



**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2682  
21 April 1986

ENGLISH

---

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 21 April 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de REMOULARIA

(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. RAKOTONDAMBOA  
Mr. KASEMSRI  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. DUBININ  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. MAXEY  
Mr. WALTERS  
Mr. AGUILAR

---

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table. I also invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, 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. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table;  
Mr. 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. Nyandoo (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; Mr. Riyad Mansour (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Malta and Uganda in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Borg (Malta) and Mr. Iumba (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 21 April 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations, 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. Ahmet Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer ad interim to the United Nations of

(The President) .

the Organization of the Islamic Conference to make a statement in connection with the consideration of the item inscribed on the Council's agenda."

That letter will be issued as document S/18025.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the following documents: S/18021, a letter dated 18 April 1986 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Bolivia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and S/18022, S/18023 and S/18024, letters 18 April 1986 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Burkina Faso to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to join the speakers who have preceded me in welcoming you to the presidency of the Security Council during this month and acknowledging the personal qualities and diplomatic skills that have enabled you to guide the work of the Council with such distinction and success. My expression of confidence in your leadership of this august body is a reflection not only of my deep personal regard and admiration for you but also of the cordial relations and ties of close friendship that exist between your great country and mine.

Through you, I should also like to convey our deep appreciation of the exemplary manner in which Ambassador Bierring of Denmark conducted the work of the Security Council during the month of March.

We fully share the profound concern of the international community over the tragic turn of events in the Central Mediterranean region. Tripoli, the capital city of Libya, as well as Benghazi, Libya's second largest city, have suffered heavy damage from the aerial strikes launched by the United States. Many public buildings, including some diplomatic missions, have been demolished or damaged and a number of innocent civilians, have been killed or seriously injured.

In a statement on 15 April, Mr. Mohammad Khan Junejo, Prime Minister of Pakistan, said:

"I am dismayed and distressed by the bombing raids carried out by United States aircraft against targets in Libya, a brotherly Islamic State. The Government and the people of Pakistan share the profound grief of the people of Libya at the unwarranted action taken by the United States Government. We extend our sincere sympathy at the grievous loss of life and destruction of property suffered by the Libyan people.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

"I urge an immediate halt to unlawful acts and the prevention of escalation which would pose a serious threat to the maintenance of peace and security.

"The Government of Pakistan will fully co-operate with the efforts of the Islamic and non-aligned countries in order to uphold the rule of law in inter-State relations."

Similarly, Sahabzada Yacub-Khan, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, expressed the shock and profound concern of the Government and the people of Pakistan at reports of United States attacks on installations in Libya. He said that this unilateral resort to force contravened the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and added that in deploring this action, Pakistan joined its voice to those of all other nations committed to the supremacy of international law for the maintenance of peace and security.

Terrorism is a state of mind and has complex causes. It is a state of mind borne out of frustrations which can find no outlet other than in individual or group acts of violence. Terrorism, undoubtedly, is unlawful and a deplorable and impermissible form of expression for anger or frustration. We have consistently expressed our abhorrence of this barbaric practice in contradistinction to armed struggle in self-defence in pursuit of legitimate national aims. It is for these considerations that we joined the international community unreservedly in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 40/61, which unequivocally condemns all forms of terrorism.

The evil of terrorism can be eradicated only by addressing its identifiable root causes. In an article in The New York Times of Thursday, 17 April 1986, Anthony Lewis pointed out the risk of believing that military blows could be a substitute for the slower work of politics and diplomacy. He went on to emphasize

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

that the action in Libya highlighted the need for seeking solutions of the underlying problems of the Middle East - problems that, unsolved, bred support for acts of terrorism.

The action against Libya can create a dangerous precedent which can have serious ramifications. States would feel encouraged to take the law into their own hands and decide unilaterally to deal punishment for perceived lapses.

The international order, as we know it, cannot survive if the choice of means to achieve an objective remains unfettered by moral or legal considerations. State conduct must not be based on the assumption that international organs, such as the Security Council, are moribund and may, therefore, be bypassed. Whatever its shortcomings, the authority of the United Nations must not be allowed to be compromised. Let us not forget that this Organization was built by the international community to prevent wars and conflicts and to provide a forum for the pacific settlement of disputes.

Libya lies in the overall Middle East region, where the root cause of the turmoil and the turbulence, particularly the prevalence of terrorism, in one form or the other, is the continued denial of the fundamental and legitimate right of the people of Palestine to an independent and sovereign homeland.

We are convinced that there will be no peace in the Middle East until justice has been done to the Palestinian people, whose 40-year-old struggle for the restoration of their legitimate rights continues to rage today. The remedy lies in a resolution of this problem rather than retaliatory action against individuals or States.

The Security Council has a clear duty of upholding the principles of non-intervention and non-interference as well as that of respect for the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of Member States in this situation. Unless the

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Security Council fulfils its responsibility in this regard, the danger of escalation of the cycle of violence, which diminishes the United Nations and its Charter, cannot be ruled out.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay, Acting Permanent Observer to the United Nations of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ANSAY: Since this is the first time this month that we have addressed the Council, I take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April and to wish you all success in the difficult task of guiding the Council's work and deliberations. I am sure that your well-known professional merits and authority will enable you successfully to conduct this month's proceedings of the Council.

I also wish to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Bierring, Permanent Representative of Denmark, on the exemplary way in which he conducted the Council's work during the month of March.

I should like to express gratitude for the opportunity afforded me as the representative of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to participate in the discussions of the Security Council on the situation resulting from the United States attacks against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a State member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The American air raids on Tripoli and Benghazi, which have resulted in the deaths of dozens of innocent civilians, including children, have quite justifiably aroused anger and indignation throughout the world, including the United States and



(Mr. Ansay)

Britain. The aggression against the Jamahiriya has been condemned by the majority of peace-loving States. The statement issued by the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned nations at their meeting in New Delhi a few days ago reflects the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of States members of the United Nations and of the international community as a whole. The States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, most of which belong to the third world and are members of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, whole-heartedly uphold that statement.

The aggression against Libya in the early hours of Tuesday, 14 April, constitutes the culmination of a premeditated effort on the part of the United State Government to intimidate, harass, and coerce the Government and the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Members of the Council will recall the intransigent rejection by the United States of all moves for a peaceful resolution of its differences with Libya.

(Mr. Ansay)

The sixteenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, which met at Fez in January 1986, unanimously adopted a number of declarations condemning the aggressive threats and provocations and the imposition of an economic boycott by the United States and the Zionist entity against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The Islamic Conference condemned the United States military movements in the vicinity of Libyan territorial waters, which constituted a threat to the security, safety and sovereignty of Libya. It rejected all the pretexts and arguments put forward by the United States in an attempt to justify its aggressive actions, and warned that those pretexts, threats and military movements would only aggravate the critical situation. The Conference expressed solidarity with and support for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and its people in their efforts against the United States threats and military movements, efforts aimed at defending the security and integrity of their country. The Conference called upon the Government of the United States to rescind its threats and provocations, military movements and economic measures against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

The United States Government chose to ignore the appeals of the States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and a large number of nations all over the world, and carried out provocative and unwarranted activities in the Gulf of Sidra. In a statement issued on 27 March, Mr. Syeed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, strongly condemned the entry of United States naval forces into the Gulf of Sidra and called upon the United States Government to refrain from actions liable to aggravate the situation and to pose a threat to international peace and security.

A number of States which believe in the inadmissibility of force and military means to resolve differences between States counselled the United States against resorting to force against the Jamahiriya. The United States, however, blatantly

(Mr. Ansary)

snubbed all those efforts and mobilized its full military might against Libya.

Most recently, in a statement issued on 15 April, immediately after the United States armed attack, the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference condemned the aggression and described that act against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya as a gross violation of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law.

Let us ask ourselves what this action of the United States has achieved. We can only say that this military action has flouted the Charter of the United Nations and undermined principles of relations between States that have taken decades to evolve. This action has portrayed the United States as a super-Power bent upon undermining, intimidating and harming a small State.

No matter how the United States Government tries to justify its action, nothing can justify this kind of use of force and this disregard of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms of international law. Instead of resorting to the use of its mighty military machine, the United States would do well to ponder awhile the injustice prevailing in the Middle East. It is that injustice which has been dealt out for decades to the Palestinians through the denial of their most fundamental and legitimate rights, including their right to self-determination and statehood.

Only after actively contributing to the elimination of those inequities - such as the illegal occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem - and after the recognition of Palestinian rights can the United States recover the respect it once enjoyed as a bastion of freedom and justice.

On this occasion I should like to reiterate the Organization of the Islamic Conference member States' abhorrence and rejection of terrorism by individuals and by States and their readiness to contribute fully to efforts exerted by the international community to eliminate the scourge of terrorism.

(Mr. Ansay)

The United States military aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is indeed one of the most serious developments of recent years. It is therefore incumbent on the international community to take measures to ensure that such acts are not repeated. The Security Council, which, under the Charter, has the primary responsibility for establishing and maintaining international peace and security, must take cognizance of threats of further acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and ensure that those threats do not materialize. We call upon the Council and the international community to take appropriate measures to defuse the serious crisis caused by the United States actions and to safeguard the delicate and endangered fabric of international peace.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Ansay for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda): Allow me, Sir, at the very outset to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that your wealth of experience in international affairs and your skills as a diplomat will facilitate the successful completion of the onerous tasks before the Council this month.

We wish too to convey our satisfaction to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Denmark, for the exemplary manner in which he steered the deliberations of the Council during the month of March.

My delegation wishes also to thank all the members of the Council for having invited us to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

The facts of the case before the Council are clear. In the early morning hours of 15 April, United States fighter planes, flying 2,800 miles from bases in Britain, bombarded the Libyan cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. Several civilian and military targets were destroyed, leading to great loss of lives and property. The United States, citing the bombing of a discothèque in West Berlin, invoked Article 51 of the Charter to try to justify its actions, claiming the inherent right of self-defence.

Uganda, as a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the Non-Aligned Movement, is extremely perturbed at this latest resort to the use of force in the settlement of a dispute. In a press release issued on 15 April 1986, which reflected the views of Africa, the OAU condemned the latest raids against Libya and reaffirmed its solidarity with the people of Libya.

The Uganda Government also issued a statement, which reads as follows:

"The Uganda Government expresses its concern at the report of the bombing of the Libyan capital, Tripoli, and the city of Benghazi by American aircraft.

"Whilst Uganda does not condone terrorism, the Government and the people of Uganda regret the use of force, especially by a super-Power, in settlement of disputes between sovereign States."

During the last few weeks, we have viewed with concern the escalation of tension and conflict in the Mediterranean due to the increased use of force contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. Since the Security Council had started deliberations on the situation, it was our hope that all sides in the dispute would show restraint so that the Council's efforts might result in the easing of tension and the restoration of peace in the region. Thus, it is all the more regrettable to us that force was used at the very time the Council was seized of the situation.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

The United Nations Charter spells out very clearly the obligations of Member States. All States are under an obligation in their international relations to refrain from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of any other State. All States are equally under the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means. The permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility in that regard. It is thus regrettable that a permanent member of the Council has used force against a small developing country, a member of the OAU.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

Article 51 of the Charter does not give unlimited freedom to strike at another State in the name of self-defence. The purpose of the Article is to grant the right of self-defence to any United Nations Member State which is actually being attacked, until the Security Council can take appropriate action. The evidence thus far proffered does not persuade us that an armed attack within the meaning of Article 51 had taken place that warranted the resort to the use of force.

As Sir Anthony Parsons, a distinguished national of the United Kingdom who in the past contributed enormously to the deliberations of the Council, wrote in The Observer of 25 April 1985:

"There cannot be many people in the Clapham omnibus, including myself, who can bring themselves to believe that even outrageous behaviour [such as is involved in the present case] constitutes an armed attack against a Member of the United Nations".

He counselled that the right approach for the United States would have been to call for an emergency meeting of the Security Council and to present its evidence. It is also noteworthy that the act complained of - that is, the bombing of a discotheque in West Berlin - occurred in a third State which itself did not feel compelled to resort to force.

The sovereignty of a State means its independence from external intervention. The principle of sovereign equality forbids States to intervene directly or indirectly, for any reason whatsoever, in the internal or external affairs of another State. By the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States,

"armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements are in violation of international law". (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex, preamble)

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

Senator Mark Hatfield, writing in The New York Times of Sunday, 20 April 1985, stated:

"Hospital beds filled with bloodied children are a strange definition of justice. Streets strewn with the rubble of bombed apartment buildings are a strange definition of justice. And the death of Colonel Qaddafi's infant daughter is a strange definition of justice. I suggest that these tragic sights have nothing to do with justice ...".

"Nietzsche once warned that 'whoever battles with monsters had better see that it does not turn him into a monster'. We would do well to heed that warning". (The New York Times, 20 April 1986, section IV, p. E24)

The Security Council too would do well to heed that warning.

My delegation is concerned about the dangerous precedent which this latest action sets. As members of the Council are aware, South Africa, under the pretext of fighting terrorism, has been mounting constant acts of aggression against the front-line States. There is a grave danger that the latest United States action might be viewed as providing South Africa with the example to emulate and to justify its sinister designs against peace-loving African neighbours.

As I have indicated, Uganda condemns all forms of terrorism in all their manifestations, be they State-sponsored or by individuals or groups. But we are dismayed when fighting terrorism is used to justify aggression or to destabilize Governments of small, developing countries.

The core of the problem in the Middle East has been and remains the question of restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The lesson to be drawn from the massive Israeli bombardment and invasion of Lebanon is that unless there is a serious attempt to address that injustice and remove the root-cause of the problem, tension will always remain in the region.



(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

In conclusion, I call on the Security Council, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security, to take a principled stand upholding international law, so that peace in the Mediterranean region can be restored.

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

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

Mr. BORG (Malta): May I begin by thanking you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for acceding to the request of my delegation to participate in this important debate.

It would not be out of place if I were to draw the attention of this Council to the initiatives taken by Malta this year in its strenuous efforts to avert the present crisis in the Mediterranean, which, if left unchecked, could involve more and more States in an uncontrollable conflagration.

In the first half of January of this year my Government had consultations with the Ambassadors of the United States, the Soviet Union, Libya and Italy, amongst others, on the increasing tension between the United States and Libya. At the same time, my Foreign Minister invited the regional non-aligned foreign ministers to meet to review the present situation and publicly reiterate pledges on non-aggression. That invitation did not elicit an encouraging response.

On 15 January my Prime Minister invited the Prime Ministers of Algeria, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Libya, Tunisia and Yugoslavia to attend a meeting to discuss and agree on the necessary undertakings concerning the non-use of force and the non-use of bases and desistance from giving any assistance to terrorist activities. The Libyan Government accepted the proposal for such a meeting but,

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

unfortunately, the response of the other countries invited was not encouraging and, consequently, the meeting was not held.

In the same spirit of highlighting the importance of negotiations and avoiding the resort to force, my Prime Minister visited Tripoli on 16 January and brought with him the message that Libya was ready to have talks with the United States at any level regarding their relations. However, the United States refused.

Malta's initiatives were also brought to the notice of the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe by my Foreign Minister at the end of January.

Immediately the confrontation between the United States and Libya started in the Gulf of Sidra, at the end of March, Malta called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council, calling on the United States to desist from carrying out further military manoeuvres in disputed waters close to the Libyan mainland and to refrain from making any attacks on Libyan ships and territory, and requesting the Secretary-General to take all possible steps to ensure the maintenance of peace in the central Mediterranean area.

On 12 April, following renewed tension between the United States and Libya, Malta called for an immediate meeting of the Security Council. Malta called on the Security Council to reaffirm the obligation of all Member States of the United Nations to refrain from the threat or use of force in the settlement of disputes, in accordance with the United Nations Charter. It also called on all parties concerned to desist from all further action which could lead to the use of armed force in the central Mediterranean, and entrusted the Secretary-General with taking appropriate action with the parties concerned to ensure that only the peaceful means envisaged by the United Nations Charter were utilized to reconcile any differences between them.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

At the same time my Prime Minister sent an invitation to the Prime Ministers of the other Mediterranean countries, urging an early meeting to review the situation and take the necessary action to avoid a worsening of the situation.

My Government has since early this year left no stone unturned in its efforts to defuse the critical situation in the Mediterranean and to work for peace in the area through peaceful means. Unfortunately, all our efforts came to naught with the United States attack on Libya, which left so many innocent victims.

We firmly believe that no act of terrorism can ever justify, or be used as a pretext for, another. We condemn and combat all forms of aggression and terrorism, whatever their manifestation, be they acts by individuals or - more so - irresponsible acts by States.

When the crisis came to a head and flared up in the Mediterranean, with the United States attack on Libya, countries in the area woke up to their responsibilities, advising restraint and urging talks and consultations, not only to defuse the situation in the Mediterranean, but also to go to the roots of the problem - the unfulfilled rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people.

My Government has at all times emphasized the need for preventive diplomacy and the use of negotiations to avoid the use of force. We tried it with Libya, we tried it with the United States and we tried it twice in the Council. At no time did we try, even unconsciously, to lead anyone into a state of false expectations by presenting, or even hinting at, possibilities that did not even exist. We were at all times concerned with the true facts, and it was those bare facts of life that my Prime Minister explained to everybody, especially the partners directly involved in the dispute.

Once again Malta appeals to the Security Council to urge the sides involved in the Mediterranean crisis to desist from using force and resort only to peaceful

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

means to reconcile their differences. This we insist upon, not only in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which we, all Members of the United Nations, have pledged to honour, but also as a country which has always believed that only peace and security can save the world from a catastrophe, the nature of which in this nuclear age we have only read of in books. We hope that humanity will never witness it in our lifetime or in its history.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We might have been able to proceed to the vote now, but there are still some problems; technical services have asked for a few more minutes to complete the revised draft resolution so I propose that we suspend the meeting and proceed to the vote in 15 minutes.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.45 p.m. and resumed at 5.25 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would venture to suggest that perhaps on a future occasion we might have a champion runner to cover the ground between the printing shop and the Council Chamber and thereby save a few valuable minutes. Members of the Council now - I might say, finally - have before them document S/18016/Rev.1, a revised text of the draft resolution submitted by Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Arab Emirates. I understand that the Council is now ready to proceed to a vote on that draft resolution. If I hear no objection, I shall therefore put the draft resolution to the vote.

Since I hear no objection, it is so decided.

I shall now call upon members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): The United States rejects this draft resolution as totally unacceptable. We categorically reject its assumption that the essential problem before us stems from the actions taken by the armed forces of the United States against Libya. That is a false assumption, contradicted by the facts, by irrefutable evidence and by the long and tragic list of countries which have suffered brutality after brutality at the hands of Libyan terrorism.

We deplore the failure of this draft to come to grips with the real issue before this Council: Libya's blatant, unrepentant and continuing use of force in violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. For this Council to endorse such an erroneous and deficient draft would be to mock the oft-stated commitment of this body - and of the General Assembly - to oppose terrorism in all its forms as criminal conduct that must be resisted and punished.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

My delegation is outraged by the fact that nowhere in this draft resolution do we find any mention of the brutal campaign of terror waged by Libya, a campaign that has grown and become increasingly violent over the years.

Colonel Qaddafi did not merely state it is a time for war. He said, and I quote Colonel Qaddafi: "We must force America to fight on a hundred fronts." Libya did not content itself with merely threatening to use force - itself a violation of the Charter. Colonel Qaddafi followed through on his threats by launching murderous attacks against American citizens, by firing at our ships, by plotting yet more deadly atrocities. How many Americans and innocents must be killed before our right to respond is recognized?

(Mr. Walters, United States)

I need not elaborate on the United States position on this matter, which is set forth fully in our letter to the President of the Security Council dated 14 April 1986, and our statement in this Council on 15 April. I wish to stress only this: If the inherent right of self-defence, specifically recognized in Article 51 of the Charter, does not include the right to protect one's nationals and one's ships, what does it protect? The idea that a State should be condemned for seeking to protect the lives of its nationals who are subject to armed attack is too absurd for further comment.

What do we find in this draft resolution before us? We see a harmful and potentially disastrous approach that equates the use of terrorism with an act of justified self-defence against terrorism; an approach that condemns acts of the United States against Libya but ignores totally Libya's documented, open, undeniable use of terrorism; an approach that perverts the meaning and intention of the Charter of the United Nations and international law; and, finally, an approach that creates an appearance of even-handedness, but not the reality. Nowhere is Libya asked to refrain from its murderous activities.

Operative paragraph 3 begins to reflect some awareness of the nature of the problem at hand. Unfortunately, it does so in such general terms that it conveys no idea of the magnitude of the threat posed by the activities of terrorists in general and by Libya's flagrant violations of Article 2 (4) of the Charter in particular. We are not dealing here with the acts of individuals or groups, but rather with a State policy to use force by clandestine means or, as one speaker in the debate put it, "war by another name". Adoption of a resolution which fails to focus on these aspects of the situation and the specific conduct of Libya can only encourage more widespread violence and lawlessness by Libya. It would be highly imprudent and misguided for the Security Council to adopt any resolution along the lines of the present draft.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

This text is a product of perverted thinking that distorts logic, values and common sense. This text equates the criminal with his victim. As such, it will be opposed vigorously by the United States of America. We expect all nations of good will and true commitment to the values and principles of this Organization to stand with us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I note that over an hour ago I asked the Secretariat to have the television crew take their places. They still have not appeared. Accordingly, I propose that the Council wait until those in charge of the television are there with their equipment.

They are now in their places.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): I cannot begin my short statement without expressing our deep emotions at the news a few days ago of the most recent terrorist incident, the wanton killings of the three hostages in Lebanon - one of them after months of anguish and humiliation in the hands of the perpetrators.

My delegation will not be able to support the draft resolution before us since it does not reflect appropriately the complex of issues with which the Council is confronted. No attempt had been made in the draft to address the inter-relationship between action and reaction which has been at play.

In order to safeguard the very fabric of civilization it is urgent and imperative to take measures against international terrorism. To my Government it is beyond any doubt that Libya was behind the acts of terrorism which created the tension in the Mediterranean.

However, reaction to terrorism must be proportionate in order to stand a chance to achieve its goal without leading to a dangerous escalation of violence. My Government therefore had to dissociate itself clearly from and deeply deplore the military action taken by the United States against Libya. On 14 April 1986,



(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the European Community stressed the need for political solutions while at the same time clearly rejecting the threats made by Libyan leaders against Europe. The member States of the Community also decided to take a number of diplomatic measures against Libya while making it clear that new acts of terrorism would provoke stronger reactions.

In its resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985 the General Assembly unanimously and unequivocally condemned all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed. The time has now come for this Council - as has already been stressed by several previous speakers in this debate - to move beyond the mere expression of moral judgements by seriously discussing and taking practical steps in a co-ordinated fashion to combat terrorism as a means of achieving political goals.

In the meantime my Government remains deeply concerned at the tension in the Mediterranean and strongly urges all parties to show moderation and exercise the utmost restraint.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): We have given very careful consideration to the views of the non-aligned members of this Council and to those expressed by the representatives of Libya.

We have also considered carefully the statements on its action by the representatives of the United States.

The Australian delegation sincerely regrets that it is unable to support the draft resolution on the situation in the Mediterranean.

In my statement on 16 April, I said that a peaceful resolution of the situation would involve, as an essential condition, that the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya terminate its involvement in terrorist activities and that the United States should desist from further military action against Libya.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

In the opinion of the Australian delegation the draft resolution has not approached the issue with that same sense of balance. It focuses its criticism on one party, the United States. While it does address the issue of terrorism, it does not directly address the actions of Libya, which have played a large part in contributing to the current tensions. We do commend the willingness of the sponsors to refer to General Assembly resolution 40/61 and to condemn all terrorist activities. There must be full respect by all States for the terms of that important resolution.

My delegation also welcomes the readiness of the sponsors to call on the parties to resolve their differences by peaceful means and to contemplate a role for the Secretary-General in restoring peace.

As I said in the Australian statement five days ago, failure to bring terrorism to an end can only lead to an escalating cycle of violence. This now seems to be happening. In this context, my delegation strongly condemns the recent murder in Lebanon of three foreign hostages.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

Australia previously called on the Security Council to take urgent steps to bring this issue to a constructive, forward-looking conclusion. We were heartened by the positive responses to the ideas in the Australian statement of 16 April by a number of Member States, both in New York and in a number of capitals in which our Missions discussed them with other Governments.

We welcome the fact that many countries supported our contention that the Security Council has an obligation to respond to situations like the present one in a positive and constructive way. Our efforts have revealed a recognition of the real dangers in permitting tension to grow unchecked.

Regrettably, developments since then have led to precisely the outcome we feared: a largely acrimonious exchange in the Council ending in a draft resolution which is likely to be vetoed.

In our view, the Security Council may still be able to help resolve the differences between the parties. The Council could continue to explore ways of reducing tension between the parties.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): It is indeed a pleasure for me to extend to you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Our pleasure is enhanced by the fact that Thailand and France are commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of their official relations. Moreover, we highly esteem your fine personal qualities, among which are sagacity, tenacity and joie de vivre, as well as your outstanding skills and experience in the realm of diplomacy. My delegation is confident, therefore, that this Council will benefit from your inspired guidance and leadership and that it will exercise to the best of its ability its important functions in the interest of the world community at large.

(Mr. Kasemri, Thailand)

Permit me also to express the grateful thanks of my delegation to His Excellency Ambassador Ole Bierring, Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations and President of the Security Council for the month of March, for the skilful and courageous manner in which he conducted the Council's business.

Disparate acts by desperate individuals are often a manifestation of deep-rooted frustrations and hopelessness. No matter how spontaneous they may be, if they cause loss of innocent lives they can never be condoned. Sponsorship by Governments of similar acts is, however, utterly deplorable, because it is calculated to substitute organized force and intimidation for diplomacy and peaceful negotiation.

On 13 July 1985, after the terrorist incidents at Frankfurt, Beirut and Tokyo, the Foreign Ministers of the six countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and their dialogue partners issued a joint statement calling on the international community

"to take all necessary measures individually and collectively to eliminate those acts of terrorism".

On 9 December 1985, Thailand joined in the consensus in the General Assembly in the adoption of resolution 40/61, in which the Assembly

"unequivocally condemns, as criminal, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations among States and their security". (para. 1)

On several occasions Thailand participated in the formulation of presidential statements setting forth the united stand of the members of the Security Council on terrorism. Most recently, on 30 December 1985, it was affirmed that the Council members

"strongly condemn the unjustifiable and criminal terrorist attacks at the Rome

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

and Vienna airports which caused the taking of innocent human lives". (S/17702)

Earlier, on 9 October 1985, after the Achille Lauro incident, it was stated that the Council members

"resolutely condemn this unjustifiable and criminal hijacking as well as other acts of terrorism, including hostage-taking". (S/PV.2618, p. 2)

On 18 December 1985, the Security Council adopted, with Thailand's support, resolution 579 (1985), which "condemns unequivocally all acts of hostage-taking and abduction" (para. 1). It urges "the further development of international co-operation among States... in accordance with the rules of international law" (para. 5) to deal with such manifestations of international terrorism. It also affirms the obligation of all States to prevent the commission of such acts.

It is therefore patently clear that the United Nations, particularly its major organs, is actively preoccupied with the issue of terrorism and has managed to win some consensus on the subject. The road to further international co-operation in establishing international legal norms, similar to the useful efforts in the area of aircraft hijacking, may be long and arduous, but the possibility is there, on the basis of the consensus already achieved.

It is also clear that Thailand is ready to take that road, and how deeply shocked we were to learn of the deaths on board the Trans-World Airways (TWA) aircraft and in the Berlin discothèque bombing, which led to the present crisis, as well as of the subsequent brutal murder of three hostages last week in Beirut.

The present crisis, now before the Council, may be seen as another phase in the long-feasting malady: finally, the boil has burst, with all the ugly consequences. The situation has been growing more dangerous daily, and we have now witnessed long-simmering passions reaching the boiling point. The road it has

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

followed is a rugged path strewn with the corpses and mangled limbs of innocent victims. Before it lie a revolving door of retribution and an escalator of violence. Where will this passage lead to? No one can tell; perhaps to an unending corridor of despair and desolation.

Surely, this is not what is intended by "development of international co-operation... in accordance with the rules of international law" (resolution 579 (1985), para. 4).

While the threat or use of force has become synonymous with violence, particularly when it is State-sponsored and when its victims are innocent civilians, the Charter obligations are still valid. By its very nature, the Charter circumscribes unilateral action by providing multilateral rules and procedures. There are some important exceptions, such as the right of self-defence, which is an inherent right of every State.

(Mr. Kasemari, Thailand)

The Security Council, however, has the authority to review the situation on the basis of information provided by, among possible sources, the State which bases its unilateral action on self-defence. Thus far, the Charter does not go so far as to permit pre-emptive attack or reprisal as a valid substitute for its multilateral procedure. In this sense, the Charter may be said to circumscribe traditional norms of international law, for obvious, though perhaps overly optimistic, reasons.

One clear lesson for any State sponsoring terrorism which relies on absence of published evidence or proof, or on the absence of legal norms or lack of precision thereof, is that great Powers throughout history have exercised their power and the inclination to shape or influence the development of international law. And, despite present difficulties, international consensus is moving towards anti-terrorism.

Such a crisis as the present one and its aftermath often serve to jolt the international community from its complacency and passivity. Perhaps something constructive may yet come out of these pains and sufferings. We note in particular that the draft resolution

"Calls upon all parties to refrain from resorting to force, to exercise restraint in this critical situation and to resolve their differences by peaceful means in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations"

(S/18016/Rev.1, para. 4),

and we hope that there will be renewed efforts to mobilize international co-operation to cut, once and for all, the Gordian knot of violence and counter-violence.

My delegation will cast its vote with a heavy heart, not only because of abiding friendship and understanding but also because of the death and suffering of so many innocent people, because the circle of violence has now been joined, with

(Mr. Kasemeri, Thailand)

no end in sight, and because despair and desperation have displaced diplomacy, to the detriment of world peace.

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

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of France.

The position of the French Government is both clear and responsible. France categorically condemns the intolerable escalation of terrorism. It shares the legitimate indignation of the United States and the United Kingdom concerning the odious attacks perpetrated against their nationals. Confronted with the same scourge, France affirms its full solidarity with all countries that are victims of barbaric acts, which spread blind terror and in no way serve the political causes that their perpetrators claim to defend. France calls on the States victims of such acts to join together in the fight against a threat affecting all of them. Terrorism cannot be effectively combatted unless determined, tenacious and patient efforts are made, combining national measures with greater international co-operation.

As everyone knows, the French Government considered that it should not associate itself with the United States intervention against Libya. Nevertheless, the French delegation believes that the text on which the Security Council is to take a decision is excessive and unbalanced. It notes in particular that Libyan responsibility is not mentioned therein. For those reasons, my delegation feels that the text is not acceptable and will vote against the draft resolution.

In conclusion, I wish to appeal for reason. There are serious risks of escalation in the present situation. Everything must be done to ensure that the



(The President)

chain of violence is broken now and that the world can finally emerge from the vicious circle of attacks and reprisals in which the terrorists and those who support them seek to enclose it.

I resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/18016/Rev.1.

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

Against: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain  
and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Venezuela

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 9 votes in favour, 5 votes against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

I shall now call on members of the Security Council who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): In our statement on the 17th of this month, we clearly set forth our position on the item now before the Council. In that statement we said that in our view the Security Council could and should play a constructive role in the solution of the dispute between Libya and the United States. Specifically, we said that the Council should, in accordance with Article 36 of the Charter, recommend the appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Unfortunately, that was not the course taken by the sponsors of draft resolution S/18016/Rev.1. Frankly, we do not believe that the adoption of that text would have encouraged a solution of the dispute by peaceful means, nor would it have alleviated tension in the central Mediterranean region - although we do consider operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution to be very positive.

Furthermore, we believe that this draft resolution on which a vote has just been taken did not take duly into account the whole background of the problem and all its aspects; nor did it establish the link - in our view, the necessary link - between the crucial issues that led to this conflict.

Finally, we scarcely had an opportunity to read the final text of the draft resolution, which, as everyone knows, has only just been distributed. In the circumstances, we were naturally unable to receive instructions on the revised text, which includes some suggestions but does not substantially change its substance or direction.

Mr. DUBININ (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the representative of Venezuela, who, in a previous statement, welcomed the beginning of my activities here as representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations and in the Security Council. I also thank him for his kind words about my modest knowledge of the Spanish language.

The discussion in the Council has shown serious concern over the threat to international peace and security resulting from the armed attacks by the United States on Libya. That concern has been expressed by practically all the Members of our Organization that have taken part in the discussion here. It was reflected in the communiqué issued in New Delhi by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The same feelings are being expressed today by hundreds of public organizations in various countries and by eminent public figures. Throughout the world the actions of the United States Administration are being widely condemned.

It is clear to the whole world that the armed attack by the United States on Libya was direct aggression against a sovereign State, a glaring violation of the universally accepted norms of international relations and of the United Nations Charter, which directly forbids the use of force against any State. If anyone could still harbour any doubts about the true culprit in the present build-up of tensions, the most recent events have made it very clear that it is the imperial policy of the United States in all its manifestations. In its attempt to turn back the course of history, imperialism is relying ever more openly on force, interference in the affairs of free peoples and State terrorism.

(Mr. Dubinin, USSR)

Speaking recently in Berlin, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, said:

"The USSR and other socialist countries have been demonstrating their solidarity with Libya in words and in deeds. They have warned about the grave responsibility the United States is shouldering by engaging in armed aggression against an independent country which is a Member of the United Nations.

"Set in a broad international context, the crime against Libya, the stubborn continuation of nuclear testing and the escalation of threats against Nicaragua cannot be viewed as isolated developments. They are all manifestations of the general policy of Washington, whose militaristic, aggressive nature has revealed itself most clearly during the past few days.

"I wish to stress that in Washington and in the European capitals people should realize that such actions are also doing direct harm to dialogue between the USSR and the United States and between East and West in general. There should be no pretending that the US Administration is not aware that Soviet-US relations cannot develop independently of how the United States is behaving on the international scene and what kind of situation is taking shape as a result."

In his statement Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized that nothing gave the American Administration the right to act as an international judge and self-appointed punisher to replace the principles of international relations by the law of the jungle.

Thus the Soviet Union's position is absolutely clear. Acting against the use of terrorist methods in international relations, as is well known, the Soviet Union at the same time regards as completely inadmissible the use by the United States of armed force against a sovereign State. Such arbitrary action in international

(Mr. Dubinin, USSR)

relations can lead only to their total disruption and to a sharp increase in the threat to universal peace.

The issue is as follows in the extremely serious situation existing today. If measures are not taken now to end aggression against Libya, tomorrow any other sovereign State can become the target of armed violence, with all the consequences that flow from that for international peace and security. It was precisely on that point that attention was focused in the recent statement from the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Eduard Shevardnadze, to the Secretary-General in connection with the most recent events. In such a situation it is the direct duty of the Council vigorously to condemn the adventuristic actions of the American Administration and to take all measures necessary for the immediate cessation of the policy of State terrorism that it is implementing. Only in such a way can the Council carry out its duties under the Charter as the fundamental United Nations body bearing major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

On the basis of the views that I have just expressed, the Soviet delegation voted for the draft resolution, which was submitted by the group of non-aligned countries that are members of the Council. Naturally, we believe that in the draft resolution the United States acts of aggression against Libya should have been subjected to even more vigorous condemnation, and that it should have reflected the fact that, in accordance with the norms of international law, Libya has a legitimate right to compensation for damage suffered as a result of that barbaric attack. Nevertheless, in so far as the draft resolution was in keeping with the minimal demands that arose from the situation, the Soviet delegation voted for it.

(Mr. Dubinin, USSR)

The fact that, as a result of the three vetoes of the United States and its allies, the Security Council has not been able to adopt the draft resolution does not mean that consideration of this issue is not giving results. On the contrary, it only emphasizes that the Western Powers have wound up in isolation and have been forced to utilize extreme means in order to prevent the Security Council from putting its condemnation in the form of a resolution.

It is obvious that the Security Council will have to consider dealing with this question until such time as it finds ways to resolve it. As regards the United States, it will not be able to escape condemnation of its adventuristic actions by all peace-loving States and the entire international community.

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

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Permit me first on behalf of our people, against which aggression has been committed and whose rights have been violated, and on behalf of our children, the victims and the martyrs of United States aggression, to thank the Council for its support. Our people, despite its sufferings and its wounds, is proud of the the international support it has received following the barbaric, savage American aggression.

Although the draft resolution received a majority of the votes, the Security Council has been unable to take a decision because of utilization of the right of veto by the United States and its allies. None the less we continue to believe that the entire world is with us. The United States use of the veto to justify the aggression and to paralyse the United Nations and the Security Council, while very dangerous indeed, is by no means new to us. The United States continues to use its right of veto constantly, whenever it can to obstruct the freedom of peoples and to support aggressors and aggression. It has used that option in the case of occupation in Palestine and for the benefit of apartheid in South Africa.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

While we are here at this meeting of the Security Council, we can note that the non-aligned countries have just taken a decision resolutely condemning the United States aggression and expressing their support for the people of Libya and its leaders. Just yesterday the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries of the five continents arrived in Tripoli to express their support and sympathy for and their solidarity with the victims of the United States aggression.

The entire Arab nation is on the side of our people because it is deeply aware that what has happened to Libya could happen to any other Arab country, because the Arab world knows full well that the United States aggression is actually aggression against the entire Arab nation, and it also knows that the United States and Israel are identical.

The peoples of Africa have supported our people because they know very well that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is in the vanguard of the struggle for the benefit of the peoples of the continent and that it is because of the Jamahiriya's position with regard to the freedom of peoples that it has been attacked.

The United States has not boycotted South Africa although it applies the policy of apartheid; on the contrary, the United States supports South Africa and has even used its right of veto to obstruct the Security Council's efforts to end apartheid.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The members of the socialist community, particularly the Soviet Union, have supported our people, and we are proud of the support of those countries because the Soviet Union and the socialist community are the natural allies of the third world countries and are opposed to United States imperialism and colonialism.

The whole Islamic nation supports Libya, as the Council has heard today. The Islamic nation regards this latest act of United States aggression as a new crusade against Islam. Indeed, United States aggression supports the Zionist entity, which continues to occupy Jerusalem, in contempt of the Islamic nation and the Arab world.

While we are proud of the support of the international community, we must denounce the dangerous policies of the United States and its desire to paralyse the United Nations and prevent it from taking any decision whatsoever.

What recourse do we, the peoples of the small countries, have here? Our sole recourse is to the Security Council in trying to face this aggression. Indeed, we have come to this Council four times in the past to warn the Council of United States preparations for aggression, and over the last two weeks we have further stressed the fact of those preparations and that aggression. Our fears were well-founded, as this large-scale United States aggression demonstrates. To make matters worse the arbitrary abuse of the veto by the enemies of humanity has utterly paralysed the Security Council.

The representative of the United States speaks of terrorism. Can we speak of any terrorism other than the terrorism carried out by the United States Administration under President Reagan? The Palestinian people, evicted from its homeland, is today being killed. Apparently, that is not terrorism but justice! All that is taking place because, to President Reagan and the United States Administration, the Arab is not a man. One has to be an American or an Israeli - not an Arab; not a black man, either - to be a human being.



(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The United States supported the massacres in Sabra and Shatila and continues to support Israeli aggression and the acts of genocide committed against the Palestinian people. President Reagan himself, the President of the greatest Power, applauded Israeli aggression Tunisia and the Palestine Liberation Organization. President Reagan has imposed a new policy: the assassination of presidents. We heard him say in Florida: "Cuba, yes; Castro, no." And today we see him sending his aircraft and giving personal orders to murder Heads of State and presidents. His policy is to abort revolutions, in utter contempt for the United Nations, in order to impose his wishes on us.

Who has flouted and undermined the United Nations Charter: the aggressor, or those who have come here to complain of aggression? It is those who support the occupation of the occupied territories and the genocide committed against the Palestinian people because it is an Arab people, a Moslem people - just as they support the genocide committed against the black people of South Africa. We must not betray mankind. The real terrorism is that practised by the United States Administration. The real terrorism is that which kills thousands of Palestinian children with United States warplanes, napalm and grenades. American terrorism has massacred Libyan children because we have said "no" and will continue to say "no" to the American Administration. Despite the sacrifices of our people, we will never abandon our struggle. We will never submit to United States domination. The sacrifices of our people will be an example for the peoples of small countries to say "no" to American aggression and finally to unite to face that aggression.

We issued a warning with respect to what happened in Grenada. What happened there is happening today in Nicaragua and Libya; yet this tragedy will be repeated if the peoples of small countries do not unite to confront American imperialism.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

While we appreciate international support, including that of the European peoples, who themselves are victims of American domination, we shall continue in spite of everything to say that we want peace, we want to preserve the peace and we condemn terrorism. We ourselves have been the victims of terrorism. Some of our ambassadors and representatives have been murdered and our planes have been intercepted in the air; others have been destroyed by the Zionist entity, supported by the United States. Nevertheless we support, and will always continue to support, the freedom of the people of Palestine, the freedom of the people of South Africa and the freedom of all peoples so that they can once and for all rid themselves of colonialism.

Mr. President, I should like to state, in conclusion, how fully determined and ready we are to co-operate with you to bring about peace in the Mediterranean region. I wish to stress that we shall never initiate aggression, nor shall we ever do anything to threaten peace and security. But, at the same time, we should like to say here before the Council that it is our legitimate right to defend ourselves if American aggression ever takes place again. It is up to the Council to shoulder its responsibilities because it has taken note of the fact that the United States has thwarted the role of the United Nations in order to perpetrate its acts of aggression. The responsibility of the Council is bound up with the struggle of the peoples of small countries, supported by the socialist countries, and with the struggle finally to rid ourselves, once and for all, of colonialist force and American threats, which we reject.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to apologize for speaking at this late hour but I do wish at the end of the deliberations of the Council to express, with respect to our complaint, the thanks of my delegation to those friendly delegations that were kind enough to express their support of the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya following the American act of aggression against that country.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

I should also like to thank those delegations that expressed their condemnation of the American aggression. The representative of the United States of America, speaking here today, claimed that the air raids carried out by his country's aircraft bombed only military targets. The whole of the international community, as represented in this Council, saw the photographs displayed here by Mr. Ali Treiki, representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, at the last meeting of the Council. Those pictures showed that the targets bombed by the United States were exclusively civilian: schools, hospitals and centres for the handicapped, in which women, children and the aged were among the victims.

A short while ago, we heard the representative of the United States reject the draft resolution. That rejection is nothing new for us. In this very Chamber, from the beginning of this year on, he has on several occasions used the veto to reject draft resolutions submitted by non-aligned and socialist countries represented on the Council and supported by the overwhelming majority of Council members. Yet the representative of the United States raised his hand to reject those draft resolutions.

I grant him his right to do so on this occasion, since the draft resolution condemns his own country, but when he does so, as he has done on many prior occasions, to thwart draft resolutions condemning Zionist aggression, that is inadmissible and reprehensible. But we expected this outcome when we came to the Council.

In conclusion, I can only reaffirm to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and to its people and leaders in Libya that in this Council nine voices are enough; their voices speak for the overwhelming majority of the world's States represented in the Council. Those nine voices have spoken. I should like to reaffirm to Mr. Ali Treiki, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, that

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

the people of Libya are not alone in their struggle. Behind them stand all the peoples of the world - all Arab peoples, all friendly, peace-loving peoples.

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

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

