan Arabist responsibilities and national obligations towards the Arab nation and its just causes. In addition to being part of the Islamic world and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we are also bound to the international community through bilateral relations and mutual co-operation within the framework of serving common interests and safeguarding the principles of peace, security and legality throughout the world.

40. Notwithstanding the divergent views as to the causes of the tension that came into being last week around the borders of Libya and other neighbouring States, and irrespective of the pros and cons of the present crisis on the regional and international levels, my Government believes that it is in the interest of none of the parties to internationalize Arab affairs; therefore, the transfer of such issues to the international arena will serve only to aggravate them further, making them more complex and leading to a polarization in the region that will result in more suffering for the Arab nation. Such a course can only serve to weaken further the bases of Arab solidarity and co-operation and lead to a concomitant increase in the tension that exists in international relations.

41. Jordan's foreign policy is based on the principle of opposition to interference in the internal and external affairs of nations on the part of any party in any circumstances and for any reason whatsoever, and in any form or manifestation. On that basis we cannot accept threats to the security of any State from outside its borders. Responsibility for safeguarding the sovereignty and security of each State is an absolute right of the concerned State; the safeguarding of international peace and security is an international responsibility exercised by the United Nations through the Security Council.

42. Israel has continuously threatened the security of Arab States, as well as their territorial integrity, launching many attacks and invasions and committing acts of

aggression. Moreover, for over 15 years Israel has been occupying Jerusalem and the West Bank, as well as Gaza and the Golan Heights.

43. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations, foremost among which is Council resolution 242 (1967), Israel has failed to implement a single one and has refused to heed the international call for its withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, for the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace in the area, and recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Nor has there been any successful attempt to compel it to do so.

44. Jordan opposes the threat or use of force in international relations and, in conformity with this policy, calls for respect for international norms and instruments which make it incumbent upon States to strive to settle their disputes amicably and by peaceful means, avoiding provocative acts and extremist policies and practices.

45. All countries bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the safeguarding of stability and the development of co-operation all over the world. That responsibility requires all States to abstain from any action that could lead to tension in international relations; it implies the need to proceed on the basis of the principle of safeguarding the atmosphere of détente, international co-operation, non-intervention in the internal affairs of others and respect for good-neighbourliness.

46. There are certain practices that, on the one hand, might not serve the dignity and reputation of various countries and, on the other, might prompt smaller countries to go to extremes or to try to form blocs. There are also grave risks that the great Powers may conduct their foreign policies on the assumption that peaceful coexistence and détente cannot be achieved.

47. In conclusion, we realize the importance of respecting the right of every State to exercise its sovereignty within the framework of choosing and implementing its own foreign policy; to formulate its international relations in order to safeguard its security and territorial integrity; and to use every legitimate means to that end. National and regional stability is synonymous with international stability and progress. Indeed, the national security of every State should be respected by all members of the international community.

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to offer my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. Your personal diplomatic skills and the policy of peace pursued by your Government augur well for the successful discharge of your responsibilities.

50. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to the representative of brotherly Togo for the efficient manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council last month.

51. Last but not least, I should like to congratulate the new members of the Council and to wish them success in the fulfilment of the high hopes we have all reposed in them.

52. Today the Council is once again meeting to consider a situation in which the might of a super-Power is being imposed on the will of a small nation to deny it the right to chart its destiny free from foreign domination. Some might wittingly or unwittingly view the agenda item before the Council today as representing a conflict situation between two neighbouring States, but the facts belie that point of view. If the issue had been an imminent threat emanating from one African country against another, neighbouring African country, as some would like us to believe, surely the countries of the region themselves would have been able to contain that threat. But the fact that the colossal might of a super-Power has been deployed so swiftly compels us to look for reasons other than those advanced by the representative of the United States in her statement to the Council yesterday [*ibid.*].

53. As is well known, the present United States Administration has publicly and unequivocally stated on numerous occasions the high priority it attaches to what it characterizes as "the containment of Libyan adventurism"—which actually means the overthrow of the legitimate Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Indeed, for the last two years the United States Administration has pursued this objective with uncharacteristic consistency and determination. That, we submit, is the real source of the tension on the northern shores of Africa, and therefore no amount of sophistry can alter that incontrovertible fact.

54. When we say that, we are not, of course, oblivious to or denying the fact that there are differences and difficulties between Libya and some of its neighbours, but we are convinced that those differences are not the real source of the present tension in that part of the world. Those differences can and will be resolved by the countries concerned, bilaterally or through the instrumentality of regional organizations. Unfortunately, however, the differences are being deliberately fanned in order to serve as a pretext for intervention in and ultimate domination of that region.

55. In this connection, let me refer to a simple and very recent example of how the United States pursues a policy in the region that could be characterized as one of "divide and dominate". In her statement to the Council, the representative of the United States stated that: "A number of Libyans are in Ethiopia advising Somali and Sudanese guerrillas." [*Ibid.*, para. 66]. We, of course, view that as malicious. What makes that statement noteworthy, however, is not its lack of scruples but the sinister motive that lies behind it.

56. The whole world knows that Ethiopia and Somalia have strained relations. But what the world probably does not know is how the United States exploits these strained relations in order to maintain military bases and facilities in our region. The whole world also knows that Ethiopia and the Sudan enjoy very good relations and that both countries are striving to strengthen further that good-neighbourliness at the highest possible level. Unfortunately, the United States is not happy with this state of affairs and, as has been attempted here by its representative, is sowing seeds of distrust and discord in the bilateral relations of those sister nations.

57. In this connection, I wish to state that not only are there no Sudanese guerrillas being trained by Libya in my country but even the Sudanese Government itself has not made such charges against my country. When viewed against this background, the motive behind the statement of the United States representative should become very apparent. And, we submit again, the purpose is to raise suspicion, create tension and strain the good-neighbourly relations that exist between the people and Government of my country and the people and Government of the Sudan. The statements and actions of the United States should therefore be viewed at all times within the context of its guiding policy of divide and dominate.

58. Being a permanent member of the Security Council obviously entails primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. At this point in time, if one asks the question how the policies of the present United States Administration measure up to its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, the answer is not a difficult one. The global policy of peaceful coexistence and détente is today being replaced by a dangerous policy of confrontation; the cherished goal of disarmament is countered by extensive rearmament; the ardent desire for the creation of zones of peace in different regions of the world is being supplanted by a chain of military bases where intense military activity is taking place, albeit in the form of manoeuvres. Where wisdom and caution are imperative, Washington acts with haste and brinkmanship. Where responsibility and a sense of justice are expected, the world finds a singular lack of those qualities. One can go on enumerating the difficult situations in which the world finds itself as a result of the policy pursued by the present United States Administration.

59. Faced with such predicaments, what should the Security Council do to discharge its Charter responsibilities? Indeed, what should small countries like Libya expect from the Council when a super-Power threatens to exercise its military might against it? Those are some of the questions that the members of the Council have to address. As for the Ethiopian delegation and Government, we commend Libya for its courage and perseverance in the face of the boundless might and ceaseless provocations of a nuclear Power. At the same time, we continue to hope that the dictates of world peace and security, rather than narrowly conceived national interests, will one day be given due consideration by the

Government of the United States. When that takes place, at some future date, it will certainly mark a significant turn of events in favour of the maintenance of global peace and stability and the enhancement of international co-operation in promoting progress and prosperity for mankind as a whole.

60. There is no denying, however, that such positive developments uncertain and unspecified as they are, will not provide a solution to the present situation, which is so replete with all the possibilities for escalating into a conflagration. The present dangerous situation and the tension that mounted dramatically last week in and around the northern shores of Africa appear to be the result of a deliberate plan and the culmination of a whole series of hostile and provocative acts committed by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We shall not burden the Council by restating those facts, as a whole inventory of those provocations over the past several years was given only yesterday by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya [*ibid.*, para. 14].

61. The statement of the representative of the United States not only has failed to assure us that the present crisis is over but in fact has added to the confusion generated by the contradictory statements of high officials in Washington, including the President of the United States himself.

62. The official Government statement from Khartoum, as reported in *The Washington Post* of 21 February, is that there had been no *coup* attempt and that only 25 persons had been arrested over the past three months. The Egyptian Minister for Defence was also reported in the same newspaper as having asserted that he did not see any signs of crisis or a possible aggression against the Sudan at present. Also, no joint military manoeuvres have been confirmed by the countries concerned; in fact, they have been denied outright. Yet, those were the justifications offered by the United States for the dangerous military activities that it undertook.

63. However, *The New York Times*, in its issue of 22 February, touched upon what appears to be the more likely and, indeed, the most disturbing currents underneath the high drama of last week. It reported that:

“The plan, according to the American officials, was to lure Libya into striking and then to destroy as much of its air force as possible. If no strike occurred, the plan was to assert that prompt help to Egypt had deterred Libya.”

The same *New York Times* article continued:

“The cover story was to be that the AWACS planes had been sent to Egypt as part of a training exercise.”

It was further stressed that:

“The apparent contradictions in the public posture and the private explanations, officials said, were due more to poor execution than to a faulty plan.”

In other words, it was a good plan with poor implementation.

64. Thus the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, with its sophisticated, deadly weapons, was diverted to the shores of Libya on a mission of fishing for a pretext that would provide a semblance of justification for clobbering a weak and small country. What is even more disturbing is the fact that this was done by a super-Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, which has responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, for protecting the weak and the small and for promoting the rule of law in international relations.

65. Indeed, the world is approaching a new international anarchy, as was emphatically expressed by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization, submitted to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.¹ What reason do we have for optimism when a permanent member of the Council, the organ in which the Charter of the United Nations reposes special responsibilities for maintaining world order, is arrogating to itself the role of international policeman or, worse, is acting as a lawless gang bullying the weak and the small?

66. For our part, our response to that can only be to call for prudence and to urge all States concerned to conduct themselves in accordance with the norms of international law, as enunciated in the Charter. The alternative to prudence and the rule of law is not only dangerous but also irreversible.

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

68. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A little more than a year ago, in August 1981, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held an extraordinary meeting in New York to consider the grave situation created by the provocative naval manoeuvres carried out by the United States Navy near the coasts of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Those manoeuvres, obviously carried out for intimidatory purposes, resulted in the shooting down of Libyan aircraft by the United States Air Force. The Co-ordinating Bureau regarded those actions on the part of a permanent member of the Security Council, which has, as we know, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, as a series of threats to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the non-aligned countries of the region, which advocate the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

69. The Council is today considering the dangerous situation arising from the new provocative actions of the United States Navy in the vicinity of Libya and the dispatch of AWACS spy planes to a neighbouring country. Indeed, the most powerful imperial Power of our time is striving to intimidate a small, non-aligned country,

accusing it of dark plans against its Arab neighbours, which not only are not threatened by Libya, but whose peoples are linked by historical and indissoluble ties of brotherhood and by battles waged in common against the Zionist régime of Israel, colonialism and imperialism.

70. The actions today of the United States are nothing but a repetition of the 1981 occurrences. The propaganda campaign unleashed by the United States mass media against Libya is an attempt purely and simply to disguise and justify the aggressive policy of Washington against the Libyan revolution, against its position of anti-imperialism, independence and solidarity with the national liberation movements and the struggle of peoples for their national and social emancipation.

71. Cubans cannot be surprised at such conduct. For, at the end of the last century, José Martí, the founder of our independence, conceived his struggle for freedom as a means of preventing the nascent imperialism of the Yankees from being unleashed—with the force that had taken possession of Cuba—against the territories of Latin America. Therefore, in the Buenos Aires newspaper *La Nación*, following the first Pan American Conference, held in Washington, he warned our peoples against the hegemonistic designs of their powerful neighbour and said that the time for its second independence had come for Latin America.

72. Simón Bolívar, the great fighter for Latin American liberty, had exclaimed with singular far-sightedness several decades before this that: "The United States seems to be destined by providence to beset Latin America with miseries in the name of liberty."

73. It is of course, again, in the name of liberty—which for the Indians of the United States is the liberty to take refuge in their tiny concentration camps on reservations; which for the black people of that country is the liberty to live in ghettos, be discriminated against, downtrodden and persecuted; which for millions of Latin Americans, Africans and Asians is the liberty, purely and simply, to die of hunger, malnutrition or disease; liberty to be enjoyed only by the great monopolists and their most outstanding representatives—it is, I repeat, in the name of liberty that the Government of the United States has come forward in the role of policeman of the world.

74. I would like to know what principle in the Charter of the United Nations authorizes the Government of the United States to impose unilaterally an economic blockade, already 23 years old, on my country. What Article of the Charter authorizes it to organize, train and finance mercenaries to destabilize Nicaragua and Grenada? What precept of international law is invoked for sending its fleet to the coast of Libya, to the Indian Ocean, to South Korea and to the Caribbean and to maintain military bases throughout the world, even against the will of the peoples concerned, as is the case of the naval base which is being illegally maintained on Cuban territory in Guantánamo?

75. The members of the Council may perhaps have a good answer to my questions. Since I do not want to be guilty of ingenuousness, I wish to make clear that the questions are purely rhetorical. We all know that no one asked the Government of the United States to become the world's policeman and that it has no right to assume that role, either under the Charter or in international law. More than one President of the United States has already admitted this. Yet the United States does all this; it interferes, when it deems it necessary, in the internal affairs of States Members of the United Nations in the name of its sacrosanct interests.

76. This is the strange way the imperialists have of confusing everything and distorting values and principles. That is one thing. But it is another thing to claim that independent, sovereign States should share the misguided vision of the world and of international relations of the United States. None of our countries, regardless of its size or power—or lack of power—is ready to yield an inch in defence of its principles, sovereignty, independence and the freedom to chart its own destiny.

77. We are no longer in the era of the gunboat. The Davids of the world today do not fear Goliath, although he may possess nuclear warheads. Therefore, once again we wish today to express our unswerving solidarity with the Libyan people and with its inalienable right to direct its own destiny without any outside interference or intervention. Therefore, we vigorously condemn the aggressive policy of the United States Government against a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and we call to the attention of members of the Council this grave situation, which, together with the repeated acts of aggression by Israel against the Arab nation, jeopardizes international peace and security.

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

79. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I thank you, Sir, for permitting me to speak in the Council. Although the Algerian delegation has already paid you the tribute you deserve as President, I should like, in my turn, to express to you the sincere pleasure I have in addressing the Council under your distinguished presidency.

80. Algeria cannot remain indifferent to events which, for several days now, have been occurring in the Mediterranean region, an Arab and African region, which is Algeria's own immediate geographical and political environment and to which it is attached by so many links. The Algerian delegation therefore believes it to be entirely legitimate, urgent and important for the Council to meet to examine the deterioration of the situation in the vicinity of the Libyan coast. We should like to take this opportunity to recall Algeria's position of unswerving principle in the consideration of the events which caused this matter to be presented to the Council by a neighbour and fraternal country.

81. The movements of a powerful unit of the United States aircraft-carrier fleet in the Gulf of Sidra and the dangers that this poses to the countries of the area confirm the correctness of the traditional policy of Algeria to do everything possible to make of the Mediterranean a sea of peace, co-operation and understanding among the coastal countries and a zone free from all external threats, a zone of peace, security and independence for the countries and the peoples of the region. This policy has been constantly endorsed and confirmed by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to which the great majority of the island and coastal countries of the Mediterranean belong.

82. The argument of joint manoeuvres by a Power outside the region and a country inside the region—whether this be in the Mediterranean or elsewhere—cannot be accepted as a valid explanation. Such exercises, precisely because they occur in sensitive areas, inevitably carry with them the risk of confrontation and destabilization, while at the same time placing regional conflicts within a much broader framework of confrontation.

83. Whatever the reality and complexity of the problems confronting the countries of the region, there can be no justification for intervention or the threat of intervention by a Power from outside the region. In this part of the Arab world, which is also part of the African world, it is deplorable that there should have been such interventions at a time when dangerous actions are undertaken to weaken and undermine the bases of regional organizations, which are the natural forums for the examination of the problems of a region and for the search for peaceful solutions.

84. In the face of the paralysis of these regional organizations, which are those that truly regulate international life, in accordance with the very spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council remains the ultimate recourse for safeguarding international peace and security and for deterring and condemning any action which might undermine it. In this particular grave situation before the Council today, Algeria wishes to express the hope that the Council will live up to its responsibilities.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken at the start of this meeting, I invite the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, Mr. Mafole, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. MAFOLE: Mr. President, on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the custodian of the true aspirations of the oppressed and exploited African majority of Azania, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for permitting us to make a statement in solidarity with the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

87. We also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February, we are confident that under your able lead-

ership the Council will objectively examine the facts as presented and take appropriate measures in order to uphold peace and security in that region.

88. The PAC, on behalf of the oppressed and exploited people of Azania, denounces in the strongest terms possible the United States imperialist aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

89. United States imperialist warmongers are at it again. It will be remembered that the same aggressive activities were carried out in 1981. The aim of this imperialist provocation and aggression remains the same: to further the strategic designs of the United States for global domination and continued exploitation of the world's peoples. It is becoming more and more explicit that the United States wants to create a state of permanent instability in the Mediterranean so as to further its exploitative interests in the region. This obviously poses a serious threat to international peace and stability.

90. It is an historical fact that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has consistently been in the vanguard of the struggle against the imperialism led by the United States both in Africa and the Middle East. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya continues to support, materially, politically and diplomatically, the struggles of the peoples of Namibia and Azania against *apartheid*, colonialism and imperialism. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is also in the forefront of the struggle against Zionist Israel and whole-heartedly supports the progressive struggle of the Palestinian Arabs in occupied Palestine. All this commitment and dedication on the part of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya not only poses a threat to the imperialist interests of the United States in the two regions and hinders United States designs to penetrate the regions further, but also exposes the adventurist gunboat diplomacy of the present United States Administration, led by the most predatory and belligerent representatives of monopoly capitalism.

91. The United States hopes that it can save this situation by continuing its aggressive activities against Libya and hopes to bully and cow the militant Libyan people. Far from it. The PAC believes that, on the contrary, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will continue playing its revolutionary role against United States imperialism in that region and elsewhere.

92. Finally, the PAC condemns, in the strongest terms possible, the United States aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which is also an attack against the African revolution. We therefore express our unequivocal support for and revolutionary solidarity with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in its goal of maintaining its right of self-determination, national independence and international sovereignty.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should now like to make a statement as the representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

94. The Council has been urgently convened to take up the worsening situation in the vicinity of Libya, the acts of provocation by the United States, which sent out ships of its Sixth Fleet to the coast of Libya, thus creating, as is stated in the letter from Libya, a threat to regional and international peace and security.

95. This is certainly not the first time that the United States Government has had recourse to armed acts of provocation against Libya, an independent, sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. The events of August 1981, when American fighters shot down two Libyan aeroplanes over the Gulf of Sidra, are still sufficiently fresh in everyone's memory. For some years now, the authorities in Washington have been pursuing a systematic campaign of threats and intimidation against Libya and its leaders.

96. The leaders of the United States Government are always spreading fabrications about Libya's independent foreign policy, which is obviously not to the liking of the architects of American policy. They clearly find unpalatable the fact that Libya is pursuing an anti-imperialist policy in international affairs and is decisively opposing attempts by the United States and Israel to force a capitulatory peace on the Arab peoples.

97. That is precisely why the American fleet was in the vicinity of the Libyan coast, whereas Washington once again dredged up the hackneyed propagandistic canard about a Libyan threat to neighbouring countries and, one would almost believe, to the United States itself.

98. This clearly points to the serious consequences of the imperialist policy of the United States in the Middle East. That policy seeks to militarize the region, to expand the direct American military presence there and to interfere in the affairs of States of the region. In places beyond the reach of the strategic ally of the United States, Israel, Washington immediately turns up as a self-styled arbiter, shamelessly trying to dictate its conditions to other countries.

99. And here I should like to remind the Council of what Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, said at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly:

"Who, we might well ask, has given Washington the right to tell sovereign States what they should and what they should not do in their own house? Who has given it the right to try to punish those who cherish their sovereignty and would not yield to pressure, to apply all kinds of sanctions, to impose economic blockades, and even to brandish arms?"

"From what some say, it would appear that United States interests are being endangered almost everywhere in the world. This is an absurd thesis. Yet it is being used to justify crude interference in the affairs of others, used on a sweeping geographic scale, as regards both nearby countries and those situated

many thousands of kilometres away from the United States.”²

100. Those words admirably sum up the present policy of the United States in respect of Libya.

101. To judge by the statement made by the Secretary of State of the United States, it was only thanks to the “speedy, decisive actions” of the United States Administration that the threat to international peace was averted, a threat which was allegedly posed to Libya’s neighbours. The question is: What threat are we talking about? The Egyptian Defence Minister, Mr. Abu-Ghazala, said, according to reports, that he saw no signs of crisis or possible aggression from Libya. It would seem that this time, as indeed in the past, the latest mirage about the Libyan danger was born not in the sun-baked sands of the Sahara but in the cauldron of the propaganda kitchen of the Administration in Washington.

102. Witness, too, the clumsy attempts by United States officials to try to smooth over the glaring contradictions in the hastily concocted version of recent events which seeks to justify the sending of the United States fleet to the coast of Libya. At a press conference on 17 February, the President of the United States stated that there were no movements of the fleet towards Libya. At the same time, other representatives of the Administration—in an attempt, as it were, to correct their President—acknowledged the presence of the United States fleet near the Libyan coast but stated that this had nothing at all to do with Libya. Now, the Administration would have us believe that it was only this decisive action it undertook that led to a lessening of the danger. Everything becomes clear if we take a look at the articles in American newspapers which shed real light on Washington’s intentions. According to an article in *The New York Times*, which specifically names United States officials, the Administration’s plan was to provoke Libya and then to destroy its air force. Certain representatives have already quoted this article, but I considered it my duty to refer to it again in my statement.

103. There is another aspect of these recent events which should not be forgotten. The question is: Is Libya the only target of United States attempts to wave the big stick? No one can seriously believe that that State, with a population of about 2.5 million, could be a threat to the United States. Would it not be closer to the truth to say that the actions of the Administration are aimed against all non-aligned countries, particularly those that do not want to go along with the hegemonistic policies of the United States? It would seem that that country wants to make it clear to them too that if gross slander cannot prevail upon them to change their independent policies, the United States always has at the ready warships and planes to teach them a good lesson and to restore “order”, cooked up from colonial recipes concocted in Washington.

104. The Soviet delegation believes that this type of behaviour is inadmissible in relations between States. The United States action was aimed at subverting the

basis of international relations and at gross interference in the affairs of others, and it constitutes a serious threat to world peace, leading to a further exacerbation of tension in that already explosive region of the Middle East. An end must be put immediately to such acts of provocation against Libya.

105. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

106. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): As frequently happens in the proceedings of the Council, the apparent focus of its attention tends, under the harsh blows of rhetoric and inflamed passion, distortion and misrepresentation, to sink, like the proverbial stone, without a trace.

107. My delegation has been particularly impressed by some of the presentations made in the course of this discussion—which we had thought was a discussion of the unstable situation in and around the area occupied by Libya. We were struck by the noble sentiments expressed in behalf of noninterference in the affairs of others by the representative of Viet Nam, who is, of course, probably experienced in these matters, as the people of Kampuchea might attest. And even, Mr. President, at the risk of your well-known and richly deserved reputation for charm wearing somewhat thin, I was impressed by your statement, in view of the well-known activities of your Government in helping, I am sure, to stabilize the situation in Afghanistan with the neighbourly injection of upwards of 110,000 of your troops. But I thank you, Mr. President, as the representative of the Soviet Union, for putting a spotlight on what apparently is truly the issue before the Council, namely, in your words, Libya’s “anti-imperialist policy in international affairs”.

108. Well and good; we wish simply that Libya would take counsel as to whether it wants to apply its anti-imperialist policy against Chad and against the Sudan and against numerous other of its neighbours and, through its support and arms and finances to world-wide terrorist organizations, against other Governments and other peoples far, far beyond north-east and central Africa.

109. I said that the subject of our concern has tended to sink without a trace beneath the onslaughts of our rhetoric. Let me remind the Council of the subject of our concern, and let me read to the Council—particularly because its members and those who have asked to speak have paid a massive lack of attention to the detailed, concise, straightforward and utterly convincing statement delivered yesterday by the representative of the Sudan—from the transcript of the press conference held yesterday in Khartoum by Presidents Mubarak of Egypt and Nimeiri of the Sudan:

“President Nimeiri indicated that Qaddafi himself openly declared that he was intending to attack the Sudan on 18 February and was preparing for it . . .

“ . . .

"President Nimeiri said that Qaddafi told one of his agents that on the morning [of 18 February] he would send a TU aircraft to bomb Khartoum . . . Afterward, he tried to preoccupy world public opinion with anticipated moves against himself and submitted a complaint to the Security Council. By so doing [Qaddafi] was applying the proverb we use: 'He hits me and hastens to complain'."

What of the prospects for the future? President Nimeiri replied to another question on the current situation by saying:

"The threat from Libya against the Sudan is continuing. I believe that it will not stop for a long time because, for three years now, the Libyans have been really ready to attack the Sudanese Government and its President. Qaddafi has clearly said that he wants to change this Government and to do away with Nimeiri by all means, even if he has to kill him. He is working toward this end. What I want to say is that we are aware of his . . . plan."

President Mubarak of Egypt then added, at another point in the press conference:

"I believe that President Nimeiri has explained to you accurately everything that happened. Following the Sudan's discovery of the attempt against it, I do not believe that this attempt will be repeated."

110. It is the earnest hope and the profound wish of my Government, the motivation behind its recent acts of deterrence, our profound hope and prayer that President Mubarak will turn out to be a good prophet.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

112. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)(*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like in a few simple words to draw the attention of the representative of the United States to the following. If his country is concerned about spreading peace and righteousness in the world and about combating interference, we hope that his Government will deter Israel—not to mention South Africa, which interferes daily in the affairs of neighbouring African countries and applies the policy of racial discrimination against its own black majority. Is that in conformity with the principles of human rights that the United States claims to uphold, or are human rights—as Eliot Abrams, who is the United States official responsible for human rights, said—restricted to concern over those who oppose national Governments? Abrams also said: "The dissidents of today are the heads of State and the prime ministers of tomorrow."* This is the real secret of the United States interest in human rights.

113. The mission of the United States is to sow dissent among the Arabs. We assert that there is no genuine

disagreement between the Libyan, Egyptian and Sudanese peoples because they are Arab peoples who share a common destiny, a common history and a common goal. There are many Egyptian and Sudanese brothers working in Libya. We are proud of the struggle of the Egyptian people for the cause of the Arab nation, and we are also proud of the struggle of the Sudanese people.

114. The representative of the United States is still asserting and maintaining that his country may interfere in the affairs of any country that might interfere in the affairs of its friends or agents. Let him call them what he likes. "Foreign intervention" might be acceptable. But what if we are dealing with internal affairs? Peoples have awakened; they do not wish to see their rulers as puppets of the United States, which is the enemy of the Arabs, the Palestinians, the Muslims and the oppressed peoples of South Africa.

115. I have one question: Is not the presence of the nuclear-powered aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, near the Libyan coast, as reported in the American press, a violation of United Nations General Assembly resolutions and those of the Organization of African Unity that call for implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa?³ Is not the presence of that nuclear-powered warship near the shores of Lebanon in contravention and violation of General Assembly resolutions that call for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East? What is the fate of General Assembly resolutions that provide for the need to agree on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons?

116. The United States representative mentioned that Libya finances terrorism or terrorist movements. A short while ago, the Council heard a statement by the representative of one of those organizations the United States deems to be terrorist, namely, the representative of the PAC, who spoke on behalf of the oppressed and the tortured. We hope that the United States will one day recognize the rights of those peoples.

117. There are many motives for the interference by the United States or for its having raised this issue. There are certain internal domestic motives that are inspired by the need to gain approval for the large sums of money to be devoted to the machinery of war and destruction. There are external motives as well, namely, the imposition of an American policy on the Middle East, the imposition of the Zionist entity upon the peoples of that region, the interference in Libya and the diversion of international public opinion from feelings that are inimical to the United States, especially on the continent of Europe, with regard to the issue of disarmament and the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe.

118. Libya, Viet Nam and other States need no testimony from the United States. Some 26 representatives have made statements here. No fewer than 24 of them have taken the side of the Jamahiriya. Those who have made statements represent Asia, Europe, Latin America

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

and the struggling peoples in those regions. Because of its composition and structure, we do not expect anything from the Council, for we realize that, unfortunately, there is the United States veto power, a power that has come to be directed especially against Arab and African issues.

119. I should like to thank all those who showed concern over this issue, and I should like once again to state that Libya is a small country that wants to live in peace and to pursue a policy of non-alignment. It also wishes to establish normal relations with the peoples of all States, including the people of the United States. As the repre-

sentative of Libya stated yesterday [2415th meeting], the Jamahiriya is prepared for dialogue and is ready to iron out differences, if any, with the Government of the United States.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/37/1).*

² *Ibid., Plenary meetings, 13th meeting, paras. 98 and 99.*

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 105, document A/5975.*