



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2680  
18 April 1986

ENGLISH

---

### PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 18 April 1986, at 10.30 a.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. GARVALOV  
Mr. LIANG Yufan  
Mr. GAYAMA  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. DUMEVI  
Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA  
Mr. KASEMSARN  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. DUBININ  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
Mr. OKUN  
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 11.30 a.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, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them 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. Nengrahary (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Siddiky (Bangladesh),  
Mr. Ogouma (Benin), Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet  
Socialist Republic), Mr. Velazco San Jose (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia),  
Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Hucke (German Democratic Republic),

Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Ms. Kunadi (India), Mr. Damavandi Kamali (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Somvorachit (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Nyamloo (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. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) and Mr. Sekulic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations, dated 17 April 1986, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item on the agenda in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

That letter has been circulated as Security Council document S/18018.

The proposal by the representative of the United Arab Emirates is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the discussion would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37.

Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States has consistently taken the position that, under the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For 40 years

(Mr. Okun, United States)

the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39 and would certainly not object had this matter been raised under that rule. We are, however, opposed to special ad hoc departures from orderly procedure. The United States consequently opposes extending to the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Security Council as if that organization represented a Member State of the United Nations. We certainly believe in listening to all points of view, but none of that requires violating the rules.

In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Security Council which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules.

For those reasons, the United States requests that the terms of the proposed invitation be put to a vote. The United States will, of course, vote against the proposal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is prepared to vote on the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Emirates.

It is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bulgaria, China, Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions. The proposal has therefore been adopted.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Riyad Mansour (Palestine Liberation Organisation took a place at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume consideration of the agenda item before it. Members of the Council have before them document S/18016, containing the text of a draft resolution introduced by the Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/18015 containing the text of a letter dated 17 April 1986 addressed to the Secretary-General from the Permanent Representative of Mongolia to the United Nations.

(The President)

The first speaker is the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): First of all I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and express the hope that under your leadership the work of the Council will be successful and fruitful.

It is a particular pleasure for us to be able to point out that you are the representative of a country whose people made such an important contribution to the victory over fascism in the Second World War. Our people remember, in particular, the heroic feats of the French pilots of the Normandy-Niemen Squadron who fought the enemy along with Soviet pilots over the territory of Byelorussia and whose names were linked with one of the French regions, Normandy, and the well-known Byelorussian river.

Over the last few weeks the Security Council has held a number of meetings to discuss the tense and dangerous situation in the Mediterranean, as was only natural. The Council, on which the United Nations Charter, in Article 24, has conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should not remain inactive with regard to any act of aggression, still less if this action is committed by one of its permanent members against an independent and sovereign State.

On 14 April the international community learned of one more act of aggression carried out by the American militarists in striking evidence of the United States Administration's implementation of its doctrine of "neo-globalism", which boils down to an attempt to revert to the old, as it were, classical system of imperial

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

piracy. This time, on orders of the United States Administration, the United States Air Force, operating from bases in the United Kingdom and ships of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, carried out a barbarous bombing raid against the Libyan cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. This cruel raid inflicted casualties among the civilian population, including women and children, and did a great deal of material damage.

This new act of armed aggression by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is one more criminal act committed by the United States Administration in its long-standing anti-Libyan campaign. The most recent act of piracy committed by the United States was undertaken literally a few hours after the Security Council had convened in order to prevent tension reaching such a pitch in the central Mediterranean that peace itself would be endangered. This carefully planned and prepared piratical raid can only be described as an act of naked defiance of world public opinion, unprecedented cynicism and lordly disdain for the universally acknowledged norms of international law and overweening arrogance in its assumption that it could wreak its will with impunity. It has once and for all dispelled any illusions with regard to the Pharisaic, specious peace-loving assertions of the United States Administration. What is but a mockery of the United Nations Charter and this Organization's decisions is the fact that the aggressive actions of the United States of America were committed against Libya in 1986, the very year that has been proclaimed by a United Nations decision as the International Year of Peace.

The act of bringing to bear against Libya the tremendous United States military machine, equipped with the most advanced modern military technology, is testimony of the United States total disdain for the sovereignty and interests of small countries and peoples. It is leading to a serious exacerbation of international tension and endangering international peace and security at large.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

It is only natural that the statement issued by the Emergency Session of the Ministerial-level Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on 15 April contained a strong condemnation of

"this dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression... which constituted a violation of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and endangered international peace and security". (S/17996, p. 2)

The arbitrary anarchy that is being committed by Washington in the international arena and its readiness on behalf of its narrow, selfish interests and plans to stop at no atrocity and by force of arms to set up régimes to its liking in what it has described as its spheres of "vital interest" cannot but arouse universal concern and indignation. The international community must raise its voice in defence of the cause of peace and improvement in the international situation.

No one can any longer harbour doubt that Washington's hopes to cower and bring to its knees the peace-loving Libyan people have been dashed, and the United States itself has now suffered a new moral and political defeat. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev, has stated that the armed attack on Libya by the United States Administration has unmasked the true nature of its approach to cardinal international problems. Mr. Gorbachev went on to stress:

"The United States again stands for all to see as the main culprit responsible of the escalation of international tension, irresponsibly playing with the fate of millions of people for the sake of satisfying its imperial ambitions. While declaring that they are fighting 'international terrorism', the United States leaders in reality only confirmed once again their adherence to the policy of State terrorism and the aggressive doctrine of 'neo-globalism'."



(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wholeheartedly supports the vigorous and indignant condemnation expressed here in the Security Council of the aggressive and piratical action of the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a sovereign and independent State Member of the United Nations, as well as the demand for an immediate end to these actions. This appeal for a condemnation of the United States policy of aggression, blackmail and threat in order to prevent any repetition of such acts in future should be reflected in the Security Council's decision on the item under discussion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic for his particularly kind words regarding the role played by my country during the last world war, when he mentioned the Normandy-Niemen Squadron, in which I have a number of friends.

The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on whom I now call.

Mr. TREINI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has already had occasion to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would only reaffirm, therefore, that your wide experience is an assurance that the Council will carry out its work to a successful conclusion.

As we are meeting here today in this Chamber, the Libyan people in Benghazi and Tripoli is marching in funeral processions for the victims of the barbarous and atrocious American attack against our people. Today, in Benghazi and Tripoli, dozens of children, women and the elderly, the victims of America's so-called civilisation, have been buried. Children like the ones in the pictures I am now holding up, victims of the biggest Power on earth, have suffered the results of America's military manoeuvres and are proof of the ability of American pilots to carry out their missions with success, killing innocent women and children.

Before all present here today, we challenge the American Administration to allow a delegation from this Council to go to Libya to see for itself that all the targets that were struck were civilian targets - civilian airports, the homes of civilians - and that no military targets whatsoever were hit - unless the dwelling of the leader of the Libyan revolution is deemed to be a military objective.

For many years, the United States has pursued a premeditated policy and campaign of aggression and provocation. We brought this before the Council on several earlier occasions and directed the Council's attention to the gravity and threatening nature of that premeditated policy. What is the problem that exists between the United States and Libya? It is the same problem that exists between the United States and all small peoples, beginning with Nicaragua and Grenada and extending to Viet Nam, to Angola, to Ethiopia, to the Palestinian people and to the people of Namibia. The United States has fallen prey to the arrogance and madness of power, and it wants to become the world's policeman. Any party that does not

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

agree to become a vassal and agent of the United States is an outlaw, a terrorist, a communist and a devil. Such is American logic. Such is the law of the jungle.

Do the Americans not wonder why other peoples hate them? - and when I say "the Americans", I am referring not to the people of America but to the American Administration, the régime. Why, for example, does the United States find itself isolated in the United Nations? Who in this Council supports them, aside from their ally and accomplice in aggression, the United Kingdom? Would it not be logical for the American Administration to wonder, even for a second, why it is so isolated and why it is so hated by the peoples of the world? I think there should be no difficulty in finding the answer to those questions. We can even help them to do so, if they need assistance.

The record of the United States is a record of colonialism, treachery and aggression. What can be the future of the world when the President of the biggest Power says, with pride, that he has bombed some civilians in Libya or that he has been forced to occupy tiny Grenada? What will happen to the world, when the United States is its biggest military Power?

Our small people never came to the Gulf of Mexico. We have no means of striking American targets. We are a small people living like other small peoples who want to be free. That is our only mistake. The fault committed by the Libyan people is that it ended the presence of American bases in Libya. The fault committed by Colonel Qaddafi and the Libyan revolution is that they expelled the Americans and their bases from Libya. They ended the American oil monopoly in Libya. They have helped the persecuted elsewhere in the world.

Only a short time ago, we heard the representative of the United States, again isolated and alone, vote against the right of the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to speak in this Council. The Palestinian people, like the Libyan people, like other Arab peoples and African peoples, has no rights. The only right is the white man's right, the American white man.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

When Libyan or Palestinian children are killed, the United States President applauds the talents of the United States pilots who bombed and killed them. When Arabs, including Palestinians and Tunisians, are bombarded by aircraft supplied by the United States to the Zionist entity, the United States President applauds and thanks the Israeli aggressor.

In the view of the President of the United States, a Palestinian fighting for the liberation of his land or an African fighting for an end to racial discrimination is a "terrorist", while a group of mercenaries, all of whose equipment is supplied by the United States and who kill women and children in Nicaragua, are "freedom fighters".

The logic of the aggressor is revealed when the President of the United States receives Jonas Savimbi - the head of the UNITA gang, which is supported by South Africa - and treats him as a hero even as he is killing his own people and is considered an outlaw. That is a logic based on force, a logic employed only against peoples small in number, for the United States Administration wants to achieve only easy victories: against Grenada, against Nicaragua, against Libya, against the Palestinian people.

What is the legitimacy of the presence of the United States fleet in the Mediterranean? Is it the legitimacy of blockade and aggression? When the Soviet Union proposed that both the Soviet and the United States fleets be withdrawn from the Mediterranean - a proposal welcomed by the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean - the United States rejected it, because it considers that the United States fleet has a role to play in supporting the aggressor in Palestine and in southern Lebanon, and in threatening peoples which are small in number, including the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Only a few weeks ago, aggression was launched because the self-proclaimed policeman of the world, the United States, wanted to enter the Gulf of Sidra in

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

order to "maintain international legitimacy and support international law". The latest act of aggression was carried out because the United States Administration claimed to have evidence that Libya was behind the bombing of the night-club in West Berlin.

It is strange that the United States should claim to have documentary evidence for that. I would remind members of the Council that a few years ago the United States Administration claimed that Libyan squads intended to assassinate President Reagan. The United States Administration attempted to forge documents, which were subsequently proven to be fabrications. We are reminded by the latest aggression of the famous "Ems cable", fabricated by Bismarck when he wished to carry out aggression against France. We are reminded also of the tale of the lamb and the wolf.

The United States is hated all over the world. The peoples of the world are rising in revolution against the United States all over the world. Who is supposed to be responsible? Libya: Libya is responsible for demonstrations in Mexico, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy and other United States allies.

The United States is acting according to the law of the jungle. The aggression was purposeful and premeditated; the aggressor prepared for it years ago. Small in numbers though we are, the Libyan people tried to maintain good - or at least normal - relations with the United States, but the United States wanted us to be a mere vassal State, an agent. It wished to impose conditions; it rejected all dialogue. Despite efforts by United States allies in Europe and by other Arab countries, the present United States Administration has rejected any possibility of dialogue and has persisted in its policy of blocading and of committing aggression.

It has been encouraged by its impunity in carrying out aggression against other peoples small in number. The defeat in Viet Nam has been counterbalanced by the invasion of Grenada and the aggression against Libya. Yet I do not believe

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

that the American people - which knows the meaning of freedom, and which struggled to achieve that freedom - can be duped by such trickery.

If the aggression against the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, no greater in number than the people of New York City, is allowed to go unpunished, it will be repeated. Other peoples will fall victim to such aggression; many other countries with limited capabilities and small populations will be the targets. By the terms of the Charter, this Council must take the appropriate decisions.

What are we expected to do? Are we to say "yes" to aggression? Are we to acquiesce? Our answer is "no". We shall fight to the finish in defence of our law, our dignity and our independence, as well as our waters. We do not wish to be at war with the United States; it is not because of weakness that we are willing - as I aver that we are - to engage in dialogue and to co-operate. But we shall accept no conditions.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Our people has made enormous sacrifices. More than half of our population died in the struggle against Italian fascism. We will never yield to threats - whether from F-111 aircraft, the "Phantoms" or any other kind of weaponry.

We are against terrorism. We condemn terrorism. We are for the freedom of peoples. We do not support the terrorism of Savimbi. But we support the people of Palestine and the people of Namibia. We do not side with the rebels in Nicaragua. But we support the small peoples that are struggling to achieve their freedom.

We must now turn to the partner in the aggression: the United Kingdom. We yesterday listened to the statement by the United Kingdom representative. He was the only speaker who supported and indeed encouraged aggression. Of course, with the history of the United Kingdom, the record of the United Kingdom - and the United Kingdom representative must admit it - that was to be expected.

The United Kingdom representative said that the Libyan policy had hurt the Arab cause. We were very pleased to hear the United Kingdom representative expressing such concern for the Arab cause. But I would ask him this: Who gave Palestine to the Zionists? Who armed the terrorist Shamir? Was it not the United Kingdom? Who originated the South African problem and left South Africa to the racists? Was it not the United Kingdom? A diplomat, a colleague of mine, once said that had it not been for the United Kingdom there would be no reason for the existence of the United Nations. That is quite true. All the problems before the Organization are the fruits of British colonialism: Palestine, Cyprus, the dispute between Pakistan and India, South Africa. All the problems being discussed in this Organization have some relation to the United Kingdom.

The responsibility of the British Empire - on which the sun has now really set - for the repression and killing of peoples is only too well known. I think

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab)  
Jamahiriya)

that the United Kingdom representative should be the last person to talk about terrorism. Who practised terrorism against the people of India? Indeed, who practised terrorism against the American people? The American people, like other peoples, was the victim of British colonialism.

The United Kingdom representative was only being logical when he spoke about the history and policy of his country. He talked about terrorism. But what better description of terrorism could there be than the colonization of peoples, the killing of peoples, the destruction of peoples? Throughout the African continent the peoples are still suffering the effects of British colonialism. British colonialism divided those peoples and even annihilated some of them. If I were in the shoes of the United Kingdom representative, I would not mention history; I would try to be logical with the present rather than with the past.

The United Kingdom representative referred to some United Nations resolutions. I would have liked him to refer to resolutions condemning the United Kingdom, the United States and the Israeli entity. But of course he did not refer to those resolutions. I promise to make a present to him of the United Nations resolutions which condemn the policies of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Israeli entity. That will perhaps refresh his memory.

What the United Kingdom representative was trying to do was simply to cover up his country's participation in the aggression. We cannot be duped by that trick. The United Kingdom is an active partner in the aggression. It must shoulder its responsibility for that. Indeed, the people of the United Kingdom have shown that they are aware of the United Kingdom's responsibility for the aggression. They have done that through their demonstrations and in the debates in the House of Commons. There is no need for me to dwell on that.



(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

In conclusion, I wish to state to the Security Council that this aggression by two permanent members of the Council must be terminated. The aggressor must be condemned. We repeat that we are anxious to see peace and security reign in the Mediterranean area, to which we belong. We wish the Mediterranean to be a zone of peace, in the service of international communications and transport and the interests of the peoples of the area. But, as we said in our statement at the meeting in Malta of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, that cannot happen until an end is put to the presence of foreign fleets and until foreign bases are eliminated. Only in that way can peace and security be achieved.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words addressed to me.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, the masterly way in which you have been conducting the Security Council's deliberations during this particularly acute international crisis testifies to your great experience in dealing with international affairs. The very warm congratulations of the Congo delegation are, therefore, no mere formality. We assure you that, in the performance of your duties, you will find the same willingness on our part to co-operate as exists in the relations between our two countries.

Last month we benefited from the diplomatic skills of Ambassador Bierring of Denmark, whose effectiveness and extremely courteous manner as President were felicitously employed in the service of this body.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The question before us is of paramount importance for international peace and security. We should therefore be grateful to the many delegations that brought the matter before the Council. We hope that the Council will emerge from this test strengthened rather than weakened.

By reacting in a brutal and surprisingly emotional manner in what it has said to be the only way to deal with what it considers to be the only source of terrorism in the world - Colonel Qaddafi and Libya - the United States has unfortunately, above all else, gone in for dangerous conduct with unforeseeable consequences.

The People's Republic of the Congo regards what happened as a clear and simple act of aggression, within the meaning of article 1 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. As such, we condemn it and find no justification for it, just as there can never be any justification for blind terrorism, whether carried out by individuals or States.

The behaviour of the United States as distrustful arbiter, a role it has deliberately adopted with regard to conflicts in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East, does not suggest respect for the essential principles of international law, such as the non-use of force or the threat of its use.

By deciding to violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Libya in a flagrant and premeditated manner, with, moreover, the avowed intention of removing its Head of State, as in the worst of terrorist acts, the United States Government has displayed a political irresponsibility that is difficult to understand from a great Power and permanent member of the Security Council.

A dispassionate consideration of the facts of the events of the night of 14 April raises a basic question. Why was the United States constrained to order an operation by its armed forces to deal on their own with terrorism in Libya, and

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

only in Libya, disregarding the whole range of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter and all appeals for restraint?

The intensity of the anti-Libyan campaign has at times been such as to make one wonder whether Libya, a small country with 3 million inhabitants, has become public enemy No. 1 for the United States, a status that one would have expected to be conferred on a more powerful country. That campaign resulted, in particular, in a freeze in American-Libyan relations, the order to all American nationals to leave Libya, as a prelude to the unilateral decision to impose an embargo on that country, and, finally, the naval manoeuvres in the Gulf of Sidra, which led to the events of 24 and 25 March.

The need to resort to the law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth against terrorism was, Washington claimed, sufficient reason for a reaction described as self-defence. It will be recalled that a few days before 24 and 25 March the United States Navy was lying off the coast of Libya in the Gulf of Sidra to try out ways of asserting the right of navigation in international waters. Everyone knows what followed.

It seems to us that the present situation, created by the act of aggression of 14 April, can be understood only within the general context of American-Libyan relations, which themselves result from the prevailing situation in the Middle East, and particularly, in their most central aspects, from the Arab-Israeli conflict. Only in that context can we evaluate the anti-terrorist struggle component of the American attitude.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

Congo believes that we must distinguish between terrorism - a universally condemned phenomenon, as we see in General Assembly resolution 40/61 - which, like crime, drug addiction and other scourges, requires the most active international co-operation to end it, and everything that flows from the Arab-Israeli conflict, which has cost the lives of so many innocent people in the two opposing camps.

Combating that evil rationally requires dealing with the root cause, which we believe to mean recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

In our opinion the mission of all the Member States of the Organization is better served by an attitude conducive to dialogue, conciliation or arbitration in the event of a dispute than by the wanton use of force.

The hundred human lives lost, together with the heavy material damage, in the latest American raid on Libyan territory; the innocent victims - Americans and others - who have shed their blood; the serious misunderstanding that continues between Israel and the Arabs - all that demands that the sacrifices, resulting from passion born out of that misunderstanding, which has lasted too long, should usher in a new spirit, a new way of behaving based on dialogue and mutual understanding in the handling of sensitive international affairs.

We live in a world of great tension because of the seriousness of unresolved problems and the build-up of means of destruction enabling the systematic employment of military power. Bearing in mind that increased danger to which the world is exposed, the Congo expresses the hope that the latest attack on Libya will at least sound the alarm, for if it does not we risk falling into a dangerous trap and having to rewrite history.

That risk is understood by the Non-Aligned Movement. Indeed, at the meeting of its Co-ordinating Bureau now being held in New Delhi the Ministers and Heads of Delegation have called on the Security Council to take the necessary measures to

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

prevent the resumption of such acts, which violate the independence, sovereignty and integrity of small countries, simply on the unilateral decision of a major military Power.

With regard to the Mediterranean, which only yesterday was the meeting point of the civilizations of Africa, Asia and Europe, and which today is a dangerous theatre of rivalries of all kind, the appeal to reason is as valid as ever. The goal of the non-aligned countries is to turn that subregion into a zone of peace. That is a lofty duty for the international community to carry out in a spirit of dialogue, understanding and mutual respect.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Congo for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. DUNEVI (Ghana): Mr. President, the Ghana delegation is happy to see you, the representative of a country with which Ghana has excellent relations, presiding over the Council's affairs. We are confident that your vast experience as a diplomat will lead you to steer them successfully as we take up the difficult subject before us.

The Ghana delegation also wishes to put on record its deep appreciation of your predecessor, Ambassador Bierring, representative of Denmark, with which Ghana has historic relations, for the excellent manner in which he too dealt with the Council's affairs in March, which was also a very difficult month.

The events of the past few days have taught us yet another hard lesson in international relations - that right is always right. In spite of several appeals from the international community for restraint and resort to the established norms of international law to settle its dispute with Libya, the United States Administration ordered its armed forces to attack Libya in the early hours of Monday, 14 April 1986.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

World reaction to Monday's outrageous military raids is well known to the Council. The reaction stems not only from the "massive and inhuman destruction of lives and property" but also from the fact that this aggression came barely a fortnight after the United States provocative action in the Gulf of Sidra, as a result of which a significant number of lives were lost.

In a statement that has been circulated as Security Council document S/18003 of 16 April 1986, the Government of Ghana has in no uncertain terms condemned this latest "act of aggression against Libya" as "the culmination of a persistent onslaught by the United States against the rights of people throughout the world" and "a manifestation of the blatant arrogance with which the United States demonstrates its power". Ghana has also, in concert with its non-aligned colleagues now meeting in India, condemned the United States Administration's preference for the military option over peaceful negotiation.

My delegation has listened attentively to Burkina Faso, the Syrian Arab Republic and Oman, which requested the Council meeting, as well as to the representatives of Libya and the United States, the two parties involved in the conflict.

All the statements agree that on 14 April 1986 United States armed forces carried out air strikes against Libya as "a reprisal" for a catalogue of "terrorist acts" allegedly committed by Libya against United States citizens and property. The United States representative contends that his country acted in exercise of its right of self-defence within the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Libyan representative, however, denies those allegations.

The concept of self-defence in the context of relations between big Powers and small countries is a troublesome one, because of the practical possibility of its one-sided application. That is why the Charter of the United Nations has

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

imposed certain clearly defined limitations on that concept. It is sufficient for the moment to dwell on only two of those limitations.

A specific pre-condition for the exercise of the right to self-defence, if we may refer to the language of the Charter, is "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". My delegation has listened very closely to the various statements describing the incidents that gave rise to the use of force by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We have considered the nature of the incidents in question and have weighed them in the light of the possible legal interpretations of this aspect of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

In the first place it would seem to us doubtful that an armed attack within the meaning of this Article has occurred that would justify resort to the use of force in self-defence. The incidents described are not in the nature of armed invasions perpetrated against the territorial integrity or sovereign independence of the United States. Indeed, they did not occur on United States territory. These incidents took place in the territories of other sovereign States, and it is relevant to note that those States have not considered those incidents to be armed attacks against them. In these circumstances it is highly debatable that a third State could legitimately invoke the concept of self-defence. Furthermore, the fact that a national or nationals of such a State became victims of the incidents could not in our view be sufficient to trigger the use of force in the name of self-defence.

Related to this also is the question of imputability. Clearly the use of force in self-defence can only be directed against the party that has perpetrated the armed attack. The fact of the matter is that the Council has not been presented with evidence establishing to its satisfaction linkage between the perpetrators of the various incidents and the Government of Libya such as would render them official acts of that Government. Instead in these particular cases

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

reference has been made to secret communications emanating from unidentified sources going to further unidentified parties. The Council therefore faces a difficulty with regard to the imputability of some or all of those incidents to the Government of Libya, and the Ghana delegation feels that the difficulty is all the more complex in view of the disavowal already made by the Government of Libya. In these circumstances Ghana cannot be convinced that the Government of Libya should be the object of the use of force in the name of self-defence against acts for which Libya's responsibility beyond all reasonable doubts is yet to be established.

We have raised these pertinent points because in our view the United States, it would seem, did not bother to exhaust the provisions and arrangements set forth in the Charter for settling disputes. One gets the impression that the obsession with teaching President Qaddafi a lesson was so great that a founding Member of the United Nations did not think it was necessary - and that is most regrettable - to avail itself of the arrangements for redressing complaints within the framework of the United Nations.

Let me touch briefly on some of those guide-lines. Article 33, for example, provides adequate guidance for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In addition, the General Assembly Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States contained in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 26 October 1970 prescribes clear principles on what Member States should do in times of a dispute. The objective in these cases is to encourage the peaceful settlement of conflicts in such a manner that international peace and justice is not endangered. One should also mention the good offices of the Secretary-General, which are available to any Member State, in dealing with inter-State disputes.

The Ghana delegation therefore cannot support the claim that the United States completely exhausted all the available arrangements for the peaceful negotiation and settlement of international disputes.



(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

It would seem that the United States is interested in taking military action and then later informing the Security Council, which is thus deprived of the opportunity of applying any preventive action. My delegation is not impressed. Indeed, to quote from the statement of the Government of Ghana:

"The world faces a bleak future if use of force should be substituted for settlement of international disputes by peaceful negotiation." (S/18003, p. 2)

We have also been presented with a long list of alleged "terrorist activities" committed by Libya against the United States. I should like to emphasize this point. Ghana has consistently condemned terrorism no matter from where it emanates. Consistent with this policy, we have not missed the opportunity of lending support to any international efforts aimed at combating this menace. Ghana, accordingly, joined the consensus support for General Assembly resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985, concerning measures to prevent international terrorism. We have done so because of our belief that terrorism cannot solve political problems. On the contrary, it makes them worse and exacerbates violence. However, we do not believe the way to react is to take the law into one's own hands merely because one is a super-Power. The so-called tapes containing the taped conversation between Tripoli and its Mission in West Berlin allegedly linking President Qaddafi to the discotheque bombing have not been subjected to any impartial examination either by this Council or by the Secretary-General. It must also be remembered that the United States claims of incontrovertible evidence failed to convince its European allies. It is quite clear that the belated turn-around by some of its European allies was the result of

United States-Libya relations are anything but cordial. There is no delegation in this Chamber that will deny this. We are yet to find, in our time, a situation where personal differences could drive the Head of State of a permanent member of the Council to resort without the least exercise of restraint to making

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

humiliating remarks about his fellow colleague. The fact of the matter is that personal prejudices would seem to have infected the average American. One only has to mention Libya and one immediately conjures up in the minds of the average American violence and terrorism. The net result is that any tragic event in Europe or elsewhere is immediately blamed on President Qaddafi and his Government. Those prejudices have had sinister influences on United States policies, of which the recent United States economic sanctions against Libya in the wake of the Vienna and Rome airport killings is only one example. It is like the old saying: give a dog a bad name and hang it.

As a small country, Ghana is naturally concerned over the serious implications of the recent developments. We see them as posing serious threats to the security of non-aligned and small States. We are particularly concerned over the Libyan experience since it could mean that a permanent member of the Security Council, exercising a superior military power, could ignore all the norms of international behaviour and, whenever it felt like exercising its military muscle, launch an armed attack against any Member State. I quote again from my Government's statement:

"The United States action which cannot be defended under any international law is a flagrant violation of acceptable standards of international behaviour." (S/18003, p. 2)

That should be discouraged. It should not be encouraged at all.

Having said that, the crucial question remains: What should the Council do to put an end to the continuing United States-Libya conflict? We are in entire agreement with the view that "the Council will not be facing its responsibilities nor will it ease tensions if it seeks to avoid the root cause of the problem". We, however, disagree that the "root cause... is the murderous behaviour of the Government of Libya and its agents". The root cause, in our view, is Arab frustration and feelings of hopelessness over the continued denial of justice and

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

the inalienable rights of millions of their people to a homeland. These are the underlying causes which the United States as a permanent member of the Security Council must address. There is a close link between the Palestinian demands for justice and the so-called Qaddafi problem. These are the realities which must be faced.

The United States conflict with Libya has been allowed to go on for far too long. It does no credit for the records of the Council that this state of affairs has been allowed to exist, particularly since it involves a permanent member of the Council. It is the view of Ghana that the Council should seek guidance and objectivity in the Charter provisions. While my delegation is not insisting on any specific provision, it is, however, our view that Articles 33, 34, 35 and 36 are useful procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Additionally, the General Assembly Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States - resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970 - and resolution 40/61 on measures against terrorism, provide a sufficient legal framework and principles for dealing with inter-State disputes. The mediation and conciliation offices of the Secretary-General are also available and can be resorted to immediately.

Finally, the prestige of the Council as the principal organ responsible for international peace and security is at stake. The entire international community is watching how the Council will acquit itself of the present serious challenge facing it. We in the Ghana delegation will work assiduously to offer any assistance that may be needed.

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

The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MANSOUR (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset I should like to extend the gratitude of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to those States which voted in favour of our participating in the proceedings of the Council in conformity with normal practice.

I should like also to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month of April. We are aware of your great skill and are sure that you will discharge your functions most successfully.

We also thank your predecessor, His Excellency the Ambassador of Denmark, for his excellent conduct of the Council's proceedings last month.

The item under consideration is the imperialist United States act of aggression committed against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, an act committed by a great Power supposed to bear great responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as a permanent member of the Security Council. This is an act of aggression against the whole Arab nation that threatens international peace and security and is in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and international laws and customs, in spite of all specious attempts by the United States Administration to justify State terrorism.

The whole world has borne witness to the exacerbation of United States imperialist attacks in many countries throughout the world ever since the current Administration came to power in Washington. As a consequence, tension and acts of aggression have increased in southern Africa, the Caribbean, Central America, the Middle East and the Mediterranean. This latest act of aggression carried out against Libya is one more link in this endless escalating chain of events. The United States is extending its imperialist hegemony to the whole Arab region. Its objective through the war against Libya, Nicaragua and the Palestinians and the aggression carried out in Grenada and Lebanon is to fan the flames of tension and create a psychosis in the United States itself to justify United States extremist,

(Mr. Mansour, PLO)

militarist tendencies to widen nuclear testing and increase stockpiles of armaments in spite of the considerable danger to humanity flowing from nuclear war.

Aware of these dangers, the United States allies, in particular in Western Europe, did not support the latest United States act of aggression against Libya, and demonstrations were organized in many European cities against the United States frivolity. Mrs. Thatcher's Administration is like that of Mr. Reagan's. For that reason the British administration contributed to the aggression in spite of the opposition of 70 per cent of British public opinion, according to reports from ABC yesterday. In this regard, those who want to explain to the Arabs that the nature of their interests rests in understanding the reasons for these actions should rather seek to convince public opinion in their own countries as to the justification for their own Government's behaviour. What will happen to Mrs. Thatcher's government will duplicate what happened to Mr. Eden's following upon the tri-partite aggression committed against Egypt in 1956. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

The tri-partite United States-United Kingdom-Israeli aggression of 1986 against the Arab nation prompted us to discuss the question of the Israeli-United States strategic alliance, whose first act was the 1982 brutal aggression against Lebanon and its Palestinian inhabitants. Once again the United States reverted to the same sort of direct intervention as it committed in 1958 and, just as it was forced to withdraw in 1958, once again in 1982, despite fierce air bombardment and naval shelling by the infamous New Jersey, it was forced to withdraw by virtue of the joint resistance of the valiant Lebanese and Palestinians. In spite of that defeat, Israel has since 1982 enjoyed the benefits of direct United States intervention against the Arabs: after Lebanon in 1982 the United States, as all of you know, participated with Israel in its aggression against Tunisia and positions of the Palestine Liberation Organization at the end of last year, as well as in the hijacking of civilian aircraft in the Mediterranean - all this in addition to the

(Mr. Mansour, PLO)

increase in military and economic assistance to Israel - so that it could continue to oppress our people, occupy its land and threaten the independence, security and integrity of the Arab countries.

For some time now we in the Arab region have been going through a stage in which United States imperialism, no longer content with giving military, economic, political and diplomatic assistance to Israel, is playing a direct role in the aggression and fighting. It is in this context that the Arabs view the latest United States act of aggression against fraternal Libya. We condemn it and it will be resisted by the whole Arab nation until final victory. This latest tri-partite act of aggression waged by United States imperialism must be condemned and stopped so as to avert its repetition. To this end, the Council must shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter, despite United States abuse of the right of veto. Those who defy international law and norms and public opinion should not be permitted to succeed in their attempts to undermine and paralyse this Organization.

In this connection, let me recall why it has so far been impossible to implement United Nations resolutions calling for the exercise of the Palestinians' inalienable right to return to their own country and to create an independent Palestinian State on their national soil under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. The path towards a just and lasting peace with regard to the question of Palestine, the core of the Middle East conflict, is well known and starts with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C calling for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

We are well aware of those who want not a just peace in the Middle East but war, destruction and aggression. The heroic Arab peoples, like all heroic peoples, will speak to the aggressors and occupiers in the only language they understand, the language of escalating resistance. As our ancestors used to say while

(Mr. Mansour, PLO)

resisting the British Mandate, Britain was the disease because it gave the Zionists the Balfour Declaration and allowed them to colonize our country, Palestine. So we say to the new imperialists: leave our country while we resist Israeli occupation and United States imperial aggression against us until final victory.

Permit me to quote from several declarations of the PLO on the occasion of the aggression against Libya.

"As scheduled and after careful preparation, the United States, using American aircraft based in Britain and on aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, undertook a flagrant act of aggression against certain positions in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including residential quarters of Tripoli and Benghazi. We denounce this act of aggression.

(Mr. Mansour, PLO)

"What causes astonishment and condemnation is also the perfidious position adopted by Mrs. Thatcher and the British Government, which participated in the aggression by allowing aircraft stationed in American bases on British soil to carry out the aggression, despite statements to the contrary by the British Prime Minister.

"The Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization vigorously condemns this act of aggression, and, on behalf of the Palestinian people and of all militants in the Palestinian revolution, declares our solidarity with the fraternal Libyan people, the Libyan armed forces and the heroic Libyan leadership. We pay tribute to them for their valiant resistance to the flagrant American aggression."

The statement also adds that, in the face of the United States aggression - aimed as it is against the Libyan people and against all Arab countries - all Arab nationalists and revolutionaries must rise up to resist and combat the American invader and stand alongside their brothers in the Jamahiriya in the struggle for their territory and for their Arab dignity.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization for his kind words addressed to me.

I am looking at the time, and I see that on my list there remains only one speaker, whose statement will, I know, be relatively brief. There are then requests to make three statements in exercise of the right of reply. If there are no objections, I therefore propose to continue this meeting. Since I hear none, I invite the next speaker, the representative of Nicaragua, to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Mrs. BELLORINI PARRALES (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like first to express to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, one that promises to be full



(Mrs. Bellorini Parrales, Nicaragua)

of tension and threats to international peace and security. We are certain that your wisdom, your long experience and your diplomatic skill will bring success to our debates. We should also like to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Denmark on the brilliant manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

The Security Council has on numerous occasions considered various acts of aggression against smaller third-world countries whose only crime has been to assert their sovereignty and independence.

The perpetrator of such acts of aggression has been a major Power whose foreign policy openly includes the threat and use of force. That practice by a nuclear Power has brought mankind to a situation fraught with unprecedented danger.

The peoples of the world watch with concern the imperial and anachronistic ambitions of a Government that has set itself up as the legislator, prosecutor, judge and policeman of the conduct of other sovereign countries. We refer, of course, to the Government of the United States.

We have listened to its representative in the Council advance the thesis that the United States - which in fact is always the aggressor - is merely exercising its right of self-defence against the victims of its wanton use of force. So-called proof, which only it has seen, is mentioned, and the international community is urged to place its trust in a policy based on lies, manipulation and systematic violations of the United Nations Charter and of international law.

The incidents in the Gulf of Sidra are reminiscent of those in the Gulf of Tonkin, where an act of provocation was used as a pretext for escalating a war of aggression whose effects are still with us. Everything would seem to suggest that the present United States Government believes provocation and the use of force to

(Mrs. Bellorini Farrales, Nicaragua)

be the remedies contained in the Charter for the settlement of disputes between States.

The United States would have us believe that its victim has violated Article 2 (4) of the Charter. For the ruling circles in Washington, it appears that the story begins when the victim moves to defend itself against America's constant acts of aggression. It also refers to Article 51 and speaks of "self-defence" in a far-off country, and without there being any invader to be expelled. Some of the targets in the bombing were civilian targets, but one of the aims of the attack was the death of Colonel Mu'ammarr Qaddafi - in other words, there was a clear intent to assassinate a Head of State and to achieve with airplanes what the Central Intelligence Agency had been unable to achieve through its own well-known methods.

The Government of Nicaragua has its own reasons for condemning this fresh act of aggression by the American Government. As the Council knows, Nicaragua has insisted that differences and disputes that exist between States - in this instance with the United States - should be settled by peaceful means, with recourse to the provisions of the Charter, to justice and to law. In this connection we have had recourse to the Council, to the International Court of Justice and to regional groups such as Contadora and the Organization of American States, and we have also entered into bilateral talks with the United States. However, as the international community is well aware, the present American Administration is persisting in its aggressive and interventionist policy against Nicaragua.

The Government of Nicaragua vigorously condemns this further act of aggression by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and it denounces the use

(Mrs. Bellorini Parrales, Nicaragua)

by the United States of blatant State terrorism in Libya and elsewhere in the world on the pretext that it is thereby combating international terrorism.

Those are the same arguments the American Administration is now bringing to bear against my country by raising the spectre of attacks against its bases in Central America to be carried out by Libyan citizens allegedly operating in Nicaragua. We would alert the international community to the fact that behind that campaign there is a clear aggressive intent, directed today against Libya, tomorrow perhaps against my country.

In the communiqué issued by my Government with regard to the aggression against Libya, we stated the following:

"The actions of the United States are absolutely unjustifiable given the fact that some days ago Libya not only denied responsibility for the acts invoked by the Reagan Administration in an attempt to justify its aggression, without there being any hard evidence to support its charges and attacks, but even condemned those acts.

"Moreover, one can only describe as irresponsible the attitude of ignoring the appeals of various Governments throughout the world, which urged restraint and peaceful settlement as a means of avoiding the further escalation in military tension now taking place in the Mediterranean.

(Mrs. Bellorini Parrales,  
Nicaragua)

"In the light of this new act of aggression, Nicaragua, in its capacity as a non-aligned country, expresses its solidarity with the Libyan people and appeals to the international community to do its utmost to ensure that the United States Government conducts itself in accordance with the basic norms of international law." (S/18004, p. 2)

I wish in conclusion to express our appreciation of the firm position taken by European countries, including your own, Mr. President, which did not lend support to this act of aggression.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Nicaragua for the kind words she addressed to me.

I call now on the representative of the United States, who wishes to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): In seeking to buttress his charges against the United States - charges which consistently and obstinately confuse cause and effect - the representative of Libya has shown us some photos. Like others, my delegation, of course, was touched.

But it is our right - indeed, it is our duty - to ask what are the real origins of those photos. Who is the moral author of the events of 14 April? In short, how and why did this happen?

Everyone in this Chamber knows the answer to these questions. The moral author of the events was and is Colonel Qaddafi. His chosen weapon was and is terrorism. He was and is the true perpetrator of crimes against his own people, as he was and is the perpetrator of crimes against other peaceful peoples and States.

We are told that Libya, a small people, never got to the Gulf of Mexico. True: and a good thing, too. But all too tragically Libya's agents, skulking by night and moving by stealth, did reach West Berlin.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

We have all seen other photographs, of burned and bombed airports, of civilian aeroplanes torn apart, of other bodies, from Berlin to Beirut: innocent lives snuffed out at the order of Colonel Qaddafi's terrorist agents. This must be remembered.

The United States will not shrink from this difficult but necessary struggle against terrorism and those who practise it against us.

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

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The Libyan representative spoke with great passion and with his accustomed fluency. It was a fine performance - and it needed to be a performance in order to disguise the absence of any reply to the points I made in my speech yesterday. May I remind him and the members of the Council that I said yesterday that Colonel Qaddafi had lied when he said

"We have given no orders that anyone, anywhere in the world, should be killed. Libya has not ordered anyone killed." (S/PV.2679, p. 19-20)

May I also remind Ambassador Treiki and the members of the Council that I said Colonel Qaddafi had tried repeatedly to interfere in the internal affairs of my country. I said it was beyond doubt that Libya provided the provisional IRA with money and weapons. The Libyan representative did not deny either of these charges, nor did he deny that Colonel Qaddafi has systematically carried out and planned State-directed terrorism.

What Ambassador Treiki did say was that Libya was against terrorism. He even said, I have recorded his words correctly, "We condemn terrorism". This is Humpty-Dumpty language. Humpty-Dumpty said, "When I use a word it means exactly

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

what I choose it to mean". This is one of the troubles we all face: No Government can believe any longer what the Qaddafi Government says.

The Libyan representative advised me that if he was in my shoes he would try to forget history and to live in the present. But he did not take his own advice. He spoke extensively - and, incidentally, inaccurately - about history, but carefully avoided the present. The present is represented by the corpses of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Padfield, who were murdered in cold blood yesterday.

I must now disclose, sadly, what we have for some time kept secret for reasons of security. My Government has firm evidence of Libyan involvement in the kidnapping of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Padfield, and has good reason to believe they were in Libyan hands.

So much for living in the present; so much for Libyan condemnations of terrorism.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to make a statement in reply, and I call upon him now.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Had I known the content of the statements of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, I should not have asked to speak in reply: in my view, what they said was mere repetition and warrants no reply.

Sir John Thomson has just said that he has "good reason to believe" in his allegation; yesterday, we heard Sir Geoffrey Howe use the same expression. That is only natural, because the Government of Mrs. Thatcher lied when it stated that it would not permit the United States Administration to use aircraft from United States bases in Britain to engage in an act of aggression. Now Mrs. Thatcher has to try to justify that act of aggression and British participation in the eyes of British public opinion.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

I wish also to inform Sir John Thomson that the information available to his Government is false: Libya has never called for or been a party to what has happened to British subjects who have been held hostage. Like all other small peoples which have suffered at the hands of British terrorism in the past and of United States terrorism at present - peoples such as the Palestinian people and the Egyptian people - the Libyan people understand better than other peoples the meaning of State terrorism. We cannot participate in such terrorism.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

If the United Kingdom, to whose history I have already alluded - and I am happy to see that the United Kingdom representative agrees with me, since he could not deny what I said - and the United States, which now represents imperialism, want to change facts and give the name "terrorist" to peoples struggling for their freedom, if they want to ascribe to these peoples or to others their own faults, we can only say that we are not fooled by such attempts.

As proof of that we need only say that Sir John Thomson - and I think he knows this full well himself - was the only person to support the United States Administration. I repeat: he was the only one to support the United States Administration. I would make it clear to him once again that the aggression which took place against Libya was the most abominable form of terrorism. I would have hoped that Sir John Thomson would at least be able to condemn aggression against innocent children. But the blind alliance with the aggressor has prevented him from doing that.

I ask you, Mr. President, to excuse me for having taken up so much of the Council's valuable time.

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



Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I too have some photographs which would be available. They relate to Mr. Padfield and Mr. Douglas. I reserve my right to return to that question later.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no other speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will be scheduled after consultations with members of the Council.

I would inform members that the Security Council will consider the report (S/17965) of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon at a meeting at 4 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.