



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.78
22 November 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 20 November 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)
later: Mr. HENAR (Suriname)
(Vice-President)

- 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] (continued)

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 10.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 142 (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 (A/41/L.35/Rev.1)

Mr. KASIRYE (Uganda): In spite of numerous appeals from the international community for restraint, the United States of America, in complete disregard of the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law, launched a two-pronged attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the early hours of 15 April this year. This attack, which represented a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Libya, was the culmination of a whole series of hostile actions and measures taken by the United States Administration in a bid to bring Libya to its knees. These measures included, inter alia, the severing of diplomatic relations, the imposition of a trade and economic embargo, the carrying out of provocative naval manoeuvres in the southern Mediterranean, including the Gulf of Sidra, and the carrying out of a well planned campaign of disinformation about Libya.

The bombing, which was carried out by 18 F-111A fighter aircraft based in Britain, and 15 A-6 planes from the carriers Coral Sea and America, killed and maimed scores of women and children in their sleep and caused considerable destruction to civilian buildings and property.

On learning of this unprovoked attack on a fellow member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement, the Uganda Government issued the following statement:

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

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

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

Uganda, as a member of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, was party to the 15 April Communiqué in which the Ministerial Meeting at New Delhi

"noted with deep shock and profound indignation the armed attacks by the United States of America undertaken with support and collaboration by its NATO military ally, the United Kingdom, against the territory of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. They strongly condemned this dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression against a fellow non-aligned country, which constituted a violation of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and endangered international peace and security. This act of aggression by the United States was all the more condemnable since, by virtue of its position as a permanent member of the Security Council, it has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations." (A/41/285, para. 1)

The same sentiments were voiced by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its twenty-second ordinary session in Addis Ababa in July. In addition, that Assembly, in its Declaration, affirmed:

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

"The deliberate attempt to kill Libyan nationals in a plan of destruction that included the killing of the Leader of the Socialist Peoples Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Brother Muamar Al-Qaddafi, is not only a dangerous precedent, but constitutes a contemptuous and condemnable act in violation of the principles of international law;" (A/41/654, p. 56, para. 2)

In conclusion the Declaration stated:

"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. To this effect the Organization of African Unity stands ready to offer its good offices towards that objective." (Ibid., para. 7)

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

Uganda is an active member of the Non-Aligned Movement, and in this capacity was party to the decisions taken in Harare during the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government in September. 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 their 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 on 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, para. 82)

The Reagan Administration has sought to justify its actions against Libya as acts of self-defence provided for in Article 51 of the Charter. It has blamed numerous terrorist attacks, including the bombing of a discotheque in West Berlin, on Libya. Although the Administration claims to be in possession of irrefutable evidence of the Libyan Government's involvement, such evidence has not been produced to independent observers, or to anybody else so far as one can tell. My delegation is concerned that the action taken by the United States provides further encouragement to South Africa to continue with its acts of aggression against front-line States on the pretext of fighting terrorism; indeed, hardly two months had passed before South Africa launched further unprovoked attacks on Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana.

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

The Libyan Government has consistently denied any part in terrorist activities. When the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed this Assembly yesterday he stated

"The Jamahiriya has repeatedly ... 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."

(A/41/PV.76, p. 20)

It is the view of my delegation that this offer by Libya presents the United States Administration with a golden opportunity to prove its case against Libya beyond any reasonable doubt. In that way the world at large would be able to sift fact from fiction. My delegation has followed with utter dismay revelations about campaigns of disinformation and deception sponsored by the Administration against Libya. The world has a right to know the true facts.

My delegation believes that being a super-Power in political, economic and military terms has its obligations as well as its privileges. There is an obligation to exercise that power prudently and justly. There is an obligation to set a good example in the maintenance of international peace and security. There is an obligation to assist the weaker and less fortunate members of the international community. There is an obligation to share equitably in the exploitation of the earth's natural resources with those who are less endowed, either in resources or in technological know-how.

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

It is therefore a source of great disappointment to my delegation when super-Powers abandon those obligations to the community of nations and instead seek to advance their own interests, in complete disregard of the interests of the smaller and weaker States. Where can a small and weak State seek redress in the event of falling victim to aggression by a super-Power? Recourse to the Security Council is automatically rendered impotent by the offending super-Power, through its use of the veto. We cannot accept the concept that might is right, which appears to be the guiding principle of some countries. Even the International Court of Justice has not been spared such treatment. The mighty and the powerful can now decide for themselves whether or not it is convenient for them to accept the jurisdiction of the Court. Its decisions are contemptuously flouted. When we do not like the views expressed in certain international organizations, all we need do is to pull out, taking all our financial resources.

My delegation appeals for a change of heart before international anarchy becomes the order of the day.

I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the position of our National Resistance Movement Government on terrorism. Uganda condemns all forms of terrorism, whether committed by individuals, groups or States. For that reason Uganda joined the consensus support for General Assembly resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985 on measures to prevent international terrorism.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to make clear that the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is fully entitled to take appropriate measures to safeguard and defend its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. That is a principle which we recognize and fully support and one which ought to be respected by all nations.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly is now considering a question which is very important for the maintenance of international peace and security, that of the air and naval attacks against the Socialist Libyan People's Arab Jamahiriya. This item is of exceptional importance not only because its inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly was requested by a prestigious organization - the Organization of African Unity - but also because it touches upon essential principles and standards of inter-State relations in the contemporary world.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

As is stated in the Declaration of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted at its twenty-second ordinary session, last June:

"The deliberate bombing of civilian targets and the killing of children by United States fighter aircraft from aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, and those based in the United Kingdom, is ample evidence that the present United States Administration was determined to carry out an operation it had long planned, and found the pretext for it. The action is also inexcusable and condemnable." (A/41/654, p. 56)

It is quite understandable that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations are quite rightly alarmed and appalled at the dangerous turn of events in the southern Mediterranean region following the acts of armed aggression committed by the United States against Libya. The Declaration I have quoted, like the position taken on this question by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Harare Conference, is incontrovertible evidence of this.

As we know, the Security Council, as the sole organ of our Organization entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, was convened in April of this year to consider the situation thus created. The Bulgarian delegation expressed on that occasion its strong condemnation of the massive armed aggression perpetrated by the United States against a sovereign State as proof of the irresponsibility of the present Administration, together with its dangerous ambition to play the role of the world's gendarme, which punishes sovereign States when their policies are not to its liking.

There can be no doubt that the powerful campaign and the acts of aggression against Libya are but a new manifestation of neo-globalist ambitions that have a single aim, whether in Central America, the Caribbean, the Near East or southern

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Africa: the aim of erecting up barriers to the legitimate aspiration of peoples to develop in peace and independence and decide their own future. The international community cannot remain indifferent to the ambition of a great Power to arrogate to itself the role of arbiter judging by its own lights the policies of other sovereign States, whether situated close to it or thousands of kilometres from its territory. Even less valid is the explanation that that Power is thus combating terrorism and exercising its right to self-defence.

There is no doubt either that the open aggression of the United States against Libya is a further attempt by imperialist forces to destabilize the Arab world by striking a blow at those who oppose principled resistance to neo-colonialist designs aiming at the military and political domination of that region. No hypocritical pretext can justify the acts of aggression against Lybia, which could have uncontrollable consequences for international peace and security in that region and beyond it.

The General Assembly is examining this question also, and not least, because this is not the first act of provocation by the United States against Libya. The policy of the United States towards that country has for years already been characterized, contrary to the principles and rules of the Charter, by a whole range of military preparations, economic blockades and the continuous presence along the coasts of that country of combat units of the United States Sixth Fleet.

It is against that background that we should consider the latest campaign of disinformation prepared and implemented by the United States Administration and designed to increase the tensions in that region, which has led to the protests and deep indignation on the part of the entire international community and, indeed, of the American public itself.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

At the same time, the United States continues to seek pretexts for carrying out direct acts of aggression against Libya. It has set in motion its powerful propaganda machine, mobilizing all the national mass media for the purpose of exerting massive psychological pressure and creating the necessary climate of justification and approval of the aggressive policy against Libya.

In response to the deep concern of the international community, my country resolutely condemns the acts of provocation and aggression against Libya and their continuance in the future, since threats in this regard are already being heard. Such acts are contrary to such fundamental principles of international law as respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

As requested in the Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the OAU,

"The present United States Administration must cease its provocative acts in the southern Mediterranean, and desist from any future attacks against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a member State of the Organization of African Unity." (A/41/654, p. 56)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria appeals urgently for the cessation once and for all of infringements of the sovereignty and independence of Libya, the adoption of effective measures capable of guaranteeing that there will be in that region of the world no new acts of aggression, which could have unforeseeable, indeed fatal, consequences for international peace and security.

This is all the more necessary at a time when we are witnessing a new campaign of the same kind against another independent State of the region, Syria. All possible means have been set in motion to discredit also that non-aligned country, whose foreign policy is not to the liking of some.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

In the view of the Bulgarian delegation, the General Assembly should adopt draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1, which calls upon the Government of the United States to refrain from the use or threat of the use of force in the settlement of disputes and differences with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and to resort to peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The adoption of this draft resolution would clearly mean that our Organization is reaffirming what constitutes its firm foundation, namely, condemnation of acts of aggression and respect for the essential rules of civilized relations between States, whether large or small.

Mr. BARTKEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Consideration by the General Assembly of the question entitled "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" reflects the serious concern of the international community regarding the aggressive action of the United States against a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

It is difficult to disagree with the view expressed by the leaders of the African continent:

"the ... 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 that connection, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government:

"strongly condemns this fact of aggression that has further exacerbated tension in the Mediterranean and the Middle East". (A/41/654, p. 56)

Such an assessment of the piratical actions of the United States against Libya is fully justified and logical in so far as it reveals with utter clarity the essentially imperial approach of the United States of America to independent developing countries which, day by day, is taking on an ever more bellicose nature and one which is dangerous to the cause of peace. Such a policy and such a current in American foreign policy is the core of the policy of neo-globalism and State terrorism now adopted by Washington, aimed at trampling underfoot the legitimate rights and interests of peoples and in building up an atmosphere of war psychosis and whipping up the arms race.

It is for this very reason that the Soviet Government in its statement made in connection with the American air raid on civilian Libyan cities on 16 April 1986 emphasized that this criminal action of the United States military clique irrefutably testifies to the fact that the present American Administration is making violence, aggression and militant chauvinism the norm of its policy.

Firmly condemning the United States aggressive action against Libya, the Soviet Government once again came out in support of unswerving compliance with the principles found in the Charter and in United Nations decisions, principles which

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

do not allow for the use of force in international relations, the need for resolving any difficult questions through political means and respect of the right of each people to choose the ways and forms of its own development.

As is well known, the question of United States aggression against Libya was twice considered in the Security Council which, however, was not able to take the decision needed because a member of the Council whose actions were condemned in the draft resolutions blocked their adoption. Nevertheless, a very broad and extensive discussion which took place in the Council clearly showed that the anti-Libyan adventure of the American Administration is perceived throughout the world as a glaring violation of the United Nations Charter and of norms of international law, and also as a real threat to international peace and security.

The point was made that if effective measures were not taken to curb aggression against Libya then any other sovereign State could become the object of armed violence, with all the serious consequences which flow from this for the situation on the international front taken as a whole.

The major argument which representatives of the United States Administration resorted to in an attempt to justify this anti-Libyan action was the attempt to accuse Libya of supporting international terrorism. In this connection, it should be noted that recently this has become a rather odd kind of stereotype when the United States, or its strategic partner, Israel, carry out aggressive and piratical raids and acts and then, to justify their actions, they refer to the struggle against terrorism. Moreover, in so doing, they totally ignore the fact that the roots of the dissemination of terrorism, for example, in the Middle East, are found first and foremost in the fact that the Arab-Israeli conflict remains unsettled and the reason for that is precisely the reluctance of the United States and Israel to

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

renounce their attempts to impose their diktat and hegemony in the region and in the expansionist and annexationist policy of Tel Aviv, which is based on support and assistance rendered by Washington.

In the last analysis, things are developing in such a way that the claims of the United States and of Israel to the role of arbitrary chastisers lead to the replacement of principles of international contacts and behaviour by the law of the jungle.

There is hardly any need, we would think, to explain in detail the position of the Soviet Union regarding international terrorism. I should merely like to recall the following statement made in a recent interview by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Edvard Shevardnadze:

"Individual criminals and individual terrorists cannot be identified with States and peoples. Individual incidents cannot be used in order to punish peoples and States, as was the case with Libya and as is now threatening Syria. The problems of terrorism must be resolved jointly, pooling efforts to achieve the eradication of terrorism as an evil."

I should like to add that actions such as the aggression against Libya and several others can only create fertile soil for the growth of extremism and violence.

The attempts of the United States to justify the attack on Libya through references to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter are unfounded and totally unconvincing as was demonstrated yesterday in the statement of the representative of Qatar and that of other representatives. The real reason for these unbridled actions of the United States Administration clearly lies in the fact that the independent anti-imperialist policy of certain developing countries in international

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

affairs is not to its liking. And neither is the firm resistance to attempts made by the United States to impose its will. It is not to the liking of the United States that those countries firmly oppose the claims of the American Administration to deal with the developing countries as though they were its own property. It cynically wishes to show all the developing countries that if harsh bellowing from Washington is not sufficient to bring about changes in their independent policy, then the United States has in readiness naval forces and aircraft in order to impose order, using neo-colonial formulas prepared in Washington.

Condemnation of the United States attack on Libya was reflected in appropriate statements of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and in the decisions of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Harare, and in a number of other international forums.

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

In expressing its support for the provisions of those documents the Soviet delegation at the same time also believes that in order to prevent similar dangerous acts from being committed in the future, the General Assembly must also make its authoritative opinion felt and give a principled assessment of the aggressive actions of the United States. It must firmly come out in favour of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-use of force in international relations and must firmly demand a cessation of the policy of aggression, armed provocations and threats.

The Soviet delegation therefore fully supports draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1 and has become a sponsor.

The Soviet delegation would like to emphasize that the dangerous situation in the Mediterranean region resulting from the American adventurist action against Libya persistently raises the question of the need to step up joint efforts by States to adopt practical measures to strengthen security in the Mediterranean basin. A programme of action in that area was put forward by the Soviet Union and met with positive reaction. It includes a broad range of initiatives designed to weaken tension in that region, ranging from confidence-building measures in the military field to the reduction of armed forces and the withdrawal from the Mediterranean of nuclear-weapon-bearing ships.

What is also very important is the readiness expressed by the Soviet Union to engage immediately in negotiations with the United States on the question of the simultaneous and mutual withdrawal of the naval forces of the USSR and the United States from the Mediterranean. The objective of the Soviet proposals is absolutely clear. It is designed to normalize the situation in the Mediterranean, to lessen the level of military confrontation and to turn that region into a zone of stable

(Mr. Bartkevich, USSR)

peace and good-neighbourly relations. Implementation of that programme would exclude the possibility of a repetition of situations such as that under consideration today by the General Assembly.

In conclusion the Soviet delegation reaffirms the full support in solidarity of its country with the people and Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the defence of its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): The Lao People's Democratic Republic, like other countries and peoples all over the world who cherish peace, freedom and justice, welcomes the fact that agenda item 142 has been diligently and judiciously inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly. It shows how deeply concerned the international community is over a series of events that occurred in the first months of this year in the Mediterranean region as a result of the repeated acts of aggression and provocation committed by the air and naval forces of the United States against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

The whole world learned with indignation of the criminal bombing of the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi on the night of 14-15 April last by the air and NATO forces of the United States with the co-operation of a close ally.

The international community vigorously condemned that unprovoked military act of aggression. It will be recalled that in New Delhi the emergency meeting of the Ministers and Heads of delegation of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned on 15 April published a communiqué condemning that criminal act, while Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, President of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries, made a statement along the same lines.

The Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at the twenty-second regular session of their organization held in Addis Ababa in

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

July, as well as the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their Eighth Summit Conference held in Harare, in September, also condemned that act of aggression in their respective statements. The Eighth Summit Conference in its economic statement condemned the arbitrary measures taken by the American Government against Libya, such as economic boycotting and freezing of its assets in the United States.

The military acts of aggression that we are talking about, in addition to clearly violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Libya, a full-fledged member of the United Nations, of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries, and of the Organization of African Unity, constitutes a grave threat to regional as well as international peace and security, and thus flagrantly violates the United Nations Charter and the elementary principles of international law as regards in particular respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in their internal affairs, non-use of force in international relations and peaceful settlement of all international disputes.

In debates in the Security Council in March and April on this issue the overwhelming majority of speakers condemned and rejected the specious, not to say fallacious, pretexts and arguments adduced by the representative of the United States in defence of the criminal actions undertaken by his Government against Libya. His arguments were shared by two of the closest allies of the United States, permanent members of the Council. They included references to the right of self-defence, the concern for fighting international terrorism and so forth. Thus the United States arrogates to itself the right to commit acts of aggression against a small independent country, thousands of kilometres from the coast of the attacking Power.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

It is logical and reasonable to conclude that the military aggression of which Libya has been a victim has in fact been an act of aggression against a developing country, a member of the Organization of African Unity and of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is truly regrettable that on the eve of the year 2000 the United States Administration should still be practising gunboat diplomacy - or rather aircraft carrier diplomacy - against sovereign independent peoples and countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other parts of the world whose domestic or foreign policies may not be to its liking.

In Central America the heroic people of Nicaragua is as we know a victim of the policy of State terrorism. In South-East Asia, in my own country, as well as in other countries in Indo-China, we too not very long ago suffered from that policy.

The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in a communiqué issued on 15 April by the spokesman of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, which was read out to the Security Council by our representative two days later, joined in the international condemnation of the military and naval attacks against Libya by the United States. That is the Laotian position on the question before us. Not only is that criminal action condemnable and unjustifiable, but as draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1 underscores, its perpetrator should be required to pay to the victim, Libya, appropriate compensation for the human and material losses it has sustained as a result of that act of aggression.

My delegation wishes to reaffirm here the unwavering support that the Laotian people and Government have given and will continue to give to the just and heroic struggle that the people and the Government of Libya are now waging to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. ADOUM (Chad) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Chad, deeply concerned about the tensions throughout the world, wishes to express its position on item 142.

We should recall here one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations - the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations. In adopting that principle the aim of the founders of the United Nations was to eliminate war forever, thus ensuring world peace.

However, today hotbeds of tension are proliferating throughout the world, whipped up by certain régimes which, pursuing false dreams, organize destabilization and cause indescribable suffering to innocent, peaceful peoples.

At a time when the international community is mobilizing to face the problems of underdevelopment, such as hunger, drought, debt and the fall in raw material prices, certain States are engaging in subversion and trying to wipe out the commendable efforts that others are making at great sacrifice to themselves.

That is precisely the case with Libya, where an anachronistic, oppressive, terrorist and expansionist régime has been in power for more than a decade against the will of the Libyan people. That régime, intoxicated by sudden riches, muzzles its own people, summarily executes all those who dare to comment on its dictatorial and bloody nature and organizes, trains and finances all the tiny groups that sow terror throughout the world.

In neighbouring countries the Libyan régime has not ceased since the 1970s to stir up trouble and intervene militarily or by terrorist acts to carry out its sordid designs - among them the establishment of the so-called United States of the Sahel, which Qaddafi dreams of setting up a great empire and becoming its leader.

Therefore, when we speak of terrorism is it not right and relevant to remind the Assembly that terror would not exist in the world without the material and financial support of the undisputed head of international terrorism, Qaddafi?

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

Indeed, it has been proved more than once that all acts of terrorism throughout the world are ordered by Qaddafi, who acknowledged this recently in Harare, during the Eighth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, when he publicly declared that he was ready to lead an international organization for destabilization.

The list of Qaddafi's crimes is long and his criminal methods well known. Since he believes that he has a divine mission to purify our world, no continent and very few States have not suffered from his activism, terrorism and crimes - especially in Africa, where he has directed innumerable destabilization, subversive and terrorist operations against certain African régimes, that refuse his tutelage. Moreover, to serve his ends many training camps for terrorists and mercenaries have been set up on Libyan territory and elsewhere.

My delegation does not wish to go into the details here of events that are well known to all. However, we would stress that Chad, more than any other country, is the victim not only of Libya's hegemonist and expansionist plans, but of its acts of terrorism. It will be recalled that in the space of four years the Government of Chad has had recourse to the Security Council on a number of occasions. In April and August -

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): At the beginning of his statement the representative of Chad referred to the number of the agenda item under discussion, but he has gone beyond the bounds of the subject. I request you to draw his attention to the need to limit himself to the item under discussion, otherwise I shall have to raise another point of order.

The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Chad to proceed.

Mr. ADOUM (Chad) (interpretation from French): I was saying that in the space of four years the Government of Chad had had recourse to the Security Council several times: in April and August 1983 following the wanton bombing and pillaging of several areas in the north and east of my country; and in January 1985 because of the unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the President of the Republic of Chad, El-Hadj Hissein Habré, and the members of his Government - here I refer to document S/16923, of 5 February 1985.

More recently, on 18 November, my Government went to the Council with regard to Libya's persistent aggression and the acts of genocide which its army and its legion of mercenaries are now carrying out against the civilian populations of the occupied zone.

The terrorist Tripoli régime's aggression against Chad and its expansionist and hegemonist designs on my country first became apparent when, in 1973, it annexed the 114,000 square kilometres of Chadian territory known as the Aouzou Strip. It became clear with the Libyan military interventions of 1980, 1981 and 1983, which led to the present situation of the occupation of all of northern Chad, an area of 550,000 square kilometres. At the beginning of this year the barbarous Tripoli régime launched hostilities in February and March and in an attempt to extend its zone of occupation beyond the 16th parallel even dropped heavy bombs on the runway of N'djamena international airport, seriously damaging part of it.

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

Bearing in mind all these actions and the bellicose and barbaric behaviour of the Libyan régime towards Chad, the delegation of Chad, at the twenty-second ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held from 28 to 30 July 1986 in Addis Ababa, and at the eighth summit of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 1 to 7 September 1986 in Harare, expressed reservations regarding the condemnation of the American military air attack on Libya in April 1986. Indeed, how could it be otherwise while Libyans are, without distinction, massacring defenceless civilians in Chad and destroying our country and our identity?

Thus, while it is true that Libya suffered damage through the American air raid, that damage was undoubtedly slight compared with that caused to Chad by the Tripoli criminals, but was clearly exaggerated and blown up in the interest of Libya's cause, we believe that this gives Qaddafi an opportunity to understand and weigh the suffering Libya is causing the people of Chad who are the victims of his open aggression and who are now being subjected to artillery shelling bombing by military aircraft.

Yet the people of Chad have done Libya no wrong. On the contrary, the people of Chad offered the people of Libya asylum and hospitality during the difficult periods in the past. Why, then, should those same people of Chad today have fallen victim to such gratuitous acts of aggression? We hope that Libya will draw the proper conclusions and put an end to its unjustified aggression against the people of Chad, which bears no hatred towards the brother people of Libya, who are themselves victims of the tyranny of Qaddafi.

We must say, however, that if there is to be compensation as claimed by the Tripoli terrorists, we believe that their arguments should oblige them also to

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

compensate Chad for the hundreds of thousands of citizens of Chad who have died because of them and for the massive destruction and the serious setback to development caused by their actions.

Before concluding, the delegation of Chad would like to repeat here the appeal made on 6 October 1986 by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Republic of Chad, Mr. Goura Lassou, to the international community to put pressure on Libya to withdraw its occupying troops and its mercenaries forthwith from the territory of Chad and end the genocide in the occupied part of the country, so that at last the people of Chad may devote themselves freely and in a calm atmosphere deal with the development of the country.

We urge Qaddafi to cease to sponsor and orchestrate the odious terrorism that has so afflicted more than one family and more than one State.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): For a number of years now Yugoslavia has pointed with concern to the continued dangerous deterioration of the situation in the Mediterranean as a result of the failure to solve the problem of the existing hotbeds of crisis, the increasing presence of the military elements of non-Mediterranean Powers and their intensified rivalry in that area.

The unfavourable situation has of late been further complicated and aggravated by frequent military manoeuvres and demonstrations of force in the vicinity of the territorial waters of some Mediterranean countries. This situation, in our opinion, is fraught with the constant danger of the outbreak of unwanted dangerous incidents and constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the region.

Parallel with these developments we are witnessing ever more frequent encroachments on the security and stability of some Mediterranean countries, particularly the non-aligned ones, as well as attempts to influence their internal development and foreign policy orientation through pressure and threats.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Yugoslavia has always publicly stated its determined opposition to the recurrent demonstration of force and interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the region. We have clearly pointed out the unacceptability of such policy and behaviour, regardless of the motives and pretexts, which is a violation of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law. We have always stressed that dialogue and negotiations are the only acceptable means for the solution of problems and disputes, supporting fully and firmly the sovereignty and independence of all Mediterranean countries.

Aware of the fact that the Mediterranean is increasingly becoming a new, serious source of international tension with unforeseeable consequences for world peace and security, the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has pointed on many occasions to the dangers arising from such developments, which are a result of the failure to settle the existing crisis, increased rivalry between the super-Powers in the Mediterranean and the ever more frequent recourse to the policy of force and pressure.

Unfortunately, the dangerous developments which culminated in the aggressive attack by United States air and naval forces against civilian targets in the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on 15 April 1986 confirmed the justification for our concerns and anxieties.

That armed act, which coincided with the beginning of the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries in New Delhi, met with the unanimous condemnation and opposition of all non-aligned countries and the greatest part of the international public. The non-aligned countries issued a separate joint communiqué at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on this matter.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The non-aligned countries reiterated their solidarity with and support for Libya at their eight summit Conference, in Harare, Zimbabwe, held at the beginning of September this year. In the statement of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia my country condemned the attack against Libya, stressing that this

"violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a non-aligned country dangerously threatens peace and stability in this region and the world at large".

On that occasion the non-aligned countries also appealed to the political wisdom and sense of responsibility of those that carried out that military action to avoid further unfavourable developments and preserve peace and stability in the Mediterranean, and thus prevent the general deterioration of the international situation.

As a non-aligned Mediterranean and European country, Yugoslavia is naturally most directly interested in the situation in the Mediterranean. We proceed from the fact that peace and security in that region and in Europe are closely interrelated, which is also stated in the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The only way to overcome the existing dangerous developments is, in our opinion, by launching at an early date a process designed to lead to a lasting, just solution of the existing crises and conflicts which burden the situation in the region and prevent the creation of an atmosphere of confidence and dialogue. We consider that it is necessary in this context to leave it to the Mediterranean countries to seek the means and solutions which would enable them to influence the positive development of the situation in the region in a sovereign and independent

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

way and without external interference. This would bring about a lasting relaxation of tension and the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and all-round co-operation.

May I, in conclusion, quote from the message of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in February of this year. It urged:

"all factors of the international community to engage in the struggle against the use of force and confrontation and for the creation of better conditions for the strengthening of confidence and security in Europe and the Mediterranean, for the unhampered and free development of all Mediterranean countries and for encouragement of their mutual co-operation, in the interest of peace, stability and security in the Mediterranean, Europe and the world at large".

Mr. BEIN (Israel): Once again we are called on to consider and to vote upon a draft resolution which has been taken out of the theatre of the absurd - written in the Orwellian language of double think and mobile truth. The General Assembly is asked to condemn a country that dared to react - dared to strike at one of the centres of international terrorism - dared to defend itself.

Who is the victim and who is the aggressor? Should we not change the wording of the draft resolution and condemn Libyan terrorist attacks? Should we not reaffirm the right of the United States, and of European and other countries - as draft resolution A/41/L.35 states - "to receive appropriate compensation for the material and human losses inflicted upon" them - by none other than Libya?

In his statement yesterday, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya claimed that - as he termed it - "the barbaric and brutal attacks" against the bases of international terrorism in his country were a "danger to peace and security". Peace and security where? Definitely not in the free and democratic countries. Danger to peace and security to the bases of terrorism? Yes, I would hope so.

It is a known fact - and one that Libya is proud of - that since 1969, when Qaddafi came to power, Libya has supported, funded and trained virtually every known international terrorist group. Inside Libya there are at least 20 training camps for foreign - non-Libyan - terrorists. In these camps the terrorists are grouped by nationality. Arab terrorists are trained at the Sar'i and Alzawiyeh camps; those who come from African countries in the Zangour and Kudas camps, and so forth: terrorists from Asian countries in one camp, from European countries in another.

Once trained, the operations of these terrorists are supervised and directed by organs of the Libyan Government: The "Secret Bureau", which reports directly to

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Qaddafi; The "Arab Bureau", which supervises terrorism in the Arab world and the "Foreign Relations Bureau", which recruits mercenaries for operations around the world. These operations, then, are directed and carried out by yet other Bureaux: the "People's Bureaux" - namely, the Libyan Embassies which direct terrorist operations in the battlefield, the capitals of Europe, the Middle East and Africa. It was to one of these Bureaux - the Libyan Embassy in London - that orders were sent in April 1984 to open fire with automatic weapons on a crowd demonstrating in front of the building. A British policewoman was killed in that burst of gunfire.

There is no point in repeating here the list of terrorist acts perpetrated by Libya. We have heard this sordid record from several speakers over the last two days. Is there still doubt in the minds of any delegates present here that international terrorism is endorsed by Libya and tens of dozens of terrorist acts in foreign countries are orchestrated by Qaddafi and his Government? Even "price lists" payable by Qaddafi upon completion of terrorists acts have been published. On 27 April 1984, L'Express said that Qaddafi pays for terrorists acts committed in Lebanon: 20,000 pounds for throwing a grenade, 30,000 for "a kill". The pricelist is quoted in Lebanese pounds. Libyan terrorist activities, however, are not restricted to Lebanon. They touch every region of the globe. They include assassinations and kidnappings; bombings and attacks on civil aviation; subversive activities and outright military invasions.

Some of the African and Arab delegates seated here represent countries that have been targeted by Qaddafi: Sudan, Ethiopia, Tunisia, Egypt, Togo, Cote d'Ivoire, Zaire, Kenya - the list goes on and on. Just two days ago, in the Security Council meeting, we were all brought up to date on Qaddafi's latest exploits in Chad, a country which has for years been partly occupied by Libyan forces.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Libya's relationship with the PLO terrorist organization deserves special attention. Qaddafi not only finances the PLO on a regular basis, but on top of this he was and is bankrolling some of the most horrendous crimes committed by Palestinian terrorists.

Libya granted 5 million pounds sterling to the PLO's Fatah group "Black September" for the murder of 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympics - that is about £455,000 for the murder of each Israeli athlete.

In 1975 Qaddafi proudly announced another "heroic" murder when he financed the PFLP's seizure of an Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) building in Vienna where four people were brutally killed.

More recently, on 2 January 1986, according to West German sources Qaddafi held a press conference in Tripoli and announced another "holy activity" which he had financed. He gave \$13 million to Abu Nidal. For what? For a "holy activity" indeed. For the mass murder, the massacre of innocent tourists, for the killing of 14 civilians and the maiming and wounding of 120 in the airports of Rome and Vienna on 27 December 1985.

In February of this year a "congress" was held in Tripoli, Libya, an international congress of dozens of terrorist groups from around the world. Represented there were Basques, Catalans, Kanaks, Moros, Palestinians and Lebanese. A month later a "committee of 9" was nominated. Their mission was to improve the international network of terrorism, to better the ways and means to hit and intimidate free and democratic societies. With the aid of Syria and Iran, a "war cabinet" was established. They declared war against the West - against democracy - against all those who do not bend to intimidation and threats. Qaddafi and his senior allies prefer violence to all other forms of public and international activity - violence, not as a necessary evil, but as a desirable form of action.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

When organized crime disrupts life in a free society, we are bound to stop it. We do so by punishing those who organize it - the godfathers. Terrorism must be dealt with in a similar fashion. One has to go after its godfathers - after the planners, the trainers, the financiers.

What is at issue here is not whether Libya is responsible for perpetrating and organizing international terrorism. It is. There is no question about that. There is irrefutable evidence of Libyan complicity. The United States struck at the source - not only at those who pull the trigger but at those who pull the strings as well. What else could it have been expected to do? To wait for further acts of terrorism? For more "holy actions" and massacres?

What is at issue here is whether the civilized world can face the challenge of international terrorism. The United States - in the name of freedom - has sent a message, loud and clear. The message reached Tripoli and all other centres of international terrorism.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Contrary to the draft resolution before us, this message declares fundamental beliefs of the free world. Pirates at sea were eliminated by a bold decision and a concerted effort by the civilized world. Organized crime in every society is overcome by uncompromising action by those responsible for the well-being and protection of society. International terrorism must be dealt with in the same manner. The message is loud and clear: the free world will not surrender to intimidation and terrorism. We will respond to acts of terrorism and it will be directed at the planners and organizers, those who pull the strings - Libya and its allies who control the international terrorist network. Let us condemn international terrorism, not its victims.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The General Assembly now has before it a new agenda item which has been inscribed on the recommendation of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). This item concerns United States policies and practices against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

We all recall that before coming to the General Assembly the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had had to resort to the Security Council more than 26 times. Acting in blatant disregard of the Charter of the United Nations and all norms of international law, the United States circumvented all Libya's peaceful efforts by abusing its veto power. Thus Libya still remains under constant threat of further armed aggression by United States imperialism.

In normal circumstances, armed provocations and wanton acts of aggression carried out by the mightiest military Power in the world against an independent non-aligned country would have brought shock and astonishment. That seemed not to be the case, however, when the United States launched its piratical attacks against Libya, in the aftermath of a long series of economic and cultural blockades, political and military intimidation, a disinformation and propaganda campaign and

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

other acts of subversion and destabilization. The reason for this is mainly that the source of aggression is all too familiar and because the verdict of United States imperialism on progressive, independent countries is no longer a secret.

The United States, which has developed a curious attachment to the role of defendant in the Security Council, the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice and before the judgement of world public opinion, has broken by far all records set by it in the past for arrogant behaviour. Its ominous and bloody hands are stretched to virtually all corners of the world, with only one aim in mind: to mould the world in accordance with a pattern drawn up in Washington. To see that illusion materialize, Washington has set out to acquire unlimited and unquestioned supremacy over any and all nations. Thus, it has pumped trillions of dollars into the military, industrial monopolies in its lust to muster, quantitatively and qualitatively, an ever greater destructive potential.

In its unbridled striving, all political, legal, moral, terrestrial and space boundaries have been brazenly violated. Signed treaties have been abrogated and conspiracies are hatched to erect barriers to the conclusion of new treaties.

A preposterous mentality of jingoism and "Ramboism" has dominated the sick minds of the cliques in charge of affairs in United States militarist circles. The concept of the so-called new globalism has brought about a recrudescence of violence, aggression, interference and intervention. The use of direct armed force or proxies and mercenary legions has become a routine part of United States foreign policy and has been publicly debated in the centres of power.

These undeniable realities leave no shred of doubt of the arrogant and aggressive essence of imperialism in general and of United States imperialism in particular.

Although in the long run all mankind may be subjected to these policies and practices, for the moment a few carefully selected nations are the prime targets.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, along with several other progressive countries, is a natural object of imperialist machinations by virtue of its independent, non-aligned and anti-imperialist stance. Libya's steadfast and vigorous rejection of imperialist and Zionist designs against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and its consistent support for the forces of liberation and independence in the Middle East and in other parts of the world are a matter of record. Such a posture would inevitably occasion fluster and outrage in the White House. Hence the elaborate defamation campaign, the economic and cultural blockade, the acts of armed provocation and destabilization and the naked acts of aggression perpetrated by the United States against Libya are by all indications elements of a premeditated design within the overall United States global policy of state banditry and terrorism.

Some had naively wished us to believe that what happened in the Gulf of Sidra on 24 and 25 March and on 15 April this year was in exercise of the right of free navigation in international waters, or was based on the right of self-defence enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

There can be no denying the pervasive differences of the mind-set that identifies the opposing positions and underlies the conflicting arguments; but what was adduced by the aggressor - namely, United States imperialism - is nothing more than political balderdash which it is attempting to force down the throats of a watchful international community.

The United States Administration should be reminded that its undignified and impolitic endeavours to deceive American and world public opinion resemble, to put it mildly, the desperate efforts of someone to hawk his fake wares in a market of very unlikely customers. The ignominy of the American actions is most demonstrably unveiled by the United States Administration's stark adoption of a double standard on the Law of the Sea in general and on territorial waters in particular.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Other allegations of the United States Administration have also proved to be no more than sheer lies intended for casting a semblance of legitimacy over its criminal anti-Libyan actions. The disinformation scandal unravelled recently in the United States Administration leaves no room for any doubt in this regard.

It is indeed a contemptible absence of morality on the part of the United States Administration to bully small, independent nations with impunity. What was committed against Libya was nothing less than outright aggression, a grave violation of all norms and principles of international law governing inter-State conduct and a blatant affront to all humanity, which is struggling to strengthen international peace and security. No matter how hard the United States may try to the contrary, these facts shall continue to remain incontestable.

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has vigorously condemned the United States' illegal and hostile policies and practices against fraternal Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and has called for an immediate end to be put to the United States' aggressions, provocations, blockades and disinformation campaigns. We once again express our firm solidarity with the people and leadership of Libya in their efforts to safeguard the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and achievements of their revolution.

It is our expectation that the General Assembly will also uphold justice, condemn the aggressor for its totally unjustifiable actions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and call for appropriate compensation to be paid for the loss of lives and material inflicted on Libya.

Such a course of action would be in full conformity with the demands of the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States. We urge all delegations to give their full support to draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): For a year the Maghreb has been plunged into an era of violence and turbulence, fraught with danger for international peace and security. Brutal intervention and repeated bloody incidents and a multiplicity of individual or joint military manoeuvres and displays of force, the threat or use of force, have thus stamped with particular gravity the course of events in the region and prompt the deepest concern in my delegation.

Barely six months after the Zionist terrorist attack against the capital of Tunisia, which represented a dangerous precedent as well as a perilous development inasmuch as it constituted an extension of the area of Israeli aggression to the Arab Maghreb, yet another Maghreb country, Libya, was twice the victim of an unjustifiable attack against its sovereignty.

After an initial attack upon its territorial integrity, the Libyan people a few weeks later sustained a new armed attack, which revealed, by the full extent of the human and material losses it caused, the dimensions of the military resources mobilized to carry it out. More than Libya alone, it was once again the Arab Maghreb as a whole which was gravely affected, at a time when efforts were under way for the building of a harmonious Maghreb block based on the fundamental principles of the right to self-determination, non interference in internal affairs and strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Moreover, it happened at a time when the countries of the Maghreb had a right to expect the understanding and encouragement of all for the success of the process they had engaged in, the aim of which was to restore an abiding trust in the region in the best interests of all.

Aware of the dangers for the whole of the region, Algeria had expressed its deep concern and warned against the use of force, which could only heighten the tension in the Mediterranean, endanger peace and stability in the countries of the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

region as a whole and seriously compromise the chances of success of the move towards dialogue that had begun at the Maghreb level.

It was therefore essential that moderation and restraint should prevail between the United States and Libya and that an effort should be made through dialogue to seek ways for a peaceful settlement of such disputes as might exist.

That is even more true since one of the protagonists is a permanent member of the Security Council, whose actions on each occasion affect the credibility of the principles laid down by the Charter of the United Nations.

The concentration of foreign warships and fleets in the Mediterranean, the power rivalries of which the Mediterranean is the theatre and the prize, and the continuation in the Middle East of a grave conflict of which some stubbornly perceive only the side-effects are a permanent cause for concern.

Recent developments in the region have confirmed the fears that Algeria and the non-aligned Mediterranean countries have constantly felt at seeing their region increasingly exposed to aggression and foreign intervention.

This is why the non-aligned Mediterranean countries have from the outset consistently drawn the attention of the international community to the dangers looming over security in the Mediterranean and have called for an easing of tensions and for the withdrawal of foreign fleets from the region.

It is that same concern which led Algeria, even before the beginning of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to request that the approach to security and co-operation should proceed from a universal initiative, and thus should include the Mediterranean dimension. As recent history clearly shows, it would be illusory to imagine that a conflict occurring in the Mediterranean could be confined to that region. Recent events in the Mediterranean, which have had their implications for Europe, are there to remind the signatories of the Final Act

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

of Helsinki that the time has come to work with the countries of the southern Mediterranean in order to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation.

That aim, needless to say, can only be achieved through just and lasting solutions in the focal points of crisis in the region.

It is clear that the escalation of tension in the Mediterranean is caused by the dangerous continuation of many conflicts in which the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, as well as the sovereignty of States, are at stake.

The lasting damage done to peace and security in the Mediterranean and the Maghreb by developments in recent months is serious. It has struck a serious blow at the basic principles governing inter-State relations.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The acts of aggression of which the Maghreb has repeatedly been the victim make it increasingly imperative and urgent to adopt a policy to promote peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean, and to restore its historic role as an arena for trade and civilization. In the present context, the appeal to that effect made by the Ministerial Conference of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement meeting in Valetta in 1984 takes on even greater relevance.

Moreover the parties to a conflict, however serious and complex the problems that divide them, should seek patiently, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter, for a peaceful solution to their dispute, and should avoid any action or measure likely to endanger international peace and security.

The Security Council, which in all circumstances remains the organ that the Charter has entrusted with responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, has a duty to make every effort to ensure that peace and confidence can finally be restored in this very sensitive area of the world.

In conclusion, let me say that Algeria wishes to reaffirm its full solidarity with the Libyan people and to reiterate its strong and unwavering support for the safeguarding of the sovereignty and independence of Libya.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to introduce draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has the honour to present, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution in document A/41/L.35/Rev.1 entitled "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". That draft resolution deals with the question of the aggression perpetrated by a great Power with a

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as a permanent member of the Security Council.

That country has carried out an act of aggression against a small, non-aligned Arab African country whose sole crime is that it follows a policy of independence, refuses to subject itself to hegemony and maintains solidarity with the peoples fighting colonialism and racism, particularly in southern Africa and in Palestine, now occupied by the Zionist racist terrorist entity.

That is the reason why all the Zionist organizations and those who oppose liberation movements have devoted all their resources to stifling their aspirations to liberty and independence.

In its preamble this draft resolution stresses the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and norms of international law governing the rights of peoples and relations among nations, and the need for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. It deals with the American acts of aggression, the disinformation campaign directed against my country, and the stand taken by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, of the Organization of African Unity and of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in condemning that aggression.

In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly condemns this act of aggression, and calls upon the Government of the United States to refrain from the threat or use of force and to settle disputes ... by peaceful means. It also calls upon all States to refrain from extending any assistance or facilities for perpetrating acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Lastly, it reaffirms the right of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to compensation for the material and human losses inflicted, and requests the Security Council, in view of the continuing hostility shown to Libya and the repeated acts of aggression against another Member State of this Organization, to remain seized of the matter.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

We hope that the General Assembly will approve this draft resolution designed to put an end to such acts, for if the international community fails to give this question the necessary attention, there will be very serious consequences for many small countries and for their independence and sovereignty. For us our membership of this Organization is a guarantee of our security and independence. We believe that the doctrine of might is right, and that those who are armed to the teeth can act with impunity, is unacceptable. This is the challenge that our Organization is facing. We therefore hope that the Assembly will adopt this draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, I now call on the Observer of the League of Arab States.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): We in the Arab world have long been accustomed to seeing half-truths, untruths and outright lies about our countries in much of the Western media. It is an unfortunate fact that a fair number of those who write about or analyse events in our region seem to be unable, or unwilling, to deal honestly and informatively with the realities of the Middle East. But we have learned to live with this "misinformation", which gives the public false premises for evaluating the Arab scene, but does not threaten us to any great extent.

Lately, however, we have encountered a new form of falsification, a campaign of "disinformation", sponsored by a Government agency and used deliberately in an attempt to destabilize an Arab country. I am, of course, referring to recent revelations that the United States Administration sought late this summer to spread false and distorted information in the United States and in the world media about Libya, with the admitted objective of destabilizing it.

It is clear that the United States has developed a fixation about Libya and that for some time it has been operating a campaign just short of declared war against that Arab country. In fact, on 2 October, the day that the Washington Post

(Mr. Maksoud, League of
Arab States)

exposed the Reagan Administration's disinformation offensive, Secretary of State George Shultz said here in New York City in reference to Libya:

"We didn't have a declaration of war, but we have something pretty darn close to it."

On 15 April 1986, the United States launched air strikes against Tripoli, the Libyan capital, and other Libyan population centres. We all saw on television and in press reports the tragic results of the raids: a large number of dead and wounded civilians and extensive destruction of peaceful neighbourhoods, disproving United States claims that the warplanes attacked only military targets.

It was an act of aggression for which the United States could not provide, then or later, credible justification. There were accusations that Libya was linked to anti-United States violence in Western Europe, but no "evidence" was made public. Nor did the United States, as a responsible major member of the international community, as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, as a super-Power, see fit to follow the procedures open to it under international law to redress any grievance it may have had against Libya.

The United States could have come to the United Nations Security Council. It could have resorted to the International Court of Justice. It could have sought the help of third parties, including other Arab States. It could have taken advantage of any of these options if it were truly interested in settling its conflict with Libya. As we know, the United States ignored these remedies, provided under international law, and chose military force instead.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

It was, to say the least, disheartening to see this super-Power mobilize its fleets in the Mediterranean and launch long-range bombers all the way from Britain to attack a small country whose civilians were virtually defenceless in the face of the great war-making capacities of the United States. We all wondered at the time whether the attack on Libya was an example of how the United States proposed to solve its problems with nations of the third world, and we regretted that the great democracy, whose values and traditions were universally admired, had come to such a pass.

The Arabs were outraged that the United States, which hardly ever tires of emphasizing the importance of its relations with the Arabs, would bomb one of our countries, a member of the League of Arab States, and victimize men, women and children. Indeed, the negative ripples of the attack still persist throughout our region.

Perhaps those same United States decision-makers, who so glibly minimize the impact of the aggression against Libya on the Arab world, have yet to understand that all the Arabs consider themselves part of one Arab national constituency. Whatever our differences, they are part of our national affairs. When one of our countries is attacked by a foreign Power, we close ranks.

We have watched how the United States built up Israel's military strength beyond any defence requirements to turn Israel into a military Power, complete with a nuclear arsenal. We have protested, to no avail, against this build-up, which Israel, time and again, has used in devastating attacks against Arab countries, violating in the process the very United States laws under which those weapons were obtained. We have, moreover, witnessed with great consternation Israel's increasing influence over United States policy in our region, guiding it into ways that serve only the interests of Israel, which are not necessarily those of the United States and should not be.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

But Israel is at war with the Arab world, while the United States is not. In fact, the United States Administration and its predecessors have sought routinely to claim a privileged role in the Middle East, as the broker and mediator in the Arab-Israeli conflict, as the friend of many Arab countries, as the super-Power concerned about the security and stability of the region.

How can we reconcile those United States claims of concern about, and friendship for, the Arab world with the kind of United States actions carried out against Libya, an important member of the Arab League? And how can the United States Administration explain the inflamed rhetoric it used before and after the attack on Libya, the kind of reckless charges that generated a wave of anti-Arab feelings in the United States? It was a very sad experience to hear and read the irresponsible attacks against Arabs in general by members of the United States Congress, by American officials and by some in the United States media. Innocent people of Arab origin, good, solid American citizens, suffered as a result, and they continue to feel the backlash engendered by United States statements and actions last April.

Obviously, however, the United States was not content with the bombing of Libya. It felt no guilt about the human and material wreckage its bombers left behind in Tripoli and other Libyan cities. United States leaders saw no need to make public the evidence they claimed they had against Libya, despite repeated demands from many quarters for proof that Libya constituted a threat to United States interests or to the safety of Americans.

Barely four months after the air strikes, an organ of the United States Administration hatched its new campaign to destabilize that Arab country, the same aim it had hoped would be realized in the April aggression. By mid-August, as was discovered later, the State Department and the National Security Council were completing plans for a programme of disinformation against Libya, a programme based on feeding false, misleading and distorted information to the media.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

According to 2 October article in The Washington Post, which exposed the plan, President Reagan's national security adviser, Admiral John Poindexter, wrote in a secret memo:

"One of the key elements of the plan is that it combines real and illusionary events - through a disinformation program - with the basic goal of making Qaddafi think that there is a high degree of internal opposition to him within Libya, that his key trusted aides are disloyal, that the United States is about to move against him militarily."

By late August, stories attributed to United States Administration officials began to be published and broadcast in the United States suggesting the possibility of another military confrontation with Libya. Those new reports, described by the White House spokesman as "authoritative", quoted Administration officials as saying that the United States had new evidence of Libyan complicity in anti-United States terrorism and that the Administration was preparing to respond with economic, diplomatic and military pressure against Libya, including a possible repeat of the 15 April attack on Tripoli.

That campaign of disinformation caused widespread and serious concern in the Arab world, and even among United States allies in Europe, who still had misgivings about the April attack. The Los Angeles Times, in an article on 3 October, reported that some United States allies became so concerned about the reports of possible new United States military action against Libya that a special envoy had to be dispatched from Washington to reassure them that no armed clash was contemplated.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

The exposure of the disinformation campaign against Libya was, in some ways, as bad as the military strikes the United States had launched in April. Apologists could explain the bombing as an overreaction, perhaps a mistake in judgement. But there was no explanation for a campaign of lies, carefully crafted by the State Department, ostensibly the zealous guardian of America's touted diplomatic tradition, and implemented by the National Security Council, which is supposed to provide the President of the United States with the best possible advice on foreign policy.

It was, indeed, a sorry episode, a black mark against the integrity of a super-Power and a country with storied democratic traditions. What was even worse than the exposed campaign of falsehoods was the Administration's lame explanation that the lies were never meant to deceive the American media, only news organizations abroad.

Is this a new morality the United States Administration has adopted, one justifying deception abroad but not at home? What are we to think of America's word from now on? How can we trust United States assurances, pledges, promises, even signed agreements? That is why I saw that the disinformation campaign against Libya, in some respects, was at times worse than the attack of 15 April because if the bombing of Tripoli aroused anger against the United States and censure of its action, the disinformation campaign badly shook the world's confidence in its integrity and trust in its statements.

It is not for me to discuss here the damage this deception caused to the traditional compact between the media and the Government in the United States. Scores of editorials and commentaries have already dwelt amply on that point. But I can and will say that, at least in the Arab world, the revelations that the United States was not above using disinformation and distortion as a foreign policy tool has caused serious damage to America's credibility, particularly

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

because these deceptions were aimed at an Arab country already victimized by United States acts of aggression.

By persisting in its warlike hostility towards an Arab country, the United States has displayed total disregard for the rest of the Arab world. It is telling us that our feelings, our aspirations and the national bonds that intimately link us with each other are irrelevant in the eyes of those who make policy in Washington. It no longer even weighs the consequences of its actions, as if our region were some colonial backwater to be arbitrarily dismissed even when the destiny of its people is at stake.

Permit me to state clearly and unequivocally that the Arab countries and the Arab nation are not so easily dismissed. We have fought hard and worked long, against great odds, to liberate our homeland from the colonial yoke and to put our people on the road to a better life. Each sovereign Arab country conducts its relations with other States on the basis of respect for international law and conventions, and with abiding faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter. We expect those who deal with us to support these same principles, not just in words, but in deeds.

There was a time when we looked forward with great anticipation and hope to the development of enduring relations with the United States. Major disappointments over the years have taught us, however, to be much more cautious in our expectations.

To this day, many Arabs recall with admiration the name of Eisenhower, because in 1956 he forcefully told Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula, which it had occupied during the tripartite aggression against Egypt. Many more review with deep regret the stages that have marked the deterioration in United States-Arab relations, as the United States, abandoning even minimum impartiality, has increasingly underwritten Israel's many instances of aggression against Arab countries.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of
Arab States)

No matter how deep the rift between the United States and Libya, it does not justify United States airmen killing Arabs by dropping heavy loads of bombs on sleeping civilian neighbourhoods in Tripoli. Regardless of how intense is the desire of the United States Administration to cause problems for Libya, the disinformation campaign was not the honourable option to choose, certainly not the smart one. For in each case it was the United States that suffered damage to its reputation, its credibility and its judgement.

In the Arab world, an area valued for its strategic location and important resources, the United States has lost much of the goodwill that it once enjoyed, and goodwill is in itself a resource beyond estimation.

We simply cannot go on ignoring United States hostility towards this or that Arab country and accepting lame excuses for United States behaviour. We refuse to be divided into so-called moderates and radicals to suit some unrealistic yardstick crafted by American policy-makers to measure the degree of our response to United States policies.

As I have said many times before, Arab moderation or radicalism is predicated not on United States whims, but on the realization of our legitimate national rights and sensitivity to our aspirations. These include the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to their usurped homeland, to an independent State of their own. They include the right to liberate Arab lands occupied by Israel. They include our right to dispose of our natural resources without being accused of trying to beggar the West, especially the United States, and to undermine the world economy. Above all, they include our right to be non-aligned and to prevent our homeland from becoming an arena for global power games.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

When these rights are respected and achieved, all the Arabs are moderates. But when they are repressed, denied and ignored, then we invariably respond to radical appeals.

Our position has not been ambiguous. On the contrary, this world Organization has heard us proclaim our aims and our stance many times over the years. We have tried assiduously to make the United States understand us, and we still are trying. Yet it seems that our message either did not get through or was ignored, because the United States appears oblivious to the danger its recent policies and actions pose not only to relations with the Arab world but to the security and stability of our entire region. For it should be made obvious that military attacks and disinformation campaigns against one Arab country cannot but affect the rest of the Arab world, and in the worst possible way.

We seek no quarrel with the United States. We would much rather concentrate on developing good, friendly and productive economic, political and cultural relations with the United States and especially with its people. And we have demonstrated that we are willing to go extra miles to prevent confrontational policies and pay greater heed to the realities of our national purpose.

Our region is in need of peace and stability. The United States can still play a constructive role in achieving those aims, but not if it continues to opt for actions that make some people feel good at the expense of major and serious policy initiatives to secure long-term gains in a vital part of the world.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1.

(The President)

I remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1. At the same time, I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the position of the Chinese Government on the related questions concerning agenda item 142.

The attack carried out by the United States Navy and Air Force against the territory of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya last April was an act which contravened the norms guiding international relations and violated Libyan sovereignty and territorial integrity. China is opposed to such acts.

The Chinese Government always opposes and condemns terrorism in whatever form. We are against using terrorist means to carry out a political struggle. At the same time, we are also against violating the territory of a sovereign State on the ground of combating terrorism.

As everyone knows, the peaceful settlement of international disputes is a universally recognized principle in contemporary international law and also one of the important principles enshrined in the Charter. Strict observance of this principle in relations between States and to refrain from the use or threat of force against each other are obligations common to all countries. We are of the view that both the United States and Libya should abide by this principle and settle their differences in a fair and reasonable fashion through peaceful talks.

We are also of the view that the proposal and aspiration of the Mediterranean countries to make the Mediterranean a zone of peace, security and co-operation should be given due respect by all countries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (New Zealand): New Zealand will vote against draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1 because it involves General Assembly endorsement of a very one-sided and unbalanced view of the events of 15 April 1986. This is unacceptable to our Government.

In a statement on 16 April the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable David Lange, expressed the deep regret of the New Zealand Government that the United States should have considered it necessary to take military action against Libya. Major acts of terrorism, especially those conducted with the connivance or under the direction of a State, may justify the use of force, said the Prime Minister, so long as the force used is reasonable and proportionate to the danger. American military action may have been justifiable as an act of self-defence, continued Mr. Lange, but the fact that it conforms with America's rights under international law does not necessarily make it right.

New Zealand is opposed to all forms of violence in international relations. We have consistently condemned all forms and acts of terrorism. We shall support all efforts to protect the innocent against terrorism, to deter or prevent terrorist attacks and, if those efforts fail, to bring the perpetrators of terrorist acts to justice. We shall always be ready to play our full part in international measures to put an end to terrorist outrages. New Zealand also believes, however, that terrorism will not be eradicated until the situations that give rise to it have been resolved.

The draft resolution makes no reference to the actions of the Libyan Government over a period which provoked the United States attack. The failure of the Libyan Government to heed earlier American efforts to persuade it to desist from supporting terrorism should not go unremarked. Regrettably, the sponsors of the draft resolution have chosen to condemn the retaliation while disregarding the chain of events which led to the United States action - hence, our intention to oppose this draft resolution.

Mr. LUNA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): As a non-aligned country, Peru will vote in favour of the revised draft resolution because it constitutes a rejection of the acts of any State that departs from the rules of international co-existence established by the Charter of the United Nations and under international law.

At the same time, the Government of Peru wishes to reiterate its condemnation of terrorism in all its forms, whoever those responsible may be, whether individuals or States, and whatever the motives, or the national and international arenas chosen.

Similarly, we reaffirm our conviction as to the need to strengthen the multilateral international system represented by the United Nations, the sole medium for conducting civilized life between States based on the rule of law and justice.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1. We wish to add that we would have preferred to have before us a text that considered all aspects of the problem. That is why we feel we should reaffirm our position on this matter as set forth in the communiqué issued by the Ministry of Foreign Relations and Worship on 15 April, in which, inter alia, we stated:

"The Government of Argentina has repeatedly and emphatically condemned the terrorism in all its forms. At the same time we consistently oppose any act of military reprisal unilaterally taken by Governments that consider themselves affected by the commission of terrorist acts."

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): In the aftermath of the United States air raids over Libya last April, the following statement was issued on behalf of the Turkish Government on 15 April 1986:

"In view of the recently increasing tension in the Mediterranean, the Turkish Government had expressed its concern in its statement of

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey

25 March 1986. Later, the Turkish Prime Minister had personally voiced Turkey's concern about the danger of an armed clash in the Mediterranean and stated that Turkey desired the maintenance of calm and peace in the area.

"As a country which has suffered from international terrorism, Turkey is extremely sensitive on this question. Turkey has all along drawn the attention of the international community to the need for effective collective action to fight international terrorism and to refrain from selective attitudes in this regard. Action by all States in the framework of an effective co-operation is the only way to terminate terrorism in the world. Only through such an effective and collective co-operation can terrorism be prevented.

"Turkey, which has always been of the view that negotiations and other peaceful means should not be discounted in the settlement of disputes, cannot reconcile the air raids carried out today against Libya with the principles of international law.

"Turkey sincerely wishes the present situation to be defused before it assumes greater and more dangerous dimensions."

Our position remains unchanged. Nevertheless, we find it difficult to vote for draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1, because it does not encompass all the elements reflecting the position of the parties and does not take into account the distinct competence and responsibilities of the Security Council. We furthermore do not believe that the adoption of such a resolution can promote a solution to the dispute through peaceful means and a gradual return to normal relations between Libya and the United States. We shall therefore abstain during the vote on the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ireland, Jamaica, Liberia, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to 28, with 33 abstentions. (resolution 41/38). *

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. KEISALO (Finland): To explain the vote of the delegation of Finland on resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1, wish to state again the position of the Government of Finland concerning the use of force in all its forms.

* Subsequently the delegation of Papua New Guinea advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Keisalo, Finland)

The use of violence in international relations is inadmissible. This rule covers the violations of the territorial integrity of States, as well as acts of terrorism.

The cycle of violence which plagues today's world must be broken. Disputes must be settled peacefully through negotiations, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation was not able to support the draft resolution because its contents and formulations are not apt to promote the attainment of a peaceful solution to the dispute concerned.

Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Austria firmly believes in the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means. My country attaches the utmost importance to the obligations of all Member States under the United Nations Charter to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State and to settle international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered.

Consequently, the Austrian Government, as early as last April, voiced deep concern about the increased tension in the central Mediterranean region.

Austria has firmly and consistently condemned terrorism in all its forms. Austria hopes that it will be possible to resolve the dispute and the differences which are at the basis of this item by peaceful means.

Although Austria strongly subscribes to a reaffirmation of the obligation to refrain from the use of force, certain paragraphs of the resolution, which has just been adopted, appear to be inappropriate. For this reason the Austrian delegation decided to abstain on this resolution.*

*Mr. Henar (Suriname), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. ENERLOF (Sweden): The Swedish Government's position on the American military attack against Libya on 15 April 1986 has been made clear. The Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a statement on that same day, said, inter alia, the following:

"The action by the United States is in contravention of international law as it is set out in the United Nations Charter and other documents. Conflicts must be resolved by peaceful means. An attack against the territory of another State in peacetime is contrary to the principles that regulate the relations between States.

"We call most urgently on the States involved to show restraint and to seek, by diplomatic means, to settle the conflict that has arisen."

The reason given by the United States for the attack was that Libya was responsible for acts of terrorism. The Swedish Foreign Minister, therefore, went on to say:

"The Swedish Government has repeatedly condemned all forms of terrorism. This threat must be met by intensified international co-operation. Terrorist deeds must be combated by political and police means, not by acts of war."

My delegation can support several elements of the resolution just adopted. In our view, the American military attack against Libya cannot be defended under Article 51 of the Charter.

The resolution, however, rather narrowly focuses on only one, although extremely serious, action in the dispute in question. Furthermore, it contains elements, notably in the eighth preambular paragraph, which my delegation cannot accept for reasons of principle. Therefore, my delegation had to abstain in the vote on the resolution, in spite of our support for its general thrust.

Mr. SPOTTORNO (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The position of my country regarding the events that took place on 15 April 1986 and which form the subject of the draft resolution upon which we have just voted has been stated by the Spanish authorities and is well known to all Member States. Spain voted against the draft resolution today because it reflects an incomplete picture that is out of context with the complex set of circumstances and the factors that played a relevant part in those events. In particular, there is no reference in the resolution to the problem - unfortunately, a very real problem - of international terrorism, which for us is a subject of particular concern and which my country categorically condemns.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): A draft resolution sponsored by the Soviet Union which talks about the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own form of government and to choose their political, social and economic system without any interference, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind represents a kind of sarcasm. Failure to respect those rights is precisely that Power's habitual form of conduct. In our view, its sponsorship of a draft resolution on a subject of this kind disqualifies that draft resolution.

My country and my delegation reject the use of force. Indeed, throughout our history we have frequently given concrete proof of our commitment to the policy of settling disputes by peaceful means. However, this draft resolution does not tackle the problem that has arisen and is obviously not balanced.

The matter with which the Assembly is dealing cannot be broached without mentioning terrorism. We note that the mention of terrorism in a draft resolution previously submitted to the Security Council has been removed.

My country, a victim of terrorism and violence, encouraged by several of the countries that sponsored this draft resolution, cannot support a decision that

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

disregards terrorism, which is an essential element of the matter before the Assembly. For this reason, my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. JOSSE (Nepal): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/41/L.35/Rev.1, which has just been adopted by the General Assembly. As a small peace-keeping, peace-loving country committed to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, Nepal has, as a matter of principle and practice, consistently opposed the use or the threat of the use of force in the settlement of international disputes or differences between States Members of the United Nations.

In the light of the many references to terrorism made during the debate on agenda item 142, my delegation wishes to place on record once again Nepal's firm opposition to terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, as well as Nepal's expressed desire to co-operate with all regional and international endeavours to combat this deadly affliction of our times.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): The Arabs are one nation, one body. If one member of the body is ailing, the other members feel sympathetically the same aches and fevers, as the Prophet Mohammed said.

Whatever the points of view of the Arabs on different issues, there are two things about which they have no difference. The first is that any act of aggression against any Arab country is an act of aggression against the whole Arab people. The killing of one Arab citizen is considered to be the killing of his Arab fellowmen.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

Those that bombarded Tunisia and murdered innocent civilians, both Tunisians and Palestinians, bombarded Arab cities and Arab citizens. Those that daily murder the Palestinians in southern Lebanon or other occupied Arab territories murder Arab citizens. Those that struck the Iraqi nuclear reactor struck an Arab nuclear reactor.

I totally understand that the representative of the Zionist entity, Mr. Netanyahu, is not aware of this fact, because on the one hand he is alien to the area - the Bostonian accent that characterized his statement testified to that - and on the other he is not well-read in history, because he has devoted his time to terrorism, so that he has become an expert in terrorism and its practice. I confirm to him that when we settle our differences, unify our positions, realize our potential and act in accordance with our cultural status, he will have no place among us.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

He will have to go back to Boston to lecture on terrorism, being an expert who has practised it.

The second fact, over which as Arabs we have no difference is that racism in all its forms, whether based on colour in southern Africa or on race and religion in occupied Palestine, is the chief enemy of all Arabs.

The representatives of the Zionist entity are the last to have the right to speak of terrorism, because their State is based on terrorism. It practises terrorism daily. It has exported it to the Middle East region. Israel's Prime Ministers, from Ben Gurion to Shamir, are well known terrorists, as the records of the Ministries of the Interior of European countries testify. Let us read what was reported in the French news agency on the eve of Shamir's accession as Prime Minister of Israel:

"He was born in the east of Poland and emigrated to Palestine in 1935. At that time he was 20 years old. He joined the clandestine terrorist Irgun gang at a time when that organization was planting bombs in Arab markets. In 1940 he joined the terrorist movement led by Abraham Stern. The British arrested him for the first time in 1941. However, he was able to escape. Then he was arrested once more in 1946 and was banished to Eritrea. However, he managed to escape. He went to Djibouti, then to France, and in May 1948 Shamir went back to occupied Palestine."

That quotation is not from an Arab news agency but from a European news agency well known for its credibility and the accuracy of its information.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to express the appreciation of my delegation and of the people of my country to all those who voted in favour of the draft resolution just

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

adopted, in defence of justice and right and in condemnation of arrogance and hegemony. Despite the fact that I could find some excuses for some of the States which abstained or even voted against the draft resolution - few as they were - because we know the power of the dollar and the strength of the elephant, yet I take pride in the fact that small countries with very limited resource have come out to give expression to the conscience of humanity by condemning aggression and standing by the side of the right of peoples. That gives us hope and raises our confidence in the United Nations and the role it plays as an international organization devoted to the defence of peoples and the rejection of exploitation, aggression and racism.

I asked to speak in order to refer to some of the paragraphs in the statement of the strategic ally of the United States of America, the representative of the 51st American State - the Zionist representative. Here I would recall what was said by an American diplomat in Cairo: "Tel Aviv is closer to Washington than Hawaii or Alaska". However, the words uttered by the representative of the Zionist entity are a source of pride and honour to us.

When the representative of the Zionist entity slanders us and speaks of terrorism, while his very presence here is a symbol of terrorism, because he is present here over the corpses of millions of Palestinians, that confirms the meaning of terrorism.

Just as Rhodesia became Zimbabwe - and we heard its voice yesterday and witnessed its vote today - so-called Israel will become Palestine. History will correct itself. Might was of no use to either Mussolini or Hitler. Peoples are always victorious in the end.

The result of the vote with such a large majority affirms the falsity of the allegations made by the United States Administration and confirms that the United

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

States act of aggression constitutes a violation of the Charter and of all norms of international law. The United States Administration has been exposed on the question of the disinformation campaign and again it is being exposed by the General Assembly today. We have declared, and continue to declare, that we are opposed to terrorism; but we declare also, and strongly, that we support liberation movements. We will support the Palestinian people until they have liberated their land and until the terrorist Shamir and others have been expelled.

We support and will continue to support the people of Azania until racial discrimination has been brought to an end once and for all. We are not afraid or intimidated by the campaign of disinformation or by acts of aggression. We lost half of our population in defence of our territory against the Fascist Mussolini. We stand ready to make considerable sacrifices to defend our country against Zionist arrogance and aggression, which unfortunately has employed the greatest country in the world to carry out its schemes. It is truly regrettable that a permanent member of the Security Council should be used by the Zionist entity as a tool of aggression.

However, we are confident that the great American people - a people who achieved unity, fought against British colonialism and liberated their country, a people who today enjoy their freedom - will very soon free themselves from Zionist domination once and for all. We shall stand by the American people, and by all the other peoples who are intimidated by world zionism.

World zionism used Britain at one stage to achieve its interests. That was when the Balfour Declaration was signed and this odious alien entity was established over the corpses of a whole people. Today it is using the greatest Power in the world.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

But the American people are having their wealth squandered - \$5 billion is being given to the Zionist entity every year to build more settlements on Arab land and to perpetuate this occupation; this money would better be used in the United States or for the benefit of the peoples. There are 15 million children in Africa who need immunization against diseases; hundreds of millions of people are starving to death; yet at the same time billions of United States dollars are squandered on lethal weapons for the Zionist entity, for Savimbi, to kill the people of Angola, and going for the contras, to kill the revolutionaries in Nicaragua. We hope that the United States will reconsider this policy; we hope - and we would be grateful - to see this policy of animosity towards the peoples of the world change. We will be the first to stretch out the hand of friendship to the United States. We have no desire for or interest in antagonism to America; we would like to be friends with the American people. But we refuse to be anyone's lackeys or puppets, the United States or anyone else. If the United States stretches out the hand of friendship to the peoples, we shall be the first to extend our hands to the friendly American people.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Zionist régime occupying Palestine was imposed upon the international body in the early days after the Organization was born. In those days imperialism had more control over the Organization and more power to manipulate it. It was at that stage of infancy and immaturity, and under the control of imperialism, that the occupation of Palestine was wrongly and mistakenly recognized by this body. We know that all of us have done things in our childhood that we would not do as mature persons. As a representative in this Organization, I cannot and will not reaffirm the mistakes that the Organization made in its infancy. The régime occupying Palestine is a mistake. This régime should not be here at all. It has no legitimacy. The

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

international Organization will sooner or later apologize to the Muslim world for this gross mistake that it has committed.

The second point is that this régime is based on a mistake and therefore all its actions, whether within or outside the Charter of the United Nations, whether they are in accordance with the rules of procedure or in discordance with the rules of procedure, all of them are wrong. They are just illegitimate; they have no basis of legality at all. Therefore it is ill-judged to point the finger at some of the activities of this régime and to condone others. This is just wrong; it is a mistake. It should not be here, either for good or for evil. This is a legal fallacy, and the product of an absurd political paradox.

Thirdly, this régime, in terms of both its Administration and its actions, remains a terrorist régime par excellence. Almost all its high-ranking officials are professional terrorists with clear records of terrorist activities in different parts of the world. So far as the actual practices of the régime are concerned, everybody knows of Sabra and Shatila; everybody knows of their dirty and ugly practices, expansionist policies, the policies that it has towards the Palestinians inside and outside the country, the policies that it has had and still has with regard to Palestinian girls in the schools and in the hospitals. They are well known. All these practices show that this régime remains a criminal régime and a terrorist régime. For this it deserves the sincere condemnation of every human being, every representative, every delegation and every honest person who is committed to the principles of humanity, international law and moral rectitude.

Fourthly, this régime is also a criminal régime and a terrorist régime. Its terrorist activities are slightly different from its criminal activities.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. BEIN (Israel): The President has given Iran the right to speak in exercise of his right of reply. We are listening here to a speech which calls for the eradication of a Member State of the United Nations. It openly calls for war. I would ask the President not to let the representative of Iran go on with his speech.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you, Mr. President, for ignoring that irrelevant point of order.

This régime, as I was saying, is a criminal régime. During 1967 I was in Beirut and it was in that year when the war broke out. I have all the newspapers, which have fully registered the details of the crimes that régime perpetrated in Jordan, in Syria, in Egypt and inside occupied Palestine. The people of the region...

The PRESIDENT: I call upon Israel on a point of order.

Mr. BEIN (Israel): This is not the item on the agenda. The representative of Iran is supposed to exercise the right of reply. To whom does he reply?

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): It has been involved in committing crimes all over the place - in the neighbouring countries and inside occupied Palestine. For this it must be condemned, and we strongly condemn it. This régime has murdered many thousands of innocent Muslims and non-Muslims both inside and outside Palestine. For its acts of murder and genocide, it must be condemned. This régime is a racist entity. Its racist inclinations and propensities are facts recorded in international documents and it must be strongly condemned for them. The official representative of this régime, to the best of my

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

interpretation of what has happened in the course of the history of the United Nations, is the official representation of international terrorism, racism and crime. In this sense, the international body is enjoying the concept of universality because it has accommodated the dirtiest representation. For this we condemn the régime and its representation in the international body.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Finally, the representative of that régime is also a liar, because on page 7 of his statement he said that a war cabinet had been established with the assistance and co-operation of three friendly countries, Iran, Libya and Syria. He said that that war cabinet was established against the West. Regrettably, this war cabinet has not yet been established. I think it should be established, and when it is established it will definitely be against the occupation of Palestine. Of course, our position, the position of Libya, the position of Syria and of many other countries in the Arab world towards the occupation of Palestine is quite clear. We have nothing, no war cabinet, nothing, against the West.

The error that the régime is committing is that it is hiding its dirty face behind the West. It thinks that people will buy that falsehood. Nobody will buy it. That representation is not representing the West and we are not in any alliance against the West. We are in the West, and in the West there are plenty of good things. We have moral criticisms of some aspects of the West, but that has nothing to do with it. The unity which exists between Iran, Libya and Syria, and some other Moslem and Arab countries, is based on many important things. One of the most important and strongest elements which binds us together is our opposition to the occupation of Palestine.

I can assure Members that this unity will remain and this opposition will remain active. We shall soon eradicate the occupation of Palestine and the flag of Palestine will be rehoisted. The seat which has been usurped here by the representative of the régime of occupation will soon be given back to its rightful owner, the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 142.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.