



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.76
22 November 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 19 November 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)

- Adoption of the agenda and organization of work: request for the inclusion of an additional sub-item submitted by the Secretary-General: [8] (continued)
- Declaration of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity on the aerial and naval military attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by the present United States Administration in April 1986: draft resolution [142]

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 General Assembly.

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 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK: REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL SUB-ITEM SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/245)

The PRESIDENT: This morning, I should first like to draw the Assembly's attention to the note by the Secretary-General (A/41/245) relating to the appointment of a member of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee owing to the resignation of one of its members.

Inasmuch as agenda item 18 of the forty-first session of the General Assembly, "Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments", does not include a sub-item relating to the appointment of members and alternate members of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee, the Secretary-General suggests that, in order to enable the General Assembly to take the required action, the General Assembly should, in accordance with established practice, include this additional sub-item in the agenda of its forty-first session and allocate it to the Fifth Committee.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to include that additional sub-item on the agenda of the forty-first session and allocate it to the Fifth Committee?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 142

DECLARATION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY ON THE AERIAL AND NAVAL MILITARY ATTACK AGAINST THE SOCIALIST PEOPLE'S LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA BY THE PRESENT UNITED STATES ADMINISTRATION IN APRIL 1986: DRAFT RESOLUTION A/41/L.35

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed today at 12 noon.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I therefore request those representatives wishing to participate in the debate to put their names on the list as soon as possible.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Today we begin our consideration of the item pertaining to the act of aggression committed by the United States Administration against Libya, which was included in the agenda of the General Assembly at the request of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its summit meeting last July.

Everybody knows that the United States has adopted a policy of open antagonism towards the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya since the revolution of September 1969.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The reasons for this hostility are no secret. They can be traced to the fact that, since its revolution, the Jamahiriya has adopted an independent non-aligned policy on international issues. It has eliminated American military bases on its soil and exercised its full sovereign rights over its natural resources through the nationalization of foreign oil companies and the ending of American monopolies.

The Jamahiriya has always stood by colonial peoples suffering under the yoke of racism and colonialism, including the peoples of Palestine, Namibia and South Africa. The Jamahiriya has also assisted the liberation movements of these peoples in their just and legitimate struggle for freedom, independence and the eradication of racial discrimination.

This independent policy adopted by the Jamahiriya has not been to the liking of the United States of America, which would like the Jamahiriya to be one of the pliant tools subjected to its hegemony and control. Moreover, the United States wants to keep under its control the backbone of the Jamahiriya's economy, namely, oil, to pressurize it into dependence and subservience.

That is why the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has been and still is the object of disinformation campaigns aimed at distorting its image, in addition to a series of threats, provocations and even direct and indirect acts of aggression by the United States Administration. These have taken the form of concrete action in all political, economic, cultural and information spheres. The United States Administration has never disguised the fact that the aim of these provocations and blatant hostile acts is to isolate the Jamahiriya politically and economically. This policy is also designed to spread confusion and suspicion and cause destabilization as a prelude to the overthrow of the popular national Government in the Jamahiriya. The United States has never ruled out the military option, to which it actually resorted when all its other attempts failed to achieve its hostile objectives.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The United States of America has frozen its diplomatic relations with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and exercised all sorts of pressure against the Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations - of which the Secretary-General has been repeatedly informed - thus impeding the Mission's efforts to carry out its tasks properly in accordance with the agreement with the host country.

These political steps have been coupled with coercive economic measures, including an announcement by the United States that it would not buy Libyan oil or any of its derivatives. The United States has also exerted all kinds of pressure on American experts and technicians working in the Libyan oil industry to force them to leave their jobs and the Jamahiriya. This has been followed by an order to all American oil companies to cease their activities in the Jamahiriya. All these decisions are a part of an attempt to damage seriously and cut off the Libyan oil industry.

In addition, the United States Administration has prevented the export to Libya of all spare parts necessary for the operation of commercial civil aircraft, in violation of a number of commercial contracts relating to this subject.

The United States followed this by doing everything possible to impose a total economic blockade against the Jamahiriya. On 7 January 1986 the United States Administration announced a series of new economic measures against the Jamahiriya and issued Executive Order No. 12543 prohibiting trade and dealings of all kinds between Americans, whether companies or individuals, and the Jamahiriya from 1 January 1986.

On 8 January the American Administration issued Executive Order No. 12544 freezing all Libyan assets in the United States and American corporation branches abroad. This constituted a violation of all international laws and norms and even

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

of the principles that it claims are at the basis of the free economy of the United States. The United States was not content with the coercive economic measures it had taken, but began to put pressure on its allies and friends to follow suit.

These American coercive measures run counter to the Charter and international laws, customs and norms calling for international co-operation in the settlement of international, social, economic, cultural and human questions and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. These laws and norms also prohibit the use or encouragement by any country of economic, political or any other measures to force another country to forfeit its rights and its sovereignty.

The Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 1 to 6 September 1986 in Harare, condemned these arbitrary economic measures and stated:

"The Heads of State or Government examined the measures taken by the United States Administration against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, namely, the imposition of an economic boycott and the freezing of its assets in the United States. They condemned these measures as a form of economic coercion for political ends, and called on the United States Administration to rescind them forthwith. They expressed the solidarity with the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in countering these measures, which are aimed at undermining its economic and social development plans, and infringing the sovereignty and independence of its people. They called on all countries to make appropriate and concrete arrangements to assist the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in overcoming these arbitrary measures." (A/41/697, p. 216, para. 82)

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The United States has also harassed Libyan students studying in the United States and fabricated certain accusations against them with a view to hampering their scientific and technological studies. The sole purpose of this harassment is to deprive the Jamahiriya of scientific knowledge in these fields.

In the area of information, the United States has waged an information war against the Jamahiriya and its political leadership to the point that the American media described it as an "information scandal". This was because the United States Administration began a series of misleading campaigns, the latest of which was exposed by The Washington Post in its issue of 2 October 1986.

The paper referred to a memo from Mr. John Poindexter, the National Security Adviser to President Reagan last August in which he called for the launching of a campaign of lies and false and misleading reports in order to confuse the political leadership in the Jamahiriya, and spread confusion in the country and destabilize it. Mr. Poindexter has recently confessed to sending the memo to which The Washington Post referred. This story caused sharp reactions within the United States and throughout the world. This was because it showed contempt for the American people and public opinion within the United States.

American public opinion was the prime victim of the false and misleading campaign launched by the American Administration, which led to the resignation in protest of Mr. Bernard Kalb, the official spokesman of the State Department. Mr. Kalb told reporters after his resignation that he felt that he had "been used by the Administration in this campaign of deception". As a result of the ensuing embarrassment, the United States Administration dismissed a senior staff member of the United States National Security Council as a punishment for leaking the secret of the memo in question.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

In an attempt to dissociate himself from this campaign Mr. George Shultz, the Secretary of State, said on 2 October 1986:

"I might have been guilty in some of what I said about destabilizing the Libyan régime."

The fact of the matter is that at the same time he attempted to justify this campaign of disinformation which he wanted to be used as a tool of aggression. I believe that this misleading campaign, the victim of which was Mr. Bernard Kalb, will claim Mr. Shultz himself as a victim because Mr. Shultz, who attempted to justify those lies against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, is in a very embarrassing situation - he was himself a victim of such lies regarding recent events pertaining to United States-Iranian relations. Those lies were told to friends and allies of his country at the same time that the United States Administration was engaged in different activities. This media campaign, which has been waged against the Jamahiriya for many years, was controlled by world zionism in the United States of America. Zionism feeds that campaign, in response to the strong and principled stand taken by the Libyan Jamahiriya in defence of justice and the legitimate struggle of national liberation movements in the world, in particular the Palestinian National Liberation Movement.

The United States of America resorted to the military option after it had failed to achieve its aggressive objectives through political pressure and economic, information and cultural wars. It paved the way for this military option with a series of violations of Libyan territorial waters and airspace. The United States has persevered in carrying out provocative military manoeuvres off the Libyan coast and in its territorial waters, especially in the Gulf of Sidra, which is historically a Libyan gulf. These exercises and manoeuvres were no more than attempts at dragging Libya into a military confrontation.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

On 19 August 1981 American military aircraft intercepted a number of Libya's military planes in Libyan airspace, fired missiles at them and shot down two of the Libyan aircraft over Libyan waters.

On 31 January 1981 American military fighters intercepted one of Air Libya's civilian airliners while it was on a scheduled flight between Benghazi and Athens.

On 24 March 1986 American bombers bombed a number of civilian targets in the city of Sidra. At the same time some of the ships of the United States Sixth Fleet fired their missiles at Libyan patrol boats that were on routine patrols in Libyan territorial waters. That act of aggression caused great material damage and casualties, damage and casualties that were doubled when American aircraft returned on 25 March to bomb anew the same civilian targets at a time when the debris was still being cleared and the bodies of innocent civilians were still being dug out of the ruins.

On 15 and 16 April 1986 the United States carried out its barbaric and brutal raids against residential areas and civilian airports in both Tripoli and Benghazi. Scores of F-111 fighters took off from their bases in Britain and other F-14s took off from aircraft carriers stationed off the Libyan coast, together with a number of support planes and fuel tanker planes, and carried out barbaric air raids in which they threw tons of cluster bombs over civilian airports, hospitals and residential districts in both Tripoli and Benghazi, including the Headquarters of the leader of the Libyan revolution. These raids led to the martyrdom of a large number of innocent civilian citizens and caused great material damage to civilian targets.

An eyewitness, namely, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, described those barbaric raids during the Security Council debate on the cities. He said

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

"Our visit to Libya this week enabled my delegation to witness at first hand the traumatic results of the use of force to settle disputes between countries. The victims of the ... bombing of Tripoli were, unhappily, mostly women and children. The inscriptions on the graves in the cemetery on the outskirts of Tripoli showed the victims to be of such tender ages as six, seven and nine. They died in their innocent sleep ... The mistakes made by the United States bombers in either identifying their targets or taking accurate aim led to many civilian lives and property being destroyed."

(S/PV.2683, pp. 31-32)

The international community has condemned this wanton aggression. The Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 1 to 6 September 1986 issued a statement in which the Conference declared that:

"The Heads of State or Government strongly condemned this unprovoked aggression, which constitutes an act of State terrorism and a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and called on the United States to desist forthwith from undertaking such aggressive acts, including military manoeuvres in the Gulf of Sidra, which are considered a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and which endangered peace and security in the Mediterranean ..." (A/41/697, p. 99, para. 215)

The Heads of State or Government also declared that

"the air attack against the residence of the leader of the Libyan revolution with the purpose of eliminating him and his family is considered a grave precedent in international relations and a crime that is devoid of any political or moral value." (A/41/697, p. 100, para. 216)

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

This aggression was also condemned by the Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity, who affirmed in the statement issued by their conference that

"The Assembly of Heads of State and Government wishes to convey to the present United States Administration that the April 1986 premeditated attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is not only a threat to peace, but constitutes an attack on the Organization of African Unity. In this regard, the Assembly of Heads of State strongly condemns this act of aggression that has further exacerbated tension in the Mediterranean and the Middle East." (A/41/654, p. 56)

On 2 October 1986 the Foreign Ministers of Islamic countries held a meeting in New York in which they also condemned this aggression and issued a statement in which they said

"The meeting vigorously condemned the American armed aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in April 1986 and called upon the United States to desist from any action that violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Jamahiriya. It also condemned the imposition of an economic boycott against the Jamahiriya and the freezing of its assets in the United States. (A/41/740, para. 23)

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

At its meetings in March and October 1986, the Council of Arab Foreign Ministers condemned the United States aggression against civilian targets in the Gulf of Sidra. In the statement issued at the end of one of those meetings, the Council strongly condemned the United States aggression against the Jamahiriya as a flagrant violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Libya. It stated that

"The continuation of this aggression constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the Arab countries and to international peace and security. The Council holds the United States responsible for the dangerous consequences of this aggression".

Various other countries of the world condemned and denounced that act of aggression. There were mass demonstrations in many countries - particularly in Europe, which the United States wanted to use as one of the tools in its aggression against Libya.

In addition the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) recommended that the United States military, air and sea attack be inscribed as a separate item on the agenda of the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

The Jamahiriya has resorted to the General Assembly in the wake of the failure of the Security Council to deal with this question, owing to the abuse of the veto by the United States and some of its allies.

The United States of America is one of the big Powers that enjoy permanent membership of the Security Council and, as such, it enjoys the right to use its veto power. That in itself automatically doubles the responsibility shouldered by that country under the United Nations Charter. Article 23 of the Charter stipulates that a country, in order to be elected to membership of the Council as a

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

non-permanent member, should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and should respect and observe the purposes of the United Nations. If that is the case, then it becomes quite obvious that the United States, as a big Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, has a bigger responsibility when it comes to the maintenance of international peace and security. However, the record of United States actions against small countries and peoples fully contradicts the letter and spirit of Article 1, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Charter.

The United States Administration prevents the imposition of any economic sanctions against the apartheid régime in South Africa. Notwithstanding the total condemnation by the whole international community of the abhorrent régime in South Africa and its obnoxious racist policy, the United States still brandishes the slogan of "constructive engagement" with that isolated racist régime.

In the Middle East, the United States is the ally of another racist régime - the Zionist entity. It has even concluded a strategic alliance with that entity. The United States frustrates the international community's attempts to condemn the Zionist entity's illegal practices and its military aggression against the Palestinian people under its occupation or against displaced Palestinians living in camps - not to speak of its aggression against the Lebanese people and the population of the Golan Heights. The United States has continuously provided that entity with financial, economic, military and technological assistance. That has encouraged it to continue its occupation of Arab territories, its refusal to withdraw from those territories and its non-recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and its just national aspirations.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

In Nicaragua, the United States Administration mined the ports of that country and imposed on it an arbitrary economic blockade. It is encouraging certain elements to overthrow the national Government of the country. It supports terrorists and regards them as freedom fighters.

In Cuba, the United States still insists on having a military presence. In addition, it has continued its economic blockade against Cuba.

We cannot fail to mention here what happened to the small people of Grenada.

Those are but a few examples. They are indicative but not exhaustive. What I have set out to do is make clear that the series of United States acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya fall within the framework of this United States policy which is characterized by strong opposition to the objectives and principles of small peoples. That policy is blatantly hostile to the aspirations of those peoples to be liberated from the chains of imperialism and colonialism.

The Jamahiriya has had to resort to the Security Council more than 26 times to submit complaints against United States aggressive practices. In some cases we have limited ourselves to warnings and to drawing the attention of member States to what was going on, through letters and notes which have all been circulated as documents of the Security Council and General Assembly. In other cases, we have called upon the Security Council to convene to consider the United States acts of aggression and threats against the Jamahiriya.

During 1983 we resorted to the Security Council nine times. We did so three times in 1984 and once in 1985. However, we have had to resort to the Council

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

13 times in 1986 either to complain about or warn of, or draw attention to, what has been going on.

The Council has never been able to take action when we have submitted complaints; it has never been able to adopt any resolution or even a statement condemning the United States military attacks. As a result we have had to resort to the General Assembly, just as another small people - that of Nicaragua - has had to do.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya sees in the United States armed aggression, the heavy military presence in the area and the continuation of military exercises and provocations a threat to the region's peace and security. Those practices are a reflection of the policy of terrorism practised by the United States against small peoples. More importantly, it is a clear violation of the provisions of the Charter, the principles of international law, the purposes of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the aspirations of the community of nations to peace and prosperity. The policy is also in contradiction with the General Assembly resolutions calling for the strengthening of co-operation and security in the Mediterranean in order to transform it into a sea of peace, security and stability, in addition to the promotion of economic and cultural ties in that area.

To our mind, the United States military aggression is part of the United States policy that seeks to intimidate and terrorize the world and threaten the peace and security of third-world countries. This aggression is but a link in the chain of United States policy aiming at subjecting peoples to its control and hegemony. To that end, the United States Administration raises very transparent pretexts such as the support of terrorism. The Assembly will be hearing from

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

succeeding speakers a number of fabrications and misleading information about what they claim to be terrorism.

But the United States Administration has failed to submit any material proof of what it calls Libyan terrorism. The Jamahiriya has repeatedly affirmed its rejection of terrorism and challenged the United States Administration to accept arbitration by the International Court of Justice regarding its claims. The Jamahiriya has also affirmed its prior acceptance of any decision taken by the Court. Moreover, the Jamahiriya has stated in official letters to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General that it stands ready to accept an international investigation by the Security Council - on condition that the other party accepts that procedure. I have reaffirmed that in an official letter to the Secretary-General and, in a meeting with him, I asked him to inform the United States Administration of Libya's readiness to have an international investigation by the Security Council or by the International Court of Justice. But I have received no response from the Secretary-General in regard to the position of the United States Administration.

The Jamahiriya, with its policy of non-alignment and neutrality, desires to establish balanced relations with all, on a basis of mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs. However, that willingness on the part of the Jamahiriya has met only with continued confrontation, provocation and aggression on the part of the United States Administration.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

The Jamahiriya reaffirms its commitment to the United Nations Charter and its readiness and willingness to co-operate for the good of all mankind.

The United States Administration is a tool in the hands of world Zionism and wishes to silence or stifle any voice that speaks out against its policy in the Arab region. After Libya, against which all kinds of accusations have been levelled, it now moves against Syria, using as its tool the United Kingdom - the United Kingdom of the Balfour Declaration, the United Kingdom which established the Zionist entity and the racist régime in South Africa - which now wishes, in collaboration with the United States Administration and in accordance with the Zionist scheme, to silence any voice that speaks out against it. An act of aggression was carried out against Libya and misinformation was disseminated. Now it is Syria's turn, and the United Kingdom is again being used, just as bases there were used as a jumping-off point to bomb Libya.

I cannot conclude without referring to a statement by Mr. Jacques Chirac, Prime Minister of France. I do not believe that either the United States or the United Kingdom considers him to be a friend of the Arabs or an enemy of the United States. Mr. Chirac affirmed, as reported in the Washington Times of 10 November, that Mr. Kohl, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Mr. Genscher, its Foreign Minister, both made it clear to him that the incident at London's Heathrow airport was prepared by the Israeli Mossad. We know how deeply the Israeli Mossad has put down roots in both the United Kingdom and United States intelligence services in its efforts to achieve Zionism's goals.

What Mr. Chirac said makes it quite clear that the Mossad was also behind the campaign against Libya and Syria. Having succeeded in silencing some Arab voices, they want to muzzle Libya and Syria and liquidate the question of Palestine after

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

the bombing of Palestinians in their camps. It is a manoeuvre, a plot hatched and carried out by both Britain and the United States as tools in the hands of world Zionism.

We hear both parties - the Zionist entity and the United Kingdom - speaking in the General Assembly in defence of the United States position and listing the accusations they have levelled against us. This Assembly, representing the conscience and the peoples of the world, will undoubtedly respond in an appropriate way to that act of aggression by denouncing and condemning it.

However, we must not confine ourselves to condemnation, because condemnation alone is not sufficient. The record of the United States Administration is replete with condemnations. Only yesterday the Assembly adopted a resolution on Central America which will not be implemented, as has been the case with previous resolutions. Yet we must close ranks and stand together to compel United States imperialism and its puppets and tools - its other tool being the Zionist entity - to respect the United Nations and its resolutions.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall make my statement on behalf of the Arab Group of which I am Chairman for the month of November.

I shall simply deal with the legal aspect of the repercussions of the United States act of aggression against the Libyan people and its future impact on international law, and allow other speakers who will participate in the discussion of this item to deal with the other aspects. I wish now to make the following observations.

First, was the attack in exercise of the right of self-defence - as alleged at the time - in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter? The various elements of the answer to that question are: (a) The text of Article 51 is clear in that the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

legitimacy of the use of force in self-defence is qualified by the prior occurrence of an armed attack against the State which wishes to justify its use of force on the basis of self-defence; (b) The armed attack by one State against another involves the use of the armed forces of the attacking country against the territory or political independence of the State attacked; (c) Acts of self-defence must take place immediately after the occurrence of the prior armed attack and must aim at repelling the attack and thwarting its objectives. In the famous words of a United States Secretary of State in the last century, Mr. Webster, self-defence must be "An urgent, immediate necessity that leaves no time for reflection or scope for a choice of means"; (d) Acts of self-defence must be commensurate qualitatively and quantitatively, with the armed attack that occurred previously. Those are the conditions of self-defence in international law. They are abundantly clear and there is therefore no need for me to review the facts. None of those conditions were met when the attack of last April took place.

Secondly, the text of Article 2 (3) of the Charter is explicit in committing the Member States to

"settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

Paragraph 4 of the same Article commits Member States to "refrain in their international relations from the ... use of force". Were those norms and principles observed or respected in the case under consideration?

The means of peaceful settlement of disputes - means long established in the custom of States - were embodied in the Manila Declaration, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 37/10 of 15 November 1982, and spelled out in its paragraph 5 to the effect that all States are committed to

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

"seek in good faith and in a spirit of co-operation an early and equitable settlement of their international disputes by any of the following means: negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements or agencies or other peaceful means of their own choice ...".

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

Did the parties exhaust all those peaceful means before the attack under consideration?

The danger of the use of force in international relations must be stressed. The main purpose of the international system and this International Organization is to avoid such dangers. Although the attack in question did not widen the scope of conflict or engulf the whole world, who can sincerely say with confidence that such recourse to force will not on the next occasion have the gravest consequences for the safety and security of the world, through miscalculation or error in estimating the implications, or through other factors that the attacking State may ignore, thus making it to be the first to be dragged into a world-wide conflict?

On behalf of the Arab Group, I call upon the Assembly to adopt the draft resolution.

Mr. BASENDWAH (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Since this is the first session of the Assembly since the American aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on 15 April, it is only natural that we should debate that flagrant aggression, so that we may adopt firm resolutions and decisions commensurate with the gravity of the aggression and of its consequences.

As we all know, on that dark day in April F-111 aircraft of the United States Air Force left their bases in the United Kingdom and, accompanied by other types of aircraft from the United States aircraft carriers stationed off the coast of Libya, violated the airspace of that Arab, African, non-aligned country, a Member of the United Nations and of other international organizations. They dropped their terrifying loads of bombs on the populations of the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi, claiming the lives of scores of women, children and defenceless elderly people, injuring hundreds of others and destroying houses and districts. They mercilessly killed innocent people with utter brutality.

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

In spite of all that, in an open challenge to world public opinion, the United States proudly announced its perpetration of that brutal attack. It was so proud of it, indeed, that the resident of the United States appeared on television as if he were giving good news to the American public.

The Security Council met immediately after the aggression and would have adopted a draft resolution clearly and unambiguously condemning the United States, but the United States representative resorted to his country's right of veto to prevent its adoption. The United States having prevented the adoption by the Security Council of that draft resolution, which enjoyed the support of an overwhelming majority of Member countries, I wish to take this opportunity to express my view about what I and others believe is a clear loophole in the Charter, even if this means a slight digression from the subject under discussion.

I do not contest the right of the permanent members of the Security Council to keep their veto. I do not deny their right to enjoy this exceptional privilege, since I know that its withdrawal would mean incredible problems for our international Organization, which in present circumstances can do without additional troubles and problems. Moreover, we all know that it would be almost impossible to make such a change.

However, I have no hesitation in saying that I deny every permanent member of the Security Council the right to use its veto power when it is the accused or a protagonist, since it could thus escape condemnation, thereby preventing the Council from exercising its authority and adopting the draft resolution before it. It would mean the accused or a protagonist in a conflict at the same time being one of the judges, using the veto to nullify any draft resolution that would otherwise be adopted against it. Would that be just or logical?

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

I was prompted to make that remark by the Security Council's having been prevented from taking a firm decision about the blatant American aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya last April. A number of other people have talked about the matter of the veto over the last four decades. I wanted only to give an example and prove that permitting the right of veto in circumstances such as I have described is an error which should be put right; the right should not exist.

However, I am fully aware that a country such as the United States would always find another to use the veto on its behalf. The clearest proof of that is that another country also used the veto when the draft resolution condemning the American aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was put to the vote in the Council. Therefore, the question is primarily one of principle: should the accused, a protagonist, or even its accomplice, have the right to participate in making the judgment?

Like other peace-loving countries which reject all forms of aggression, the Yemen Arab Republic did not hesitate to condemn the aggression immediately. The attack ran counter to all international rules and to the simplest norms of relations between States. Today I reiterate my country's position and call upon the Assembly to adopt a clear resolution condemning the aggressor and denouncing the crime. That is the least we can do. Whatever the might or power of any country, we should never overlook its behaviour; it has no right to violate the sovereignty of other countries or commit aggression against the people of any other country under any pretext or excuse.

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

This would transform our world into a jungle ruled by the logic of brute force. What happened to our sister Libya on 15 April 1986 and even before that date, as described in detail by Ambassador Treiki of Libya at the start of the debate, could happen to any other country if we remain silent and do not raise our voices to condemn and denounce, since we can only do that.

If we reject terrorism by an individual, we also reject terrorism by a country, particularly a super-Power. If the American Administration accuses some countries of supporting terrorism through some individuals, how would it characterize its brutal aggression against Libya last April? Perhaps the United States Administration thinks that we are stupid enough to accept its interpretation and explanation of its aggression as no more and no less than a retaliatory measure. I do not think that anyone on earth in his right mind could accept that logic.

What would be the explanation of international terrorism if the definition did not include aggression by one State against another State? Does not the United States consider the killing or kidnapping of an individual or the hijacking of an aircraft or a cruise ship by an individual or a group of individuals to be terrorist action that deserves condemnation. So should not squadrons of military aircraft violating the airspace of another country, dropping horrifying bombs and killing civilians be considered a clear case of terrorism? Did not that aggression result in the killing of innocent Libyan people, the destruction of many houses and the intimidation of hundreds of thousands of people in the Libyan capital, the city of Benghazi and other places? Is that aggression not the clearest manifestation of terrorism?

If we are concerned about the safety of an individual or individuals, we should be even more concerned about the safety of a people and the sovereignty of an independent country. If we do not endorse terrorism by an individual or a group

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

of individuals against a person or a group of persons, we must firmly reject terrorism by a country against another country and a whole people. Silence in the face of aggression by one country against another would transform our world into a jungle in which the Charter would have no authority and international law no prestige, and the United Nations, consequently, would lose its value entirely, and even the justification of its existence would be lost.

It has been revealed that in the wake of that aggression, the United States Administration has resorted to a disinformation campaign against that brother African and Arab country designed to mislead American public opinion in particular and world public opinion in general by deceitfully putting the responsibility for all terrorist actions all over the world on Libya. This was in preparation for the resumption of acts of aggression against Libya. But the will of God was strong and that very dangerous disinformation campaign was exposed.

These are facts that we have all learned by following the American media, but the United States Administration still stubbornly insists that the act of aggression against Libya on 15 April last was not aggression but merely retaliatory or disciplinary action. Of course, the United States Administration can say whatever it wishes, but we are not obliged to accept what it says.

We are called upon to adopt a position that expresses the letter and the spirit of the Charter and of international law and affirms our condemnation of aggression and the need to make the aggressor materially and morally responsible for the consequences of its aggression. The seriousness of the aggression is even greater when the perpetrator of that aggression is a country of the stature of the United States, which, as we understand it, should be the protector of peace and should respect the Charter and international law. Therefore, condemnation must be commensurate with the stature of the aggressor. This being the case, we do not want to bargain or make specious statements. We base ourselves on a clear

(Mr. Basendwan, Yemen)

conviction that the United States aggression against Libya on 15 April 1986 constituted a very dangerous precedent and that there must be no repetition of it. We should condemn it firmly and strongly, and, regrettably, that is all we can do.

Mr. PRESSLER (United States of America): The General Assembly is meeting here this morning at the behest of Libya. Libya is trying to portray itself as an innocent victim and to portray the United States as having engaged in unprovoked and unjustified action against us. Let us look very carefully, first, at these professions of innocence. Such a look should make clear why the United States, after many years of verbal warnings and appeals to this body, finally found it necessary, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, to act in self-defence on 15 and 16 April of this year.

Let us turn to this sordid record of Libyan terrorism and violence. We could begin in 1969 when Qaddafi came to power, but let us go back only towards the end of the last decade. In the wake of the seizure of our embassy in Tehran, the United States embassy in Tripoli was burned on 2 December 1979. The United States suspended most diplomatic activities, but a small embassy staff remained. The attack on our embassy was followed by similar attacks on the French embassy in Tripoli in early 1980, which led to the closing of our embassy on 15 February 1980.

The record of Libya's readiness to carry its terrorist campaign to other countries was similarly established early on. Already in February 1979 Libya had used civilian aircraft to send troops to assist Uganda's dictator, Idi Amin. By 1981 Libya had begun its campaign of assassination attempts and interference against Chad. In October 1981 the planned assassination of Hussein Habre during a visit to the Sudan failed when Libyans sent to conduct the operation surrendered to Sudanese authorities. In July 1983 Libyan forces invaded and occupied parts of Chad for the second time.

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

The Libyans started attacks on airline passengers, airports and civilian transport in 1981. In February 1981 a Libyan gunman opened fire on passengers arriving on a flight from Algiers at Rome's airport, targeting a prominent anti-Qaddafi exile. In October 1981 two bombs exploded in luggage being unloaded from a plane arriving in Egypt from Libya. In April 1984 a bomb hidden in an unclaimed suitcase unloaded from a Libyan airliner exploded at London's Heathrow Airport, injuring 25 innocent victims, civilians.

Another aspect of Qaddafi's world-wide terrorist campaign which started in the early 1980s has been assassinations of his opponents living abroad. In October 1980 a graduate student was shot and seriously wounded in Colorado; the following July another anti-Qaddafi student was skilled in Ogden, Utah. Throughout 1982 and 1983, Libyan students studying in Europe were harassed and their lives threatened. In March 1984 four bombs exploded in London and Manchester near the homes and businesses of Libyan exiles; over 25 people were injured.

The year 1984 was a particularly bloody year as Qaddafi spread his terrorist net throughout Europe and the Mediterranean. In March a mob burned the Jordanian embassy in Tripoli, while Libyan authorities stood by and took no action. In April 1984 shots were fired from the offices of the Libyan People's Bureau in London, killing a British policewoman. When the British Government closed the Bureau and severed diplomatic relations, the Libyans arrested a number of British subjects in Tripoli on trumped-up charges and held them hostage in an effort to pressure the British Government not to prosecute those arrested in London.

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

By mid-1984 Qaddafi's terrorist campaign entered high gear. In June 1984 the official Libyan news agency, Jana, announced that the:

"Libyan masses have decided to form suicide commandos to chase traitors and stray dogs wherever they are and liquidate them physically."

That same month the anti-Qaddafi Libyan editor of an Arab newspaper in Athens was killed by two men on a motorbike. Three months later, in 1984, a Libyan exile was found gagged and strangled in his hotel room in Rome. That summer 19 ships were damaged by mines which exploded in the Red Sea. These mines were generally accepted to have been laid by a Libyan vessel. In September the Libyans were again implicated in a plot to assassinate Chad's President Hussein Habre using a briefcase bomb. In November Egypt's President Mubarak announced that four assassins who had been sent to Egypt by Qaddafi to kill former Libyan Prime Minister Bakouh had been arrested. Pictures were sent to the Libyan People's Bureau in Malta showing Bakouh apparently dead. Official Libyan press sources then claimed that Bakouh had been executed by suicide squads sent abroad to liquidate enemies of the revolution. Qaddafi's intentions were clearly on record, although his thugs fortunately were unable to accomplish their mission.

Libya's terrorist campaign continued unabated during 1985. In a speech on 31 March 1985 Qaddafi urged that:

"Our task here in this command is to see to it that the individual suicidal operations are transformed into an organized action which will bear fruit, defeat the enemy and liberate the nation ... we want everyone of us to say: 'I have decided to die just to spite America, because this decision is one that America cannot veto'."

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

Who have been the victims? In February it was the former Libyan Ambassador to Austria who had resigned in protest against the régime five years earlier. In March it was a Libyan jeweller in Rome; in April a Libyan businessman in Nicosia, and a Libyan student and a Moroccan citizen resident in West Germany. In September it was two postal workers in Tunis injured by letter bombs smuggled into Tunisia by a Libyan diplomat. The incident caused Tunisia to sever diplomatic relations. That same summer my Government expelled a Libyan diplomat here at the United Nations whom we had found to be involved in a plot against Libyan opponents of the Qaddafi régime living in the United States.

The year 1985 ended with the horrendous terrorist attacks at the airports in Rome and Vienna on 27 December. Twenty people were killed, including four terrorists. More than 110 people were wounded. Five of the dead were Americans, including a teenage girl. Libya was deeply involved in support for the Abu Nidal group which co-ordinated and carried out these terrorist attacks. Libyan complicity was clear. Tunisian officials reported that the Qaddafi régime was in possession of two Tunisian passports which had been used by the terrorists. These passports could only have come into their possession with the deliberate connivance of the Libyan authorities.

We come now to 1986. Qaddafi's determination to spread death and destruction has led to further atrocities. The pattern of interference by force in the affairs of other African States has continued. On 10 February Libyan-backed rebels attacked Chadian forces in southern Chad, and on 17 February a Libyan bomber attacked the airfield at N'djamena. While Libya denied any involvement in the fighting, the Chad Government reported that Libyans were among those who were taken

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

prisoner. Alongside these events, Qaddafi's speeches were full of hate and violence. On 5 March he announced that:

"Any person who left Libya is now in the hostile ranks on America's side. He is finished. He will receive no mercy or compassion shown at home or abroad. All traces of him will be wiped out. Even his house should not remain."

On 5 April a bomb ripped through a West Berlin discotheque frequented by American troops, killing an American serviceman and a Turkish woman and injuring more than 230 people; about one-fourth of them were Americans. A second soldier died of his wounds in June. The irrefutable evidence pointed clearly to the involvement of the Libyan People's Bureau in East Berlin.

I will not repeat here the long list of verbal warnings and diplomatic efforts through this Organization by which we sought to dissuade Libya from its campaign of terrorism. They are a matter of public record in the documents of the United Nations and are available to all of you.

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

It was in these circumstances that we finally acted in self-defence. On 14 April our President Reagan authorized actions against centres of terrorist planning in Libya in response to repeated terrorist attacks against United States persons and property mounted under Libyan auspices. This step was taken with great reluctance: after repeated warnings; after conclusive evidence that the Qaddafi Government continued to involve itself in support and control of terrorist actions against United States targets; and after conspicuous surveillance of American installations and personnel and other similar actions by Libyans which pointed to further terrorism. Our strikes were limited to terrorist facilities and military assets which support Qaddafi's attacks on us. As the President stated at the time:

"The attacks were concentrated and carefully targeted to minimize casualties among the Libyan people, with whom we have no quarrel."

That night, the President, describing the monstrous brutality of Qaddafi's reign of terror, laid out the following standard of proof:

"The evidence is now conclusive that the terrorist bombing of the La Belle Discothèque was planned and executed under the direct orders of the Libyan régime. On 25 March, more than a week before the attack, orders were sent from Tripoli to the Libyan People's Bureau in East Berlin, to conduct a terrorist attack against Americans to cause maximum and indiscriminate casualties. Libya's agents then planted the bomb. On 4 April, the People's Bureau alerted Tripoli that the attack would be carried out the following morning. The next day, they reported back to Tripoli on the 'great success of their mission.'" As the President stated: "Our evidence is direct; it is precise; it is irrefutable."

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

Our evidence is sound. Those charged by their Governments with dealing in this kind of evidence recognize it as such. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has announced that it has independent confirmation of the Libyan involvement in the La Belle bombing. The members of the Tokyo Economic Summit and the European Community have declared that they cannot have normal relations with a State which supports terrorism, specifically citing Libya as one such State.

The question which many countries have asked is whether the United States response was proportionate; was it in accord with international law? The answer is, yes, on both counts. President Reagan has said:

"When our citizens are abused or attacked anywhere in the world on direct orders of a hostile régime, we will respond so long as I am in this Oval Office. Self-defence is not only our right, it is our duty. It is the purpose behind the missions ... fully consistent with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which recognized the 'inherent right of ... self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations'."

The United States action was taken to reduce Libya's ability to continue to commit unlawful aggression through terrorist force against the United States and its nationals. The United States action was not blind retaliation or the seeking of retribution. No. The United States actions were designed only to prevent further attacks.

Unfortunately, while responsible Governments have sought to isolate and contain Libya's terrorist virus, Libyan violence has continued. On 17 April four rocket-propelled grenades were fired at the British Ambassador's residence in Beirut. A Libyan-affiliated group, Omar Al Mukhtar, claimed responsibility. On the same day, one American and two British hostages were murdered in Beirut,

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

allegedly in reprisal for the air strikes on Libya. The next day four Libyans, including members of the Libyan People's Bureau, were arrested by Turkish authorities in Ankara for attempting to attack a United States Officers' Club.

Many Members were present at the non-aligned summit meeting in Harare this September. Qaddafi used that rostrum to challenge the principles of this Organization, to divide us into hostile camps and to champion the cause of terrorism. He said:

"I promise you from this rostrum that from now on I will, with all my capabilities, divide this world into two camps - the liberation camp and the imperialist camp ... everything must be liberated ... all the French-speaking States ... are not independent and are a fifth column inside this movement ... the word commonwealth is very embarrassing ... it means that you are properties of Britain ... it is something shameful."

Two weeks later Qaddafi equated terrorism with wars of liberation and revolution.

Thus, I have presented here today the record of the Qaddafi régime. The proof of Qaddafi's moral bankruptcy is before the Assembly. I ask members: what is the source of Libya's moral authority even to appear before this Assembly? What is the basis of its claim to be the exponent of international law and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter? It is the height of hypocrisy for Libya to present a draft resolution to the General Assembly which reaffirms:

"the obligation of all States to refrain from the use or threat of use of force in their international relations" and "the inalienable right of all peoples ... to choose their political, social and economic system without any interference, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever".

(Mr. Pressler, United States)

With all this Libyan-inspired activity, it is hardly surprising that Qaddafi's régime increasingly is shunned globally by Governments which abide by a sense of principled adherence to internationally accepted norms of behaviour. Let me emphasize, my delegation did not ask for this debate. But now that it is taking place, we hope that it will be the occasion for every country represented here to make clear its opposition to Libyan terrorism and to dissociate itself from Libya's aggressive rhetoric and reprehensible actions. The American people, as well as all those around the world who have been the victims of, or who fear Libyan terrorism, will be watching what this body does and says on this hypocritical complaint from a régime that deserves the contempt of the international community.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation was gratified to note the decision of the General Assembly to include in its agenda for this session item 142 devoted to the question of the military attack of the United States against Libya last April.

We have studied with interest the Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted at their session in Addis Ababa in late July this year. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic identifies itself with the content of that Declaration which represents the collective wisdom of the member States of that significant international organization. We also fully agree with the unequivocal conclusions reached with regard to this question at the eighth summit meeting of the non-aligned countries held in Harare. The Political Declaration adopted at that meeting says, among other things, that:

"The Heads of State or Government strongly condemned this unprovoked aggression, which constitutes an act of State terrorism and a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations."

(A/41/697, p. 99, para. 215)

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

We have closely followed developments in the southern Mediterranean, especially since the beginning of this year when the United States escalated its political, psychological, economic and also, later, regrettably, military pressure on the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

We have condemned the economic embargo imposed on Libya. We consider that action to be yet another link in the series of incidents of the misuse of international economic relations for political coercion. As a country that, together with other socialist States, has been exposed for decades to various sanctions, discriminatory measures, the impact of controls over "strategic exports", and so forth, we fully understand the justifiable indignation felt by Libya, as well as by a number of other Member States, at this step by the United States Administration. Incidentally, this example of the imposition of an economic embargo once again proves that there is justification for discussing such matters every year at General Assembly sessions. This phenomenon has to be eradicated from international economic relations.

Yet, regrettably, developments in the southern Mediterranean in 1986 have brought more than just economic pressure on Libya. The United States Navy and Naval Air Forces have carried out a series of manoeuvres of a clearly provocative and intimidating nature. This action in itself has brought about increased tension in the region. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic issued a statement on 25 March 1986 condemning the aggressive attack by the United States on sovereign Libyan territory. We also voiced our indignation the following day in the Security Council.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

We were in sympathy with the initiative of Malta in requesting, three days before the United States attack on Libya last April, the convening of the Security Council and, guided by the effort to avert the impending conflict, tried to involve the Security Council in preventive diplomacy in this regard - regrettably, to no avail.

The aggressive armed attack by the United States against Libya last April aroused the justified indignation of the world public and of the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations. This flagrant violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and civilized norms of conduct in relations among States was committed at a time when a Ministerial Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement was taking place in New Delhi. The participants in that meeting expressed, in their communiqué and later through their ministerial delegation that came here to address the Security Council, their disdain for the policy of gunboat diplomacy, which at one time was mistakenly considered already to have been laid aside and relegated to a chapter in the history of the international relations of the beginning of this century.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has unequivocally condemned the armed attack by the present United States Administration on Libya, an Arab developing country. We reaffirm our sympathy and solidarity with the people of that country and express our conviction that it will continue to withstand the pressure of those that have not accepted the progressive orientation of a number of developing countries, including Libya. We once again emphasize our strong disapproval of the use of force, international diktat and warmongering hysteria. We demand the discontinuance of military and other provocations against Libya and of all pressure on that country. This is necessary not only in view of the need for the peaceful

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

development of that country but also in the interest of the fate of peace and security in the entire Mediterranean region, which is so close both to Europe and to Africa and also to the severely tried Middle East.

In this connection, I wish to recall the statement made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the general debate at this year's session of the General Assembly, when he said:

"For our part, we believe that deterrence, intimidation and threats of retaliation could be replaced by firm guarantees of trust. Peaceful coexistence can and must become the highest universal principle of inter-State relations. Security must be viewed as mutual and indivisible."

(A/41/PV.18, p. 53)

It is our considered opinion that the United States should respond constructively and positively to the Soviet Union's appeal for the mutual withdrawal of their naval fleets from the Mediterranean. We appreciate and support the efforts of neutral and non-aligned States of the region to make the Mediterranean a zone of peace and co-operation, not of aggression, war and confrontation.

We are convinced that, if the international community exerts concerted efforts to this end and if there is sufficient political will, this goal can be attained.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is today discussing the agenda item on the United States aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The aggression took place last April but in practical terms, its consequences are still with us. It was an act of aggression against Libya by the United States Administration in which the United Kingdom took part by placing its territory and air fields at the disposal of the United States so that the latter could carry out that aggression. I think that the

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab
Republic)

item should have been entitled "United States and United Kingdom aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" in view of the fact that the aggression took place after consultations, preparations and planning by the administrations of the United States and the United Kingdom. However, some international and regional organizations - namely, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States - decided to refer to the United States aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya without mentioning the United Kingdom, since the latter country played a lesser role in that aggression.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab
Republic)

On 14 April 1986, the United States launched a barbaric, brutal act of aggression against the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. American fighter-bombers left United Kingdom airfields and, simultaneously, other United States fighter-bombers took off from aircraft carriers of the United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. Both flights headed towards the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, where they dropped their loads of bombs on purely civilian targets in the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi in a dastardly attack in the dark of night, killing and wounding scores of women, children and elderly people and destroying hospitals, schools, embassies and places of worship in a manner that gives the lie to the assertions of the United States Administration and its representative in the Security Council on 15 April that:

"... United States military forces executed a series of carefully planned air strikes against terrorist-related targets in Libya. Those strikes have been completed and the United States aircraft have returned to their bases."

(S/PV. 2674, p. 13)

Information indicated, however, that it was not military targets or, as the United States Administration claimed, "terrorist-related targets" that were hit, but civilian residential neighbourhoods, houses, schools and centres for the handicapped, along with the embassies of certain countries that maintain friendly relations with the United States.

The United States aggression against Libya was not decided upon on the spur of the moment and did not surprise the world. For several years now the United States has persisted in an aggressive, provocative policy with regard to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. That small, non-aligned country has repeatedly alerted the United Nations and world public opinion to the serious provocations by the United States,

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

its economic harassment and blockade of Libya and its attempts to bring the revolutionary régime in Libya to its knees. When those provocations failed to achieve this it became necessary to label the régime "terrorist" so that the United States Administration had a pretext for acting in its capacity as the world's gendarme and striking at that régime. It prepared the ground by an information campaign, which was carried out by the Zionist organizations in the United States, in which Libya was accused of being behind every act of terrorism in the world. The gullible Americans swallowed it all, having become accustomed to such effusions from the mouthpieces of the Administration in Washington. Those who were behind that campaign got carried away and believed that the charge of terrorism was sufficient to demolish the Libyan revolution and rob the Libyans of their great leader, Colonel Mu'ammarr al-Qaddafi.

The United States Administration has claimed that it has clear, irrefutable evidence that implicates Libya in acts of terrorism. Again, I shall quote from the statement of the United States representative in the Security Council on 15 April 1986:

"There is direct, precise and irrefutable evidence that Libya bears responsibility for the bombing in West Berlin on 5 April that resulted in the deaths of Army Sergeant Kenneth Ford and a young Turkish woman and injury to 230 other people, among them 50 American military personnel." (S/PV.2674, p. 16)

We listened that day to the United States representative quote President Reagan as if President Reagan were the International Court of Justice.

Did not the General Assembly this morning hear the Libyan representative, Ambassador Treiki, reaffirm his country's rejection of terrorism and challenge the United States Administration to agree to arbitration by the International Court of

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Justice? It is only natural that the United States Administration should turn down such a challenge. Its claims are basically lies against our sister country, Libya.

Regrettably, Mrs. Thatcher's Government was fooled by that propaganda into applauding and taking part in that act of aggression. However, by the time the American allegations were exposed - and here I refer to the resignation of the State Department press spokesman, Mr. Kalb, in protest at the disinformation campaign of the American Administration - it was too late for the British to pull out, because their hands had been stained for them with the blood of the innocents killed in Libya when they allowed their territory to be used as a springboard for acts of aggression against the Libyans.

There is no doubt that the United States aggression against Libya was premeditated. That Administration had been getting ready for that aggression for years. Notwithstanding the fact that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wanted to engage in dialogue rather than confrontation, the American Administration decided on what it fondly believed was the best course to implement its strategic schemes, which have absolutely nothing to do with what it calls terrorism. What the United States Administration opted for was blockade and aggression.

It is regrettable that the American Administration should have claimed, falsely, that it was exercising its legitimate right to self-defence in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, because, when there is such cynical flouting of the provisions of the Charter and this international Organization is so abused, it is the collective mind of the international community that is degraded. Is it reasonable to claim that Libya poses a threat to the security of the United States, as the United States

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Administration has claimed? Was it the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya that approached the American coastline and threatened the security of the United States, or was it the latter that went to Libya, to the Mediterranean, flexing its muscles and sending its fleet to roam those tranquil seas?

No great perspicuity is needed to solve this puzzle. The aim of the American Administration is to overthrow the rule of the Libyan revolution, under the leadership of Colonel Mu'ammār al-Qaddafi. Libya is a progressive non-aligned country, that has adopted an independent political, social and economic policy. Libya is in the forefront of the forces intent on the liberation of Palestine from the usurping Zionist enemy. Libya has friendly relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. Libya sympathizes with the liberation movements in the world and with régimes which the United States Administration hates. Libya condemns the system of apartheid in South Africa. The American Administration acts on the assumption that whoever is not its puppet or its vassal is an outlaw and a terrorist.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

That is the twisted logic of the United States. Libya liquidated British and American foreign bases in Tobruk and Tripoli; it closed down the United States oil monopolies. Hence, it became fair game and any means had to be used to liquidate the Libyan régime.

The United States aggression is a very dangerous precedent in the area of international relations. It is a flagrant violation of provisions of the Charter, the rules of international law and the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force in relations among States. The threat of the use of force is a form of State terrorism.

The presence of the United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and the constant threat it poses to the countries of the region are part and parcel of the policy of State terrorism. The history of the United States Sixth Fleet is replete with acts of terrorism. Beirut and its suburbs were shelled from the battleship New Jersey in 1983. And I would remind the United States delegation that the pilot Mr. Goldman - whom we subsequently turned over to the United States Administration - was shot down in an aircraft which had taken off from one of the aircraft carriers of the Sixth Fleet and was engaged in an attack against our military forces. The military aircraft that intercepted an Egyptian civilian airliner bound for Tunis and forced it to land on an Italian island took off from an aircraft carrier of the Sixth Fleet. Ships from that Fleet also helped to refuel Israeli planes on their way to bomb Tunis last year.

The policy of State terrorism pursued by the United States - directly or through threats and the existence of military bases - makes us wonder about this major Power which pays lip service to freedom and democracy while pursuing a policy of terrorism, committing acts of aggression, interfering in the internal affairs of

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

other countries and destabilizing them, and thereby violating the rules of civilized behaviour.

The United States has no rival in this field except the terrorist Tel Aviv Government, which engages in killing, displacement of populations, intimidation and unending bombings, thereby creating more refugees.

The United States aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was premeditated. It demonstrated the resolve of the United States Administration to liquidate Libya and its revolution. It was the conclusive proof that the United States is the principal enemy of the Arab people and the main support of the Zionist entity and all its aggressive and expansionist actions. It is the military arsenal of the United States that feeds the war machine of Israel. The Arab people will never forget the air lift by the United States to Israel to save it during the 1973 war. The Arab people cannot and will not forget that the United States gave Israel its blessing for the latter's aggression against Tunisia and the violation of that country's sovereignty and territory. They will never forget that the United States is the main obstacle to peace in the Middle East, because of its strategic alliance with Israel. That alliance is based on the total rejection of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and the refusal to concede that Israel must withdraw from the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories.

The aggression against Libya was not aggression against that country alone: it was aggression against the Arab nation as a whole. The campaign waged by Zionism in the United States has always been a campaign against the Arabs, their civilization and their values.

Britain's participation in the aggression against Libya had very serious significance. That colonialist State must bear the responsibility for its participation in the aggression. The British people, in demonstrations and through

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

debates in the House of Commons, expressed their anger at Britain's action in placing its territory and bases at the disposal of the United States Administration for the purposes of aggression against Libya. Britain's participation in the aggression against Libya would indicate that it still feels hatred for the Libyan revolution, which liquidated the British bases in Libya. By taking part in the United States aggression, the British Government proved that it can never forget its colonial past and its history in the area. It was Britain that conspired against the Arab people and the exercise of their right to freedom and independence. The colonial history of Britain is closely linked to the present developments in Palestine, such as the Zionist activities against the Palestinian people. Was it not Britain that gave Palestine to the usurping Zionists? Is not Britain responsible for the persecution and aggression and other practices of the apartheid régime in South Africa? The United States is not the only enemy of the Arabs. Britain is the partner of the United States in aggression. It is therefore also the enemy of the Arabs and must accept the consequences of its actions. Indeed, it is the cause of everything that has taken place in the area, for it implanted the Zionist entity in the heartland of the Arab nation, displaced the Palestinian people and co-operated with the United States in supporting that entity, thereby enabling it to occupy Arab territories. The history of Britain's role is well known. We are only too familiar with the aggression that it committed, together with Israel, against Suez in 1956.

The Security Council was prevented from taking any action because of the use of the veto by the United States. If we do not put an end to United States aggression, aggression will be committed against other countries. This aggression must be clearly condemned and guarantees must be given that it will not be repeated.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

We say to the aggressors that we will never be intimidated by their threats and will never say "yes" to their aggression. Our Arab people will continue to struggle against aggression and its perpetrators and to defend our territory, our dignity and our independence.

Mr. BUI XUAN NHAT (Viet Nam): The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at its twenty-second ordinary session in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 28 to 30 July 1986, decided, inter alia, that the issue of the aerial and naval attack by the present United States Administration against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should be put on the agenda of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. That timely and laudable initiative of the Organization of African Unity testifies to the high sense of responsibility and firm commitment of that organization, the spokesman for the interests of the African people, to the cause of peace and security in Africa and the world over. The inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly gives us an opportunity to consider a matter which is of grave concern to the international community.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

Seven months ago, on 15 April, the peoples of the world learned with shock and profound indignation of the air and naval blitz launched by the United States against Libya, a fully-fledged Member of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement. That act of open aggression was a gross violation of Libya's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and an insolent challenge to peoples throughout the world who love peace and justice, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and this important international body, the United Nations.

By timing the aggression to occur on the eve of a Ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement and despite the repeated efforts and appeals that had been made to dissuade it from taking any such precipitate step, the United States intended to deliver a severe warning to the peoples of the world, especially to those of small countries who wish to live in independence and dignity and who refuse to enter the United States orbit. The warning was well received. The Libyan people faced the challenge with admirable courage and determination. The world's peoples vigorously and fearlessly condemned it.

The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement meeting in emergency session on the same day, 15 April 1986, issued a communiqué in which it

"condemned this dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression against a fellow non-aligned country, which constituted a violation of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and endangered international peace and security ...;

"... demanded that the United States of America put an immediate halt to its military operations, which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, endanger peace and security in the Mediterranean region, and pose a grave threat to international

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

peace and security, and ... full and prompt compensation be provided to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the human and material losses that it has suffered." (A/41/285, annex, paras. 1 and 6)

That unequivocal position of the Non-Aligned Movement was reaffirmed in the final documents of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare from 1 to 6 September last.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU), of which Libya is a member, has expounded its stand on the matter most explicitly. The following is found in the Declaration of the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the OAU:

"The Assembly of Heads of State or Government wishes to convey to the present United States Administration that the April 1986 premeditated attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is not only a threat to peace but constitutes an attack on the Organization of African Unity. In this regard the Assembly of Heads of State strongly condemns this act of aggression which has further exacerbated tension in the Mediterranean and the Middle East." (A/41/241, annex, p. 2)

The same feelings were expressed by the Foreign Ministers of the Arab League Council, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, most States Members of the United Nations, numerous mass organizations and eminent persons all over the world. The progressive peoples of the world have addressed to the United States Administration a strong message that its criminal act of aggression against Libya is absolutely unjustifiable and intolerable. They have said "no" and will continue to say "no" to it.

We are all aware of the serious consequences and implications of the United States acts of aggression against the Libyan people for regional and international peace and security. Innocent persons - many of them women and children - have been

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

killed, civilian targets razed to the ground, and tension has been exacerbated. Similar aggressive actions by Israel and South Africa have been intensified against the struggling peoples in the Middle East and southern Africa.

What is still more serious is that those acts of aggression marked a shift in United States foreign policy towards increasingly open reliance on the use of force in international relations. Through the invasion of Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua and then the aggression against Libya, the United States authorities want to demonstrate that the Viet Nam syndrome is no longer holding them back from wars on foreign soil. The United States, while trying to avoid a second Viet Nam, seems prepared to engage in armed intervention wherever and whenever possible. This dangerous tendency must be ended if other small States are not to become victims. We appeal to the peoples of the world, including the American people, not to permit that.

Seven months have elapsed and the United States accusation against Libya has turned out to be mere deception. It is part and parcel of a large-scale campaign of disinformation directed at the newly independent States. The peoples of the world have had an opportunity to see how this dirty trick was used against Viet Nam, Cuba, Nicaragua, Angola and other countries. Many Americans, including former officials of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), have written about it. Most recently a high-ranking United States official, a State Department spokesman, resigned in protest against this infamous propaganda campaign. Lies and manipulation of words cannot cover up the truth. It is beyond any doubt that the United States Administration is pursuing a foreign policy of the threat and use of force to undermine the national liberation movements and interfere in the internal affairs of States; it is bent on implementing the "neo-globalism" doctrine. The

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

case of Libya is just a link in the chain. This is amply proved by situation in southern Africa, the Middle East, Central America and other parts of the world.

The people and Government of Viet Nam reiterate their full support for and militant solidarity with the Libyan and other Arab peoples in their struggle against United States-Israeli acts of intervention and aggression, and in defence of their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We strongly condemn the United States unprovoked attack and demand that all acts of aggression and provocation against Libya be halted immediately and unconditionally, and that full and appropriate compensation be provided to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We support all efforts aimed at turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation. In this regard we welcome the Soviet Union's proposal for the simultaneous and mutual withdrawal of the Soviet and United States naval units from the area as a step in the right direction.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

The situation in the Mediterranean remains tense and explosive. A large fleet is still poised off the Libyan coast. Provocative actions are still being taken against Libya, Syria and other Arab countries. If no measures are taken now, the incident of 15 April can be repeated at any time. In view of the gravity of the subject under consideration and its serious repercussions on international peace and security, our General Assembly should make its position undeniably clear, and come out in support of the Libyan people, victims of overt aggression.

Draft resolution A/41/L.35, which my country has the honour to sponsor, addresses the essence of the matter under discussion. It reiterates some of the views expressed earlier by the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and other regional and international organizations. In fact, it has been formulated to include what is considered the least the General Assembly can do within its power to help contain the situation and to prevent the tension from escalating.

The only way to normalize the situation in the Mediterranean is through dialogue, not confrontation. For its part, Libya has declared its readiness to settle all differences between it and the United States through peaceful negotiations on the basis of equality and mutual respect and to improve relations between the two countries. In this connection, my delegation endorses the appeal made by the Heads of State and Government of the OAU in their Addis Ababa Declaration on the matter:

"The principle of dialogue is a moral as well as political imperative which must be taken to defuse the situation as it exists between the present United States Administration and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya." (A/41/654, p. 57)

Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): The General Assembly is dealing today with the United States attack on Libyan towns in April this year.

The fact that this agenda item is being considered testifies again to the complex character of present-day international relations. On the one hand, there has been a growing awareness that in the nuclear age peace can be assured only through the common action of all States and peoples. This finds expression in the prospects opened up by the summit meeting between the Soviet Union and the United States as well as in the results of the Stockholm Conference and the agreements reached by the member States of the International Atomic Energy Agency to improve international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Other steps along these lines are the unilateral goodwill measures and the far-reaching disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist States and non-aligned countries, all of which are marked by a persistent search for dialogue and understanding.

In contrast to these efforts and hopeful signs, an increasing trend to settle problems by the threat or use of force, in disregard of the interests of the peoples, has been discernible. Neo-globalism, a quest for domination and military superiority and vast stockpiles of nuclear and conventional weapons are threatening mankind. This situation must be reversed with the energy and determination of all peace-loving States and peoples, irrespective of political and ideological differences. Especially today, relations of peaceful coexistence must determine international relations. The German Democratic Republic therefore condemned most strongly the barbarous and entirely unjustifiable raids on Libyan towns, and jointly with the other States allied in the Warsaw Treaty Organization expressed its

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

"deep concern at the rapid deterioration of the international situation brought about by the hostile acts perpetrated by the United States against Libya".

The German Democratic Republic is of the view that the act of aggression against that country, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the United Nations, constitutes defiance of the most elementary norms of international life and contempt for world public opinion.

Quite a few attempts have been made to justify that act of aggression. But all efforts to invoke a need for the use of force to settle conflicts have rightly been rejected by the international public. Today, too, concern has been aroused by attempts to launch a similar campaign against another State in the region.

My country has on various occasions outlined its position on the problem of terrorism, and I reiterate that we are opposed to any kind of terrorism. We condemn both individual terror and all forms of State terrorism, and are prepared to co-operate in combating them. But we oppose with the same resolution attempts to enforce selfish aims by military means under the pretext of fighting terrorism - all the more since every regional conflict is fraught with the danger of assuming global dimensions and unleashing a nuclear catastrophe that would destroy everything.

Common sense and realism are therefore imperative needs in international relations. They are an indispensable prerequisite for stability, continuity and predictability in world affairs. That is why the Charter, as a universally recognized code of peaceful coexistence, has lost none of its relevance. Many subsequent documents have reaffirmed the basic methods and procedures outlined in

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

the Charter to maintain peace and strengthen international security, as well as the people's right to self-determination. That goes, first, for the strict observance and strengthening of the obligation in the Charter to refrain from the use or threat of force in international relations. Another example is the document adopted at the Stockholm Conference, which delegations widely welcomed during the general debate at this session.

It is appropriate to recall here that the participating European States and the United States of America and Canada undertook the following commitment in that document, which was adopted by consensus:

"The participating States, recalling their obligation to refrain, in their mutual relations as well as in their international relations in general, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, accordingly reaffirm their commitment to respect and put into practice the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force, as laid down in the Final Act."

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

That means they will abide by the same commitment in their relations with any non-participating State in the Conference, regardless of that State's political, economic, social or cultural system.

The new way of thinking and acting that is required and has begun to emerge, should make it possible to settle existing conflicts and controversial issues, in the interest of the States and peoples concerned, exclusively by peaceful means, by a policy dictated by a responsibility for life. Our world is too fragile, and peace and security are too vulnerable to be carelessly exposed to the risk of destruction. Prudence, political wisdom and readiness for dialogue should determine political decisions. The socialist States have been guided by this need in proposing to the General Assembly at its forty-first session the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Such a system, covering political and military as well as economic and social aspects, would be particularly helpful in the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts. In this important and complicated field all-round conditions could thus be created for giving effect to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in the nuclear and space age.

If one looks at the map of the world, at the southern Mediterranean which has in its immediate vicinity a long-standing and most dangerous hotbed of tension - the Middle East - and also at Europe, one gets a feeling of the unpredictability of developments should any conflict break out there. The German Democratic Republic therefore supports all initiatives and measures which are designed to scale down political and military confrontation and tensions in the Mediterranean and turn the area into a zone of lasting peace, security and co-operation.

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

We support the Declaration of the eighth summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement at Harare which calls for the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean, and we also support the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity of July 1986, which states,

inter alia:

"The principle of dialogue is a moral as well as political imperative which must be taken to defuse the situation as it exists between the present United States Administration and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

(A/41/654, Annex II, p. 57, para. 7)

The German Democratic Republic will at all times stand at the side of those who are fighting for national independence, freedom and social progress. Our solidarity goes to the Libyan people and to all other peoples who are subjected to imperialist policies of aggression and threat. Our practical actions today and in the future will be guided by the conviction that the forces of peace, reason and realism will triumph over the forces of war and violence.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.