



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

SUPPLEMENT FOR JANUARY, FEBRUARY AND MARCH 1981

UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1982

YOUNG LI KU

NOTE

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

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

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

**CHECK LIST OF SECURITY COUNCIL DOCUMENTS ISSUED DURING THE PERIOD
1 JANUARY-31 MARCH 1981**

NOTE. The titles of the documents printed in the present *Supplement* appear in bold type. Unless otherwise indicated, the other documents remain mimeographed and are kept for archival purposes in the Dag Hammarskjöld Library.

Document number	Date	Subject Index*	Title	Observations and references	Page
S/14311/Add.1	13 January 1981		Election of two members of the International Court of Justice: note by the Secretary-General transmitting the list of candidates nominated by national groups	Circulated under the double symbol A/35/786/Add.1-S/14311/Add.1 (see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-Fifth Session, Annexes</i> , agenda item 15 c)	
S/14313/Add.1-3	2, 13 and 14 January 1981		<i>Idem</i>	Circulated under the double symbol A/35/788/Add.1-3-S/14313/Add.1-3 (see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Annexes</i> , agenda item 15 c)	
S/14320/Add.1 and 2	7 and 21 January 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the representatives and deputy and alternate representatives of the members of the Security Council elected for the period 1981-1982		
S/14323	6 January 1981	a	Letter dated 5 January 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General		1
S/14324	7 January 1981	b	Letter dated 24 December 1980 from the Secretary-General to Governments of all States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies, containing a further appeal for voluntary contributions for the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus		1
S/14325	12 January 1981	c	Letter dated 8 January 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		4
S/14326 and Add.1-12	9, 13, 22 and 26 January, 2, 13, 17 and 23 February, 2, 11, 23, 24 and 30 March 1981		Summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration		
S/14327	14 January 1981	a	Letter dated 12 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General		5
S/14328	15 January 1981	d	Letter dated 14 January 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		6
S/14329	16 January 1981	e	Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraphs 5 and 7 of General Assembly resolution 35/146 A and paragraph 5 of resolution 35/146 B	For the text of the resolutions, see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 48</i>	
S/14330	16 January 1981		Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 35/154, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons"	For the text of the resolution, see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 48</i>	

* The letters in this column correspond to those in the index on page viii and indicate the subject matter of the documents to which they refer.

Document number	Date	Subject Index*	Title	Observations and references	Page
S/14331	16 January 1981	f	Letter dated 14 January 1981 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Secretary-General		7
S/14332	16 January 1981	f	Letter dated 15 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General		7
S/14333	19 January 1981	g	Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978)		8
S/14334	19 January 1981	a	Letter dated 15 January 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		10
S/14335	19 January 1981	h	Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General		10
S/14336	20 January 1981	a	Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the Secretary-General		11
S/14337	21 January 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the deputy and alternate representatives of Tunisia on the Security Council		
S/14338	20 January 1981	i	Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of the United States of America to the Secretary-General		12
S/14339	23 January 1981	a	Letter dated 22 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General		12
S/14340	23 January 1981	h	Letter dated 22 January 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General		13
S/14341	23 January 1981		Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraph 17 of General Assembly resolution 35/117, entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity"	<i>Idem</i>	
S/14342	23 January 1981	d	Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraphs 4 and 13 of General Assembly resolution 35/169 A	<i>Idem</i>	
S/14343	23 January 1981	f	Letter dated 23 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General		13
S/14344	23 January 1981	f	Letter dated 21 January 1981 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Secretary-General		14
S/14345	29 January 1981	a	Letter dated 27 January 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General		14
S/14346	29 January 1981	g	Letter dated 28 January 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General		15
S/14347	29 January 1981	g	Letter dated 29 January 1981 from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council		23
S/14348	29 January 1981	f	Letter dated 27 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General		23
S/14349	30 January 1981	a	Letter dated 28 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General		25
S/14350	30 January 1981	d	Report of the Secretary-General [submitted in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/122 D]		25
S/14351	2 February 1981	a,c	Letter dated 29 January 1981 from the representatives of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		27
S/14352	2 February 1981	j	Telegram dated 30 January 1981 from the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to the Secretary-General		30
S/14353	2 February 1981	j	Letter dated 1 February 1981 from the representative of Ecuador to the President of the Security Council		31
S/14354	30 January 1981	d	Letter dated 30 January 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council		31
S/14355	3 February 1981	d	Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		32
S/14356	3 February 1981	d	Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General		32

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject Index*</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>	<i>Page</i>
S/14357	3 February 1981	f	Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General		33
S/14358	3 February 1981	k	Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Mozambique to the Secretary-General		33
S/14359	4 February 1981	e	Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 35/206 A, paragraphs 2 and 3 of resolution 35/206 B, paragraph 1 of resolution 35/206 C, paragraph 3 of resolution 35/206 D, paragraph 6 of resolution 35/206 O and the operative paragraph of resolution 35/206 Q	For the text of the resolutions, see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 48</i>	
S/14360	5 February 1981	a	Letter dated 3 February 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General		34
S/14361	5 February 1981	e	Note by the President of the Security Council containing the text of his statement made in the Council on behalf of its members on 5 February 1981	For the text of the statement, see 2264th meeting; see also <i>Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1981</i>	
S/14362	5 February 1981	j	Telegram dated 5 February 1981 from the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to the Secretary-General		35
S/14363	5 February 1981	j	Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the representative of Ecuador to the President of the Security Council		36
S/14364	6 February 1981	a	Letter dated 4 February 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General		36
S/14365	6 February 1981	d	Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the representative of Morocco to the Secretary-General		37
S/14366	6 February 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the representative of the United States of America on the Security Council		
S/14367	6 February 1981	k	Letter dated 6 February 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General		37
S/14368	9 February 1981	k	Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique to the Secretary-General		38
S/14369	9 February 1981	a	Letter dated 6 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		39
S/14370	10 February 1981	k	Letter dated 9 February 1981 from the representative of India to the President of the Security Council		40
S/14371	10 February 1981	j	Letter dated 10 February 1981 from the representative of Peru to the President of the Security Council		40
S/14372	11 February 1981		Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 35/219 A, concerning the inclusion of Arabic among the official and working languages of the Security Council	For the text of the resolution, see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 48</i>	
S/14373	12 February 1981	a	Letter dated 10 February 1981 from the representative of China to the Secretary-General		41
S/14374	17 February 1981	c	Letter dated 13 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		42
S/14375	18 February 1981	f	Letter dated 17 February 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General		42
S/14376	19 February 1981	d	Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		43
S/14377	19 February 1981	c	Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General		43
S/14378	19 February 1981	l	Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Sierra Leone to the President of the Security Council		44
S/14379	19 February 1981	m	Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Iran to the Secretary-General		47

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject Index*</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>	<i>Page</i>
S/14380	20 February 1981	j	Letter dated 20 February 1981 from the representative of Chad to the President of the Security Council		47
S/14381	24 February 1981	d	Letter dated 24 February 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council		48
S/14382	25 February 1981	b	Letter dated 23 February 1981 from the representative of Turkey to the Secretary-General		48
S/14383	25 February 1981	d	Note verbale dated 24 February 1981 from the Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Secretary-General		49
S/14384	25 February 1981	j	Letter dated 23 February 1981 from the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America to the President of the Security Council		49
S/14385	25 February 1981	h	Letter dated 24 February 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General		50
S/14386	26 February 1981	a	Letter dated 25 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines to the Secretary-General		51
S/14387	27 February 1981		Letter dated 26 February 1981 from the representative of Egypt to the Secretary-General [concerning the ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by the Government of Egypt]		51
S/14388 [and Corr.1]	2 March 1981	a	Letter dated 25 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines to the Secretary-General		53
S/14389	2 March 1981	d	Letter dated 27 February 1981 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to the Secretary-General		53
S/14390	2 March 1981	g	Letter dated 1 March 1981 from the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon to the Secretary-General		54
S/14391	3 March 1981	d	Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council		55
S/14392	4 March 1981	c	Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General		55
S/14393	5 March 1981	i	Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of the United States of America to the Secretary-General		56
S/14394	8 March 1981	d	Letter dated 8 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council		56
S/14395	9 March 1981	g	Letter dated 6 March 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General		57
S/14396	9 March 1981	b	Letter dated 6 March 1981 from the representative of Cyprus to the Secretary-General		60
S/14397 and Corr.1*	10 March 1981		Note by the Secretary-General drawing attention to paragraph 15 of General Assembly resolution 35/158, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security"	<i>Idem</i>	
S/14398	10 March 1981	d	Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council		61
S/14399	11 March 1981	b	Letter dated 9 March 1981 from the representative of Cyprus to the Secretary-General		62
S/14400	11 March 1981	d	Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General		62
S/14401	16 March 1981	m	Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Iraq to the Secretary-General		63
S/14402	12 March 1981	d	Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		64
S/14403	12 March 1981	d	Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		65

* Circulated on 8 June 1981.

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject Index*</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>	<i>Page</i>
S/14404	12 March 1981	d	Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General		65
S/14405	13 March 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the deputy and alternate representatives of Ireland on the Security Council		
S/14406	16 March 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the representative of Uganda on the Security Council		
S/14407	16 March 1981	d	Special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon		66
S/14408	17 March 1981	a	Letter dated 16 March 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General, transmitting the military map of February 1981 published by the high command of the national army of Democratic Kampuchea together with an explanatory note on the said map	Circulated under the double symbol A/36/131-S/14408	
S/14409	17 March 1981	d	Letter dated 16 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		67
S/14410	19 March 1981	n	Letter dated 17 March 1981 from the representative of Mauritania to the Secretary-General		68
S/14411	19 March 1981	d	Note verbale dated 17 March 1981 from the Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Secretary-General		68
S/14412	19 March 1981	k	Telegram dated 18 March 1981 from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique to the Secretary-General		70
S/14413	19 March 1981		Report of the Secretary-General concerning the credentials of the representative of Panama on the Security Council		
S/14414	19 March 1981	d	Note by the President of the Security Council containing the text of his statement made in the Council on behalf of its members on 19 March 1981	For the text of the statement, see 2266th meeting; see also <i>Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1981</i>	
S/14415	20 March 1981	k	Letter dated 20 March 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General		70
S/14416	24 March 1981	d	Letter dated 23 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General		71
S/14417	26 March 1981	a	Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines to the Secretary-General		72
S/14418	26 March 1981	d	Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council		72
S/14419	27 March 1981	n	Letter dated 26 March 1981 from the representative of Morocco to the Secretary-General		73
S/14420	27 March 1981	a	Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General		75
S/14421	27 March 1981	d	Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of the Netherlands to the Secretary-General		76
S/14422	30 March 1981	o	Letter dated 26 March 1981 from the representative of the Netherlands to the Secretary-General		76

INDEX

to matters discussed by the Security Council or brought before it during the period covered in this Supplement

- a Telegram dated 3 January 1979 from the Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea to the President of the Security Council
- b The situation in Cyprus
- c The situation in South-East Asia and its implications for international peace and security. [Letter dated 22 February 1979 from the representatives of Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the President of the Security Council (S/13111)]
- d The situation in the Middle East
- e The question of South Africa
- f Letter dated 1 September 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council
- g The situation in Namibia
- h Complaint by Angola against South Africa
- i Letter dated 25 November 1979 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council [*Iran*]
- j Communications concerning relations between Ecuador and Peru
- k Communications concerning relations between Mozambique and South Africa
- l Communications concerning the situation in Chad
- m The situation between Iran and Iraq
- n Communications concerning relations between Mauritania and Morocco
- o Letter dated 3 January 1980 from the representatives of 52 Member States to the President of the Security Council [*Afghanistan*]

DOCUMENT S/14323*

Letter dated 5 January 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[6 January 1981]

Upon instructions of my Government and pursuant to my letter of 5 September 1980 [S/14164], I have the honour to inform you that, following a most serious incident of 23 and 24 June, when Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces attacked and destroyed Kampuchean refugee encampments and Thai villages, Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces have, on over 80 separate occasions, continued to violate Thailand's sovereignty and territorial integrity. These violations not only seriously threatened the lives of innocent Thai villagers but also caused damages to their property.

The latest serious incident occurred on 3 January at 2.30 a.m., when Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces crossed the Thai-Kampuchean border and intruded about 700 metres into Thai territory at border post No. 31, east of Ben Sa-ngae in Ta Phraya district, Prachinburi province.

The intruders attacked a Royal Thai Army unit guarding the area, forcing Thai soldiers to return fire in self-defence, resulting in heavy fighting for one and a

half hours before the intruders were driven back into Kampuchean territory. In this engagement, two Thai soldiers were killed and one seriously wounded, while the number of casualties suffered by the intruders was not immediately known.

This incursion and armed attack constitutes yet another blatant violation of Thailand's territorial integrity and sovereignty and having serious consequences affecting the peace and stability of the South-East Asian region.

The Royal Thai Government strongly condemns this act of aggression and reserves the right to take all necessary and legitimate measures to safeguard Thailand's sovereignty and territorial integrity, including bringing the matter before the Security Council for appropriate action.

I have the honour to request that the text of this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) M. L. Birabhongse KASEMSRI
Permanent Representative
of Thailand to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/66-S/14323.

DOCUMENT S/14324

Letter dated 24 December 1980 from the Secretary-General to Governments of all States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies, containing a further appeal for voluntary contributions for the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus

[Original: English/French/Spanish]
[7 January 1981]

I should be most grateful if you would bring to the urgent attention of your Government this further appeal which I am addressing to all States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies in order to obtain additional voluntary contributions for the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).

The importance of UNFICYP has been emphasized time and again by the Security Council, and the stationing of the Force in the island has been repeatedly extended by it. In its resolution 482 (1980) of 11 December 1980, the Council, noting my report of 1 December [S/14275], decided to extend the stationing of the Force in Cyprus for a further period ending 15 June 1981 and requested me to continue my mission of good offices. I have reported to the Council that the continued presence of UNFICYP remains necessary, both in helping to maintain calm in the island and in creating the conditions in which the search for a peaceful settlement can best be pursued.

As I reported to the General Assembly¹ and the Security Council [S/14100 and S/14275], a substantial step forward was made when, following intensive efforts within the framework of the mission of good offices entrusted to me by the Council, negotiations between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities were formally resumed on 9 August 1980. While progress so far has been slow, the discussions have been, on the whole, constructive, and it is to be hoped that an acceptable arrangement has at last been found for a sustained, serious and result-oriented joint exploration and negotiation of both the basic problems confronting Cyprus and the approaches to their solution. Naturally, the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the island, which is the task of UNFICYP, is indispensable if the talks are to have a reasonable chance of success.

I am, however, obliged to draw attention to the

¹ A/35/659.

difficulties I face in maintaining the United Nations Force in Cyprus, owing to the continuing deficit in the UNFICYP budget. The United Nations operation in Cyprus is financed in part by the troop-contributing Governments and in part by Governments making voluntary contributions. But the voluntary contributions received have consistently fallen short of needs, resulting in an accumulated deficit for the period ending 15 June 1980 of more than \$68 million. Additionally, \$14.6 million, of which \$2,994,185 have been received, are required to meet that portion of the total cost of UNFICYP for the six-month period ending 15 December 1980 that is normally financed by such contributions. This would leave costs of approximately \$29.3 million, based on past practice, to be met by the troop-contributing countries, a figure that includes both certain reimbursable extra costs and the non-reimbursable regular costs incurred by them which these countries finance at their own expense (see annex). The Governments concerned have conveyed to me their growing and very serious concern over the disproportionate financial burden which they have been carrying for more than 16 years now and which has obliged some of them to review their commitments relating to their participation in UNFICYP. I am equally concerned at the inability of UNFICYP to meet its financial commitments in full and at the implications of this situation in regard to the continued functioning of this peace-keeping operation.

I consider it essential to make every possible effort to rectify the serious financial situation confronting UNFICYP. Under existing arrangements, this has been done by obtaining additional voluntary contributions to replenish the UNFICYP Special Account. I therefore urgently request Governments to consider increasing their contributions or to begin making voluntary contributions if not made before. I also wish to express the hope that regular financial contributors to the UNFICYP Account will find it possible at least to maintain the level of their contributions. I now appeal to your Government to respond promptly and generously with a voluntary contribution to enable UNFICYP to carry out its important function.

(Signed) Kurt WALDHEIM
Secretary-General

ANNEX

Financial position of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus

Since 1964, 66 countries have made payments or pledges of voluntary contributions to support the United Nations operation in Cyprus. Contributions to the UNFICYP Special Account since the beginning of the operation, as well as the pledges and payments received so far for the period from 16 December 1979 to 15 June 1980, are listed in the attached table.

In order to provide contingents for UNFICYP, the troop-contributing Governments divert from national duty troops and other resources at an ongoing cost to them presently estimated by them at \$29.3 million for each six-month period. This figure includes: *a* the troops' regular pay and allowances and normal *matériel* expenses for which, under existing arrangements, the United Nations is not required by the troop contributors to reimburse them; these therefore constitute costs of maintaining the Force which are being financed directly by the troop-contributing Governments; *b* certain extra and extraordinary costs that they incur in respect of UNFICYP for which, under existing arrangements, the troop contributors would be entitled to claim reimbursement from the United Nations, but which they have agreed to finance at their own expense as a further contribution to the United Nations operation in Cyprus.

Including the above two elements of costs, the actual cost of financing the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the six-month period ending 15 December 1980 would total approximately \$43.9 million, estimated as follows:

	<i>Millions of dollars</i>
1. (a) Regular troops' pay and allowances and normal <i>matériel</i> costs, and	
(b) Certain extra and extraordinary costs of the troop-contributing Governments that are financed directly by them	29.3
2. Direct costs to the United Nations which the Organization is required to meet (including the extra and extraordinary costs of Governments providing contingents for which they seek to be reimbursed), financed through voluntary contributions . .	14.6
TOTAL	43.9

Voluntary contributions from Governments are required to finance the second of these cost elements, as indicated in the cost estimates included in my report of 3 June 1980 [S/13972, sect. VI].

The voluntary contributions received from Governments have not been sufficient to cover these costs. The accumulated deficit from the inception of the operation through 15 June 1980 now stands at \$68.7 million, as compared with the deficit of \$58.4 million about six months ago, as indicated in my letter to you of 30 June 1980 [S/14051]. Eleven contributions, amounting to \$2,994,185, have been received so far towards that portion of the costs of maintaining the operation during the six-month period ending 15 December 1980 (that is, \$14.6 million) that is to be financed by voluntary contributions.

PLEDGES AND PAYMENTS TO THE UNFICYP SPECIAL ACCOUNT FOR THE PERIOD 27 MARCH 1964 TO 15 JUNE 1980 AS AT 3 DECEMBER 1980

(United States dollar equivalent)

Country	Thirty-seventh period (16 December 1979- 15 June 1980)	Total pledges	Payments received
Australia	50 000	2 369 889	2 369 889 ^{ab}
Austria	125 000	3 065 000	3 065 000 ^{ac}
Bahamas	500	500	500 ^b
Belgium	—	3 355 146	3 355 146
Botswana	—	500	500
Canada	—	—	— ^a
Cyprus	175 000	2 591 359	2 591 359 ^b
Democratic Kampuchea	—	600	600 ^d
Denmark	—	3 885 000	3 885 000 ^{ac}
Finland	—	900 000	900 000 ^c
Germany, Federal Republic of	525 000	19 025 000	19 025 000 ^b
Ghana	—	76 897	76 897
Greece	400 000	16 950 000	16 950 000

Country	Thirty-seventh period (16 December 1979- 15 June 1980)	Total pledges	Payments received
Guyana	—	11 812	11 812
Iceland	3 000	56 157	56 157 ^b
India	5 000	45 000	45 000 ^b
Iran	—	144 500	94 500
Iraq	5 000	45 000	45 000 ^b
Ireland	—	50 000	50 000
Israel	—	26 500	26 500
Italy	—	6 381 645	6 347 128
Ivory Coast	—	60 000	60 000
Jamaica	—	31 033	31 033
Japan	200 000	3 040 000	3 040 000 ^b
Kuwait	—	115 000	115 000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	—	1 500	1 500 ^e
Lebanon	—	3 194	3 194
Liberia	—	13 321	11 821
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	—	50 000	50 000
Luxembourg	5 547	96 258	96 258 ^b
Malawi	—	5 590	5 590
Malaysia	—	7 500	7 500
Malta	—	1 820	1 820
Mauritania	—	4 370	4 370
Morocco	—	20 000	20 000
Nepal	—	800	800
Netherlands	—	2 518 425	2 518 425
New Zealand	—	71 137	71 137
Niger	—	2 041	2 041
Nigeria	—	10 800	10 800
Norway	—	5 868 265	5 868 265
Oman	—	8 000	8 000
Pakistan	—	41 791	41 791
Philippines	—	11 500	11 500
Qatar	—	21 000	21 000
Republic of Korea	—	16 000	16 000
Senegal	—	4 000	—
Sierra Leone	—	46 425	46 425
Singapore	—	7 500	7 500
Somalia	—	1 000	1 000
Sweden	—	6 120 000	6 120 000 ^c
Switzerland	—	4 589 844	4 589 844
Thailand	—	2 500	2 500
Togo	—	1 020	—
Trinidad and Tobago	—	2 400	2 400
Turkey	—	1 839 253	1 839 253
United Arab Emirates	—	10 000	10 000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 907 968	56 257 374 ^f	56 257 374 ^{a,b,c}
United Republic of Cameroon	—	13 567	13 567
United Republic of Tanzania	—	7 000	7 000
United States of America	4 500 000	126 900 000 ^e	119 221 177
Uruguay	—	2 500	2 500
Venezuela	2 500	15 500	15 500 ^b
Viêt Nam	—	4 000	4 000 ^b
Yugoslavia	—	40 000	40 000
Zaire	—	30 000	30 000
Zambia	—	38 000	28 000
TOTAL	7 904 515	266 931 733	259 151 873

^a Indicative figures over a six-month period of the costs absorbed by Governments providing contingents (see above, third paragraph, item 1 of table) are as follows: Australia, \$523,000; Austria, \$1.9 million; Canada, \$8.1 million; Denmark, \$600,000; Sweden, \$3.8 million; United Kingdom, \$14.4 million.

^b In addition, the following pledges or payments have been received for the period from 16 June to 15 December 1980: Australia, \$50,000; Bahamas, \$500; Cyprus, \$175,000; Germany, Federal Republic of, \$525,000; Iceland, \$3,000; India, \$5,000; Iraq, \$5,000; Japan, \$200,000; Luxembourg, \$5,548; United Kingdom, \$2,022,637; Venezuela, \$2,500.

^c Payment has been made or will be made by means of an offset against the Government's claims for reimbursement of its costs.

^d Contributions received in 1964.

^e Contributions received in 1967.

^f Maximum amount pledged.

^g Maximum amount pledged. The ultimate contribution will be dependent on the contributions of other Governments.

^h Contributions received in 1964-1966.

Letter dated 8 January 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: French]
[12 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the memorandum dated 29 December 1980 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam concerning the hostile activities carried out by the Beijing authorities against Viet Nam in 1980. I should be grateful if you would have this letter and the memorandum circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Memorandum from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam dated 29 December 1980 concerning the hostile activities carried out by the Beijing authorities against Viet Nam in 1980

In 1979, the Chinese authorities suffered lamentable defeats in their wars of aggression against Viet Nam in the south-west and north of the country, as well as in a series of hostile acts against Viet Nam. In 1980, despite their serious defeats, they intensified their collusion with the American imperialists, stepping up their hostile activities against Viet Nam and taking various measures in a number of fields.

1. *The Chinese authorities are continuing to intensify their acts of armed provocation on land, at sea and in the air, to encroach on the territory of Viet Nam and to step up their preparations for war, and are threatening to trigger a further war of aggression against Viet Nam.*

Since the start of the year, the Chinese authorities have engaged in over 2,500 acts of armed provocation along the Vietnamese border. Many Chinese units—groups and companies—have made forays and laid ambushes deep within Viet Nam, killing and kidnapping the inhabitants, destroying and pillaging property. Densely populated regions, plantations, hospitals, shops and schools along the border have frequently been shelled by artillery from across the border. Some regions have received thousands of rounds of mortar fire; in other regions, up to 10 kilometres inside Vietnamese territory, hundreds of Vietnamese inhabitants and soldiers have been killed or wounded, many houses destroyed, together with hundreds of hectares of rice paddies, and large quantities of goods and animals belonging to the population seized by Chinese soldiers.

The fact that the Chinese troops are occupying numerous hilltops along the border and encroaching on dozens of places deep within Vietnamese territory—particularly in the provinces of Lang Son, Cao Bang, Ha Tuyen and Hoang Lien Son—with a view to dominating vast regions of Viet Nam and using them as spring-boards for their attacks is a matter for concern. In a variety of ways, the Chinese have expanded the areas they had occupied, and they are constantly occupying new areas of Vietnamese territory. On 15 October, under cover of artillery fire, one regimental unit occupied areas of Xin Man commune, Xin Man district, in Ha Tuyen province.

In addition, there have been hundreds of incidents of violations of Vietnamese airspace by Chinese fighter planes, sometimes up to 10 kilometres inside Vietnamese territory. Chinese warships have entered Vietnamese territorial waters 6,000 times, engaging in provocation and intelligence activities, thus interfering with the peaceful work of Vietnamese fishermen.

For several months the Chinese have been maintaining, on a permanent basis, five corps in the border regions and 15 divisions in the neighbourhood of Viet Nam. They have been sending weapons and war matériel to the border regions around the clock, supported

by mortar and artillery units. They have widened and built several road systems leading to the border and to the hilltops which they are occupying along the border between the two countries and in Vietnamese territory. They have enlarged the airports near the frontier and have sent further fighter and bomber units to those airports together with equipment and weapons. They have stepped up military construction on Hainan island and in the Hoang Sa (Paracel) archipelago—occupied by China though belonging to Viet Nam—and are seeking to use these places as spring-boards for their aggression. They have organized manoeuvres lasting several days for various sections of the army, and have organized demonstrations of various weapons and techniques, involving regiments and army corps in the border regions and at sea. Many members of the Chinese leadership have repeatedly uttered threats of war against Viet Nam. This proves that the Chinese authorities are preparing to wage war against Viet Nam and that, by casting the shadow of war and exerting military pressure along the border, they are seeking to undermine Viet Nam's peaceful work. As a result of these actions, the situation in the border regions between the two countries remains tense and explosive.

2. *The Chinese authorities are intensifying their psychological warfare, divisive methods and subversive activities against Viet Nam.*

As part of their policy of false propaganda and psychological warfare against Viet Nam, the Chinese authorities have grossly distorted the situation in Viet Nam, have run down the policy of the Party and State of Viet Nam and have engaged in acts of incitement designed to divide and sabotage the national union of Viet Nam. They are constantly sending reactionary elements trained in China, including many Hoa, to the mountainous regions in the northern frontier provinces of Viet Nam to engage in intelligence and subversive activities. Recently, they have been organizing special troops, which they then send into the communes in the frontier regions, ostensibly to "protect the crops". In fact, these troops are commandos which China is trying to send secretly into the frontier regions of Viet Nam to engage in sabotage of all kinds. Even more shamelessly, using the traitor Hoang Van Hoan, China is now seeking to round up other Vietnamese reactionaries to oppose Viet Nam.

3. *The Chinese authorities are not averse to any treacherous move to sow discord between Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea and to set the countries of ASEAN [Association of South-East Asian Nations] against Viet Nam.*

Through the usual means, i.e., by misrepresenting the facts and engaging in slander, the Chinese authorities are seeking to separate Viet Nam from Laos and Kampuchea and to undermine the militant solidarity existing between the peoples of the three fraternal countries of Indo-China; at the same time, each day they are further intensifying their collusion with the United States, interfering in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and furthering their intended sabotage and subversion against the Lao people.

They are using every possible means to try to set Thailand and the ASEAN countries against Viet Nam and the countries of Indo-China, with a view to weakening both groups and making good their attempts at expansion and hegemonism in South-East Asia. They are hampering moves towards the initiation of talks between the ASEAN and the Indo-Chinese countries, contrary to the aspirations of the peoples and countries of South-East Asia for peace and stability in the region and in the world. Clearly, the expansionist, hegemonistic and warmongering policies of the Chinese authorities account for the absence of peace and the instability in South-East Asia.

4. *The Chinese authorities are sabotaging the negotiations between Viet Nam and China directed towards the solution of problems in relations between the two countries.*

Because of the arrogant stance and lack of goodwill on the Chinese side, negotiations between Viet Nam and China are making no progress. After refusing to negotiate, under various pretexts, since the end of 1979, the Chinese side unilaterally broke off the

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/68-S/14325.

Second round of the negotiations on 6 March 1980 and announced that talks would be resumed at Hanoi during the second half of 1980.

The policy of the Government and people of Viet Nam is still to seek a negotiated solution to the problems in relations between the two countries, to continue the negotiations and to move them forward. Accordingly, in the notes sent on 8 March [S/13837, annex I] and 12 September 1980 by the Vietnamese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to its Chinese counterpart, the former stressed the need to continue negotiations between the two countries and put forward specific proposals concerning the date of the negotiations (third round) during the second half of 1980. However, the Chinese side categorically rejected these constructive proposals and, making gross allegations, blamed the Vietnamese side for the situation. Clearly it is the Chinese side that has obstructed the negotiations between Viet Nam and China.

These facts prove that in 1980 the Chinese authorities have continued to underscore their policy of hostility towards Viet Nam and aggravate tension in relations between Viet Nam and China, threatening peace and stability in South-East Asia. Despite their aims and their foul designs on Viet Nam, they have suffered defeat after defeat in every area—military, political, economic and diplomatic—and are doomed to total defeat.

Bearing aloft the banner of peace, national independence and socialism and united as one under the leadership of the Communist Party of Viet Nam and its Central Committee headed by Secretary-General Le Duan, the army and people are moving ahead in their task of building up the socialist structure and defending the homeland.

The Government and people of Viet Nam vehemently denounce and strongly condemn the plots and acts of hostility perpetrated against Viet Nam by the Chinese authorities. They resolutely demand that the Chinese authorities halt such activities and, above all, end their acts of armed provocation and their encroachment on the territory along the Vietnamese border, as well as their preparations for and threats of a war of aggression and their acts of subversion against Viet Nam.

In the interest of the people of South-East Asia and in the interest of peace and stability in the region, the Government and people of Viet Nam are persisting in their policy of settling the problems between Viet Nam and China through negotiations, with a view to normalizing relations between the two countries and reviving and building on the long-standing friendship between the Vietnamese and Chinese peoples.

DOCUMENT S/14327*

Letter dated 12 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[14 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the text of the statement by the Council of Ministers of Democratic Kampuchea dated 7 January 1981.

I should be grateful if you would have this statement circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) KOR Bun Heng
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Democratic Kampuchea
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the Council of Ministers of Democratic Kampuchea dated 7 January 1981

1. From 3 to 7 January 1981, the Council of Ministers held a meeting presided over by the President of the Presidium of the State and Prime Minister Khieu Samphan. Except those who were engaged in urgent missions, all the Ministers attended the meeting. The Council of Ministers examined and summed up the results of the activities carried out in all fields by the Government in 1980 and adopted necessary measures for 1981.

2. The Council of Ministers noted with satisfaction the results of the activities achieved in all fields, military, political and diplomatic, which have led to a constant and good development of the struggle of the Kampuchean people under the leadership of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea and the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea. This development is more and more favourable to the sacred cause for the very survival of the nation and for an everlasting independent Kampuchea.

3. During the past year, the guerrillas and the national army of Democratic Kampuchea constantly and systematically developed and strengthened in quantity, in the fields of political consciousness and combat techniques, and they held aloft the banner of struggle against the Vietnamese aggressors. They carried out their activities everywhere in the country, in the countryside, flat areas, strategic highways, provincial cities up to the Angkor area and the capital city of Phnom Penh. They crushed down successively the enemy mili-

tary positions held by platoons or companies, and went so far as to overrun occasionally those held by battalions or regiments, while safeguarding their own strength to the maximum.

What is comforting is that the combatants and cadres of the national army and the guerrillas of Democratic Kampuchea have grasped their noble task of defending the nation. They are fully aware that only they, and nobody else, must achieve the historic task, with which they have been entrusted by the people, of driving all the Vietnamese enemy completely out of the sacred soil of Kampuchea. They have consented to sublime sacrifices in order to achieve successfully their task. Thanks to this heroic struggle, the 250,000 men of the Vietnamese army are irremediably bogged down. In Kampuchea, the Vietnamese enemy cannot foster any hope of extricating themselves. The national army and guerrillas of Democratic Kampuchea will surely fulfil their 1981 task, thus improving further their military situation into a new strategic stage; henceforth, the Kampuchean nation will never vanish.

4. Another fact which held the attention of the Council of Ministers was the success obtained in the sustained activities to unite the forces of the whole nation, at home and abroad, against the Vietnamese enemy. That is another decisive factor of the good development of the military situation.

The contradiction between the Vietnamese aggressors and the whole Kampuchean people is most acute. Everywhere, through every form, the Kampuchean people are opposing the Vietnamese aggressors. The Kampuchean people of all strata realize more and more clearly that only the political programme of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea, of which the sole condition is to fight against the Vietnamese aggressors, can guarantee the survival of Kampuchea as an independent country. They are most satisfied with this programme and have given it their full support. More and more military independent groups have welcomed this political programme and joined the Front in order to fight against the Vietnamese enemy. This situation has favoured the setting up of the Front committees during the last year. At present, the Front has its committees in villages, communes and districts, in Democratic Kampuchea zones as well as in the zones provisionally controlled by the Vietnamese enemy. The Front cadres have proved through their actual deeds their faithfulness to the political programme of the Front, to the basic principles of the laws of Democratic Kampuchea and to the new strategic political line of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea.

The Council of Ministers noted with satisfaction that an increasing number of our compatriots, political personages and intellectuals

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/71-S/14327.

abroad, have been carrying out more and more activities against the Vietnamese enemy, expansionists, landgrabbers and exterminators of nations. All of them have realized more and more clearly that only with the unity of all Kampuchean nationals, upon the sole condition of fighting against the Vietnamese enemy, can the Kampuchean nation survive. Last year, a number of intellectuals relinquished their comfortable life and joined the struggle of the people and the Government of Democratic Kampuchea.

Owing to this favourable situation at home and abroad, the mobilization of all forces of great national union against the Vietnamese enemy during 1981 will be given a new impetus.

5. In its assessment of the situation, which has improved in all fields as already mentioned, the Council of Ministers was more and more aware of the fact that the implementation of the political programme of the Front and of the strategic political line played a determinant role in the national union against the Vietnamese enemy in order to liberate Kampuchea, defend the nation and build up the country for several generations to come. The Council of Ministers has taken necessary measures so that the whole people can be penetrated by the political programme of the Front, and that all cadres in all fields and at all levels can carry it out in all circumstances everywhere.

Once again, the Council of Ministers stresses that the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, which is doing its utmost and sharing weal and woe with the people, aims only at fulfilling its historic task and has no other purpose than to make Kampuchea survive. It sincerely welcomes all patriotic forces and political personages who would like to participate in the achievement of its noble task. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea is determined to be in solidarity with all patriotic forces and political personages in order to achieve this sacred national cause.

6. The Hanoi authorities, who are carrying out a genocidal war in Kampuchea, have brought not only immeasurable sufferings to the innocent Kampuchean people by massacring millions of them, but their aggression against Kampuchea is furthermore gravely threatening the peace, stability and security of South-East Asia because they are eaten up with a regional ambition which totally squares with the expansionist strategy of the Soviet Union in the region. Therefore, the Kampuchean people, the national army of Democratic Kampuchea, the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea and the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, who are waging a deadly struggle to defend the nation and territory of Kampuchea and are preventing the Vietnamese and Soviet expansionists from pushing forward, are also playing a part in the defence of the just common cause of the countries of South-East Asia and of the peace- and justice-loving countries throughout the world. The Council of Ministers is deeply

satisfied with the fact that the countries in the region and other peace- and justice-loving countries have clearly understood the strategic role played by the present struggle of Democratic Kampuchea and have given their precious support to this struggle. It would like to renew here its most profound thanks.

7. The whole world has clearly realized that the key solution to the problem of Kampuchea provoked by the Vietnamese invasion is the total withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea. Therefore, the United Nations has adopted successive resolutions to this end. But, despite their total isolation in the international arena, because they are adepts of the law of the jungle the Hanoi authorities keep challenging this position of justice taken by the international community. They are carrying out manoeuvres in the international arena aimed at achieving their strategy of "Indo-Chinese federation" and regional expansionism which they have failed to achieve in the military field. They keep striving hard to evade the implementation of the United Nations resolutions and to legalize instead their invasion of Kampuchea. All these deeds show clearly once again the perfidious nature of the Hanoi authorities, who are trampling underfoot all civilized rules and laws and are most cruel, stubborn and cheating. Facing this situation, the Council of Ministers calls upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Governments of South-East Asian countries and all peace- and justice-loving countries to take concrete measures so as to compel the Hanoi authorities to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea in accordance with the United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6. The holding of an international conference is one of the measures stipulated by these two United Nations resolutions. The Council of Ministers highly appreciates and expresses its warmest thanks to the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations and other peace- and justice-loving countries which are endeavouring to have these two resolutions implemented.

8. Based on the fact that the people's war waged by the Kampuchean people is, more and more, improving in all fields, military, political and diplomatic, the Council of Ministers calls upon the whole people of Kampuchea at home and abroad, all combatants and cadres, men and women, to hold more and more aloft the banner of struggle by uniting as one on the basis of the political programme of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union of Kampuchea, in order to fulfil the 1981 task with many more successes for the sacred national cause.

All forefathers of the Kampuchean nation, through generations, have consented to tremendous sacrifices to safeguard up to now the prestigious land of Angkor. Facing the present great danger, the nation of Kampuchea calls upon all its sons and daughters to accept their historical task and to continue resolutely to defend and safeguard their motherland forever.

DOCUMENT S/14328*

Letter dated 14 January 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General

*[Original: English]
[15 January 1981]*

Further to my previous letters on the subject, I wish to draw your attention to two further outrages perpetrated recently against Israel citizens by the terrorist PLO.

On 10 January 1981, in the centre of the town of Gaza, a hand grenade was lobbed at an Israeli car with three persons in it, a couple and their young daughter. As a result, the husband was wounded and the wife received medium injuries.

On 11 January, an Israel citizen was shot and murdered in the township of Jabelieh, where he had gone to have his car repaired.

Responsibility for both these outrages was taken by the PLO in a broadcast on its radio in Lebanon on 11 January.

In this connection, I wish to point out that in recent weeks there has been a series of PLO terrorist acts against Israel civilians:

(a) On 4 December, an explosive charge went off in a store in the centre of Jerusalem, wounding 10 people. A PLO spokesman immediately took responsibility for this atrocity.

(b) On 25 December, an explosive device was discovered in southern town of Dimona. It was dismantled without causing injury.

(c) On 29 December, two explosive charges went off at bus-stops in southern Israel, one outside the town of

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/72-S/14328.

Ashkelon and the other at the Mishmar HaNegev road junction. While neither explosion caused injury, a PLO spokesman at Beirut immediately took responsibility for them, claiming that many soldiers had been killed.

(d) On 5 January, another explosive device was dismantled at a bus-stop near the Ra'anana junction in central Israel without causing any harm.

As I have repeatedly pointed out in previous letters to you, the mindless and indiscriminate killing of civilians has been characteristic of the PLO since its inception. Its designs, whether successful or not, are those of a group of international criminals, and not, by

any stretch of the imagination, of a national liberation movement.

Given the true character and aims of the PLO, as demonstrated yet again in the incidents listed in this letter, the Government of Israel is duty-bound to take all measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14331

Letter dated 14 January 1981 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[16 January 1981]

I have the honour to inform you that the Basic People's Congresses have decided to ratify the special agreement between the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Republic of Malta and to submit the dispute over the continental shelf to the International Court of Justice provided that no drilling in the disputed area will be allowed until the Court has concluded its consideration of the matter.

(Signed) Awad S. BURWIN
Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of the
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14332

Letter dated 15 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[16 January 1981]

I have the honour to refer to the communication dated 14 January 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations [S/14331] concerning the offshore exploration dispute with Malta, and to previous correspondence on this matter.

It is observed in particular that, as stated in paragraph 5 of your report of 13 November 1980 on the mission of your Special Representative [S/14256], the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had undertaken unconditionally to submit the original text of the agreement to the Popular Congresses for ratification during their (then) current session, scheduled to conclude on 22 November, with a view to exchanging the instruments of ratification and formulating the joint notification to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice, as provided for in article IV of the agreement, during the first two weeks of December.

It now emerges that, not only did the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya delay ratification by almost one month, but they have additionally laid down a new condition, namely that "no drilling in the disputed area will be allowed until the Court has concluded its consideration of the matter".

Against the background of the delaying tactics employed by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya over the past four years, and the threat of force actually used and still implied, this latest notification by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is viewed with grave concern by my Government as a failure by the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya fully to comply with its most recent solemn undertaking given to the Security Council and to you.

For its part, my Government unconditionally confirms all the undertakings it has already given.

In these circumstances, I have been instructed by my Government to place these considerations before the Security Council, with a request that the Council urgently take all necessary action within its powers as the guardian of international peace and security and as protector of legitimate peaceful activities of small, unarmed countries.

I should be grateful if this letter be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
Permanent Representative of Malta
to the United Nations

Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978)

[Original: English]
[19 January 1981]

1. In my report of 24 November 1980 [S/14266], I stressed the vital importance of Namibia achieving independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in 1981. I added that, in order to achieve that aim, a date for the cease-fire and a start of implementation should be set in the early part of 1981. As a means of facilitating agreement, I stated the intention to hold a pre-implementation meeting under the auspices and chairmanship of the United Nations.

2. The proposed meeting was held at the Palais des Nations at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981. In accordance with paragraph 24 of my report of 24 November 1980, South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) were contacted concerning the composition of the respective delegations that would participate in the meeting. The front-line States and Nigeria, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the contact group of the Western Five were also contacted about the sending of observers.

3. The two delegations participating in the meeting were led respectively by the South African Administrator-General of Namibia, Mr. Danie Hough, and by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma. The observer delegations were represented at a high level, including some at the ministerial level. OAU was represented by its Secretary-General, Mr. Edem Kodjo. In addition, the Minister of State of Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone attended the meeting on behalf of the President of Sierra Leone, the current Chairman of OAU, Mr. Siaka Stevens.

4. In view of the importance that I attached to the meeting, I personally chaired the opening sessions held on 7 and 8 January. The working sessions were thereafter chaired by Mr. Brian Urquhart, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs.

5. In my opening statement on 7 January, I reiterated the central purpose of the meeting as set out in my report of 24 November 1980. I emphasized that a very large area was already covered by a general consensus and noted that the problems remaining related in one way or another to confidence, and especially to confidence in the future. I expressed the hope that the courage and vision that had brought the participants to Geneva would carry them over that obstacle as well. I reiterated that our main aim was to get a firm agreement on a date for a cease-fire and the start of implementation of the proposal which would allow for the achievement of Namibian independence before the end of 1981. It was made clear that basic agreement on the proposal and the demilitarized zone had already been reached and that there could be no question of renegotiating those fundamental arrangements or of going back on agreements previously reached.

6. In a meeting on 8 January, following consultations, I called upon the leaders of the two delegations to introduce those members of their delegations whom they wished to introduce.

7. Mr. Hough, whom South Africa had designated to lead the delegation, then introduced his personal staff and the delegation led by him, "pursuant to paragraph 24 of the report of the Secretary-General and consisting of parties who are present here to discuss with the United Nations and to participate in the conference, on an equal basis with those who would take part in the elections, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and other practical proposals". I thereupon recalled the precise wording of paragraph 24 of my report, indicating that it was on that basis alone that the meeting had been convened.

8. Mr. Nujoma, in introducing his delegation, stated that some of its members were still in prison, not having been released by the South African Government. Mr. Nujoma reiterated acceptance by SWAPO of resolution 435 (1978) and added that SWAPO was "ready to sign a cease-fire with the delegation of South Africa, so that peace can come to Namibia" and to "co-operate with the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), both military and civilian components, in order to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978)".

9. Working sessions with the two delegations, in the presence of the observers, commenced on 8 January. In his opening statement, the Chairman, Mr. Urquhart, recalled the framework within which the meeting was being held. He described the wide area of agreement which had been reached with the Government of South Africa during more than two years of consultations in connexion with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). He stated that the United Nations believed that the technical issues relating to implementation had essentially been resolved and that none existed which could possibly justify any failure to decide to go forward. The Chairman reiterated that the meeting had not been called to renegotiate matters already agreed. He pointed out that in any conflict situation or prolonged dispute there was inevitably a legacy of distrust and lack of confidence among the parties. To overcome such a legacy, a high degree of statesmanship was called for. It was not only the future of Namibia that was at stake; it was also the future of the entire region and the prospects for peace and progress in Africa as a whole.

10. On 8 and 9 January, detailed presentations were made on behalf of the United Nations regarding the manner in which the Special Representative for Namibia of the Secretary-General, appointed under Security Council resolution 431 (1978), and UNTAG would fulfil their various responsibilities under the settlement proposal [S/12636] as approved in Council resolution 435 (1978). In the course of those presentations the over-all structure of UNTAG and the Special Representative's duties, the functions of the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the election supervisory role of UNTAG, the tasks and deployment of UNTAG police monitors and the tasks and deployment of the UNTAG military component

were described by Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, Special Representative of the Secretary-General; Mr. Poul Hartling, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; General Prem Chand, Commander-designate of the UNTAG military component; and other senior United Nations officials. Points of clarification arising from those presentations were dealt with during a working session held on 10 January.

11. A number of statements were also made by members of the delegation led by the South African Administrator-General. It was asserted, *inter alia*, that the United Nations had disqualified itself from supervising free and fair elections in Namibia, in particular, by recognizing SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia and by its attitude towards other political parties in the Territory. The general tenor of many of those presentations was that only after an unspecified period, in which the United Nations would demonstrate its impartiality, would a definite date for implementation be acceptable. Anxiety was also expressed as to the nature of the laws and related arrangements which would govern the Territory in the future.

12. At the meeting on 10 January, the Chairman made a number of general comments on the statements heard from the delegation led by the South African Administrator-General during the previous meetings. In particular, he referred to the context in which the United Nations had been involved in the Namibia problem and to the central purpose of the meeting, namely, the setting of a firm date for the cease-fire and the commencement of implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

13. In referring to the questions that had been raised about the "impartiality" issue and the need to create trust and confidence, the Chairman pointed out that this seemed to be putting the problem the wrong way around and that, in any case, the matter of trust and confidence was a two-way street. He explained that it was precisely because the decisions of the United Nations concerning Namibia, dating back as far as 1947, had not been heeded that the situation had reached the present pass. He pointed out that the fundamental aim of the membership of the United Nations was to enter a new phase, in which all concerned would co-operate with the international community to attain the goal of independence of Namibia through an act of self-determination. The key was a definite agreement to proceed on a specific date with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), at which time a number of things would have to change, because there would be a completely different situation. At that time, both South Africa and the United Nations would require to make the necessary arrangements for the impartial discharge of their respective responsibilities under the settlement proposal.

14. The Chairman concluded his statement by urging the participants not to be distracted from the main objective of the meeting, namely, in the words of the Secretary-General's report of 24 November 1980 to attain the independence of Namibia in 1981, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) and, to achieve this aim, to set a date for the cease-fire and a start of implementation in the early part of 1981.

15. In intensive consultations after the meeting on 10 January, a course of action was discussed which

was designed to lead, at the conclusion of the meeting, to a declaration of intent by the parties to the cease-fire. This would have provisionally established a cease-fire at an early date—30 March 1981 was suggested—to be confirmed in writing by 10 February 1981. It was also suggested that in the meantime, specific measures could be taken to ensure—and to reflect in public decisions—the impartiality of the United Nations, as well as South Africa, from the time of agreement on the implementation date.

16. It became clear, from a statement by the South African Administrator-General in the meeting on 13 January, that it would not be possible to achieve such a declaration of intent at the meeting in Geneva. In that meeting, the Administrator-General stated that, in the light of the proceedings thus far, it was clear that the questions raised in paragraph 19 of the report of the Secretary-General had not been resolved, and it would therefore be premature to proceed with the discussion on the setting of a date for implementation.

17. At the closing meeting on 14 January, the leader of the SWAPO delegation reiterated that SWAPO was ready to proceed, at the meeting at Geneva, to sign a cease-fire and to agree to a target date for the arrival of UNTAG in Namibia. Since South Africa had not agreed, SWAPO had no alternative but to continue with the liberation struggle.

18. In his closing statement, the Chairman reviewed the developments at the meeting and commented that it was clear that the date for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still remained to be agreed upon. His concluding statement contained the following remarks:

"In the light of all that has taken place during our meeting, the question arises whether the obstacle is the matter of trust and confidence which the South African Government informed us at Pretoria last October was the core issue affecting the setting of a date. If that is so, I am sure few will challenge the fact that this meeting has provided the participants not only with a better understanding of the international effort for a settlement of the Namibia question but also valuable opportunities for contact and discussion. In my view, this has been a most unusual meeting. An enormous effort has been made, in many forms and at many levels, to demonstrate good faith, reasonableness, a will to co-operate in the future and an understanding of the preoccupations and anxieties of others. It is a matter for regret that these extraordinary efforts have not yet succeeded in facilitating an agreement on a date for implementation and that a great opportunity has thus been missed . . . I believe that all participants and observers here will wish to consider urgently the events of the last few days and the course which must be taken to expedite the attainment of the objective we have set ourselves. In particular, and on behalf of the Secretary-General, I appeal to those who have been unable so far to assent to the proposals made by the Secretary-General to reconsider their position at the earliest possible time.

"The Secretary-General has been kept fully informed on the efforts made at, and on the outcome of, this meeting. He sincerely hopes that means will soon be found to go forward, as we had intended to do, to the early implementation of resolution 435

(1978), so that our time and efforts here will prove to have made a positive contribution to the solution of the question of Namibia.

"Although it has not proved possible here to secure agreement on a cease-fire date and on the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the United Nations will not relax its efforts to ensure for the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control."

Observations

19. The pre-implementation meeting which concluded at Geneva on 14 January did not succeed in achieving the objective set for it in my report of 24 November 1980, namely, the setting of a date for the cease-fire and a start of implementation in the early part of 1981. It became clear, in the course of the meeting, that the South African Government was not yet prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

20. The meeting was, nevertheless, important in

many ways. Participants were informed in detail of the manner in which the United Nations would discharge its responsibilities during the implementation process. Further, through contacts and exchanges at a variety of levels, a remarkable effort was made to demonstrate good faith and reasonableness, with a view to proceeding towards implementation in a spirit of co-operation and understanding. I wish, in this connection, to express my particular appreciation to OAU, represented at Geneva by its Secretary-General and by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone, to the front-line States, Nigeria and the contact group of the Western Five.

21. I believe that the outcome of the meeting at Geneva must give rise to the most serious international concern. Members of the Security Council, and all those concerned, will wish to consider the proceedings and the situation which has now arisen. I wish urgently to appeal to the Government of South Africa to review, with the utmost care, the implications of the meeting and to reconsider its position with regard to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) at the earliest possible time.

DOCUMENT S/14334*

Letter dated 15 January 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 January 1981]

I have the honour to forward herewith the statement issued on 11 January 1981 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam concerning the situation on the Kampuchea-Thailand border and kindly request you to have this letter and its enclosure circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative
of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the Foreign Ministry of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam dated 11 January 1981 on the Kampuchea-Thailand border situation

On 10 January 1981 [S/14336], a spokesman for the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea issued a statement severely condemning the Thai armed forces for systematically violating the sovereignty and territorial land, waters and airspace of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, and firmly rejecting the Thai authorities' allegation that the Kampuchean and Vietnamese armies had violated the Thai border.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/74-S/14334.

As is well known, over the past two years, the Thai authorities have colluded with the Beijing warmongers to foster the Pol Pot remnants and other Khmer reactionaries and to use sanctuaries on Thai territory as bases for sabotage activities against the peaceful life of the Kampuchean people. Moreover, the Thai army has encouraged armed action against the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The present tension along the Kampuchean-Thai border obviously stems from Beijing's big-nation expansionist and hegemonist policy which aims to restore the genocidal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime in Kampuchea, sabotage the trend towards dialogue, create conflict between the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, the Indo-Chinese countries and undermine peace and stability in South-East Asia. The Thai authorities are pursuing a policy of collaborating with China to intervene in Kampuchea and encroach upon its territorial integrity. Their false charges against Kampuchea and Viet Nam neither obscure the crimes of the warmongers at Beijing nor whitewash the Thai authorities' responsibility for the present tension along the Kampuchean-Thai border.

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam reaffirms its constant respect for Thailand's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. At the same time it demands that Thailand likewise respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries on the Indo-Chinese peninsula. It fully supports the just stand of the People's Republic of Kampuchea expounded in the above-mentioned statement, and demands that the Thai authorities immediately abandon their hostile policies and encroachments upon Kampuchea's territorial integrity in order to stabilize the situation along the Kampuchean-Thai border and contribute to maintaining peace and stability in South-East Asia.

DOCUMENT S/14335

Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 January 1981]

I have the honour to bring to your attention the latest act of armed aggression on the part of the racist armed forces of South Africa against the sovereignty

and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

The latest series of armed raids and invasions into

Angola began with reconnaissance flights on 11 January 1981. South African army units, backed by aircraft, including helicopter gunships, attacked Angolan troops stationed near Cuamato on 12 January.

According to the latest information, fierce fighting is still taking place in Cunene and Huila provinces.

It cannot be a coincidence that as all of us were gathered at Geneva for the pre-implementation talks on the independence of Namibia, even as the South African delegation was giving the impression of taking part in what were, after all, "peace" negotiations, even as the parties ranged around the negotiating table were discussing cease-fire dates and talking of Namibian independence, the racist armed forces of the minority régime at Pretoria were planning and carrying out a series of raids, attacks, aggressions and invasions.

In view of the positive role played throughout by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola on negotiations for the independence of Namibia, a role that has been formally and officially acknowledged by everyone concerned, the timing and intensity of these attacks, which have left a number of dead and wounded, force my Government to re-examine the intentions of the racist South African régime vis-à-vis peace in southern Africa. Furthermore, silence and inaction on the part of the international community

regarding the expansionist and militarist policies and actions of the racist régime at Pretoria will not only be contrary to the spirit of earlier Security Council resolutions on the subject of South African attacks against the People's Republic of Angola, but also cast a shadow on the Namibia negotiations as well.

Neutrality should not mean indifference to South Africa's posturing. Pretoria seeks not a balance of power, but a concert of power in southern Africa.

My Government takes a very serious view of this latest series of attacks and interprets it as a challenge to the sovereign States of southern Africa, to the support of the African continent for liberation movements, especially SWAPO, and to the international community for its efforts to secure genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

I will keep you informed of the day-to-day situation as it develops. Meanwhile, I request that this communication be circulated as a document of the Security Council in connection with the question of South African attacks against the People's Republic of Angola.

(Signed) Elisio DE FIGUEIREDO
Permanent Representative of Angola
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14336*

Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the Secretary-General

[Original: French]
[20 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of the statement made on 10 January 1981 by the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea concerning the unstable and tense situation in the frontier region between Kampuchea and Thailand.

I should be grateful if you would arrange for this letter and the enclosed statement to be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Bounkeut SANGSOMSAK
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
of the Permanent Mission of the
Lao People's Democratic Republic
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea on 10 January 1981

During 1980 the Thai authorities intensified their collusion with the Beijing warmongers in the implementation of their hostile policy towards the People's Republic of Kampuchea. In addition to allowing the Pol Pot bandits and other reactionary Khmers to use Thai territory as a sanctuary and base for their acts of sabotage against the Kampuchean people, the Thai authorities themselves directly intensified their acts of armed violence, in flagrant violation of the

territorial integrity, airspace and territorial waters of Kampuchea, in an attempt to support reactionary Khmer acts of sabotage.

1. Thai armed forces ceaselessly pounded Kampuchean soil with weapons of every kind and calibre, including bazooka shells and recoilless and 105-mm guns, wounding and killing many civilians, and damaging their homes and other property. They bombarded Kampuchean soil on 317 occasions in August, 328 occasions in October, 320 occasions in November and 476 occasions in December. In particular, from 27 to 30 December they fired on Kampuchean territory 107 times, and between 20 and 26 December 241 times, in addition to mounting artillery bombardments to cover infiltrations into Kampuchean territory by Pol Pot bandits and other reactionary Khmers which occurred on 35 occasions in December. Thailand itself sent Thai commando groups over the border to conduct reconnaissance operations and attack Kampuchean border posts. On 18 September, Kampuchean border guards put out of action a group of Thai commandos on Kampuchean soil in the south-western region of Smatdeng (province of Pursat). On 2 October, Thai armed forces, in co-ordination with Pol Pot bandits, attacked hill 172 on Kampuchean soil. But the aggressors were defeated and forced to withdraw to the other side of the border, leaving behind several dead.

The Thais also shelled civilian river craft on the Meteuk River in Kampuchean territory, as happened on 9 December, killing one civilian and injuring another.

2. Thai aircraft of all types have daily violated Kampuchean airspace, making reconnaissance flights and undertaking guiding operations for artillery fire to massacre the Kampuchean population and to cover armed infiltrations of Khmer reactionaries.

During the second half of 1980 alone, more than 500 overflights by Thai aircraft were noted in Kampuchean airspace over the provinces of Preah Vihear, Siem Reap, Battambang, Pursat and Koh Kong.

In some places, these aircraft penetrated as far as 15 kilometres

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/76-S/14336.

within Kampuchean airspace in the south-western region of Pailin and the Kon Rieng and Ta Sen regions. In November alone, Thai aircraft violated Kampuchean airspace 10 times, and in December 92 times.

3. Thai armed vessels have continually violated Kampuchea's territorial waters, engaging in provocation and intimidation operations against the Kampuchean population, particularly in Koh Kong province. On 18 October, for example, 10 armed Thai vessels penetrated as far as seven nautical miles within Kampuchean territorial waters in the vicinity of Koh Tang island in Koh Kong province.

The hostile activities carried out by the Thai authorities are at the root of the unstable and tense situation in the Kampuchea-Thailand border region. This policy, which can only serve the aims of the Beijing warmongers, not only runs counter to the interests of the Thai people and those of other peoples in the region, sabotaging peace and creating a state of instability in South-East Asia, but also places on Thailand itself a burden of responsibility for the serious consequences.

In order to camouflage their criminal acts and their collusion with the Beijing warmongers and other reactionary lackeys and to mislead public opinion, the warmongering elements among the Thai authorities have often resorted to allegations of so-called violations of the Thai border by Kampuchean and Vietnamese armed forces. However, no one is deceived by these slanders.

Pursuing its foreign policy of independence, peace, friendship and

non-alignment, the People's Republic of Kampuchea sincerely and consistently seeks to establish good relations with neighbouring countries on the basis of complete respect for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and legitimate interests of each party, non-interference in the internal affairs of each party and peaceful coexistence. The People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea has, on several occasions, made world public opinion aware of the hostile activities of the Thai authorities towards the Kampuchean people and has made several constructive proposals with a view to putting an end to the state of tension prevailing on the border between the two countries such as, in particular, the four-point proposal to the conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Kampuchea, Laos and Viet Nam, held at Vientiane in July 1980 [S/14071, annex 1, para. 2]. The just position and attitude of goodwill of the People's Republic of Kampuchea have met with the approval and support of a broad section of world opinion.

In the interests of the Kampuchean people and of the Thai people, and of peace and stability in Indo-China and in South-East Asia, the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea demands that the Thai authorities immediately cease their hostile policy and their acts in violation of Kampuchean sovereignty and territorial integrity. The People's Republic of Kampuchea always respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries. At the same time, in the exercise of its right of self-defence, it will ensure that any act endangering the sovereignty, security, territorial integrity and peaceful life of the Kampuchean people is severely punished.

DOCUMENT S/14338

Letter dated 19 January 1981 from the representative of the United States of America to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[20 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit the following message from the President of the United States:

"I am pleased to inform you that we have reached an agreement to free the 52 Americans now held hostage in Iran. We expect they will leave Iran shortly on their way home to the United States. I would appreciate it if you would inform officially the members of the Security Council, the representatives of Member States and the President of the International Court of Justice of this development.

"With the release of our hostages, the United States considers that Iran has complied fully with Security Council resolutions 457 (1979) and 461 (1979) and with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice of 24 May 1980.²

"The United States has greatly appreciated your tireless public and private efforts, as well as those of the Security Council and Member States who for the past year have sought means to gain the release of the hostages. We are particularly indebted to you,

² *United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1980, p. 3.*

the members of your staff, and the national representatives who served on the United Nations commission which travelled to Iran last year in search of a solution to this crisis.

"This long ordeal for the hostages, their families, and the people of the United States is now over. The United States Government hopes and believes that with the end to this extraordinarily difficult period for the international community all of us will be able to consider together how we might best ensure that such an occurrence is not repeated so that international relations among nations can better develop on a normal and constructive basis. My Government pledges itself to that objective.

"Once again, my Government extends its deepest gratitude to you and Member States who have worked and agonized with us over the past year."

(Signed) Donald F. MCHENRY
Permanent Representative of
the United States of America
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14339*

Letter dated 22 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[23 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the statement dated 8 January 1981

by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea on the aggression committed by the Le Duan clique against Thailand.

I should be grateful if you would have this statement

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/78-S/14339.

circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) THOUNN Prasith
*Permanent Representative
of Democratic Kampuchea
to the United Nations*

ANNEX

Statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea dated 8 January 1981, on the aggression committed by the Le Duan clique against Thailand

On 3 and 5 January 1981, the Le Duan clique sent once again its soldiers to intrude into Thailand.

The Vietnamese soldiers first intruded into the village of Sra Ngé 800 metres from the border. On 5 January, they fired several 105-mm mortar shells which landed at the Thai villages of Ban Kok and Sabang, seriously wounding five persons among the Thai population. They were met with a vigorous riposte by the Royal Thai Army, which inflicted on them a worthy punishment.

This criminal act was committed at a time when the Le Duan

clique is more and more bogged down in all fields in Kampuchea. More especially in the diplomatic field, it comes under strong pressure exerted by the international community, which demands the withdrawal of all its troops of aggression from Kampuchea in accordance with United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6. Being driven into a total impasse and facing inextricable difficulties, the Le Duan clique persists in resorting to brute force to threaten the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

These two recent aggressions constitute a flagrant and arrogant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Thailand by the Le Duan clique, increasing therefore the tension in South-East Asia.

This criminal act once again shows to the international community how far the Hanoi clique is an adept of the law of the jungle.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea strongly condemns this crime committed by the Le Duan clique. It assures the friendly Royal Thai Government and Thai people of its entire solidarity and supports all measures taken by the Royal Thai Government and Army to oppose the Le Duan clique's aggression.

As far as they are concerned, the national army and guerrillas of Democratic Kampuchea are determined to continue to wipe out more and more living forces of the Vietnamese army of aggression, thus making their actual contribution to the defence of peace, stability and security in South-East Asia.

DOCUMENT S/14340

Letter dated 22 January 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[23 January 1981]

Pursuant to my communication of 19 January 1981 [S/14335] regarding the brutal armed invasion of the People's Republic of Angola by the armed forces of the racist Pretoria régime, I have the honour to inform you that the racist South African troops are still in occupation of Cuamato in the People's Republic of Angola. Fierce fighting is still raging in that area; it has caused a number of deaths and much damage to property and services.

The Government and people of Angola, through their militants of FAPLA [*Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*] are continuing to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their country against the expansionist and warlike policies of the *apartheid* régime. In fact, even the unarmed civilian inhabitants of the area under attack and occupation are engaged in the task of defending their land. They will

continue to fight until the racist troops have been driven off Angolan soil.

I am forced to repeat the warning contained in my previous letter—that unchecked racist South African militarism is a serious threat to the peace and stability of southern Africa and a continuing obstacle in the way of international efforts aimed at genuine Namibian independence.

I request that this communication be circulated as a document of the Security Council in connexion with South African attacks against the People's Republic of Angola.

(Signed) ELISIO DE FIGUEIREDO
*Permanent Representative of Angola
to the United Nations*

DOCUMENT S/14343

Letter dated 23 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[23 January 1981]

I have the honour to refer to previous correspondence and other communications concerning the continued threat of force by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against the Republic of Malta.

As you are aware, the Jamahiriya has failed even to honour the unconditional commitment given to your representative, Mr. Cordovez, viz., that Libya, by not later than 15 December 1980, would not only have ratified the 1976 agreement with Malta but would also

have referred the dispute to the International Court of Justice (see your report of 13 November 1980 [S/14256]). Libya has not kept its promise. It is now subjecting ratification to a condition which Malta cannot reasonably be expected to accept. Had Libya, five years ago, ratified the agreement signed in 1976, the Government of Malta would have spontaneously refrained from drilling. At this late date, it is no longer equitable for Libya to impose such a condition.

In these circumstances, the duty of the United Nations and of its responsible authorities can only be that of obtaining, through all the means at their disposal, an undertaking by Libya that it will abide by its commitments under the Charter and will therefore not use force or threaten the use of force against Malta.

On its part, the Government of the Republic of Malta remains willing to have any claim the Jamahiriya might wish to put forward examined and decided upon by the International Court of Justice. For this purpose,

it is making a further declaration under Article 36 of the Court's Statute, accepting the jurisdiction of that Court on disputes relating to delimitation of its continental shelf unconditionally and without reservations. The said declaration is being deposited with you today.

I should be grateful if this letter be distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
Permanent Representative of Malta
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14344

Letter dated 21 January 1981 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[23 January 1981]

I wish to refer to the letter addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Malta dated 15 January 1981 [S/14332].

The Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wishes to affirm the following:

1. The Basic People's Congresses in their third regular session for 1980 have decided, in accordance with the legislative procedures followed in the Jamahiriya, to ratify the special agreement between the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Republic of Malta and to submit the dispute over the continental shelf to the International Court of Justice, provided that no drilling in the disputed area will be allowed until the Court has concluded its consideration of the matter.

2. The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated, at the outset and during negotiations, that it will not accept commencement of drilling operations in the disputed area until a settlement has been reached for the dispute over delimitation of the continental shelf

between the two countries. In this respect, I wish to reaffirm what was contained in paragraph 6 of your report on the mission of your Special Representative [S/14256], which states that "Malta has confirmed that it had accepted an implicit understanding, when the agreement was signed in 1976, that it would not begin drilling operations until the Court had reached a decision and an agreement on delimitation had been concluded in accordance with article III of the agreement".

3. The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reaffirms its anxiousness for peace and security in the region and the world and again reaffirms its anxiousness for the continuation of relations of friendship, co-operation and good neighbourliness with Malta.

I would kindly request that this letter be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Awad S. BURWIN
Chargé d'affaires, a.i.
of the Permanent Mission of the
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14345*

Letter dated 27 January 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[29 January 1981]

Upon instructions of my Government and pursuant to my letter of 5 January 1981, [S/14323], I have the honour to inform you of the following blatant violations of Thailand's sovereignty and territorial integrity by Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces:

1. On 5 January, at 6.10 p.m., Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces fired three rounds of 105-mm artillery into Thai territory at Ban Kok Sabang, Aranyaprathet district, Prachinburi province, injuring five Thai civilians, four of them seriously.

2. On 7 January, Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces fired 18 rounds of 82-mm mortar from Ban Yang Daeng Kum in Kampuchea into Thai territory east of Ban

Non Mak Moon, Kok Soong sub-district, Ta Phraya district, Prachinburi province.

3. On 10 January, at 12.30 a.m., Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces fired one round of mortar at a Thai army unit based at Ta Phraya district, injuring two Thai soldiers.

4. On 14 January, at 12.50 p.m., Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces fired nine rounds of 107-mm artillery into Thai territory, 200 metres to the west of Ban Taharn Pan Suk, Aranyaprathet district, injuring one person and damaging one truck.

5. On 24 January, at 6 p.m., Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces fired one round of artillery into Ban Khao Lan, Khlong Yai district, Trat province, injuring two Thai officials.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/82-S/14345.

6. On 26 January, at 3.35 a.m., two observation posts of the First Royal Cavalry Regiment, situated at border posts 29 and 30, near Ban San Ro Changan, came under attack by Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces numbering about 10 men from Ban Kalor in Kam-puchea. The intruding forces fired RPG rockets and M-79s at the two observation posts on the Thai side of the border, forcing Thai soldiers to evacuate the posts with one Thai trooper, Private Choi Suwanthad, missing.

7. On 26 January, at 4.45 a.m., the intruders fired 20 rounds of mortar at Thai positions. The shelling continued until 6.23 a.m.

8. On 26 January, at 7 a.m., Thai forces returned enemy fire with 105-mm artillery and dispatched one

unit of the First Royal Cavalry Regiment to clear the area; the unit found the body of Private Choi Suwanthad, who had been killed by RPG and small arms fire.

The Royal Thai Government condemns these blatant acts and holds the Vietnamese Government fully responsible for all of the above incidents and holds that the latter must take necessary measures to ensure that violation of Thai territory does not occur again.

I have the honour to request that the text of this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) M. L. Birabhongse KASEMSRI
Permanent Representative
of Thailand to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14346

Letter dated 28 January 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[29 January 1981]

At the request of the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, the Honourable R. F. Botha, I am enclosing the text of a letter he addressed to you on 28 January 1981.

I should appreciate it if this letter could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) D. W. STEWARD
Deputy Permanent Representative
of South Africa
to the United Nations

LETTER DATED 28 JANUARY 1981 FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INFORMATION OF SOUTH AFRICA ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

1. It was with disillusionment that I read your report [S/14333] on the recently held conference at Geneva. The immediate impression the report leaves is that, as far as the United Nations is concerned, the internal parties in South West Africa/Namibia do not exist and that they never participated in the proceedings at Geneva. This overt omission of any reference to them and the attempt to expunge their remarks from official documents of the United Nations are indeed serious. On the other hand, prominence is given to the few remarks uttered by SWAPO. I commend to your attention the following attached statements delivered during the closed sessions of the conference by:

(a) Mr. D. F. Mudge, Chairman of DTA [Democratic Turnhalle Alliance], on 13 January;

(b) Mr. K. Kaura, member of DTA, on 9 January;

(c) Adv. E. van Zijl, member of Actur, on 13 January.

The omission is not confined to the contribution made by the internal parties; important observations by the Administrator-General were ignored too. In this regard may I remind you of the following remarks the Administrator-General had to address to you after Mr. Nujoma's reference, fully reported in paragraph 8 of your report, to some of the SWAPO members who

"were still in prison, not having been released" by the South African Government:

"Mr. Secretary-General, may I address you just for once to put one matter straight as far as the record is concerned. Mr. Sam Nujoma deemed it fit to make mention of certain people who are in prisons. He made mention of Robben Island and he also made mention of Windhoek. We should just like to place on record that there are many other people whom we should like to have here in this delegation this afternoon with us who cannot be here—many who are killed, many who are in graves, many who are in camps and in other places we do not even know of."

You cannot be ignorant of the assassinations, murders and abductions perpetrated by SWAPO since the settlement proposal was submitted in 1978. These acts of terror have been brought to your attention on a regular basis as the official records of the Security Council will bear out. Up to this day, SWAPO has not been condemned outrightly by you or by the Council. Instead, the South African Government, responsible for the security of the Territory and the safety of its inhabitants, has been subjected to vicious attacks in the Security Council and to uncalled for and unjustified criticism by yourself.

2. As you are aware, the South African Government has throughout maintained that the successful implementation of the settlement proposal or of any proposal designed to achieve a peaceful solution will continue to be seriously jeopardized if all the parties are not treated on an equal basis. I stressed this particular point in my letter addressed to you on 29 August 1980 by concluding:

"The people of South West Africa/Namibia, with the support of the South African Government, have consistently demanded fair and equal treatment impartially applied. The South African Government accordingly deems it essential that you henceforth include the leadership in the Territory in all future consultation on the setting in motion of the im-

plementation of resolution 435 (1978) or on any other matter which would facilitate the achievement of an internationally acceptable solution." [S/14139, para. 23.]

3. As far as the involvement of the internal parties is concerned, you will recall that in my letter of 12 May 1980 I stated:

"You will be aware of the extreme concern which exists regarding impartiality of the United Nations, a prerequisite to free and fair elections. Moreover, it has consistently been the South African Government's position that equal treatment should be extended to all political parties participating in the political process. You will recall that the representatives of the political parties in South West Africa/Namibia found it possible to agree to travel to Geneva for the simultaneous consultations conducted there in November 1979 on the demilitarized zone, when you were able to assure them that they would have equal access to your representatives. They interpreted this reaction on your part as an acknowledgement of their equal interest in deliberations affecting their future." [S/13935, para. 7.]

4. It was against this background that your representative visited South Africa in October 1980. Your report [S/14266] on that visit, which preceded the conference at Geneva, again illustrated the South African position clearly. In his statement to a session of the conference on 9 January, the Administrator-General dealt with this particular matter. His statement reads as follows:

"Before representatives of the political parties address themselves to the statements made yesterday and today, I wish at the outset to stress the importance of the deliberations which lie before us.

"The political parties from South West Africa/Namibia have over the years expressed their views on the question of equal treatment. Their concern has always been that they are not being provided opportunities to state their case on questions affecting the future of their country. They have been denied those privileges which have been granted to SWAPO. The record of the preferential treatment accorded to SWAPO by the United Nations speaks for itself. Ever since the Western initiative which culminated in the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), these parties have played a constructive role. They remain, however, concerned about the United Nations partiality towards SWAPO and the lack of equal treatment of the political parties. Closely linked to the question of partiality is the creation of trust and confidence. Presently they do not have confidence in the United Nations supervising and controlling free and fair elections to which all parties are committed.

"During the visit to South Africa by the United Nations team in October 1980, it became evident that implementation of resolution 435 (1978) could only be possible after a solution to the problem of lack of confidence and trust and impartiality had been found. The political parties themselves emphasized to the United Nations team that that problem remained an obstacle to implementation. In his report of 24 November 1980, the Secretary-General stated:

"One of the main obstacles to progress in the negotiations hitherto has been acute mutual distrust and lack of confidence." [Ibid., para. 19.] and that 'this problem in itself affects the setting of a date for implementation' [ibid.]. In the same report the Secretary-General proposed this meeting as 'a means of facilitating agreement and of creating the necessary climate of confidence and understanding' [ibid., para. 20].

"The political parties from South West Africa/Namibia stand ready to engage in constructive discussions during this meeting on resolution 435 (1978) and other practical proposals. They are present here to discuss directly with the United Nations all those issues which they feel should be addressed before implementation of resolution 435 (1978) can begin.

"We have reached a milestone in the history of South West Africa/Namibia in that at long last we have succeeded in bringing the South West Africa/Namibia democratic political parties and other movements involving themselves in the Territory together under one roof to speak for themselves about the future.

"It is my hope that it will be possible to remove the existing doubts and that the desired trust and confidence can be established. This is the crucial test that lies ahead."

5. From the above statement and also from statements made by the internal parties, it is clear what they considered to be the objective of the conference at Geneva. Had any attention been paid to the genuine concerns of these parties, as expressed in their statements at Geneva, it would have been realized that the question of the creation of trust and confidence, which is so closely linked to the question of impartiality and to the equal treatment of parties, was of paramount importance and that that had to be overcome or resolved if a date for implementation was to be seriously considered.

They were disappointed that no real steps were taken to remove the blemish of partiality from the United Nations and to restore the necessary trust and confidence. It was beyond their comprehension to understand how it could reasonably be expected from them to agree to proceed at this stage with implementation after the United Nations had failed at Geneva to correct the ills of the past—ills for which the United Nations is responsible as a result of the political, moral, financial and propaganda support for SWAPO over the years by the General Assembly and the specialized agencies. It was because of this failure that the Administrator-General had to make the following concluding statement on 13 January:

"In the light of the proceedings thus far it is clear that the questions raised in paragraph 19 of the report of the Secretary-General [S/14266] have not been resolved. It would therefore be premature to proceed with a discussion of the setting of a date for implementation."

6. You refer to the remarkable effort which was made to demonstrate good faith and reasonableness with a view towards implementation. I wish to agree that from their side the internal parties displayed a high degree of good faith and reasonableness and that they made a substantial effort themselves to address those

issues which went to the very heart of the settlement plan—equality in the electoral process and faith in an impartial referee. It is self-evident that those issues had to be resolved prior to implementation—not the other way round.

It is astonishing that the United Nations and all those working to establish a date for implementation failed to see the necessity of first creating a climate of trust and confidence. No one could have expected a real progress without that basic objective having been achieved. No one could have been under any illusion as to its importance. On this very point you reported on 24 November 1980:

“The mission was informed by the South African Government that this problem in itself affects the setting of a date for implementation.” [*Ibid.*, para. 19.].

The United Nations has painted itself into a corner by improper bias in favour of SWAPO for years. The United Nations itself must find a way of rectifying the position. It cannot expect the internal parties—or the South African Government—to accept United Nations promises of action at a later date or to accept a mere token redress of the SWAPO bias. The actions required must eliminate the unfair advantage of SWAPO and must be seen to do so.

7. I feel constrained to remark that a promising opportunity was missed by the United Nations in Geneva, in the first place, to encourage SWAPO, who remained mute virtually throughout, to engage in a constructive, confidence-building dialogue, and secondly, to address the concerns of the internal parties, who have to contest the election in South West Africa/Namibia. At Geneva the internal parties were not satisfied that it would not be a case of one man, one vote, one time. In addition, their concerns for solid guarantees regarding freedom of speech, the freedom to form political parties, a free and independent judiciary, a free economy and respect for property—concepts basic to the democratic process envisaged in the settlement plan—were not addressed. It can only be hoped that due regard will be had by all concerned to the legitimate anxieties of the democratic parties of South West Africa/Namibia.

8. May I express the hope that the United Nations, if it wishes to pursue ways of finding an internationally acceptable solution, will give serious attention to my appeal to acknowledge the role of the internal parties in all deliberations on the political and constitutional future of their country.

(Signed) R. F. BOTHA
*Minister of Foreign Affairs and
Information of South Africa*

ENCLOSURE I

Statement by Mr. D. F. Mudge on 13 January 1981

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity of addressing this conference. For the first time since the Western Powers took the new initiative during the first quarter of 1977, leaders of the Democratic parties from inside Namibia are now given the opportunity to speak for themselves on the substance of the issue. This is real progress. It is nevertheless true that the right to do so was grudgingly yielded and that this conference is

far from being a symbol of the impartiality which is the principal subject of discussion. The conference was delayed for 10 hours while the simple right of my delegation, and others, to be introduced was debated and contested. Our opponents in the proposed elections would dearly like to keep us nameless, faceless and especially voiceless non-persons, and the United Nations was only with difficulty persuaded to take another view. Since then efforts have been made to keep us muzzled—as has happened for years in United Nations organs—by expecting us to work in closed sessions only.

Moreover, the indignity was imposed on us much against our will, of having to attend this conference as part of a delegation headed by the Administrator-General, instead of in our own right. But I want you to know that I am a Namibian, not a South African. As a native-born Namibian I am present here and address you. And when I speak, I have the interests of all peace-loving Namibians at heart, regardless of ethnic ties or skin colour. This is the land that I cherish.

Furthermore, I speak on behalf of a party that has consistently insisted that South West Africa/Namibia must become independent as soon as possible under a Government that recognizes and takes account of the inalienable rights and reasonable aspirations of the inhabitants and under a constitution that assures the protection of their basic rights.

It must also be noted that past negotiations about the future of South West Africa/Namibia were directly between the United Nations or other interested parties and the Republic of South Africa. The democratic parties were not directly and formally invited to express their views on these matters. Can it reasonably be expected of us now to reach a cease-fire date within the course of a few days and to start implementing a plan about which we were formerly only consulted via the back door?

We want to solve this problem ourselves, in the first place, for the sake of our people and not merely to relieve the international community of one of its political headaches. We are not willing to allow external forces or pressure groups, which are very often prepared to support and finance political movements so as to manipulate them for their own purposes, to use our country as a base for a new kind of imperialism.

We have not only campaigned for and agreed to independence but we have, despite severe misgivings, also accepted resolution 435 (1978) in so far as it provides for a democratic settlement and elections, supervised by the United Nations.

We are not reassured by the fact that a very large percentage of the Members of the Organization and even of countries which, according to tentative arrangements, will be directly involved in supervising this democratic election, do not know what a democratic election means because they do not have, and some have never had, a democratic system themselves.

Resolution 435 (1978) should have been implemented in 1979. We urged implementation on the Secretary-General. We urged the acceptance of a cease-fire date of 26 February 1979. If it had been so implemented, the issue would by now have been laid to rest. The fact that it was not, was not our fault. The

delay was the result of deviations from the original proposals by the Secretary-General, brought about by some as yet inadequately explained intrigue, without any consultation, at the behest of SWAPO, who wished at all costs to avoid fighting an election. Thus they refused monitoring of their bases and demanded bases in South West Africa, where they had never been able to establish any.

DTA, being a democratic party, is in favour of a peaceful solution to the problems of our country. But, unfortunately, moderate parties labour under the disadvantage of obeying rules and subjecting themselves to the law, even laws of which they disapprove.

Because democratic parties do not use force and intimidation to achieve their aims and because they are not prepared to kill people cold-bloodedly in the name of a so-called freedom struggle, they tend to be disregarded while a premium is placed on militant violence. A stigma is placed on independence achieved by peaceful means while concessions are made to the blackmail that comes through the barrel of a gun.

There is no longer a need for any party to fight for the independence of Namibia, because independence for our country has been agreed upon by all parties concerned, including South Africa. Parties continuing terrorist activities are doing so because they fear elections and are determined to seize power regardless. However, if SWAPO persists with its "armed struggle" it will be defeated in combat. Indeed, severe defeats are being inflicted on SWAPO. Small wonder it is eager to sign a cease-fire agreement. But if the choice was ours, we would not continue with a bush war, preferring a peaceful solution. We have nothing to fear from SWAPO in a free and fair election. As a matter of fact, we are looking forward to such an opportunity.

But then this process must be fair and the outcome of this election must not in any way be influenced by external factors. This is one of the crucial elements of the settlement. No party must have psychological advantage. The political process leading towards independence must be based on the elementary rules of democracy and must be supervised by a body whose impartiality stands beyond any doubt.

The third essential component is that those who vote must be assured that the Government they return will uphold democracy, permit them to vote again and protect their rights—that it will not be a case of "one man, one vote, one time".

The second crucial factor is that conditions of peace and absolute security must prevail during the election, for otherwise the victor is fear.

What is the issue at this conference? It is not independence for Namibia. That objective has already been agreed by everyone. It is not one man, one vote, or the territorial unity of Namibia, or United Nations supervision of the electoral process. There has been agreement on these fundamental issues for three years. It is not even whether we should proceed rapidly with an election. DTA is in agreement with all parties concerned that we should proceed with an election at the earliest realistically possible date and that Namibia should take its rightful but long-denied place in the family of nations as soon as can be arranged. But the issue is: Can all the parties that contest the election be put in the position of having an equal chance on the

day that implementation of the settlement commences? Can extraneous influences on the election be eliminated so that the electorate votes only on the basis of the policies of the parties? DTA seeks no unfair advantage such as presently enjoyed by SWAPO. Only parity. But then this equality of opportunity to win the election must be real, must be comprehensive, must be as nearly complete as attainable. Only then is a free and fair election possible. And only if the United Nations initiates a process calculated to bring this objective about can trust and confidence be built up in the ability of the Organization to act impartially in the role of referee.

The United Nations has a history of unfair and unacceptable bias in favour of SWAPO stretching back for 20 years. That is undisputed. There is no need for me to tabulate all the advantages SWAPO has enjoyed in and from the United Nations. They are a matter of record and the grossest excesses are well known. To counterbalance SWAPO's enormous psychological and practical, but totally unjustifiable, advantage, for example, of having enjoyed, by courtesy of the General Assembly, the title of sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia for the past seven years and the status of Permanent Observer for four years, will require ingenuity, application and consistency by the Organization ultimately responsible—the United Nations. Other parties thus far deprived of the right to participate in the General Assembly and Security Council must be conceded that right and if the United Nations Council for Namibia and Office of the Commissioner for Namibia are not to be abolished as no longer relevant, the exclusive influence of SWAPO there must be neutralized. Apart from political favouritism, SWAPO is the recipient of millions of dollars of financial and propaganda support from the United Nations, which would also have to be counteracted before DTA would be willing to stake its future on an election that could not otherwise be characterized as fair. DTA would be glad to have a United Nations-financed office in New York. Moreover, DTA would deem it essential that the emphasis of the propaganda of the Department of Public Information be switched from a pro-SWAPO bias to disseminating in equal degree the viewpoints of other parties. In particular, the Department would need to stress in an intensive long-term campaign the authenticity and equality of all the parties.

While it might be sufficient in some cases for the advantages hitherto enjoyed by SWAPO to be terminated, that would often not be the case. DTA wants a voice equivalent to that of SWAPO in the General Assembly. We are not afraid—rather we would welcome the opportunity—of debating SWAPO in the General Assembly—and in the Security Council. Terminating their rights now and continuing to deny DTA those rights will not help me unduly. SWAPO has had a voice in the highest United Nations councils for years. Give me that voice too and I can consider it equal and fair. After all, the United Nations is entitled to hear all points of view. Much the same considerations pertain to many of the United Nations support programmes. I ask you to be politically realistic. I ask any political leader to stand in my shoes and settle for less. Who can justifiably allege that by claiming this equality of free speech I am firing the first shots in an election? That argument holds no water. When I start

my election campaign, I will tell the voters about DTA policies. Now I am telling the world I want a fair deal, a fair basis for the election.

I do not propose spelling out to you, Sir, how the United Nations can correct the existing imbalance in regard to a myriad of subjects. The United Nations now admits it has been partial. The United Nations now admits it must needs be impartial. That means across the board. Then let the United Nations proceed. It is not for me to supply a shopping list of items that must be corrected. It is for the United Nations to create a balanced situation in all respects. Then the question of mutual trust and confidence will resolve itself.

But trust and confidence is not something that can be switched on and off like an electric light switch. By its very nature it is something that grows organically over a period of time, which needs to be carefully nourished. It is not possible by the mere adoption of a declaration or passing of a resolution to erase from people's minds, or from the concerns of political parties the memories of years of unequal treatment or the fears of duplicity, and to set human hearts beating in unison. It is for the United Nations not only to abandon its old ways but to demonstrate over a reasonable period of time that it can and will consistently behave even-handedly. I declare that in these circumstances the present difficulties of DTA concerning implementation of the settlement proposal will thaw, much as the snow around this beautiful city will gradually disappear with warmer weather.

Some of our critics assert that these adjustments by the United Nations are not practicably attainable. I defy any political leader worth his salt to say that, in my position, he would not regard them as reasonable. It was not DTA that caught the United Nations on this particular hook. Why should the DTA claim to equal treatment now be sacrificed in order to get the United Nations, and other parties involved in this initiative, off that hook?

It is said that what is lacking is political will on our part. Political will is not involved in an invitation to participate in a manifestly unfair election. Where political will is called for is on the side of the United Nations. The United Nations must take the steps which it knows will be unpopular but which are essential to create the conditions for fair elections and thereafter mutual trust and confidence.

Peace and security are an absolute prerequisite to a free and fair election.

Our country is under attack by SWAPO. It is not a conventional war. Their methods are terrorism, violence and intimidation, their victims almost exclusively civilians, almost exclusively black people. It is not a war of our choosing. The alleged objective is independence for Namibia but, as this has already been conceded, the war is pointless, unless the real objective is to impose a tyranny on the Territory. The defence of our countries and ourselves became essential and South Africa therefore assumed responsibility for that defence. Consequently, the judgments and decisions about such technical matters as deployment and demilitarized zones, monitoring and troop strengths are not essentially within the province of DTA concerns and I do not intend to deal with them in depth today.

Nevertheless, DTA is very much concerned about the general principle. We have not forgotten that in 1978 Mr. Nujoma said:

"The question of black majority rule is out. We are not fighting even for majority rule. We are fighting to seize power in Namibia for the benefit of the Namibian people. We are revolutionaries."

Apart from assassinating outstanding authentic leaders of South West Africa, such as Clemens Kapuuo and Toivo Shiyagaya, SWAPO, during the period from 3 July 1978 to 25 June 1980, assassinated 278 civilians by one or other means, seriously injured 227 and abducted 385, the latter mostly schoolchildren. SWAPO have never given any reason to believe that they have any intention of desisting from their terroristic activities merely because an election is in progress. They have refused to have their bases monitored by the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), leaving them free to infiltrate through the proposed demilitarized zone—which, because of its size and harsh terrain, UNTAG has not the slightest hope of monitoring satisfactorily—and to intimidate at will. Additionally, they will be able to build up their forces during the seven-month settlement period as much as they please so that they can invade Namibia, with its monitored South African troops reduced to 1,500 in two bases, if the election does not go their way. Moreover, SWAPO refuses to return without arms to South West Africa, once the settlement process begins, as they are obliged to do in terms of the settlement. Why?

One of the major concerns of DTA about security is that there is no definition of what would constitute a breach of the agreement. Intimidation by violence or threat must be so regarded, as must sporadic bombing and other tactics of dislocation. It is essential that a method be devised in advance for quantifying and evaluating incidents to determine what constitutes a breach.

What follows on from this concern, and what is much more serious, is that the people of Namibia and the democratic parties are totally without protection or security in the event of SWAPO breaches, or disputes about breaches. This is because their first recourse would be to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who happens also to be the Commissioner for Namibia (reappointed in December 1979), one of whose specific functions is to support SWAPO. The last resort of these wronged individuals and parties is the Security Council but, even assuming that the five Western Powers would put their case in the face of the inevitably hostile political pressure, who here can seriously believe that a draft resolution condemning SWAPO and calling it to order would obtain the necessary number of votes in the Council, more especially that it would not be Soviet-vetoed? Would SWAPO in any event in any way heed such a resolution? In the meantime, the illegal activities of SWAPO could well be decisive in determining the course of the election. Where is our protection? The Western Five could fruitfully consider addressing themselves to our very real fears in this regard. I may say that there is nothing in this or my immediately preceding proposal, concerning the possible definition of breaches, which is inconsistent with the settlement proposal.

Finally, free and fair elections necessarily imply the

continuation of the democratic process and the maintenance of political, economic and civil rights after the election, whatever its outcome. This is the basic understanding and unwritten contract which underlies all democratic processes.

Let us cut through all the verbiage and pretence which have characterized this exercise so far and confront the central issue: the people of Namibia are being asked by the international community to participate in an election process which might well lead to the termination of the democratic system in our country and to the end of our civil, political and economic rights. This is not like an election in Western Europe or North America where basic rights are guaranteed indefinitely whatever the outcome. What is at stake in Namibia is the continuation of the human and political rights which the Western Five demand for themselves and profess so vociferously to support. What we are talking about is the continuation, *inter alia*, of regular elections, the freedom of speech, the freedom to form political parties, a free and independent judicial system and a free economy, with respect for property.

The democratic credentials of my party are there for all to examine. We were not appointed by the General Assembly. We were chosen by 80 per cent of the people of Namibia in elections which over 300 observers and members of the international press judged to be free and fair. We have in all our dealings conducted ourselves in accordance with the best traditions of parliamentary democracy, and we have committed ourselves to continue to do so in the future. We have a legislative record of which we are proud. Under our administration, racial discrimination has been virtually eliminated from Namibia. A Bill of Human Rights has been adopted by the National Assembly. For the first time Namibia is being governed by Namibians.

But above all, we are a multiracial party. We are the only Namibian party which has succeeded in attracting the loyalty and expressing the aspirations of all Namibians from the Orange to the Cunene, from the Atlantic to the Zambezi. My delegation which is seated here today bears living testimony of this reality. We are, in short, a democratic and multiracial party which has been endorsed by 80 per cent of the people of Namibia. We stand ready to lead our people into independence, freedom and prosperity. We are confident that we would win free and fair elections. But what should happen if SWAPO were to win? Why is it that we doubt their qualifications to maintain democratic standards in Namibia?

First, because the avowed platform and philosophy of SWAPO do not admit the possibility of the continuation of basic political, civil and economic freedoms, but predicate the inevitability of a totalitarian one-party State.

Secondly, SWAPO has shown by the conduct of its own internal affairs that it is an undemocratic and dictatorial organization. It has failed to hold regular congresses. It has purged those elements which have not agreed with the dictates of its leadership; it has imprisoned or detained, and even executed, without any judicial process, large numbers of its own followers; it has sought to achieve its political objectives by intimidation and terrorism.

Thirdly, SWAPO is an ethnically based organization. It has proved to be intolerant of, and has dis-

criminated against, members who do not belong to the dominant ethnic group—look, for example, at the position of CANU [*Caprivi African National Union*].

Fourthly, SWAPO is excessively dependent on the Soviet Union and its satellites—countries with undeniably totalitarian and repressive systems. SWAPO dependence on the USSR would seriously jeopardize the independence of Namibia and the basic freedom of its peoples, should SWAPO win the proposed election.

These are the reasons why we do not believe that SWAPO would maintain democratic standards should it win the election. We categorically challenge SWAPO to lay its platform before the electorate, instead of insisting that it should be given a blank cheque. We categorically challenge the United Nations and the Western Five to deny that our concerns are valid.

Yet the Five, who have had such a great deal to say about human rights around the world and in Namibia, expect us, the people of Namibia to stake all our rights and freedoms on one turn of the electoral roulette wheel. What gives them and the international community the right to gamble in this fashion with our future? As players in this game, where is their stake? What are they prepared to put up to guarantee the rights which they expect us to jeopardize? Nobody, least of all those who profess some belief in democratic standards, can honourably press us to gamble our future in such a fateful fashion without offering us credible assurances that we would not lose all.

Mr. Chairman, we have now been at this conference for seven days. In all that time, there have been only three or four formal meetings. True, there has been a good deal of scurrying about behind the scenes and there have been a number of cocktail parties and excursions. But when are we really going to get down to business? When is all this shadow boxing going to end? You are well aware of our general concerns relating to impartiality and security. But it was the United Nations which created these problems and it is the United Nations which will have to solve them. They cannot expect lists and guidance from us. You are all aware of the justifiable concerns of the people of Namibia concerning the continuation of our basic rights. But it is not for us to spell out the details. We came here to give, and to receive assurances. We have given our assurances to the people of Namibia. But what of SWAPO? They have hardly said a word during the conference. Under whose instructions have they maintained their uncharacteristic and impassive silence? Have their coaches perhaps advised them that it is better to keep quiet and be suspected of being totalitarians and tyrants than to open their mouths and leave no doubt about the matter? Or has the United Nations, as usual, been speaking on their behalf?

This then is our situation. We are freely chosen representatives of all the Namibian people. We are a multiracial, national, and democratic party. We dearly wish to lead our people to independence and to take our rightful place in the family of nations. For this reason we accepted resolution 435 (1978). For this reason we look forward to elections which would be truly free and fair. But we insist that the elections should be conducted in an atmosphere of peace and security. And we insist that there should be reasonable and credible assurances that after the election the

democratic system and basic political, civil and economic rights would continue to be respected.

The concerns which I have expressed are valid, by all standards of equity the questions which I have asked are reasonable. It is now for you and the international community to decide whether you will be able to allay our concerns and to answer our questions. It is now for you to decide whether you are prepared to move together with us on this basis to free and fair elections and to a truly independent, multiracial and democratic Namibia.

ENCLOSURE II

Mr. Chairman, it was indicated yesterday in your opening remarks that, after each speaker had given a report, the delegates would be availed the opportunity to ask questions. I myself and a few members of the DTA delegation would like to pose a few questions.

We have noted with interest the points made in the report of the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, of 24 November 1980 [S/14266] and in particular paragraphs 19, 20 and 24.

In paragraph 19, the report reads "one of the main obstacles to progress in the negotiations hitherto has been acute mutual distrust and lack of confidence".

Those two words "distrust and lack of confidence" go to the heart of the matter, as far as the DTA delegation is concerned, not all the sweet palavers about the deployment of UNTAG and so on. We have read those voluminous reports. We understand them. However, the question is: Is there trust and confidence now to implement resolution 435 (1978) in view of the fact that the United Nations has through the years and as late as yesterday disqualified itself from supervising fair and free elections in Namibia, in view of the fact that the United Nations and the Office of the Commissioner for Namibia and special representatives of the Secretary-General have tainted their credibility by recognizing SWAPO as "the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia".

The question of the United Nations impartiality has been placed under close scrutiny and the people of Namibia have no confidence in the United Nations as an impartial arbiter. They have no confidence in the United Nations, an organization which denotes about \$15 million annually to SWAPO—composed of Russian stooges, lackeys and neo-revisionist racist murderers. The people of Namibia lack trust and confidence in an organization which has chosen SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia in the absence of an election in which the people of Namibia expressed their preferences.

The people of Namibia lack trust and confidence in Mr. Ahtisaari, whose functions include "support of the activities of SWAPO, the national liberation movement of Namibia, which is recognized by the United Nations as the authentic representative of the Namibian people".³

Mr. Ahtisaari was talking in the first person yesterday: I would do this and I would do that; I am going to satisfy myself as to the fairness of the election and report to the Secretary-General.

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6, vol. I, p. 175, para. 4 (v).

The people of Namibia must be satisfied first before Mr. Ahtisaari is satisfied and at this point they are not satisfied with Mr. Ahtisaari, whose function is to support SWAPO activities, an organization of kidnapers of schoolchildren, rapists, thugs and bandits.

It staggers the imagination and we in Namibia wonder whether we are considered that intellectually shallow that we are expected not to see the glaring abuses and the one-sidedness of the United Nations.

Take for example:

1. The Office of the Commissioner for Namibia—its budget supports SWAPO activities.

2. The Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization—supports SWAPO financially.

3. The Department of Public Information—does extensive propaganda work for SWAPO.

4. The United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka—is totally controlled by SWAPO—under the terms of article VI of the Charter of the Institute, three of the 14 members of its Senate must be SWAPO members.

5. Aid channelled through the United Nations Development Programme—goes to SWAPO.

6. Paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 31/146 again recognizes SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

7. By General Assembly resolution 31/152, SWAPO was granted Permanent Observer status.

8. Security Council—Since 1971, the Security Council has been inviting only SWAPO members to participate in Council meetings on South West Africa/Namibia under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. It invited the following:

- (a) Mr. Sam Nujoma—1971, 1975, 1978;
- (b) Mr. Peter Mueshihange—1974;
- (c) Mr. Mishake Muyongo—1973;
- (d) Mr. Moses Garoeb—1976.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot continue to tabulate the United Nations abuses; you know them. They are even getting boring to me. However, the question remains—with your sense of fairness, do you sincerely believe that the United Nations and Mr. Ahtisaari have not prejudiced their credibility in view of these abuses?

Do you sincerely feel that resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented by the United Nations, when SWAPO is going to be one of the parties to contest the election? As far as DTA is concerned, the United Nations and Mr. Ahtisaari have disqualified themselves and this resolution cannot be implemented in the absence of trust and confidence.

Mr. Chairman, we of DTA feel cheated that the press is excluded from these proceedings. We of DTA believe in a free press and have nothing to hide. Maybe you have a lot to hide because you know that the question of the impartiality of the United Nations was going to be brought up, and you did not like the truth to go out. But the truth cannot be hidden forever.

We would like to go on record that we want an open session with the press present and if not we want a cogent explanation why it should be excluded.

In paragraph 20 of the Secretary-General's report, he reiterates the point by saying "a means of facilitat-

ing agreement and of creating the necessary climate of confidence and understanding would be a pre-implementation multiparty meeting in which the parties concerned in the envisaged election would be included."

Here I am not going to talk about "confidence and understanding". What is confusing and where we want clarification is on what is meant by a multiparty meeting.

What is meant with a multiparty meeting?

Yesterday, after the Administrator-General of Namibia introduced the Namibian parties, the Secretary-General continued to refer to the Namibian delegation as the South African delegation.

What was the exact reason for that? Did the honourable Secretary-General really think that we are representing South Africa? Or has the Secretary-General of the United Nations joined the SWAPO bandwagon of categorizing us as puppets of the South African Government? If that is the case, then even the Secretary-General has disqualified himself as a liar and impartial judge of the Namibian issue.

Now, where do we go from here?

In paragraph 24 of the Secretary-General's report, he states "the basis of the meeting would conform to the formula agreed upon during bilateral discussions held earlier this year on the question of 'direct talks'. Accordingly South Africa and SWAPO have been contacted concerning the composition of the respective delegations that would participate in the meeting."

This is a contradiction—two delegations to a multiparty conference, SWAPO and South Africa.

What about the internal parties of Namibia? Who contacts them? South Africa or perhaps they simply do not matter? Or they are South African puppets anyway; they will constitute the South African delegation.

This of course was made very clear by the Secretary-General. The Administrator-General is leading a South African delegation. Maybe the election is going to be fought between SWAPO and South Africa. These are the two multiparties to participate in the discussions. These paradoxes are confusing in view of the fact that all these intellectual acrobatics are written in an alien language.

We of DTA have come here as part of the "multiparties" of Namibia to participate in a multiparty conference and if that is not the case, we are sorry.

We would also like to go on record that as far as we are concerned, resolution 435 (1978) is dead, because we can't find a fair judge.

If the United Nations wants to regain the confidence of the Namibian people, it must first do the following:

1. Rescind General Assembly resolutions 3111 (XXVIII) and 31/146, which stipulate that SWAPO is the "sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia".

2. Stop immediately the financial assistance to SWAPO through the Office of the Commissioner for Namibia.

3. Withdraw the Permanent Observer status of SWAPO in the General Assembly.

4. The Security Council must desist from consulting only SWAPO on matters touching Namibia.

5. The SWAPO Institute in Zambia must be restored to its original purpose, that of serving all Namibians.

6. The SWAPO representative in New York and his cohorts must be removed from direct participation in matters of the Office of the Commissioner for Namibia.

7. Aid channelled through the specialized agencies to SWAPO must cease immediately.

This must be done far in advance of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The people of Namibia must be satisfied of the United Nations impartiality. If that is done, then we shall have hope for a fair and free election in Namibia.

It is now for you, Mr. Chairman, to take this back to the United Nations and convince the General Assembly that this is what the people of Namibia invariably want.

As far as the terrorist war is concerned, we shall simply say "*a luta continua*". We are prepared to defeat those SWAPO thugs, either at the ballot box or in the battlefield, and they know it.

We are prepared to fight those impostors, lackeys and running dogs of the Kremlin and beat them at their own game. We are going to repair those water pipes which take water to the village where Mr. Nujoma's mother lives, blown up by the SWAPO gangsters.

This organization, to which authenticity is given, has killed more innocent Ovambo and Herero women, children and male civilians in both Ovambo and Kaokoland through the indiscriminate laying of land mines than they have killed South African troops or even our own Namibia combatants.

These impostors do all this with the blessing of the United Nations and its funds.

However, we are going to fight until a free and equitable dispensation is brought about in Namibia, and a non-racial society is established.

ENCLOSURE III

Statement by Adv. E. van Zijl on 13 January 1981

In presenting our case last Friday, we very deliberately refrained from raking over the past, except for referring to resolutions still in force and aid measures still being carried out committing the United Nations indisputably to the sole cause of SWAPO whilst, at the same time, offering itself as the impartial umpire prepared to sit in judgement in the dispute between SWAPO and the peaceful South West African parties. Despite the fact that we had our misgivings and reservations about resolution 435 (1978), we confined ourselves to the merits of the practical matters concerning the implementation thereof—matters that go to the very root of the case. In order to put things right, we made certain very reasonable demands, the object of which was to place parties on an equal footing, at the same time affording the United Nations the opportunity (perhaps undeserved?) to prove its so frequently lauded impartiality. We could have resorted to technical matters; we could have referred to the fact that South West Africa, being a C-mandate Territory, was never supposed by the international community to become independent: we could have referred to the fact that General Smuts conducted a plebiscite in 1946

conforming with international standards whereby we, the inhabitants of South West Africa, exercised our right to self-determination, but that the United Nations stopped us from implementing that decision on the ground that the population was not ripe to exercise its inalienable right—thereby causing an international dispute about South West Africa; we could have referred to earnest attempts to resolve the said dispute such as the Arden-Clarke Commission, whose recommendations the United Nations refused to implement, the Carpio Commission, whose report landed in the wastepaper baskets of the United Nations, the South African offer, during the International Court of Justice proceedings in 1970–1971, to hold a plebiscite under the supervision of the International Court—which offer was rejected, the invitation to the Secretary-General in 1972 leading to an agreement between South Africa and the Secretary-General's Special Representative (Mr. Escher), the implementation of which agreement some people sitting here today were involved with, but which was ignored by the United Nations. We could have made all these allusions and many more. We did not. We confined ourselves to the point at issue. It was consequently an unexpected and unqualified disappointment to hear how the Chairman, without even referring to our reasonable demands, specifically tried to exculpate the United Nations, to hide behind flimsy excuses and to make South Africa the sole scapegoat for the problem. We are not here to defend South Africa or to try to justify the approach they have adopted over the years. We are here in an attempt to find a solution to the problem of our country. We want to do so seriously and constructively. We are not interested in a ping-pong game between South Africa and the United Nations on matters such as

legality, etc., while South West Africa has to pay the price.

We raised the question of impartiality and equal chances for participating parties, which we consider not only to be cardinal but also *in limine*. Once agreement has been reached on these vital issues, and impartiality seen to be applied, one can tackle such immense difficulties such as intimidation, the DMZ, the impartiality and ability of individual officials, UNTAG, its composition, numbers and activities. But we do not make any progress. We are taken to the Palais for a meeting. On our arrival, we find that we have to wait for up to an hour before commencing. Shortly after we have come together, the meeting is adjourned again.

While all these things are taking place, South West Africa is going through a very difficult phase: Ovamboland is war-ridden, large parts of the country are subject to a severe drought, unemployment has shot up to about 10 per cent, money is leaving the country. Stability and confidence in the future must be restored—and restored as soon as possible.

We are concerned about our country and not about our personal positions. We come to the conclusion that this conference is a futile exercise because there is no earnest attempt on the part of the United Nations or SWAPO to get to the heart of the problem.

In the circumstances, we are left with no option but to go home and to try and work out solutions to the problems set out earlier, and to work out those solutions with all those who really have our interests at heart and who are genuinely prepared to co-operate with us.

DOCUMENT S/14347

Letter dated 29 January 1981 from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council

[Original: French]
[29 January 1981]

I have the honour to request you, on behalf of the Group of African States, to convene the Security Council as soon as possible in order to enable it to examine the further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia [S/14333].

(Signed) Taïeb SLIM
Permanent Representative of Tunisia
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14348

Letter dated 27 January 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[29 January 1981]

I am enclosing copies of an exchange of note verbales between the Government of Malta and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya which speak for themselves.

The official notification conveying the decision of the Basic People's Congress of the Jamahiriya to the Government of the Republic of Malta does not make

ratification in any way subject to any condition. This point should be noted by you and in due course reported to the Security Council

Because the ratification of the agreement by the Jamahiriya is not made conditional, the Republic of Malta finds no objection to accepting the exchange of instruments of ratification. It expects however that Libya will also keep its promise to complete the necessary formalities at about the same time by formulating and then signing the joint notification of the agreement to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the Republic of Malta recalls that almost five years have now passed since the agreement was signed, and even the date by which the Jamahiriya had undertaken to complete the procedures for the joint notification is more than six weeks overdue. Every effort must therefore now be made by all concerned to make up for lost time.

The Maltese Government would therefore be grateful if you would indicate a day, possibly in the next week, on which your representative could be in Malta for the finalization of the necessary formalities and procedures.

I should be grateful if you would kindly circulate this communication as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
*Permanent Representative
of Malta to the United Nations*

ANNEX I

Note verbale No. 4/24/54 dated 26 January 1981 from the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Malta

The People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has the honour to inform of the following.

As you are aware, the leader of the great first of September revolution, Colonel Muammar Al-Qadhafi, suggested in the beginning of September 1980 to the People's Congresses, the importance of the ratification of the continental shelf treaty between Malta and Libya.

You know also that Staff Major Abdussalem Ahmed Jalloud in the beginning of October 1980 had informed Mr. D. Cordovez, the envoy of the United Nations Secretary-General, that the agreement between Libya and Malta concerning the continental shelf would be submitted to the Peoples' Congresses in its final session by the end of 1980 to look at the question of its ratification.

While the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya conveys officially to your esteemed Ministry that the Basic Peoples Congresses have ratified the treaty to be transferred to the International Court of Justice at The Hague, we would like to inform you that the coming step is to exchange the documents of ratification between the two countries; thus the necessary procedures will be taken to transfer the dispute to the Court.

Therefore, the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison (Tripoli) is ready now to exchange the above-mentioned documents either at Valletta, the capital of the Republic of Malta or at Tripoli, the capital of the Libyan Jamahiriya, according to international traditions between countries.

In the meantime, the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison is ready to receive a Maltese delegation at Tripoli or to send a Libyan delegation to Valletta to finalize the exchange of these documents at a convenient time.

The Libyan People's Bureau as usual, avails itself of this opportunity which has put an end to the dispute between the two countries.

ANNEX II

Note verbale dated 27 January 1981 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Malta addressed to the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs presents its compliments to the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and has the honour to refer to its note verbale No. 4/24/54 of 26 January 1981.

The Ministry notes that the Basic People's Congresses have ratified the agreement signed in May 1976 between the Jamahiriya and the Republic of Malta to refer the dispute concerning their continental shelves to the International Court of Justice. The Ministry further notes that the Libyan authorities are now prepared to exchange the instruments of ratification.

The Ministry refers also to paragraph 5 of the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations [S/14256], in which he stated that the Jamahiriya had undertaken not only to exchange the instruments of ratification but also to formulate the joint notification of the agreement to the Registrar of the Court. The Secretary-General further expressed his readiness to assist the parties in carrying out these formalities.

The Ministry therefore proposes that both the exchange of instruments of ratification and the formulation and signature of the joint notification of the agreement to the Court should take place at Valletta as early as practicable on an agreed date in the presence of a representative of the Secretary-General.

For this purpose, the Ministry invites a Libyan delegation to Valletta and suggests that an early date should be agreed in consultation with the Secretary-General. Every effort should now be made to make up for lost time.

In order to expedite matters the Ministry submits the attached document as a draft joint notification.

ANNEX III

Text of draft letter to the International Court of Justice referred to in the last paragraph of the note verbale from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Malta

With reference to Article 40, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and article 39, paragraph 2 of the rules of the Court, and in pursuance of article IV of the special agreement between the Republic of Malta and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the submission of a difference concerning their continental shelves to the International Court of Justice, we have the honour jointly to notify you of that agreement and of its entry into force and to transmit to you herewith a certified copy thereof, in each of the languages of the agreement, for submission to the Court.

The special agreement was signed at Valletta on 23 May 1976, corresponding to 24 Jumada al-Awwal 1396H and came into force in accordance with article IV thereof on . . . February 1981. It was registered with the United Nations Secretariat in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter on . . . February 1981. A certified copy of the progress of exchange of instruments of ratification of the special agreement, together with a certified Arab translation, is also enclosed.

With reference to paragraph 3 of article 40 of the rules of the Court:

- (A) has been appointed agent of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and is his address for service at the seat of the Court, and
- (B) has been appointed agent of the Republic of Malta and is his address for service at the seat of the Court.

.....
.....
For the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya *For the Government of the Republic of Malta*

Letter dated 28 January 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[30 January 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the statement dated 21 January 1981 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea on the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi.

I should be grateful if you would have this statement circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) THIOUNN Prasith
Permanent Representative
of Democratic Kampuchea
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea dated 21 January 1981 on the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi

At the beginning of February 1981 the nonaligned countries will open their Ministerial Conference at New Delhi. In this regard, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea would like to make a statement as follows:

1. At present, through their henchmen, Viet Nam and Cuba, the Soviet international expansionists are infiltrating the non-aligned movement, aiming at diverting the latter from its policy and principles, turning it into an instrument of the policy of aggression in order to achieve their world expansionist strategy.

2. That is why this movement does not play its role any more in solving world major problems, turns inactive and has even been threatened with extinction.

3. This fact can be clearly confirmed by looking just at the problems of Afghanistan and Kampuchea. In the United Nations, the General Assembly has scrupulously examined the problems caused by the Soviet aggression of Afghanistan and the Vietnamese aggression of Kampuchea, opposed these aggressions and adopted by an overwhelming majority successive resolutions calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea. Among the non-aligned countries in the United Nations, about two thirds of them have upheld this position and only a handful oppose it. Therefore, this movement should very well have taken appropriate measures with regard to the situation in these two member countries, victims at present of aggression. What has then prevented this movement from taking these measures?

4. The overwhelming majority of member countries have been fully aware of the deteriorated situation of the movement. They are deeply disappointed and enraged, and they have strongly opposed

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/84-S/14349.

this situation. Thus, speaking just of the seat of Democratic Kampuchea, a great number of non-aligned countries consistently carried out activities at Havana in September 1979 categorically opposing the unilateral and arbitrary decision of Castro. Besides, these countries have rejected this injustice by defending the legitimate rights and the seat of Democratic Kampuchea at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions of the General Assembly.

5. Despite this above-mentioned injustice, Democratic Kampuchea still holds its confidence in the non-aligned movement, considers itself always as a member of the movement, adheres firmly to the non-aligned principles and wishes always to actively participate in all works of the movement.

6. Democratic Kampuchea is firmly confident that in a situation when the more than 250,000 Vietnamese troops of aggression are being bogged down deeper and deeper at the Kampuchea front and when the Hanoi authorities are facing more and more inextricable difficulties in all fields in Viet Nam and are totally isolated in the international arena, the overwhelming majority of non-aligned countries will not allow Viet Nam and Cuba to take this ministerial Conference at New Delhi as a means to achieve the "Indo Chinese federation" strategy and the common expansionist strategy of the Hanoi authorities and the Soviets in South-East Asia. That means they will not allow the Hanoi authorities to carry out diplomatic manoeuvres aiming at making the invasion of Kampuchea accepted as a fait accompli, and thus legalizing their aggression.

7. Therefore, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea calls upon the non-aligned ministerial Conference at New Delhi to thwart the Hanoi authorities' manoeuvres aiming at sneaking the Vietnamese administration at Phnom Penh into the movement and to repair the Havana unjust decision, by restoring the legitimate rights and the seat of Democratic Kampuchea back in the non-aligned movement. Along with this, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea requests the non-aligned movement to take necessary measures demanding the Hanoi authorities to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea in accordance with United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6. Among those measures, the convening of an international conference stipulated in these resolutions is one of them.

8. Only by so doing and by adopting appropriate measures to solve major world problems, such as those of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, in conformity with the non-aligned principles, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the principles governing international relations, can the non-aligned movement be powerful, strengthened, full of vitality and win back world confidence, and can it efficiently contribute to safeguard the cause of independence and peace in the world. As for the people, the national army and the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, who are overcoming all kinds of obstacles and difficulties and consenting to lofty sacrifices in their struggle for national survival, they are also taking part in the defence of the purity of non-aligned principles, the independence role and non-bloc character of the movement, as well as the defence of the cause of peace, independence and security in South-East Asia, Asia and in the world.

DOCUMENT S/14350*

Report of the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[30 January 1981]

1. The present report is submitted in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/122 D of 11 December 1980 and Security Council resolution 484 (1980) of 19 December 1980.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/85-S/14350.

2. The General Assembly, in its resolution 35/122 D, called upon "the Government of Israel, as the occupying Power, to rescind the illegal measures taken by the Israeli military occupation authorities in expelling and imprisoning the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and in expelling the Sharia Judge of Hebron

and to facilitate the immediate return of the expelled Palestinian leaders so that they can resume the functions for which they were elected and appointed". The Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to report to it as soon as possible on the implementation of the resolution. By its resolution 35/122 F of 11 December 1980, the Assembly, *inter alia*, requested the Security Council "to convene urgently in order to take the necessary measures, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure that the Government of Israel, the occupying Power, rescinds the illegal measures taken against the Palestinian Mayors and the Sharia Judge Tamimi, and to facilitate their immediate return so that they can resume the functions for which they were elected".

3. On 17 December 1980, the Secretary-General addressed a letter to the Prime Minister of Israel, which reads as follows:

"Ambassador Blum would no doubt have informed you of my conversation with him on 4 December 1980 in regard to the decision of the Israeli Government confirming the expulsion of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul. In that conversation, after recalling the relevant Security Council resolutions, I requested Ambassador Blum to convey urgently to the Israeli Government my concern over this decision and my hope that it would be reconsidered, particularly in light of the recommendation of the Israeli Supreme Court which opened the possibility of the Mayors being allowed to stay.

"Unfortunately the Israeli Government maintained its decision and the two Mayors were deported to Lebanon on 5 December.

"Since then, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions 35/122 D and F of 11 December, in which it has taken a similar position as the Security Council. The Council has now decided to meet again to consider this matter.

"In this connection, you will recall the several appeals I have made to you personally and to high officials of your Government. In making my appeals, I was motivated by my concern for the cause of peace and the welfare of the population in the area, and by my conviction that the expulsion of the Palestinian leaders will inevitably exacerbate tensions and hamper efforts for a just and lasting peace.

"May I urge you once again, therefore, to reconsider the decision of your Government in this matter and to permit the Palestinian leaders to return to the West Bank so that they can resume the functions for which they were elected and appointed"

4. The Security Council considered the situation in the occupied Arab territories at its 2259th and 2260th meetings, on 19 December 1980. At the beginning of the debate, the Secretary-General made a statement in which he outlined the efforts he had undertaken in regard to the expelled Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Sharia Judge of Hebron. In particular, he informed the Council of the appeal contained in his letter of 17 December to the Prime Minister of Israel. At its 2260th meeting, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 484 (1980), by which it reaffirmed the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to all the Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967, called

upon Israel, the occupying Power, to adhere to the provisions of the Convention, declared it imperative that the Mayor of Hebron and the Mayor of Halhoul be enabled to return to their homes and resume their responsibilities and requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the resolution as soon as possible.

5. On 14 January 1981, the Secretary-General addressed a note verbale to the Permanent Representative of Israel recalling the terms of resolution 484 (1980) and his appeal of 17 December and reiterating the latter. He also requested the Government of Israel to provide him, as soon as possible, with all available information regarding the implementation of resolution 484 (1980) for inclusion in the report which he had been requested to submit.

6. The reply of the Permanent Representative of Israel is contained in a letter dated 23 January 1981 to which is attached an annex. The letter reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your letter of 17 December 1980 to the Prime Minister of Israel and also to your note to me of 14 January 1981 and to state, on instructions, that the position of Israel with regard to the former Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul remains consistent with that elaborated by me both in the Security Council on 19 December 1980 [2259th meeting] and also in the conversations which we have had on the subject:

"The declarations and conduct of Mr. Qawasma and Mr. Milhem in the deliberations of the Security Council and thereafter have only added support to Israel's position. For your perusal, I attach a number of statements made by the two men concerned over the past year.

"Israel's approach in this matter has been guided by a concern for the cause of peace and the welfare of the population in the area concerned. In keeping with the latter consideration the holding of municipal elections was facilitated in 1976. In line with Israel's liberal policies, candidates like Mr. Qawasma and Mr. Milhem were not disqualified because of their personal views, in the expectation that those elected would perform their duties in a responsible and lawful manner.

"However, Mr. Qawasma and Mr. Milhem abused their public and official positions in order to incite the Arab population to acts of violence and subversion. The situation facing Israel, which is subject to open threats of war and terror, obliges my Government to attach the utmost importance to its duty to safeguard public order and security. It is not by accident that since the expulsion of the two men in question there has been a marked reduction in tension and an improvement in public order in Hebron and Halhoul.

"In this connection, I must express surprise at the ease with which those who are opposed to peace in the Middle East and openly declare their unrelenting hostility to my country are able to manipulate the United Nations, its organs, means and machinery, as suits their whims."

7. The annex to the letter of the Permanent Representative of Israel reads as follows:

"Statements by Fahd Qawasma and Mohmed Milhem during 1980

"Milhem:

"It is the mayors who are organizing the demonstrations in the West Bank. . . . Our struggle must be fully co-ordinated between the inhabitants of the areas and those outside.

"Al-Watan, Kuwait, 7 March

"The Committee for National Guidance [in which Qawasma and Milhem played leading roles until their deportation] has been mobilizing the masses to come out against the Israeli authorities.

"Ath-Thawra, Damascus, 19 March

"Qawasma:

"They have expelled us from southern Palestine, but we shall return from southern Lebanon! We shall return by the force of your arms, the force of your rifles . . . the force of the struggle for the liberation of Palestine.

"We shall return in spite of the enemy—in spite of Sadat and United States imperialism—to Jaffa, to Haifa and to Hebron!

"Voice of Palestine, Radio Beirut, 7 May

". . . Through newspaper ads, we would call for strikes . . . Then came disturbances . . . and, at this stage, the time seemed ripe for an escalation of mass action, and we went over to open acts of provocation: demonstrations, stone-throwing—up to the point of proclaiming a state of civil rebellion.

"Falastin ath-Thawra, Beirut, 12 May

"Force is the only logic that zionism understands . . . That is why the Arabs must move forward to the liberation of Palestine, and there is no way to do it but by force.

"Ar-Rai, Amman, 14 May

"Milhem:

"What is needed is that the world—and Europe, in

particular—should begin to take action against the common enemy called Zionist nazism.

"Al-Watan al-Arabi, Paris, 23 May

"Qawasma:

". . . all manifestations of the struggle inside the country are based on the link with the PLO—with all that this implies concerning its political and military objectives.

"Al-Watan al-Arabi, Paris, 23 May

"Neither the American nor the European initiative is capable of giving us anything of Palestine—unless we will have our own armed force capable of crushing Israel!

"Al-Hawadeth, London weekly, 13 June

"Q: 'To what extent does PLO leadership manifest itself, in practice, in the West Bank—and to what extent do you mayors have freedom of action as local leaders in the territories?'

"A: 'We don't want independence from the PLO—not even semi-independence! We are acting within the PLO, making our effort within the PLO, and we don't want independence from the PLO . . . We are, in other words, part of the PLO.'

"Ad-Destour, London weekly, 16 June

"Milhem:

". . . it [the Committee for National Guidance] considers itself an arm of the PLO, not a substitute for it, as is clear from its activities to this day.

"Ar-Rai al-Aam, Kuwait, 2 July

"Qawasma:

"Our rights will be restored only by force, by serious action and by jihad ['holy war']; that is our way.

"Radio Damascus, 16 July."

8. In submitting this report, the Secretary-General wishes to add that he will continue his efforts to secure the implementation of the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

DOCUMENT S/14351*

Letter dated 29 January 1981 from the representatives of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[2 February 1981]

We, the Permanent Representative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, have the honour to forward herewith the statement by the conference of Foreign Ministers of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea on peace, stability, friendship and co-operation in South-East Asia and the communiqué of the conference, held on 27 and 28 January 1981 at Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam.

We should be grateful if you could arrange for this statement and this communiqué to be circulated as

official documents of the General Assembly, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) BOUNKEUT SANGSOMSAK
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission
of the Lao People's Democratic Republic
to the United Nations

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/86-S/14351.

ANNEX I

Statement dated 28 January 1981 by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea on Peace, Stability, Friendship and Co-operation in South-East Asia

1. The current developments in South-East Asia continue to be a source of deep concern to world public opinion.

With their foreign policies of peace, friendship, co-operation and their goodwill, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea are increasingly becoming a factor guaranteeing regional peace and stability. The initiatives put forward by the three Indo-Chinese countries at the conferences of their Foreign Ministers held at Phnom Penh (January 1980) [S/13884] and Vientiane (July 1980) [S/14071] aimed at improving the relations between the Indo-Chinese countries and the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and consolidating peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia have enjoyed broad approval from world public opinion. World public opinion especially sets great store by the four-point proposal of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea [*ibid.*, annex 1, para. 2], which aims at restoring peace and stability on the Kampuchea-Thailand border, by the tireless efforts and goodwill of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in normalizing its relations with Thailand and by the contacts between the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the other countries in the region. Thanks to the above-mentioned efforts, the dialogue between the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries, which for a short time was discontinued, is being resumed.

In particular, the friendly relations between Laos, Viet Nam and Burma have recently been further consolidated and strengthened.

Tension, however, continues to prevail in South-East Asia. The national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea continue to be threatened. Peace and security of the other countries in the region are not yet secured. The main cause of this situation is the expansionist and big-Power hegemonist policy of the reactionary clique in the Beijing ruling circles in collusion with imperialism. They are carrying out a systematically hostile policy against the three Indo-Chinese peoples, resorting to armed provocations, constant threat of war and subversive activities against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, using the genocidal Pol Pot clique and other Khmer reactionaries grossly to intervene in Kampuchea, hoping to oppose the rebirth of the Kampuchean people, trying to instigate an atmosphere of confrontation and to disrupt the dialogue between the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries. Parallel with opposing the three Indo-Chinese countries, the Beijing authorities are employing rebels disguised as revolutionaries grossly to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries in South-East Asia.

2. Being threatened with aggression and intervention by the Beijing authorities, it is absolutely legitimate for the three Indo-Chinese peoples to strengthen their solidarity and mutual assistance on the basis of respect for each other's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. In accordance with the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between Viet Nam and Kampuchea, the presence of Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea is to deal with the Chinese threat. As on two previous occasions, the presence of Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea this time is only temporary. When the threat from China no longer exists, the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam will consider the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea. Right now, part of the Vietnamese troops will be withdrawn from Kampuchea if Thailand puts an end to the use of Thai territory by the Pol Pot gang and other reactionary Khmer forces as their foothold to oppose the Kampuchean people, stops supplying them with weapons and food and disarms and concentrates them in camps far away from the border.

The United Nations General Assembly's recent adoption of a resolution maintaining the seat of the genocidal Pol Pot clique at the United Nations and a resolution demanding that an international conference be convened so as to impose a solution on the Kampuchean problem, ignoring the protest of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people, constitute a violation of sovereignty, a gross interference in the internal affairs of the Kampuchean people, and run diametrically counter to morality and the principles

of the Charter of the United Nations. The Indo-Chinese countries once again reaffirm their position, namely that they categorically reject such resolutions.

3. In order to restore peace and stability in South-East Asia, it is essential that China put an end to its hostile policy against the three Indo-Chinese peoples and its policy of interference in other countries in the region.

The three Indo-Chinese countries and China are close neighbours whose relationship dates back to time immemorial. The peoples of Viet Nam, Laos, and Kampuchea always treasure their traditional friendship with the Chinese people. Proceeding from the policy of peace and friendship and goodwill, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea announce their readiness to sign with the People's Republic of China bilateral treaties of peaceful coexistence based on the principles of strict respect for each other's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression against each other, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, good neighbourliness and settling all disputes by peaceful means.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam calls on the People's Republic of China to resume soon the Viet Nam-China talks to settle the problems in the relations between the two countries, as repeatedly proposed by the Vietnamese side. The Vietnamese side once again reaffirms its readiness to discuss, in the context of such talks, issues raised by the Chinese side and demands that the latter show the same attitude regarding the issues of concern to Viet Nam.

In the interest of the Lao and Chinese peoples, the Lao People's Democratic Republic demands that the People's Republic of China respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Laos and stop supporting, aiding and nurturing the clique of exiled Lao reactionaries on Chinese territory and in other countries, put an end to military threats in the Laos-China border areas, stop sending spies and commando detachments into Laos and stop making slanderous propaganda against the Lao People's Democratic Republic. The Lao People's Democratic Republic deems that a favourable response to this just demand will constitute a basis for restoring normal friendly relations between the two countries.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea demands that the People's Republic of China stop using the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Khieu Samphan reactionary clique and other Khmer reactionaries against the People's Republic of Kampuchea, respect its independence and sovereignty, stop interfering in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and recognize the People's Revolutionary Council as the only authentic and legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people. The People's Republic of Kampuchea deems that the above-mentioned points constitute a basic condition for peace and stability in South-East Asia and normalization of the relations between the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the People's Republic of China.

Should the aforesaid proposals of the three Indo-Chinese countries meet with a positive response from the Chinese side, they will contribute to restoring the friendship between the peoples of the Indo-Chinese countries and the Chinese people, as well as to maintaining peace and stability in South-East Asia. The Beijing authorities should prove their words of "goodwill" by practical deeds.

4. Although differing in political and social systems and on various questions, the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries share common basic interests, i.e., regional peace, stability, friendship and co-operation, vital conditions for maintaining national independence and security and for building their countries into prosperous and happy ones, each according to its own way. In the interest of their own peoples and of the region as a whole, the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries should uproot the designs of interference and division of outside countries and should not let differences and disagreements affect the relations of friendship and co-operation between the two groups so as to build South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and prosperity. Accordingly, after defeating all imperialist wars of aggression, and regaining national independence, freedom and unification, the Indo-Chinese countries have overlooked the past and taken the initiative to promote the normalization of relations with the ASEAN countries. The normalization has opened up a new page in the history of South-East Asia, but it is unfortunate that it has been undermined over the past few years.

The experience of the past two years has again showed that

confrontation and imposition of the will by one side on the other only lead to increasing the tension in South-East Asia. The tireless efforts of the three Indo-Chinese countries for maintaining dialogue and settling all disputes by negotiations have proved to be the correct way to guarantee regional peace, stability and co-operation.

In this spirit, Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea propose:

(a) A regional conference be held between the two groups—the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries—to discuss the problems of mutual concern in the interest of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation in South-East Asia on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual agreement, respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of each country, non-imposition of the will by one group on the other, and non-interference from outside.

In the common interest of the region, the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries should early set aside obstacles and discuss the questions relating to the holding of such conference. The agenda, time and place of this conference will be agreed upon by the two groups.

For their part, the three Indo-Chinese countries propose that the conference be convened in March 1981; the place of the conference will be either, in rotation, the capital of an Indo-Chinese country (Vientiane) and the capital of an ASEAN country (Jakarta or Kuala Lumpur) or the capital of another Asian country that the parties might agree upon. The three Indo-Chinese countries will welcome the participation of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma in the conference and fully respect Burma's decision of whether or not to participate in the conference.

(b) After the countries of the two groups conclude a treaty on peace and stability in South-East Asia, a broad international conference will be convened with the purpose of recognizing and guaranteeing that treaty.

To prepare for the regional conference between the two groups, there will be a preparatory meeting between a representative of the three Indo-Chinese countries and a representative of the five ASEAN countries. The three Indo-Chinese countries appoint the Lao People's Democratic Republic their representative at such a meeting.

The dialogue between the Indo-Chinese countries and the ASEAN countries will surely help to ease the tension, gradually promote mutual understanding and trust and facilitate the settlement of urgent problems of common interest so as to improve, step by step, the relations between the two groups, thus bringing about fine prospects for the building of South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation.

The three Indo-Chinese countries hope that their fair and reasonable proposals and goodwill will meet with a positive response from the ASEAN countries, in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples in South-East Asia and the world.

ANNEX II

Communiqué of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea dated 28 January 1981

The Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Nguyen Co Thach, the Foreign Minister of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Phoune Sipraseuth and the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Hun Sen, met on 27 and 28 January 1981 at Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam. The Ministers exchanged views on the situation in the three Indo-Chinese countries and international issues of common concern and discussed measures aimed at strengthening the solidarity and co-operation between the three fraternal countries.

1. The Ministers warmly welcome the great achievements the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea have recorded in national construction and defence, in particular the prodigious rebirth of the Kampuchean people, who have during the last two years made rapid progress in production, overcome famine, stabilized living conditions, done away with the heavy consequences left behind by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary genocidal régime and built up a new life.

The conference warmly hails the decision taken by the People's Republic of Kampuchea to make public the constitution, and to hold general elections in the near future, and considers it an important

step on the way to firmly consolidating the new régime, and bringing into full play the right of the Kampuchean people as masters of their own destiny.

These achievements have increased the strength and confirmed the irreversible march forward of the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea who, with the help of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, the non-aligned countries and the world's people, are striving to overcome all difficulties and defeat all manoeuvres and acts conducted by the Beijing bellicists in collusion with the imperialist and other reactionary forces against the peoples of the three Indo-Chinese countries. The situation in the countries in the Indo-Chinese peninsula has never been as steady as now. The three countries have become an increasingly important factor guaranteeing peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia. Militant solidarity, friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance in all fields in the struggle for national liberation, national construction and defence have become fine traditions permeating the relations between the three Indo-Chinese peoples.

With a view to unceasingly consolidating and broadening the co-operation between the three countries, the Foreign Ministers exchanged views regarding preparations for a summit conference of the three countries to be held at an appropriate date.

The Foreign Ministers of the three countries decided to hold regular meetings twice a year, at the beginning and in the middle of each year, with a view to increasing co-operation between the three countries, the places of the meeting being alternatively in each country. Apart from the regular meetings, the parties can hold extraordinary meetings, if necessary.

The Ministers exchanged views on the immediate measures aimed at promoting the all-sided co-operation between the three countries, and on some specific fields, such as the co-operation between the Mekong committees of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, the co-operation between the three countries in communications and transport and providing Laos with an access to the sea.

2. The Ministers unanimously hold that the three revolutionary currents in the world, which during the last year have not ceased to grow and are in a position of strategic offensive, are changing the balance of forces in a way favourable to the forces of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Reaffirming that the struggle of the peoples of the three Indo-Chinese countries is an integral part of the struggle of the world's people, the Ministers resolutely condemn the manoeuvres of the imperialists headed by the United States imperialists, and of international reactionary forces to intensify the arms race, create international tension with a view to opposing the aspirations of the peoples, undermine peace and stability in Asia and the world. They fully support the efforts and initiatives of the Soviet Union and other countries in the socialist community aimed at realizing disarmament, easing tension, consolidating peace and international security.

3. The Ministers highly appreciate the 5 December 1980 Moscow meeting of the Party and State leaders of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the unanimous position taken by the Warsaw Treaty Organization at this meeting. They reaffirm the necessity of strengthening the solidarity among the forces of peace, national independence and socialism against the acts of aggression and war provocation conducted by imperialism and international reactionaries.

The Ministers firmly condemn the schemes of the imperialist and reactionary forces which carry out acts of sabotage against socialist Poland and interfere in its internal affairs. The three Indo-Chinese countries reaffirm their strong solidarity and support for the Polish People's Republic and the party and the people of Poland, with the conviction that the Polish working people, under the leadership of the United Workers' Party and with the strong support of the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries, will develop their traditions and revolutionary forces, overcome all difficulties and trials, foil all manoeuvres of the imperialists and reactionaries, resolutely defend the socialist régime and ensure the continued development of the country on the way to prosperity and happiness.

4. The peoples of the three Indo-Chinese countries resolutely stand on the side of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in the struggle for peace, national independence and social progress.

The Ministers stress that the expansionist and big-Power hegemonist policy of the reactionary clique in the Beijing ruling circles and the increasing collusion between China and the United

States constitute a big danger for the interests of the peoples, and for peace and security in Asia. Being deeply conscious that the solidarity of the Asian countries is an important factor checking every manoeuvre and design of the Beijing bellicist circles, the conference calls on the Asian peoples to heighten their vigilance, intensify their struggle to defeat all manoeuvres and adventurous acts of the imperialists, headed by the United States imperialists, and of reactionary forces, so as to maintain peace, stability and the development of the relations of co-operation and friendship among the Asian countries, thus contributing to the cause of peace in the world.

The Ministers totally support the struggle of the people and Government of Afghanistan, who enjoy help from the Soviet Union, to safeguard and consolidate the gains of the April revolution, to defend their independence and sovereignty. The Ministers sternly condemn the imperialists and reactionary forces' intensified armed intervention in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean region, which caused a dangerously tense situation in the area, and warmly welcome and fully support the new important proposals President Brezhnev made at New Delhi on 10 December 1980 on measures for ensuring peace and stability in the Persian Gulf area. The Ministers are of the opinion that the Iraq-Iran conflict only benefits imperialism and Zionist expansionism and wish that both sides would try to find a peaceful solution to this conflict. The Ministers support the struggle of the Palestinian people, whose only authentic representative is the PLO, to regain their fundamental national rights, including the right to establish an independent and sovereign State, warmly hail the great victories of the fraternal peoples of Angola and Mozambique in their struggle to consolidate national independence and build their prosperous countries, support the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, against the brutal domination of neo-colonialism and the *apartheid* policy of the South African racists, for the right to self-determination and genuine independence, support the struggle of the people of the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic, under the leadership of Polisario, to achieve their sacred fundamental national rights. The peoples of

Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea fully support the fraternal people of Cuba in their struggle against the policy of war threat and economic blockade imposed by United States imperialism and other reactionary forces and support the struggle of the peoples of Nicaragua and Grenada to consolidate their national independence and reconstruction. The Ministers particularly extend support and militant solidarity to the people and the revolutionary and democratic forces in El Salvador who are waging a staunch struggle for the overthrow of the dictatorial military régime and against the intervention of the United States imperialists. The Ministers support the struggle of other peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress.

5. The Ministers highly appreciate the major role played by the non-aligned movement and its active contribution to the struggle for peace, national independence, against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, *apartheid*, zionism and hegemonic expansionism, support the struggle of the developing countries, against economic exploitation by imperialism, for the establishment of a fair, equal, new international economic order. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea undertake to work for the strengthening of the solidarity within the non-aligned movement, making it more and more powerful and effective in defending and realizing its just objective, welcome Cuba who, as chairman of the non-aligned movement, has made several efforts and constructive initiatives aimed at promoting its positive role in the movement, welcome India for its active contributions to the non-aligned movement, and to the consolidation of peace and stability in Asia and in the world. The Ministers are confident that, with the active and constructive contribution of the member countries together with Cuba, the chairman of the movement, and India, the host country, the forthcoming conference of the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries at New Delhi will be successful, making the most of the results of the Sixth Summit Conference and bringing about new successes for the movement.

DOCUMENT S/14352

Telegram dated 30 January 1981 from the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French/Spanish]
[2 February 1981]

In accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, I have the honour to transmit to you the following resolution, adopted on 29 January 1981 by the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, convoking the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

"Convocation of a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

"Whereas:

"On 28 January 1981, the Ambassador, Representative of Ecuador, addressed a note to the Chairman of the Permanent Council whereby his Government asked that a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs be convoked on an urgent basis,

"On 29 January 1981, the Ambassador, Representative of Ecuador specified that his request was based on the provisions of the first part of article 59 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,

"At its special meeting held on 28 January 1981, the Permanent Council heard the statement of the representative of Ecuador pointing out events taking

place in the border area between Ecuador and Peru, as well as the clarifications made in this regard by the Representative of Peru,

"At the same meeting, the Permanent Council urged both Governments to make the utmost efforts to resolve, in a friendly and peaceful way, the situation brought before the Permanent Council,

"At its special meeting held on 29 January 1981, the Permanent Council proceeded to consider the matter presented,

"The Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, Resolves:

"1. To convoke, in accordance with the provisions of the first part of article 59 and article 60 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs on 2 February 1981 to consider the existing situation;

"To designate as site of this meeting the seat of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, at Washington, D.C.;

"To instruct the Secretary General, through the quickest means, to inform the Governments of the States members of the Organization of American States of this decision and to call their attention to

the provisions of article 62 of the Charter of the Organization;

"2. To express its deep concern over the circumstances that have arisen, which disturb the friendship and solidarity of two brother countries, and in this regard to urge the Governments to refrain

from taking any action that could aggravate the present situation."

(Signed) Alejandro ORFILA
Secretary General of the
Organization of American States

DOCUMENT S/14353

Letter dated 1 February 1981 from the representative of Ecuador to the President of the Security Council

[Original: Spanish]
[2 February 1981]

I have the honour to address myself to you on the express instructions of my Government, and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Security Council, by virtue of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the serious situation prevailing between the Republics of Ecuador and Peru because of the aggression suffered by Ecuador at the hands of the Peruvian armed forces since 22 January 1981 in the south-east region of our country, in the El Condor mountain range, in Ecuadorian military outposts, particularly that of Paquisha.

In that connection, Ecuador has supported the first resolution adopted by the Council of the Organization of American States on the dispatch of an observer mission to the area where the Peruvian attacks were being mounted; such a move has not, however, been accepted by Peru.

Ecuador has also accepted, and Peru has refused, the generous offer of mediation made by the Governments of Colombia and Venezuela, Andean countries which share historical traditions and geographical features with those of Ecuador and Peru.

Ecuador has also supported the resolution of the Organization of American States on the convening of a meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs to consider the dispute between Ecuador and Peru [S/14352], which was adopted by 20 votes to 1, the vote of Peru against, and 2 abstentions. In that connection, the Ecuadorian Minister of External Relations indicated that he had

decided to attend that meeting in order to seek peace with dignity, on the basis of specific formulas that would ensure that the peace was a lasting and not an unstable one.

In addition, the Ecuadorian Minister of External Relations, following the initiative taken by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States to express concern at the incidents that have occurred in the Ecuadorian-Peruvian frontier zone and to appeal to the two countries to refrain from any resort to force and to do their utmost to eliminate the tension through peaceful means, indicated that Ecuador had confined itself to repelling armed attacks and that the Government welcomed the initiative of the four countries, which would play a constructive role in any discussions held and any formulas put forward on this important question within the framework of the Organization of American States, as well as each and every conciliatory action proposed by friendly countries.

The Ecuadorian Government believes that, by virtue of the Security Council's own responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, and without any desire to influence the actions undertaken by the regional organization, the Council should be kept fully informed of developments in this matter. On that understanding, I have been instructed to present this letter, and I request that it be distributed urgently as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Miguel ALBORNOZ
Permanent Representative of Ecuador
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14354

Letter dated 30 January 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council

{Original: English}
[30 January 1981]

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to bring to your attention the latest acts of aggression committed by Israel against my country.

29 January

At 1400 hours, Israeli warplanes raided the area around Ain el-Helwe, near Sidon.

At 1410 hours, four Israeli aircraft raided two localities in the Tyre pocket, the station of Kharba Ma'shouq and the village of Jaroudiyeh, north of Bourj esh-Shamali.

Between 1410 and 1420 hours, two Israeli warplanes dropped four bombs on Mazra'at el-Luwaizeh, near Al-Aishiyeh.

Between 1415 and 1420 hours, one Israeli plane dropped a bomb on the Khiami area north of the village of West Zawtar, near Nabatiyeh.

At 1730 hours, Israeli aircraft raided the villages of Rumaileh, Al-Awwali, Wadi ez-Zeineh and Almat.

Preliminary reports speak of eight people killed and 42 wounded, as well as of extensive material damage to property.

30 January

Between 0930 and 1200 hours, Israel shelled the following areas: En-Nabi Taher, Kfar Tibnit, El-Jurmoq and Al-Hamra.

Casualty figures and damage to property, as of the time of reporting these attacks, could not be determined.

My Government wishes to protest strongly against these unwarranted attacks on my country. This continuing cycle of violence violates the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949 and the various Security Council resolutions on southern Lebanon. This escalation and the wanton use of air raids undermine the efforts made to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed

Armistice Commission and constitute a serious threat to the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. Accordingly, my Government reserves the right to call for a meeting of the Security Council should the situation deteriorate further.

I would be most grateful if you would be kind enough to have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council under the item "The situation in the Middle East".

(Signed) Fakhri SAGHIYYAH
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Lebanon
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14355*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Israel
to the Secretary-General

{Original: English}
{3 February 1981}

I wish to draw your attention to recent indiscriminate attacks against civilian targets in Israel perpetrated by the terrorist PLO from Lebanese territory.

On the night of 28/29 January 1981, the town of Kiryat Shmona, as well as other civilian centres in Galilee, was the target of a series of Katyusha rockets fired by PLO terrorists based in Lebanon. Similar shelling was repeated on 30 January before dawn. Seven civilians, four of them children, were injured in the first barrage. The second attack caused the injury of three civilians, one of them a woman. Considerable damage was caused to property, including two schools, residential buildings and stores.

Israel regards these renewed terrorist outrages with the utmost gravity and considers it its duty to take all measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Shamay CAHANA
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Israel
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/88-S/14355.

DOCUMENT S/14356*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General

{Original: English}
{3 February 1981}

I have the honour to convey a message which I received from the General Islamic Congress for Beitul-Maqdis (Jerusalem) at its latest meeting at Amman.

This very ominous message is a further proof, if any is needed, of the occupying Power's unbridled and shameless transgressions against Islamic sanctuaries and leaders in the occupied West Bank, including Jerusalem.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/89-S/14356.

The message reads as follows:

"The General Islamic Congress for Beitul-Maqdis (Jerusalem) at Amman condemns the Zionist aggressions against the citizens of the occupied West Bank. Further to the deportation of the religious leader of Hebron and the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul, the Zionist occupying authorities arrested three Muslim religious preachers at Nablus and Tul-karm, accusing them of violating laws of Zionism in their own homeland. These acts were intensified lately to include the arrest of 20 religious leaders and

preachers of Muslims throughout the West Bank, including the Islamic Higher Council at Jerusalem.

"There is no explanation for these aggressions except deep-rooted hatred and racism practised by Zionism and Zionist authorities against other faiths, peoples, humanity as a whole, as well as the curtailment of the religious freedom of other faiths.

"The Islamic Congress urges you to use your good offices to stop the racial Zionist aggression against the Muslim religious leaders and to take appropriate steps with a view to ensuring their immediate release."

I request you to initiate prompt measures to redeem this untenable and totally unjustified action by the Israeli occupying Power in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the norms of decent civilized behaviour.

I also request you to circulate this message as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hazem NUSEIBEH
Permanent Representative of Jordan
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14357

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

Further to my letter of 27 January 1981 [S/14348], I am instructed to inform you of the following note verbale received by the Embassy of Malta at Tripoli on 29 January from the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya:

"With reference to the special agreement concluded between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Republic of Malta at Valletta on 23 May 1976 in respect of referring the dispute on defining the border of the continental shelf between the two countries to the International Court of Justice, the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison in the Jamahiriya has the honour to announce that the Basic People's Congresses have decided, in their third ordinary session for 1980, to ratify the above-mentioned special agreement, provided that no drilling is allowed in the disputed area until the Court completes the review of the case.

"In accordance with article IV, the aforesaid special agreement comes into effect from the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification by the two countries. The People's Committee has the honour to also inform that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is now in a position to exchange the instruments of ratification of the special agreement and would be grateful if Malta could kindly agree to fix a date and venue for the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

"The People's Committee suggests exchanging the documents at Tripoli but has no objection for

this to take place at Valletta, if the Government of Malta so wishes."

You will note that in quoting the decision of the Basic People's Congresses the ratification is said to be subject to the proviso that "no drilling is allowed in the disputed area until the Court completes the review of the case". This proviso did not appear in the note verbale dated 26 January, of which I enclosed a copy in my letter of 27 January, referred to above. Malta's Chargé d'affaires at Tripoli has therefore made it clear to the Libyan authorities that that proviso was not acceptable to the Government of the Republic of Malta.

The Libyan reaction was that the proviso was not intended to form part of or to be added to the 1976 agreement but was merely an expression of Libyan thinking. The Libyans added that ratification was not dependent on our acceptance of that proviso, but they were not prepared to put this in writing.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Malta, I must reiterate that ratification of the 1976 agreement and the joint reference to the International Court of Justice must be unconditional in order to be acceptable to my Government. They must also take place without any further delay.

I should be grateful if you would inform the Security Council accordingly and if you would circulate this letter as a document of the Council.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
Permanent Representative of Malta
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14358*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Mozambique to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

I have the honour to inform you of the following.

In the morning of 30 January 1981, at about 2 a.m., a group of South African commandos invaded the terri-

tory of the People's Republic of Mozambique and had as their major objective three residences of South African refugees, members of the African National Congress, in Matola, which they attacked and partially destroyed.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/90-S/14358.

30 January

Between 0930 and 1200 hours, Israel shelled the following areas: En-Nabi Taher, Kfar Tibnit, El-Jurmoq and Al-Hamra.

Casualty figures and damage to property, as of the time of reporting these attacks, could not be determined.

My Government wishes to protest strongly against these unwarranted attacks on my country. This continuing cycle of violence violates the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949 and the various Security Council resolutions on southern Lebanon. This escalation and the wanton use of air raids undermine the efforts made to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed

Armistice Commission and constitute a serious threat to the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. Accordingly, my Government reserves the right to call for a meeting of the Security Council should the situation deteriorate further.

I would be most grateful if you would be kind enough to have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council under the item "The situation in the Middle East".

(Signed) Fakhri SAGHIYYAH
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Lebanon
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14355*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Israel
to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

I wish to draw your attention to recent indiscriminate attacks against civilian targets in Israel perpetrated by the terrorist PLO from Lebanese territory.

On the night of 28/29 January 1981, the town of Kiryat Shmona, as well as other civilian centres in Galilee, was the target of a series of Katyusha rockets fired by PLO terrorists based in Lebanon. Similar shelling was repeated on 30 January before dawn. Seven civilians, four of them children, were injured in the first barrage. The second attack caused the injury of three civilians, one of them a woman. Considerable damage was caused to property, including two schools, residential buildings and stores.

Israel regards these renewed terrorist outrages with the utmost gravity and considers it its duty to take all measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Shamay CAHANA
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Israel
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/88-S/14355.

DOCUMENT S/14356*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

I have the honour to convey a message which I received from the General Islamic Congress for Beitul-Maqdis (Jerusalem) at its latest meeting at Amman.

This very ominous message is a further proof, if any is needed, of the occupying Power's unbridled and shameless transgressions against Islamic sanctuaries and leaders in the occupied West Bank, including Jerusalem.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/89-S/14356.

The message reads as follows:

"The General Islamic Congress for Beitul-Maqdis (Jerusalem) at Amman condemns the Zionist aggressions against the citizens of the occupied West Bank. Further to the deportation of the religious leader of Hebron and the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul, the Zionist occupying authorities arrested three Muslim religious preachers at Nablus and Tul-karm, accusing them of violating laws of Zionism in their own homeland. These acts were intensified lately to include the arrest of 20 religious leaders and

preachers of Muslims throughout the West Bank, including the Islamic Higher Council at Jerusalem.

"There is no explanation for these aggressions except deep-rooted hatred and racism practised by Zionism and Zionist authorities against other faiths, peoples, humanity as a whole, as well as the curtailment of the religious freedom of other faiths.

"The Islamic Congress urges you to use your good offices to stop the racial Zionist aggression against the Muslim religious leaders and to take appropriate steps with a view to ensuring their immediate release."

I request you to initiate prompt measures to redeem this untenable and totally unjustified action by the Israeli occupying Power in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the norms of decent civilized behaviour.

I also request you to circulate this message as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hazem NUSEIBEH
Permanent Representative of Jordan
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14357

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

Further to my letter of 27 January 1981 [S/14348], I am instructed to inform you of the following note verbale received by the Embassy of Malta at Tripoli on 29 January from the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya:

"With reference to the special agreement concluded between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Republic of Malta at Valletta on 23 May 1976 in respect of referring the dispute on defining the border of the continental shelf between the two countries to the International Court of Justice, the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison in the Jamahiriya has the honour to announce that the Basic People's Congresses have decided, in their third ordinary session for 1980, to ratify the above-mentioned special agreement, provided that no drilling is allowed in the disputed area until the Court completes the review of the case.

"In accordance with article IV, the aforesaid special agreement comes into effect from the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification by the two countries. The People's Committee has the honour to also inform that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is now in a position to exchange the instruments of ratification of the special agreement and would be grateful if Malta could kindly agree to fix a date and venue for the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

"The People's Committee suggests exchanging the documents at Tripoli but has no objection for

this to take place at Valletta, if the Government of Malta so wishes."

You will note that in quoting the decision of the Basic People's Congresses the ratification is said to be subject to the proviso that "no drilling is allowed in the disputed area until the Court completes the review of the case". This proviso did not appear in the note verbale dated 26 January, of which I enclosed a copy in my letter of 27 January, referred to above. Malta's Chargé d'affaires at Tripoli has therefore made it clear to the Libyan authorities that that proviso was not acceptable to the Government of the Republic of Malta.

The Libyan reaction was that the proviso was not intended to form part of or to be added to the 1976 agreement but was merely an expression of Libyan thinking. The Libyans added that ratification was not dependent on our acceptance of that proviso, but they were not prepared to put this in writing.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Malta, I must reiterate that ratification of the 1976 agreement and the joint reference to the International Court of Justice must be unconditional in order to be acceptable to my Government. They must also take place without any further delay.

I should be grateful if you would inform the Security Council accordingly and if you would circulate this letter as a document of the Council.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
Permanent Representative of Malta
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14358*

Letter dated 2 February 1981 from the representative of Mozambique to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[3 February 1981]

I have the honour to inform you of the following. In the morning of 30 January 1981, at about 2 a.m., a group of South African commandos invaded the terri-

tory of the People's Republic of Mozambique and had as their major objective three residences of South African refugees, members of the African National Congress, in Matola, which they attacked and partially destroyed.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/90-S/14358.

From this act, 11 refugees were assassinated and several invading commandos were killed.

During the operation, the invaders murdered a government contracted person of Portuguese nationality, Mr. José Antonio Monteiro Ramos, a technician of the State enterprise Electrecidade de Moçambique. The situation is now totally under control of Mozambique armed and security forces.

In accordance with moral principles and the pertinent resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and of the United Nations, the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique strongly condemns the policy of *apartheid* and expresses its solidarity with the South African people.

With this kind of act, the South African minority régime is trying to transfer to the neighbouring States the explosive situation prevailing in the country and provoked by its abhorrent policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, for which the minority régime is alone responsible.

In accordance with international principles and the fundamental law of the Republic, the People's Republic of Mozambique accepts refugees in its territory.

The barbaric act by the South African racist régime

is an integral part of a concerted plan to weaken, terrorize and destabilize neighbouring countries of southern Africa and constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charters of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations and the elementary norms of international relations.

The People's Republic of Mozambique condemns vigorously this act of banditry and, as a sovereign State, reaffirms its solidarity and full support of the people of South Africa under the leadership of the African National Congress in their struggle against *apartheid* policies of the régime at Pretoria, leave South Africa and seek refuge in Mozambique.

The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique reserves the right to take the steps it deems necessary in order to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity in Africa.

I would like to request that this letter be circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) José Carlos LOBO
Permanent Representative of Mozambique
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14360*

Letter dated 3 February 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General

(Original: English/French)
[5 February 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the statement dated 31 January 1981 by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea on the manoeuvres launched at Saigon by the Hanoi authorities.

I should be grateful if you would have this text circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) THIOUNN Prasith
Permanent Representative of Democratic Kampuchea
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea dated 31 January 1981 on the manoeuvres launched at Saigon by the Hanoi authorities

On 28 January 1981, at Saigon, the Hanoi authorities launched a proposal for an alleged conference and conditions for a partial withdrawal of their troops from Kampuchea.

These diplomatic manoeuvres occurred at a time when the Hanoi authorities have increasingly been floundering in inextricable difficulties, both in Kampuchea's battlefield by this mid-dry season and in Viet Nam itself, and when they are completely isolated in the international arena. Since the attempted debate on their so-called "Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia" failed at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Hanoi authorities have found themselves under growing pressure from peace- and justice-loving countries in South-East Asia and in the world, which have been compelling them to implement the

United Nations resolutions calling for the total withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea.

Because it is driven into an impasse even greater than in the past rainy season, the Hanoi authorities have come to the Saigon manoeuvres.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea energetically denounces these manoeuvres, which bring nothing new but are only sheer propaganda made up for the circumstances by the Hanoi authorities, who wanted to reduce world public opinion's pressure exerted on them for the withdrawal of their troops from Kampuchea, and to make their invasion of Kampuchea and their "Indo-Chinese federation" accepted as a fait accompli through another means than the military one which they have failed to achieve in Kampuchea's battlefield. The holding of a proposed conference between, on the one hand, countries called "Indo-Chinese countries" and, on the other hand, the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), has no other aim. The "Indo-Chinese countries", so termed in broad daylight by the Hanoi authorities, are nothing else but that sinister "Indo-Chinese federation" denounced for many years by Democratic Kampuchea. The Hanoi authorities' manoeuvres in bringing the ASEAN countries to negotiating with the Vietnamese administration at Phnom Penh do not differ by any means from either those of Vientiane which have already been thwarted, or those launched by the Soviet Union which aimed at making negotiations with their Kabul installed régime accepted.

The international conference proposed by an overwhelming majority at the United Nations General Assembly offers an appropriate framework for the settlement of both the Kampuchean issue and the problem of peace in South-East Asia. The show staged by the Hanoi authorities at Saigon for a conference in their own fashion will never retrieve them from the dock, guilty of the crime of aggression against Kampuchea, the use of the law of the jungle and the violation of the principles of nonalignment, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the principles governing relations between States.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea categorically con-

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/91-S/14360.

demns and rejects all these diplomatic manoeuvres from the Hanoi authorities. It is confident in the wisdom and the position of justice of the ASEAN countries and peace- and justice-loving countries in the world to unmask those perfidious manoeuvres. The one and only key to resolve the Kampuchean problem, to lead to the return of peace in Kampuchea and to the restoration of the right of the Kampuchean people to decide by themselves their own destiny as well as of peace, stability and security in South-East Asia, is the total withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea in compliance with the United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6. To this

end, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea supports the convening of an international conference in conformity with these resolutions.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea takes this opportunity to call upon all peace- and justice-loving countries in the world to continue to support the struggle waged by Democratic Kampuchea, which is fighting not only for Kampuchea's survival, but also, by containing the Hanoi and Soviet authorities in their expansionist thrust in South-East Asia, actively contributes to turning this region into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality.

DOCUMENT S/14362

Telegram dated 5 February 1981 from the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French/Spanish]
[5 February 1981]

In conformity with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, I have the honour to transmit the following resolution adopted on 4 February 1981 by the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs:

"Cessation of the military operations in the Peruvian-Ecuadorian border area in the El Condor mountain range and maintenance of peace"

"The Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs,

"Having seen:

"The agenda of this Meeting, entitled 'Cessation of the military operations in the Peruvian-Ecuadorian border area in the El Condor mountain range, which were the reasons for convening the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and maintenance of peace',

"Considering:

"That at the request of Ecuador, the Permanent Council convoked the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation with the urgency required, in accordance with resolution CP/RES. 323 (450/81) of 29 January 1981 [S/14352],

"The basic purpose of the Organization of American States is to strengthen the peace and security of the hemisphere,

"That in that same resolution, the Permanent Council expressed 'its deep concern over the circumstances that have arisen, which disturb the friendship and solidarity of two brother countries', and urged 'the Governments to refrain from taking any action that could aggravate the present situation',

"That the information from the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States announcing the cease-fire achieved through their intervention with the Governments of Ecuador and Peru was confirmed to this Meeting by the Ministers of External Relations of the two countries, with the clarifications they felt pertinent,

"Taking into account:

"The statement by the special delegate of Brazil 'on behalf of the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States on the work they are doing with the consent of Ecuador and Peru',

"Having heard:

"The statements by the Ministers of External Relations of Ecuador and Peru on the events that occurred in the Ecuadorian-Peruvian border area,

"Reaffirms:

"The principles and purposes set forth in the Charter of the Organization of American States to strengthen the peace and security of the hemisphere, and the need to maintain a permanent climate of understanding and friendship among the nations of the Americas,

"States:

"That the Organization of American States has the ineluctable obligation to ensure the preservation, maintenance and consolidation of peace in the hemisphere,

"Resolves:

"1. To note with regret that armed confrontations have taken place between member States of the Organization of American States, disrupting the peace and security of the hemisphere;

"2. To receive with satisfaction the announcement by the two Governments of the cease-fire in the zone of the conflict, as confirmed to this Meeting by their Ministers of External Relations;

"3. To urge both countries to demobilize, disperse their forces and dismantle, as soon as possible, the military operations conducted as a result of the confrontations, restricting themselves to maintaining normal border-patrol troops;

"4. To express its satisfaction with the solemn commitment made by both countries to this Meeting of Consultation, as a genuine representation of the peoples and Governments of the Americas, to re-establish and consolidate the peace and avoid any act that might endanger that peace, and to make every effort to overcome the present difficulties;

"5. To take note that both countries have accepted the visit of a committee composed of representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States, which is now in operation to monitor observance of the cease-fire and to create conditions of peace between them, and to express its thanks for the work done by the above-mentioned countries;

"6. To reiterate the vigilant presence of the Organization of American States for the maintenance and strengthening of peace, and to contribute to the climate of understanding between the two countries;

"7. To instruct the Permanent Council to remain informed of the actions that both Governments take in compliance with the high purposes indicated herein."

DOCUMENT S/14363

Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the representative of Ecuador to the President of the Security Council

[Original: Spanish]
[5 February 1981]

I have the honour to address myself to you, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and further to my letter dated 1 February 1981 [S/14353], in order to bring to the attention of the Security Council the text of a resolution adopted unanimously at the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States, held on 4 February at the headquarters of that Organization at Washington, D.C., in connection with the conflict that has erupted between Ecuador and Peru as a result of the attacks by Peruvian armed forces in the El Condor mountain range, in the south-eastern part of Ecuador.

In the afore-mentioned resolution (see annex), the Organization of American States received with satisfaction the announcement by the two Governments of the cease-fire, as confirmed to the Meeting of Consultation by their Ministers of External Relations; the Organization urges both countries to demobilize, disperse their forces and dismantle, as soon as possible, the military operations conducted as a result of the confrontations, restricting themselves to maintaining normal border-patrol troops; the Organization expresses its satisfaction with the solemn commitment made by Ecuador and Peru to re-establish and consolidate the peace and avoid any act that might endanger that peace, and to make every effort to overcome the present difficulties. The Organization also takes note that Ecuador and Peru have accepted the visit of a committee composed of representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States, States members

of the Organization, which is now in operation to monitor observance of the cease-fire and to create conditions of peace between the two countries. The Organization also expresses its thanks for the work done by the four countries in question. Finally, the Organization decided to reiterate the vigilant presence of the Organization for the maintenance and strengthening of peace, and to contribute to the climate of understanding between the two countries, and instructed its Permanent Council to remain informed of the actions that both Governments take in compliance with the high purposes indicated in the resolution.

Thus, the Ecuadorian Government, fully aware that the Security Council should be kept duly informed of any action, situation or international resolution relating to its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has instructed me to submit this letter and its annex, which I request you to have distributed urgently as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Miguel ALBORNOZ
Permanent Representative of Ecuador
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Resolution contained in the Final Act of the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of the Organization of American States

[For the text, see S/14362.]

DOCUMENT S/14364*

Letter dated 4 February 1981 from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[6 February 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith, for your information, the statement dated 2 February 1981 by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea protesting against the arbitrary measures of the Government of India.

I should be grateful if you would have this statement circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) THIEUNN Prasith
Permanent Representative of Democratic Kampuchea
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Democratic Kampuchea dated 2 February 1981 protesting against the arbitrary measures of the Government of India

The non-aligned Ministerial Conference will open its session at New Delhi early this February. Democratic Kampuchea, which has always been a member of this non-aligned movement since its founding, has informed the Indian Government that it will attend the Conference like any other member. Participation in the Conference is the right and duty of Democratic Kampuchea. A large number of non-aligned countries have supported this position of Democratic Kampuchea. However, the Indian Government has, without any valid reason, turned down the request of Democratic Kampuchea by refusing to issue the entry visa to Democratic Kampuchea's delegation.

* Circulated under the double symbol, A/36/93-S/14364.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea expresses its deep regret at the Indian Government's decision, for between the two countries, Kampuchea and India, relations have not been affected whatsoever; instead there have been harmonious exchanges of culture and civilization ever since remote times. Now the Government of Democratic Kampuchea finds it necessary to raise its strongest protests against the arbitrary measures taken by the Indian Government, which uses its capacity as host country to take a unilateral and arbitrary decision seriously detrimental to the fundamental right of a member country of the non-aligned movement which is cruelly victim of an aggression by the Vietnamese Le Duan clique. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea urges the Indian Government to revise its stand and immediately issue an entry visa to the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea so that it will be able to arrive in time at New Delhi.

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea also protests energetically against the behaviour at the least, dubious of the Indian Government, which has circulated a draft declaration by the Conference on the problem of South-East Asia. As has been noted by many non-aligned countries, this draft emits a foul smell which seems to come from the Hanoi authorities. Through this draft, the Indian Government has no other aim than to save those authorities at a time when they are driven into an impasse, assailed in every field, in particular in the international arena, where they are under pressure from all sides—from the South-East Asian countries and the peace- and justice-loving countries in the world—to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea.

The Indian Government move has no other effect than to blemish the Indian renown, for the international community as a whole, in particular two thirds of the non-aligned countries, opposes this aggression against Kampuchea and calls upon the Hanoi authorities to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea. The Indian delegation will certainly hear the voice of justice rising again amidst the Conference.

As was said in the 21 January 1981 statement [S/14349], the Government of Democratic Kampuchea is convinced that the overwhelming majority of the non-aligned countries will not allow the Hanoi authorities and Cuba to use the New Delhi Ministerial Conference to achieve the strategy of "Indo-Chinese federation" and the expansionist strategy of the Hanoi authorities and the Soviet Union in South-East Asia. It is convinced that the Conference will reject any attempt by the Hanoi authorities to have their Vietnamese administration at Phnom Penh sneaked into the movement. The non-aligned movement will not recover its vitality and will not be able to fulfil its role as an independent and non-bloc movement as in the past, unless Democratic Kampuchea sees the Havana injustice repaired and its legitimate rights and seat restored in the movement, unless measures are taken—among which is the convening of an international conference—to compel the Hanoi authorities to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea in conformity with the United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6 and unless measures are adopted to resolve the major problems in the world such as those of Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

DOCUMENT S/14365*

Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the representative of Morocco to the Secretary-General

[Original: French]
[6 February 1981]

In my capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group for the month of February, I have the honour to inform you that the Group has requested me to draw your attention to the comments made by the Mayor of the city of New York, Mr. Edward Koch, during his recent visit to the Middle East.

Mr. Koch's expressions of approval for the annexation of Jerusalem and the establishment of Israeli settlements are calculated to give Israel even more encouragement to persist in its defiance of all the United Nations resolutions on Israeli settlements and the annexation of Jerusalem.

Mr. Koch's charge that the United Nations yields to pressure and blackmail to the point, if necessary, of "selling their own grandmothers", and his insinuations of "anti-Semitism" in the United Nations, are irres-

possible and show a lack of understanding of the process required in order to establish the international will and arrive at an international consensus.

By his actions, the Mayor, as the highest official of the host city to the United Nations diplomatic community, has in fact slandered not only the Arabs but also the international community.

The Arab Group in the United Nations wishes to lodge a strong protest and calls on the Mayor to retract his comments and apologize for his insulting remarks.

I would request you to circulate this letter as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Rachid LAHLOU
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Morocco
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/94-S/14365.

DOCUMENT S/14367

Letter dated 6 February 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[6 February 1981]

At the request of the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, the Honourable R. F. Botha, I am enclosing the text of a letter he addressed to you today.

I should appreciate it if this letter and annexure

were to be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) D. W. STEWARD
Deputy Permanent Representative of South Africa
to the United Nations

LETTER DATED 6 FEBRUARY 1981 FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INFORMATION OF SOUTH AFRICA ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On 2 February 1981, the Permanent Representative of Mozambique addressed a letter to you stating that South Africa had "invaded" Mozambique and assassinated "refugees" [S/14358]. On the same day you expressed deep concern for 'a raid into Mozambique by units of the South African armed forces'.

In order to place South Africa's action in its proper perspective, it is essential that I draw your attention, first of all, to a press release I issued on 19 February 1980 regarding activities which were already at that time being planned against South Africa from within Mozambique. That press release contained the text of a formal note addressed by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Mozambique, and read as follows:

"In spite of the assurances received from the Mozambique authorities that ANC terrorists and other subversive organizations do not operate from their territory against South Africa, recent events have produced conclusive evidence that terrorists who plan subversion in South Africa are being harboured in Mozambique and are conducting murderous operations and acts of sabotage against the Republic of South Africa from bases in Mozambique.

"The South African Government holds the Government of Mozambique fully responsible for the presence of these terrorists in its territory and for their actions which are indisputably in breach of international law. These activities violate the territorial integrity of South Africa and amount to acts of aggression.

"In these circumstances it is incumbent on the Mozambique Government, in the interests of the maintenance of internationally accepted norms of conduct, to take effective steps to terminate these hostile acts and to ensure that no haven is given in Mozambique to individuals or groups perpetrating such acts.

"The South African Government reserves the right to take whatever steps may in its view be necessary, wherever and whenever, to protect South African life and property."

In subsequent discussions the Mozambique Government was again informed about ANC activities at

Maputo. The South African Government offered to produce proof that the ANC members at Maputo were not acting and behaving as refugees, but were actively involved in terrorist activities directed against South Africa. The Mozambique Government was warned on several occasions that unless practical steps were taken to put an end to these activities South Africa would be forced to act and take appropriate steps.

The action the South African Defence Forces were compelled to take on 30 January 1981 was directed solely at ANC terrorists. Everything possible was done to avoid contact with Mozambican forces and civilians. The attack on these terrorist targets followed after irrefutable information had been obtained that Mozambique was being used as a spring-board for terrorist attacks against South Africa.

The South African Government has in its possession evidence that the terrorist attacks on an industrial installation, and on public buildings in South Africa, as well as the holding of hostages in a bank, had been planned and launched from the ANC premises at Maputo.

I am constrained to reaffirm the South African Government's position on terrorism, namely that it is resolutely committed to act against the threat which terrorism poses to South Africa and its people, whether it originates within South Africa or in a neighbouring country. A country actively or passively supporting those who plan and commit terrorism and subversion, and which, in addition, harbours them, will have to bear the consequences.

The time has come for those countries which identify with terrorist movements and their designs, and also provide sanctuaries to them, to make a clear choice between constructive development and violent destruction. South Africa's choice in that respect is clear. It is imperative that they also make their choice. The South African Government stands ready to cooperate with and assist those who want to play a constructive role in developing their countries and in promoting peace and stability in their regions.

However, South Africa shall not cease to protect its people and their property against the onslaught of terrorism, wherever it breeds. Accordingly, my Government will continue to combat and eliminate this threat, irrespective of the consequences.

(Signed) R. F. BOTHA
Minister of Foreign Affairs and
Information of South Africa

DOCUMENT S/14368*

Letter dated 5 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[9 February 1981]

I have the honour to inform you that the South African Government sent us a telex today at 1210 hours, Maputo time, stating the following:

(a) The South African personnel at Maputo is being instructed to return to Pretoria today or tomorrow for consultations.

(b) The South African Government assumes that in the meantime the Mozambican Government will guarantee the security of the personnel.

In conjunction with the South African attack of 30 January 1981 against the residences of the South African refugees, members of ANC, at Maputo, which was a characteristic act of aggression, the South African forces continue to concentrate large number of troops

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/96-S/14368.

and war equipment along our borders and have been systematically and frequently violating our airspace.

These facts, together with the "call for consultations" of the South African personnel in Mozambique, make us believe that the South African Government is preparing an aggression and other adventurous actions of unforeseen consequences against the People's Republic of Mozambique which can be translated into a declared or undeclared war.

We request therefore that you take energetic and immediate actions in order to dissuade the South Afri-

can Government from its intention to carry out this imminent aggression and to consider all measures with the view to supporting the People's Republic of Mozambique in face of the designed aggression.

I would like to request that this letter be circulated among all Member States as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Joaquim Alberto CHISSANO
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the
People's Republic of Mozambique

DOCUMENT S/14369*

Letter dated 6 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[9 February 1981]

With reference to the letter dated 27 January 1981 addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Thailand [S/14345] on so-called violations of Thailand's sovereignty and territorial integrity by "Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces", I have the honour to transmit herewith a report dated 5 February issued by the SPK news agency of the People's Republic of Kampuchea concerning deliberate acts of violation of the sovereignty of Kampuchea committed by the armed forces of Thailand during the month of January 1981.

The SPK report proves once again that the Government of Thailand continues to pursue its policy of actively backing armed supporters of Pol Pot using sanctuaries in Thai territory to carry out banditry and sabotage against the reconstruction efforts of the people of Kampuchea.

This policy of the Thai authorities, which is no secret, constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and a direct intervention in the internal affairs of the Kampuchean people. It also constitutes a serious violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law and in no way serves the cause of peace and security in the region. What is more, such an adventurous policy is a real and long-term danger for the peoples of the region—including the Thai people themselves—in that it furthers the expansionist and hegemonistic designs that the authorities of Beijing have on South-East Asia.

Consequently, upon instructions of my Government, I categorically refute the allegations of the Permanent Representative of Thailand that Viet Nam is responsible for the explosive situation currently prevailing in the border area between Kampuchea and Thailand. Peace and stability in South-East Asia, particularly peace and security in the Kampuchea-Thailand border area depend solely on the policy of the Government of Thailand, which has paid no heed to several constructive proposals made to it by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and

the attached report circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Thailand's continued violations of Kampuchea's sovereignty in January 1981

In spite of the repeated strong protests made by the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Thai authorities, while carrying out provocative acts against the Democratic People's Republic of Laos, have perpetrated, and even stepped up, their acts of violation of the territory, the airspace and the territorial waters of Kampuchea.

Thus in the course of January 1981, Thai planes ranging from L-19, C-7 to F-5 and OV-10 types, flew 67 sorties over the airspace of Kampuchea sometimes as deep as 5 to 7 kilometres inside Kampuchea. Meanwhile, big-caliber artillery pieces stationed in Thailand, such as recoilless guns, 105-mm guns, 82-mm mortars and even rockets, shelled Kampuchea's territory on 515 occasions, 76 of them to shoulder the Pol Pot bandits' penetration into Kampuchea.

During the first five days of January, Thai planes flew 19 sorties over the airspace of all the Kampuchean provinces bordering Thailand, either on reconnaissance missions or to guide Thai artillery shellings into Kampuchea. On 2 January alone, as many as 10 sorties of Thai planes were recorded in the area east and west of Preah Vihear temple (Preah Vihear province); artillery shellings from Thailand into Kampuchean territory occurred almost daily, causing numerous material damages and human casualties among the Kampuchean civilian population living in the border area and whose lives have been very much disturbed. On 25 January alone, Thai 105-mm guns hurled almost 100 shells into the areas north-east of Kala, north of Nimit and west of Pailin; under the cover of Thai artillery shellings, the Pol Pot bandits have on 76 occasions in the course of January alone penetrated into Kampuchea, in the areas of Sam Rong, Ta Santy Sratueng, east of the Menam river, west of the Klong river, Phnommelai, east of Choan Ksang, Thmar Puok and the areas around heights 172 and 322. All of these bandits have been intercepted by Kampuchean forces and 79 of them killed and 5 arrested; the rest have fled back into Thailand, leaving behind a quantity of weapons and mines.

The above-mentioned acts and figures constitute irrefutable proofs of Thailand's repeated and deliberate violations of Kampuchea's sovereignty and territorial integrity. They show that it is these very acts of Thailand in collusion with the Beijing bellicists and expansionists, the United States imperialists and other reactionaries that are the source of tension and instability in the frontier area between Kampuchea and Thailand.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/97-S/14369.

DOCUMENT S/14370

Letter dated 9 February 1981 from the representative of India to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[10 February 1981]

I have the honour to convey the following message to you from the Secretary-General of the Conference for Ministers for Foreign Affairs now being held at New Delhi:

"I have the honour to convey to you the following message on behalf of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries currently meeting at New Delhi.

"The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries strongly condemns the aggression by a group of commandos from the racist régime of South Africa against Matola, a settlement in the outskirts of Maputo, the capital of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

"The target of the commandos was three residences of South African refugees. Eleven refugees as well as an expatriate Portuguese serving in Mozambique were assassinated by the attackers.

"The barbarous aggression on the part of the minority South African régime is part of an imperialist plan intended to weaken, terrorize and unsettle the independent States of southern Africa and to divert attention from the explosive internal situation in South Africa, the sole cause of which is the disgraceful policy of *apartheid*.

"In the days following the attack, the Government of Mozambique reported a growing concentration of South African troops and combat equipment near its border and systematic and frequent violations of Mozambique's airspace. South Africa has also withdrawn South African citizens at Maputo, which indicates that it is preparing attacks on a large scale, with incalculable consequences, and that a situation of declared or undeclared war is becoming acute.

"With arrogant insolence, the authorities of Pretoria acknowledged responsibility for the aggression

that had been perpetrated and threatened the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique for having accepted South African refugees on its territory and for implementing the United Nations resolution condemning *apartheid*. There is no doubt that the racist régime feels itself encouraged by the increasing support it receives from its allies.

"The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries condemns the criminal acts that have been committed and reports the dangerous situation for the independence, territorial integrity and security of Mozambique that is represented by the atrocious acts of the South Africa régime.

"The Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries give notice that they will fulfil their obligations of solidarity with the front-line States and solemnly reaffirm that Mozambique will not stand alone against the military escalation practised by the racist régime at Pretoria. They appeal to all States to increase their financial and material assistance to the front-line States in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity with regard to strengthening the defensive capacity of those countries.

"The Conference appeals to the United Nations and to world public opinion to adopt energetic and immediate actions to prevent such acts of aggression, which threaten peace and security in the region and the world."

I should be grateful if you would kindly circulate this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) S. V. PURUSHOTTAM
Acting Permanent Representative of India
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14371

Letter dated 10 February 1981 from the representative of Peru to the President of the Security Council

[Original: Spanish]
[10 February 1981]

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to document S/14362 of 5 February 1981 containing the telegram of the same date addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States. This telegram was accompanied by the resolution entitled "Cessation of the military operations in the Peruvian-Ecuadorian border area in the El Condor mountain range and maintenance of peace" adopted by the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States.

In this respect, and to ensure that the Security Council is fully informed of all activities undertaken or planned, in conformity with existing treaties, to ensure the maintenance of peace and security in the El Condor mountain range, I have the honour to attach herewith, in addition to the text of the resolution mentioned above, the text of the statement made at that Meeting by the special delegates of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America, in their capacity as countries guaranteeing the Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 29 January 1942, and

the explanation given by the Minister of External Relations of Peru on that occasion.

I would be grateful if you would circulate this letter and its three annexes as Security Council documents as a matter of urgency.

(Signed) José URRUTÍA
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Peru
to the United Nations

ANNEX I

Resolution adopted on 4 February 1981 by the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States

[For the text, see S/14362.]

DOCUMENT S/14373*

Letter dated 10 February 1981 from the representative of China to the Secretary-General

[Original: Chinese/English]
[12 February 1981]

I have the honour to enclose herewith excerpts from the press conference given by the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, Zhao Ziyang, on 1 February 1981 at Bangkok, where he was paying an official visit as the head of a Government delegation from 30 January to 2 February. I request that the excerpts be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) LING Qing
Permanent Representative of the
People's Republic of China
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Excerpts from Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang's press conference at Bangkok on 1 February 1981

Commenting on the Vietnamese proposal for convening a regional meeting between the two State groups of Indo-China and the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Premier Zhao said the following.

Viet Nam issued a statement [S/14351, annex I] on 28 January 1981 in the name of a so-called Foreign Ministers' conference of the three Indo-Chinese countries, calling for a regional meeting of the two State groups of Indo-China and ASEAN. It is a reproduction of the four-point proposal of the Vientiane conference of July 1980 and there is nothing new in it.

Viet Nam's pursuance of regional hegemonism with Soviet backing is the root cause of tension in South-East Asia and of the disruption of peace and stability in the region. Viet Nam's military occupation of Kampuchea, its control of Laos and repeated incursions into Thailand have gravely menaced the peace and security of the South-East Asian region. This is the essence of the problem, which cannot be distorted by fabricating a so-called "Chinese threat" or hurling charges against ASEAN.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/99-S/14373.

ANNEX II

Statement by the special delegates of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America at the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States in their capacity as countries guaranteeing the Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 29 January 1942

[For the text, see S/14384.]

ANNEX III

Explanation given by the Minister of External Relations of Peru after the adoption by the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States of the resolution entitled "Cessation of the military operations in the Peruvian-Ecuadorian border area in the El Condor mountain range and maintenance of peace"

Peru has voted in favour of this resolution, which is indissolubly linked to the statement made by the representative of Brazil on behalf of the four countries guaranteeing the Protocol of Rio de Janeiro of 29 January 1942.

The hypocritical proposal of the Vietnamese authorities was made with ulterior motives and meant to achieve the following purposes:

First, to cajole the international community into recognizing Indo-China as a sphere of influence of Viet Nam;

Secondly, to dupe ASEAN countries into giving *de facto* recognition to the Heng Samrin régime;

Thirdly, to use the "conference between the two groups of countries" to substitute and counter the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session on the convocation of an international conference;

Fourthly, to distort the root cause of tension in South-East Asia and avert condemnation by international opinion.

As to the question of concluding bilateral agreements between the three Indo-Chinese countries and China, it is well known that there exists a long-standing friendship between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples and that China has pursued a consistent policy of developing friendly relations with the Indo-Chinese countries. This is beneficial not only to China's modernization and the restoration and development of the national economy of the Indo-Chinese countries, but also to peace and stability in South-East Asia. The Chinese Government stated long ago that normal relations between China and Viet Nam can be restored immediately provided that Viet Nam withdraws its troops completely from Kampuchea and the Vietnamese Government abandons its ambition for domination of Indo-China and expansion in South-East Asia and no longer serves as a Soviet base for the latter's southward drive. The Vietnamese authorities are merely attempting to dupe world opinion when they suggest the signing of bilateral agreements while continuing the policy of expansion and aggression.

The Chinese Government is ready to work with the ASEAN countries for the implementation of the resolution adopted at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. It has made clear that after the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea, China will, together with the countries concerned, including Viet Nam, join in an international guarantee of non-aggression against Kampuchean territory, non-use of Kampuchean territory for encroaching upon the independence and sovereignty of other countries in this region and non-interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea in any form. This is the correct way to safeguard peace and stability in South-East Asia.

DOCUMENT S/14374*

Letter dated 13 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[17 February 1981]

I have the honour to forward herewith the statement dated 11 February 1981 by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam on the armed provocations by Thailand against the Lao People's Democratic Republic and kindly request you to have this letter and its annex circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement by the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam of 11 February 1981

Over recent days, Thailand has committed repeated and serious armed provocations against the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Particularly on 7 February, Thai troops fired mortar and 105-mm cannon shells on Sangkhy Island, Udone village, Hatsaiphong district, Vientiane province, and at the same time invaded this area of Laos, causing tension on the Thai-Lao border. Afterwards, the Thai side unilaterally closed Tha Dua and Tam Neleng border crossing points in an attempt to impose an economic blockade and cause difficulties to Laos.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/103-S/14374.

These acts of the ultra-rightists among the Thai ruling circles have grossly infringed upon the sovereignty of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, openly violated the joint declarations and border agreements between the two countries and undermined the Thai-Lao relations. These acts, which took place following the visit to Thailand by Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang, are part of the scheme of the Chinese expansionists, in collusion with the United States imperialists and the ultra-rightist reactionaries among the Thai authorities, to cause tension in this region. It is clear that by provoking the Thai-Lao border event, the Thai authorities have deliberately strained the Thai-Lao relations with a view to increasing hostility between the Association of South-East Asian Nations and Indo-Chinese countries, eluding the fair and reasonable proposals of the conference of Foreign Ministers of Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, sabotaging peace and stability in South-East Asia, countering the trend to dialogue between the Association and Indo-Chinese countries, sowing division between the three Indo-Chinese countries and between Laos and Viet Nam; this policy runs completely counter to the aspirations of the people of Thailand and of South-East Asia as a whole for peace, stability and development of friendly relations and good neighbourhood between the countries in the region.

The only result the ultra-rightist reactionaries among the Thai ruling circles could reap is total failure should they continue to provoke hostility among countries in the region and lend a hand to the Beijing expansionists in opposing the Lao People's Democratic Republic. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam fully supports the correct stand of the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic as expounded in the 10 February 1981 statement which demands that Thailand stop immediately its acts of hostility towards the Lao People's Democratic Republic and holds it fully responsible for all consequences of its acts.

DOCUMENT S/14375

Letter dated 17 February 1981 from the representative of Malta to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[18 February 1981]

It has always been the strong wish of the Maltese Government that your representative should be present at Valletta for the ratification and notification to the International Court of Justice of the 1976 Malta/Libya agreement concerning the continental shelf. The Libyan Government, on the contrary, has strongly opposed such a presence on the grounds that this was a bilateral matter.

In order to show their good faith and not to place obstacles to an amicable agreement, at least on this issue, the Maltese Government accepted—very much against their wishes—to receive a Libyan delegation to Malta to implement their promise repeatedly made to you and to the Security Council. That promise—to quote from Mr. Cordovez's letter to the Permanent Mission of the Jamahiriya dated 6 February 1981—was that the "Jamahiriya is ready to exchange the instruments of ratification of the special agreement with Malta and to formalize the submission of the delimitation case to the International Court of Justice".

In your report to the Security Council of 13 November 1980, you stated that "the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has undertaken unconditionally to submit

the original text of the agreement to the Popular Congresses for ratification during their current session, which is scheduled to conclude on 22 November, with a view to exchanging the instruments of ratification and formulating the joint notification to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice, as provided for in article IV of the agreement, during the first two weeks of December" [S/14256, para. 5].

On Sunday, 15 February, Malta's Charge d'affaires at Tripoli was officially informed that a Libyan delegation was about to visit Malta for the exchange of the instruments of ratification. When he asked about the formal submission of the case to the International Court of Justice, he was bluntly informed that this would be negotiated and finalized at some unstated future date.

This perhaps explains why Libya did not desire your representative to be present at Valletta. The Jamahiriya has once more broken a promise it has solemnly given. What makes it more serious this time is that the promise Libya has now broken was made to the Security Council itself and to you. It is therefore not only more grave but also indisputable.

The Government of the Republic of Malta cannot but express the hope that the Security Council will now have no further doubt that unless it acts and acts quickly, the dispute will not be settled and can therefore only degenerate into a situation threatening once more the security of the region.

I should be grateful if you would kindly arrange for this letter to be issued as a Security Council document.

(Signed) V. J. GAUCI
Permanent Representative of Malta
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14376*

Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 February 1981]

I have the honour to refer to the letter to you from the Permanent Representative of Jordan of 2 February 1981 [S/14356] and to state that his allegations are, once again, without foundation.

Like members of all faiths, the Muslim population at Jerusalem and in Judaea-Samaria enjoys complete freedom of worship; all its holy places are well protected and preserved, and its religious leaders and officials are treated with the full respect due to them. The significant increase in the building of new mosques in cities, towns and villages throughout the area in recent years amply testifies to the freedom and vibrancy of religious life there. Israel makes possible religious ties with Muslim authorities and institutions abroad and also does everything in its power to facilitate participation in the pilgrimage to Mecca.

In December 1980, three Muslim religious functionaries were arrested on suspicion of involvement in terroristic activities—and not, it must be emphasized, in connection with their religious functions. All three have already been released, one on bail. The three are:

1. Jamal Abd al-Latif Attiya Jubran—a preacher from Tubas: arrested on 12 December, released on 3 February;

2. Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Rahman Abu Zeid—Supervisor of Islamic Instruction in Jenin: arrested on 18 December, released on 2 February;

3. Said Ahmad Muhammad Said, known as Sheikh Said B'lal—Supervisor of Mosques in the Nablus area: arrested on 16 December, released on bail on 9 February.

These are the only arrests which have been made. Thus the allegation made in the message incorporated in the above-mentioned letter from the Permanent Representative of Jordan, to the effect that 20 other Muslim religious functionaries have lately been arrested, is without truth or foundation.

I should also like to take this opportunity of referring to the letter of 23 December 1980 which the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to you [S/14317] in connection with the small fire which broke out in an Armenian chapel within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on 14 October. The Permanent Representative of Jordan had seized on that mishap in a letter to you of 29 October [S/14241] to suggest that the fire was "a criminal attempt to burn the Church of the Holy Sepulchre". His allegations were disposed of in my letter to you of 4 November [S/14243], and I now deem the mendacious and mischievous accusations by unidentified "witnesses" contained in his second letter on the subject as unworthy of reply.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/105-S/14376.

DOCUMENT S/14377*

Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 February 1981]

I have the honour to forward herewith the communiqué dated 16 February 1981 on Chinese crimes against Viet Nam over the past two years (1979–1980) made public by the commission of inquiry into the Chinese expansionists' and hegemonists' crime of war

of aggression, and I kindly request you to have this letter and its annex circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) HA VAN LAU
Permanent Representative of the
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/106-S/14377.

ANNEX

Communiqué dated 16 February 1981 on Chinese crimes against Viet Nam over the past two years (1979-1980)

After their defeats in the two wars of aggression against Viet Nam, the Chinese reactionaries have not given up their scheme of aggression against our country. During the past two years, they entered into an alliance with imperialism, in particular with the United States and Japan, causing other reactionary forces to oppose Viet Nam and the revolutions in Laos and Kampuchea. Following is a list of their crimes against our people:

1. Preparations for and threats of a new war

Since March 1979, the Chinese reactionaries have permanently deployed some 15 infantry divisions close to the border areas. This force is backed up by five army corps in the rear areas. Recently they deployed one army corps close to the Vietnamese border provinces of Lang Son and Quang Ninh, and several heavy artillery regiments facing the provinces of Lai Chau and Hoang Lien Son. They incessantly moved weapons and war material to the border areas, built more shelters and trenches, and fighting positions. They enlarged and opened more roads, widened airfields near the border areas and sent several units of fighter planes and bombers there. They built many military installations on Hainan island and the Hoang Sa (Paracel) archipelago, which they have seized from Viet Nam. They also conducted military manoeuvres involving various armed services in areas adjacent to the Vietnamese border and territorial waters.

2. Intensification of armed provocations and incursions on land, in the territorial waters and the airspace of Viet Nam

Chinese troops caused over 4,000 armed provocations in Vietnamese border areas, including 750 incursions; they seized 34 more heights, 27 points by illegally cultivating them. There were almost constant mortar and artillery shellings or firing of missiles, ambushes, killing and capturing of local inhabitants, and looting of property and crops. Serious incidents took place such as the firing of thousands of artillery shells and missiles on Coc Pai township (Ha Tuyen province) and the surrounding areas in one day in October 1980, the attack on Kin Man commune (Ha Tuyen province) with regiment size units supported by artillery for several days in October 1980.

As a result, more than 200 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 500 country dwellings demolished, 15,000 square metres of floor space destroyed, as well as 37 hospitals and health stations and 47 schools and many shops were ruined. Four hundred and ten head of cattle were either stolen or killed, causing tens of thousands of hectares of land to lie untilled, aggravating the tension and upsetting the normal life of the population in border areas.

In Vietnamese territorial waters, the Chinese troops sent more than 1,000 armed craft to violate the areas surrounding the islands of Bach Long Vy (Haiphong), Tran, Thanh Lan and Vinh Thuc (Quang Ninh province), Hon Me (Thanh Hoa province) and Nam Yet (belonging to the Truong Sa archipelago) on reconnaissance missions, and to upset and threaten the normal life of Vietnamese fishermen, to capture people for information or to use them as agents; they brazenly violated Viet Nam's sovereignty over its territorial waters, stating that the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa (Spratley) archipelagoes are Chinese territory, stipulating four danger areas around the Hoang Sa archipelago and brazenly announcing plans to explore and drill for oil, in areas under Vietnamese sovereignty.

In the air, the Chinese sent hundreds of flights of fighter planes to violate Vietnamese airspace, sometimes tens of kilometres inside Vietnamese territory.

3. Intensification of the psychological and spy war against Viet Nam

At the Viet Nam-China border, the Chinese reactionaries sent scouts, commandos and spies to collect intelligence, kidnap cadres and people for information; they also persuaded some to act as their agents and encouraged bandits to cause troubles in border areas.

By persuasion and force they caused Vietnamese people living in border areas to flee to China, and dispatched spies to infiltrate Vietnamese villages and hamlets.

They brainwashed a number of Hoa or Vietnamese whom they had coerced to flee to China, and concentrated them in seven centres for political, military and spy training in the military zones of Yunnan and Guangzhou; they were grouped into "special guerilla units" to conduct sabotage activities against Viet Nam. They are contemplating setting up so called "black uniform divisions".

They built 20 public address systems along the border with Viet Nam, distributed 28 types of leaflets on Vietnamese territory by mortar shells, rafts and balloons; by all these means they are waging a propaganda and spy war to distort, criticize and divide the Vietnamese ethnic minorities and to foment unrest among the population.

Inland, the Chinese reactionaries used radio broadcasts from Beijing, Kunming, Guangzhou and Fukien, and radio "Democratic Kampuchea" and co-ordinated with radio stations of imperialist countries to broadcast several daily programmes in Vietnamese to create unrest. They also made use of the postal service to send 19 newspapers in the Vietnamese language and psy-war letters.

In collusion with the United States imperialists, they talked Vietnamese citizens into leaving the country. They permanently deployed ships at sea to pick up those people, whom they used for propaganda and spying purposes.

4. Intensification of economic sabotage

At the Viet Nam-China border, they set up a network of shops, markets, and mobile open-air markets to drain Viet Nam of its agricultural produce, medicinal plants and domestic animals, thus sabotaging the Vietnamese currency. On the other hand they plundered or killed cattle and domestic animals, poisoned wells, planted mines in fields and gardens, and drove animals carrying epidemic germs into Viet Nam.

At the Viet Nam-Laos and Viet Nam-Kampuchea borders, in collusion with the Lao reactionaries and the remnants of Polpot-Ieng Sary troops, they set up contraband rings which smuggled narcotics and luxury goods into Viet Nam, draining the country of its gold and precious stones.

They used their agents to sabotage production, the economic establishments and communication lines of the three Indo-Chinese countries.

The crimes committed by the reactionary Chinese authorities have caused great damage to Viet Nam and have undermined peace in South-East Asia.

The commission of inquiry into the Chinese expansionists' and hegemonists' crime of war of aggression denounces before the peoples of Viet Nam, China and the world those heinous crimes committed against our country.

We call on all forces for peace and justice throughout the world, and the Chinese people, for the sake of peace and friendship among nations, and for the sake of peace in South-East Asia, to step up the struggle to compel the Chinese reactionaries to end their hostile actions against Viet Nam and other Indo-Chinese countries.

DOCUMENT S/14378

Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Sierra Leone to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[19 February 1981]

I have the honour, on instructions from my Government, to bring to your attention the situation in Chad. In this connection, please find attached herewith:

1. The Lagos Accord on National Reconciliation in Chad, dated 18 August 1979.
2. The resolution on Chad adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organi-

zation of African Unity at its seventeenth ordinary session, held at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 1 to 4 July 1980.

3. The final communiqué issued at Lomé on 14 January 1981 of the Bureau of the seventeenth summit of the Organization of African Unity and the OAU Standing Committee on Chad.

I shall be grateful if the above documents could be circulated as documents of the Security Council as a matter of urgency.

(Signed) Abdul G. KOROMA
Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Sierra Leone
to the United Nations

ANNEX I

Lagos Accord on National Reconciliation in Chad, dated 18 August 1979

We, the undersigned, leaders of the various Chadian Parties, meeting at Lagos, Nigeria, from 13 to 18 August 1979, in consultation with the official representatives of the following countries: Cameroon, Libya, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Congo, Liberia, Benin, Central African Empire, and the representative of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (hereafter called participating countries and observers),

Considering the tragic events which have bedevilled the national unity and sovereignty of Chad for the past 13 years,

Desirous of preserving the national unity and territorial integrity of Chad, have solemnly agreed as follows:

Cease-fire

1. (a) To proclaim immediately and maintain a cease-fire throughout the national territory and we undertake to respect it strictly. The neighbouring countries undertake on their honour not to interfere in the internal affairs of Chad and to respect its territorial integrity.

(b) To ensure that the national radio is used effectively to inform the entire Chadian people about the cease-fire.

(c) (i) To demilitarize N'Djamena: to that end, all the armed forces shall withdraw to a distance of not less than 100 kilometres from N'Djamena. To proceed to recuperate deposits of clandestine arms. All arms and gunpowder deposits shall be under the control of the neutral forces.

(ii) The neutral troops shall protect all important Chadian personalities as well as the civilian population of N'Djamena and the following towns: Abéché, Faya, Moundou, Sahr.

(iii) The specialized services of the armed forces such as the air force and the maintenance personnel of the air force shall be under the control of the neutral force until the Transitional National Union Government is formed. The responsibility of ensuring the use and control of the other public services shall be the sovereign preserve of only the Transitional National Union Government.

(d) To establish an effective neutral force composed of the troops of one or more countries not having common borders with Chad. To ensure free movement of the civilian population throughout the territory of Chad. The mission of the neutral forces shall end as soon as an integrated armed force is set up.

2. (a) To set up an independent Monitoring Commission headed by the Secretary-General of OAU or his representative and under the moral authority of the Chairman of the Transitional National Union Government and composed of two (2) representatives of each of the following participating and observer countries: Benin, Cameroon, Central African Empire, Congo, Liberia, Libya, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal and Sudan. One (1) representative of each of the Chadian Parties signatories to the present Accord. The headquarters of the Commission shall be N'Djamena.

(b) To co-operate fully with the members of the Monitoring

Commission to facilitate their free movement through the Chadian territory in the accomplishment of their mission.

(c) The mandate of the Commission shall be:

(i) To ensure the application of the conditions of the cease-fire, as stipulated in the present Accord;

(ii) To ensure the effective maintenance of the cease-fire;

(iii) To ensure that all the provisions of the present Accord relating to the action programme are applied;

(iv) To ensure the neutrality of the national radio during the period from the coming into force of the cease-fire to the formation of the Transitional National Union Government.

3. Ensure that none of the Parties signatories of the present Accord uses a secret radio station and that the national radio is effectively used to promote peace, unity and national reconciliation.

General amnesty

4. (a) To release all political prisoners of war and political detainees not later than 15 days from the date of the formation of the Transitional National Union Government.

(b) The Transitional National Union Government shall proclaim immediately amnesty for all political exiles to enable them to return to their home country.

Formation of the Transitional National Union Government

5. (a) Form a Transitional National Union Government composed of all the factions signatory to the present Accord. The Government shall last for 18 months.

(b) The Transitional National Union Government shall be the sole authority of the State. It shall be responsible for the administration of Chad for the period it shall exist.

(c) The Transitional National Union Government shall be responsible for the application of an agreed political programme enabling the formation of a freely elected Government.

(d) Carry out a general reshuffle of posts of responsibility.

Integrated armed forces

6. Dissolve all the existing armed forces and set up an integrated national armed force.

Presence of French troops

7. The Chadian Parties unanimously recognized that the continued presence of French troops in Chad is an impediment to finding a peaceful reconciliation and solution to the Chadian problems. The Chadians therefore agreed that the Transitional National Union Government when formed shall effect the withdrawal of the French troops.

Entry into force of the Accord

8. The present Accord shall come into force as soon as it is signed.

9. A copy of the present Accord shall be deposited with the General Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity.

Signatories

<i>Frolinat</i>	<i>Official Leader</i>
First Volcan Army	Abdoulaye Adam Dana
National Democratic Union	Fatcho Balam
<i>Frolinat</i>	
First People's Army	Mahamat Abba Said
First People's Army, Revolutionary	
Democratic Council	Acyl Ahmed
<i>Frolinat</i>	
Original	Abba Siddik
<i>Frolinat</i>	
West Armed Forces (FAO)	Moussa Medela
<i>Frolinat</i>	
Main	Hadjero Senoussi

<i>Frolinat</i>	<i>Official Leader</i>
Popular Movement of the Liberation of Chad (MPLT)	Aboubakar Abdel Rahane
Popular Armed Forces (FAP)	Goukouni Heddei
Armed Forces of the North (FAN)	Hissène Habré
Armed Forces of Chad	Kamouge Wadal Abdel Kader

Participating countries

Libya	Ali A. Treiki
Niger	Moumouni A. Djermakoye
Nigeria	Major-General H.E.O. Adefope
Cameroon	Sadou Daoudou
Sudan	Izzeldin Hamid
Central African Empire	Jean-Paul Mokodopo

Observer countries

Congo	Nze Pierre
Benin	Léopold Ahoueya
Senegal	Moustapha Niasse
Liberia	C. Cecil Dennis, Jr.
Organization of African Unity	Peter U. Onu

Witness

Chairman	Major-General Shehu M. Yar' Adua, Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters
----------	--

ANNEX II

Resolution on Chad, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its seventeenth ordinary session held at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 1 to 4 July 1980

The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in its seventeenth ordinary session at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 1 to 4 July 1980,

Bearing in mind the essential provisions of this Accord concerning the formation of a Transitional National Union Government, the establishment of a cease-fire over the entire territory of Chad, the demilitarization of N'Djamena, the arrival of a neutral OAU force in Chad and the holding of free elections within a period of eighteen months,

Recalling resolution CM/RES. 769 (XXXIV) by which the Council of Ministers approved the despatch to Chad of an OAU peace-keeping force composed of contingents from Benin, the Congo and Guinea,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General of the OAU on the situation in Chad,

Deeply concerned over the continued hostilities in Chad, especially at N'Djamena, which have caused thousands of casualties, both dead and injured, and a massive flow of refugees into neighbouring countries, and the displacement of people from their homes within Chad itself,

Considering the fact that the efforts being made by the Transitional National Union Government both in pursuance of the Lagos Accord and to end the hostilities at N'Djamena are being undermined by repeated acts of interference by African and foreign powers,

Concerned by the fact that so far the OAU has not been able to raise the financial and material assistance necessary to establish a peace-keeping force in Chad to enforce a cease-fire that might be negotiated,

Further concerned that the internecine carnage and destruction of property in the Republic of Chad may continue unless prompt and effective action is taken.

1. *Takes note* of the report of the Secretary-General of the OAU;
2. *Reaffirms* the validity of the Lagos Accord as the basis for the settlement of the Chadian crisis;
3. *Reaffirms* support for the Transitional National Union Government headed by the President of that Government and appeals to all OAU Member States to continue to support the Transitional National Union Government in its effort to resolve the Chadian crisis;

4. *Appeals* to the Chadians to make every effort to implement a cease-fire in accordance with the Lagos Accord;

5. *Decides* to make one further attempt to find an African solution to the crisis, particularly with regard to the provision of the neutral OAU forces, by requesting African States which are in a position to provide peace-keeping forces at their own expense in accordance with conditions to be determined at the summit, it being understood that logistic and operational costs be met from voluntary contributions;

6. *Further decides* that, in the event of failure by the OAU to raise the necessary funds of the peace-keeping force by its own effort after a period of one month, the United Nations Security Council will be requested, through the African Group, for assistance, particularly the necessary financial means, to enable peace to be restored in Chad;

7. *Expresses appreciation* to those countries and eminent persons who have so far made excellent contributions to the solution of the Chadian problem.

ANNEX III

Final communiqué issued at Lomé on 14 January 1981 of the Bureau of the seventeenth summit of the OAU and the OAU Standing Committee on Chad

The heads of State, members of the Bureau of the seventeenth OAU summit and the OAU Standing Committee on Chad, and in the presence of the head of State of the Ivory Coast, meeting at Lomé on 14 January 1981, under the chairmanship of the current Chairman of the OAU,

Having reviewed developments in Chad since the last OAU meeting on Chad, held at Lagos on 23 and 24 December 1980, especially the reported agreement between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Transitional National Union Government of Chad to work towards a merger of their two countries,

Considering that any merger between States should be through the free expression of the people concerned through their democratically elected institutions,

Concerned at the resultant heightening of tension and insecurity in the region,

Concerned further at the serious danger of military intervention in the region, especially by extra-African Powers,

1. *Reaffirm* the validity of the Lagos Accord as the basis for the establishment of real and lasting peace and security in a sovereign, independent and stable Chad;

2. *Declare* that the reported merger agreement between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Transitional National Union Government of Chad violates both the spirit and the letter of the Lagos Accord, and therefore, stands condemned;

3. *Accordingly call upon* the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Transitional National Union Government of Chad to set aside the reported agreement as null and void;

4. *Affirm* that only a Government freely and democratically elected by the people of Chad and not the Transitional National Union Government has the competence and legitimacy to commit the nation and people of Chad in such a fundamental and far-reaching agreement;

5. *Call upon* the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other Powers immediately to withdraw all their troops and military personnel presently stationed on the Chadian national territory;

6. *Call upon* all member countries of the OAU, especially those with common borders with the Republic of Chad, to refuse their territories to be used by extra-African Powers and dissident Chadian groups as sanctuaries or bases for mounting armed attacks against the Republic of Chad;

7. *Decide* to send without further delay, with the assistance of the United Nations Organization, the Monitoring Commission, as established by the Lagos Accord, and an African peace-keeping force composed of troops from Benin, the Congo, Guinea and Togo, and which should see to the implementation of the various OAU decisions on Chad;

8. *Warn* that any elections not conducted under the auspices of the OAU are invalid;

9. *Mandate* the Secretary-General of the OAU to organize free and fair elections in Chad under the auspices and control of the OAU by the end of April 1981.

Letter dated 18 February 1981 from the representative of Iran to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 February 1981]

I have the honour to enclose herewith two notes, dated 1 December 1980, and 14 January 1981 respectively, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran addressed to the Embassy of the Republic of Iraq at Teheran.

It would be appreciated if these notes are distributed as a Security Council document.

(Signed) Jamal SHEMIRANI
Chargé d'affaires of the
Permanent Mission of Iran
to the United Nations

ANNEX I

Text of the note of 1 December 1980

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, with reference to note dated 16 November 1980 of the Foreign Ministry of Iraq addressed to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran at Baghdad [S/14272, annex II], once again emphasizes that the Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations, dated 13 June 1975,^a and its three appended Protocols,^a in compliance with article 4 of the said Treaty, are conclusive, permanent and inviolable. Land and water frontiers of the two contracting parties, in accordance with article 5 of the said Treaty, are inviolable, permanent and conclusive. The unilateral abrogation of the above-mentioned Treaty by the Government of Iraq is rejected by the Government of Iran.

As mentioned in its note dated 26 October 1980 [S/14249, annex], the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has always complied with the Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations dated 13 June 1975, its three appended Protocols and four supplementary agreements, dated 26 December 1975,^b and the provisions of the said Treaty and agreements have been and are considered by Iran to be in effect and binding.

With respect to the latter part of said note, it must be emphasized that it is the Government of Iraq that has consistently violated the provisions of the 1975 Treaty, and especially its Protocol concerning frontier security, through its inhumane acts of aggression, and has

^a See United Nations, *Treaty Series* Vol. 1017, No. 14903.

^b *Ibid.*, Nos. 14904-14907.

endangered the internal security of Iran by dispatching armed agents and groups to the frontier provinces of Iran to carry on sabotage activities and by assisting the enemies of the Iranian revolution. Furthermore, it is the Government of Iraq that has inflicted irreparable injuries to the good neighbourly relations between the two countries by imposing a war on Iran through flagrant armed aggression and surprise air raids on cities and residential areas. It must be added that if there exists any difficulty for the Government of Iraq as regards the execution of the said Treaty and other concluded agreements, article 6 of the said Treaty and its annex dated 26 December 1975 have explicitly and in detail provided for the settlement of such difficulties.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran again states that it considers the Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations between Iran and Iraq dated 13 June 1975, its three appended Protocols, exchanged letters, common procès-verbaux and appendices, as well as the four supplementary agreements dated 26 December 1975, as valid and binding.

ANNEX II

Text of the note of 14 January 1981

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, with reference to Note No. 17650/4/1/7 dated 27 December 1980 of the Foreign Ministry of Iraq addressed to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran at Baghdad, states the following.

As has been already stated in previous notes dated 26 October and 1 and 15 December 1980, in compliance with article 5 of the Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations between Iran and Iraq dated 13 June 1975, and within the context of the inviolability of frontiers and full respect for the territorial integrity of States, the land and water frontiers between Iran and Iraq are inalterable, permanent and final and the unilateral abrogation of the said Treaty by the Government of the Republic of Iraq is devoid of validity and legal effect. As has been frequently declared, the Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations between Iran and Iraq dated 13 June 1975, its three appended Protocols, exchanged letters and common procès-verbaux, its appendices and the four supplementary agreements dated 26 December 1975 are still in effect for the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Therefore, the full responsibility for the flagrant invasion, imposed war, and attacking of Iran, as well as the consequent and ensuing outcomes of these actions of which the international community is well aware, lies with the Government of Iraq.

DOCUMENT S/14380

Letter dated 20 February 1981 from the representative of Chad to the President of the Security Council

[Original: French]
[20 February 1981]

With reference to the letter dated 18 February 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Sierra Leone [S/14378], and on the orders of my Government, I have the honour to draw your attention to the following:

(a) Since the defeat of the rebel group, peace and calm have returned to Chad. The situation in the interior does not constitute a threat to international peace and security. On the contrary, it is the subversive intrigues of certain powers which are threatening the new-found stability and peace in Chad.

(b) The documents annexed to the above-

mentioned letter are internal documents of the Organization of African Unity and one of them, the final communiqué of 14 January 1981, has not yet been approved by the OAU summit of heads of State. They should under no circumstances be the subject of any communication to States Members of the United Nations.

(c) The final communiqué of Lomé of 14 January 1981 in no way commits my Government, since it was adopted in Chad's absence.

(d) The predominant position has always been to avoid internationalizing the Chad problem. It is in this

context that the document recently adopted unanimously at Algiers as an outcome of the work of the Ministerial Conference of States bordering the Sahara, and intended for consideration by the heads of State of those States, expressly states that:

"all the participants forcefully reaffirmed that the problem of Chad is a purely African problem and, as such, it cannot be considered in any non-African forum".

(e) Consequently, my Government firmly opposes any consideration of the situation in Chad by the Security Council.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Ngaré KESSELY
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of
Chad to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14381

Letter dated 24 February 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[24 February 1981]

On instructions from my Government I have the honour to bring to your attention, once more, a serious and unprovoked aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon.

During the night of 22/23 February 1981, at 2205 hours, five Israeli helicopters landed troops near the village of Kfour, north-west of Nabatiyeh. This operation was carried out under the cover of heavy artillery shelling of the area, with concentration on the following villages: Beaufort, Al-Hamra, Yuhmor, Kfar Tibnit, Horsh en-Nabi Taher, Al-Jurmoq and Nabatiyeh.

The operation lasted four hours, and as a result seven persons were killed and three wounded, two houses were demolished and a large number of livestock destroyed.

This blatant act of aggression, yet again, violates the Charter of the United Nations and the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949, and constitutes a serious challenge to the Security Council's attempts to restore peace in southern Lebanon.

My Government, therefore, reserves the right to call for a meeting of the Security Council should that become necessary.

I should be most grateful if you can have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council under the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East".

(Signed) Fakhri SAGHIYYAH
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Lebanon
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14382*

Letter dated 23 February 1981 from the representative of Turkey to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[25 February 1981]

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter dated 23 February 1981 addressed to you by Mr. Nail Atalay, the representative of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) A. Coşkun KIRCA
Permanent Representative of Turkey
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Text of the letter dated 23 February 1981 from Mr. Nail Atalay to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to attach herewith a letter dated 19 February 1981 addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Rauf R. Denktas, President of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

TEXT OF THE LETTER DATED 19 FEBRUARY 1981 FROM
MR. RAUF R. DENKTAS TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

It will be recalled that the question of Cyprus was not debated at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly because it was felt by all concerned that an acrimonious debate on the Cyprus problem and the adoption of one-sided resolutions (such as the unconstructive resolution 34/30 adopted by the Assembly at its previous session) would not be helpful to the efforts being made to find a just, lasting and peaceful solution to the problem through the current intercommunal talks which began on 9 August 1980 under your auspices.

Following this example of reason and common sense set by the General Assembly, when I and my delegation from the Turkish Federated State of Kibris attended the Third Islamic Summit Conference at Taif, Saudi Arabia, last month, we decided not to make any statement which we might otherwise have made explaining our just cause to the Islamic Conference, and not to seek a debate or discussion on the Cyprus problem. Thus, the Cyprus question, although remaining on the agenda of the Conference was, as in the case of the General Assembly, not debated.

It was clearly understood that the Greek Cypriot Administration, when attending the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi, would likewise follow our example at the Islamic Conference and the precedent of the General

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/108-S/14382.

Assembly and, on this occasion, would not exploit the Non-Aligned Conference (as they had done in the past) for political propaganda or act in any way which might jeopardize the outcome of the talks. I and the Government of our Federated State were therefore most disappointed to learn that not only did Mr. Rolandis, the Foreign Minister of the Greek Cypriot Administration, make a most unconstructive and harmful statement at the Conference indulging in propaganda, but the Greek Cypriot Administration was also instrumental in having included in the communiqué, issued at the end of the Conference, a paragraph on Cyprus which contains misleading and most harmful elements. The communiqué purports to declare solidarity with the unlawful and unconstitutional Greek Cypriot Administration, which it refers to as "the Government of Cyprus", and with the "people" of Cyprus (meaning presumably the Greek Cypriot people) omitting any reference to solidarity with the Turkish people of Cyprus. Furthermore, by the inclusion in the final communiqué of a reference to "the non-aligned decisions and declarations", the erroneous, misleading and harmful impression is given that the current intercommunal talks are being held on the basis also of the said "non-aligned decisions and declarations", whereas the whole world knows, and the Greek Cypriot Administration and Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries should know, that the

current talks are being held, as stated in point 2 of the 10-point agreement of 19 May 1979 [S/13369, para 5], on the basis of "the Makarios/Denktaş guidelines of 12 February 1977 [S/2323, para. 5] and the United Nations resolutions relevant to the Cyprus question". It will also be recalled that, in your opening statement at the commencement of the current talks on 9 August 1980, you had stated that the parties had agreed to resume the intercommunal talks "on the basis of the high level agreements of 12 February 1977 and 19 May 1979" [S/4100, annex]. The inclusion, therefore, of a reference to "the non-aligned decisions and declarations" in the final communiqué of the Non-Aligned Conference is not only misleading and dishonest but is also a gross violation of points 2 and 6 of the 10-point agreement of 19 May 1979 and the first paragraph of your opening statement of 9 August 1980.

In conclusion, I need hardly reiterate that the Turkish people of Cyprus does not consider itself bound by any decisions on Cyprus, taken in its absence and behind its back, at the Non-Aligned Conference or at any other international conference or forum at which it is not represented and heard.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

DOCUMENT S/14383*

Note verbale dated 24 February 1981 from the Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[25 February 1981]

The Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and, with reference to its note of 27 October 1980 [S/14239], to which was annexed a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by His Excellency Mr. Abdul Halim Khaddam, Vice-President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic, has the honour to inform him of the following.

The Israeli authorities are practising in the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights different methods of terrorism, pressure and coercion; implementing different measures with the objective of changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights aiming at its ultimate annexation to Israel. The most recent of these measures was com-

prising the citizens of the Syrian Arab Republic in the occupied Golan Heights to renounce their original Syrian nationality and forcing them to obtain an Israeli one. Those Syrian citizens filed suits against these measures to the Israeli Supreme Court in order to invalidate these illegal measures.

The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic strongly protests against these measures and practices that constitute a blatant violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, principles of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 1949 and requests that the Secretary-General take appropriate measures in this regard. The Syrian Government reaffirms its legitimate right to safeguard the legal status of its citizens and their nationality.

The Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic kindly requests the Secretary-General to circulate the present note as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/110-S/14383.

DOCUMENT S/14384

Letter dated 23 February 1981 from the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[25 February 1981]

On instructions from our Governments, we have the honour to forward to you the text of the statement made on 4 February 1981 at the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States by the special delegates of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States

of America in their capacity as countries guaranteeing the Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 29 January 1942.

We will appreciate your circulating this letter and its annex as documents of the Security Council.

(Signed) Juan Carlos M. BELTRAMINO
Permanent Representative of Argentina
to the United Nations

(Signed) Sergio COORÉA DA COSTA
Permanent Representative of Brazil
to the United Nations

(Signed) Sergio DIEZ
Permanent Representative of Chile
to the United Nations

(Signed) Jeane KIRKPATRICK
Permanent Representative of the
United States of America to the United Nations

ANNEX

Statement of the special delegates of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America at the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States in their capacity as countries guaranteeing the Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 29 January 1942

The special delegates of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States of America at the Nineteenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs declare, through me,^a the following.

We have voted in favour of this resolution in the Meeting of Consultation as a reaffirmation of our desire to support all the efforts aimed at the maintenance of peace and security on the continent.

Our countries wish to declare their firm determination to continue contributing to the efforts being made to consolidate peace and, to this end, formally express their appreciation to the Governments of Ecuador and Peru for having accepted the proposals made first to achieve a cease-fire and then to verify it.

With respect to these proposals, our countries have already informed the Meeting of Consultation of the position of the Government of Ecuador.

Our vote at this Meeting of Consultation in no way effects the responsibilities which our countries have assumed and are ready to continue to assume in their capacity as guarantors of the Peruvian-Ecuadorian Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Frontiers, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 29 January 1942.

^a Ambassador Alarico da Silveira, Permanent Representative of Brazil to the Organization of American States.

DOCUMENT S/14385

Letter dated 24 February 1981 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[25 February 1981]

I have the honour to attach herewith a communiqué from the Ministry of Defence showing the latest acts of armed aggression perpetrated by the racist South African armed forces against the People's Republic of Angola.

This is the continuation of actions that the racist régime has been undertaking against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola since our very independence.

These actions have continued despite repeated Security Council resolutions.

I have the honour to request that this note and the attached be issued and circulated as a document of the Security Council in connection with the question of South African aggressions against the People's Republic of Angola.

(Signed) Elisio DE FIGUEIREDO
Permanent Representative of Angola
to the United Nations

ANNEX

The Ministry of Defence of the People's Republic of Angola has issued a communiqué on the military situation in the south of Angola. The communiqué outlines the increased attacks launched by the South African troops against the People's Republic of Angola since the beginning of February 1981 from the occupied territory of Namibia.

According to the communiqué, "during the first 15 days of February, aircraft belonging to the South African air force violated our airspace, flying over the areas of Oncocua, Chitado, Calueque, Naulila, Dombondola, Cuamato, Damaquero, Evale, Xangongo, Cahama, Mupa, Capundo, Mapunde, Ulundo and Ganguerra".

10 February. Nine South African aircraft strafed a FAPLA (Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola) column 4 kilometres from N'giva. Owing to the prompt response of the Ango-

lan troops, the racist aircraft were obliged to withdraw. While withdrawing, they caused losses in the Angolan forces, as well as material damage.

12 February. South African troops in 13 Puma-type helicopters landed in the area of Mulemba, former military command post when operation "Smokeshell" led to the occupation of this area in June 1980.

13 February. Nine helicopters landed more troops and military matériel in Mulemba. Two Puma-type helicopters penetrated 250 kilometres inside Angolan territory, in a surprise attack, landing troops in the area of Bibala, between Moçâmedes and Lubango. They destroyed one bridge of the Moçâmedes railways, which is of a vital importance for train traffic. These trains supply the populations of Huila, Cunene and Cuando Cubango.

14 February. South African troops occupied the village of Chiede with armoured cars and heavy artillery. On the same day, South African troops with armoured support and artillery concentrated in the area of Ionde and Nehone. A third column proceeded towards Chiede.

16 February. South African troops attacked a group of people between Chiede and Namacunde, resulting in five civilian dead. The South African troops still remain in Angolan territory. It is expected that these military acts will be intensified.

According to the communiqué, the Ministry of Defence of the People's Republic of Angola wishes to alert international public opinion to these acts of aggression by the racist South African Government. It reaffirms

"to the entire world that the glorious FAPLA will not hesitate in the presence of any type of threat by the racist major-general Charles Lloyd. FAPLA knows that when the racist South Africans fight, when they penetrate the free and sovereign territory of Angola, it is actually an attack against the people of Angola and their armed wing, the glorious FAPLA.

"More innocent and young South African soldiers will be sent by the racist major-general to spread death and misery to the undefended population in the south of our country, but many of them will never return to their homes in South Africa because the bullets that defend our people, that defend the integrity of our motherland, will meet them on the way, making them pay with death the adventure of the racist generals of Pretoria."

Letter dated 25 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[26 February 1981]

I have the honour to request that the attached statement I issued in my capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Association of South-East Asian Nations and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines on 6 February 1981 at Manila be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Carlos P. ROMULO
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Philippines

ANNEX

Text of the statement

I have been authorized by the Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) to make the following statement:

1. At the same time when the non-aligned movement is commemorating at New Delhi the twentieth anniversary of its first summit conference, the ASEAN member States consider it an opportune moment to reaffirm their support for the principles of the non-aligned movement and restate their position on the threat to peace and stability in South-East Asia which has arisen as a result of the violation of these principles.

2. The ASEAN member States are convinced that the countries in the region with different political and social systems can live together peacefully. They should abide strictly by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the principles of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the right of peoples to determine their own future free from external interference, subversion or coercion. All countries in the region should share a common basic interest in the maintenance of regional peace and stability and in the pursuit of mutual co-operation which are vital conditions for promoting national independence, security and prosperity and happiness of their respective peoples.

3. It is in this context that the ASEAN member States have opposed the armed intervention of Viet Nam in Kampuchea and its

continued military occupation of that country. The views of the ASEAN member States on the solution to this problem are well known. They have been upheld by world opinion as decisively demonstrated recently at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

4. A number of seemingly reasonable proposals about peace, stability, friendship and co-operation amongst countries in South-East Asia have lately been made, and most recently statements proposing discussions between ASEAN, on one side and Viet Nam, Laos and the illegal régime of Heng Samrin, on the other. These proposals, while presenting a seemingly conciliatory approach to the problem, ignore the root cause of the problem—the blatant breach in Kampuchea of the fundamental principles of the non-aligned movement and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

5. ASEAN member States find these proposals unacceptable. Not only are all these proposals misleading in character, but they also seek to justify and perpetuate the continued Vietnamese military occupation of Kampuchea, and to deny the rights of the people of Kampuchea to determine their own future free from outside interference and coercion. They also disregard world opinion as expressed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979 and 1980, when a large majority of members of the non-aligned movement made known their clear stand in opposition to the military intervention of Viet Nam in Kampuchea and their continued military occupation of that country.

6. The Governments of ASEAN member States remain committed to those United Nations resolutions which call upon all the parties to the conflict and other interested parties to join in the search for a comprehensive peaceful solution to the Kampuchean issue through an international conference. Any proposal which ignores the call for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Kampuchean territory and the exercise of the rights of the Kampuchean people to determine their future, free from outside interference, subversion and coercion, defies world opinion and cannot form a basis for a durable solution to the Kampuchean problem and the establishment of lasting peace and stability in South-East Asia.

7. In the interest of their own peoples and of the region, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the non-aligned movement, ASEAN member States call upon Viet Nam to respect world opinion as clearly expressed in the United Nations and join in the search for a comprehensive political solution to the Kampuchean problem through a United Nations-sponsored international conference. The ASEAN member States reaffirm their readiness to participate in all constructive efforts to seek a solution in accordance with United Nations resolution 35/6.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/111-S/14386.

DOCUMENT S/14387*

Letter dated 26 February 1981 from the representative of Egypt to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[27 February 1981]

I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Egypt has completed the process of ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII)] on 22 February 1981. Further, the instruments of ratification have been deposited today, 26 February 1981, with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Kindly find attached to this letter a copy of the

statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Egypt on the occasion of depositing the instruments of ratification of the Treaty.

I further wish to seize this opportunity to bring the following to your attention:

(a) Egypt signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on 1 July 1968 and ratified it on 22 February 1981 as a further expression of its deep commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/112-S/14387.

(b) Egypt has, since the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, in 1974, advocated the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It was on the basis of Egypt's initiative that the General Assembly adopted its resolution 3263 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974 on the creation of such a zone. Since that time, the Assembly has adopted a series of resolutions, upon the initiative of Egypt, the last of which is resolution 35/147 of 12 December 1980.

(c) Egypt's ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be seen as a concrete manifestation of its commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in general and a tangible contribution to ensuring that a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East be established in particular.

(d) In acceding to the Treaty, Egypt has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 1 of resolution 35/147 and is, therefore, reiterating its call for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

I kindly request you to circulate this letter, together with the statement attached, as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) A. Esmat ABDEL MEGUID
*Permanent Representative
of Egypt to the United Nations*

ANNEX

Statement of 26 February 1981 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Egypt on the occasion of the deposit by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt of its instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Egypt's signing and subsequent ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons stems from its conviction that the proliferation of nuclear weapons threatens the security of mankind and therefore must be curbed. It may be pertinent to recall in this respect that Egypt, being among the first countries calling for the early conclusion of the Treaty, played an instrumental role in its negotiation. The Treaty was a logical culmination of the earlier efforts that successfully led to the conclusion of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water.^a

Egypt's commitment, by virtue of the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to refrain in any way from acquiring or manufacturing nuclear weapons should not impair its inalienable right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, in conformity with the provisions of article IV of the Treaty, which affirms the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. The stipulation of that right in the Treaty itself is, in fact, a codification of a basic right which can neither be waived or derogated from.

It is based on this premise that Egypt attaches special attention to the provisions of article IV of the Treaty calling on the Parties to the Treaty who are in a position to do so to co-operate in contributing to the further development of the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

Accordingly, as Egypt is embarking on the construction of nuclear-power reactors to generate electric power in order to meet its increasing energy needs necessary for the prosperity and welfare of its people, it feels justified to expect the assistance and support of industrialized nations possessing a developed nuclear industry. This, we emphasize, would be in consonance with the letter and spirit of article IV of the Treaty, particularly since Egypt, in accordance with the provisions of article III, accepts application of the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency to peaceful nuclear activities carried out within its territory.

Within the framework of the rights provided for in the Treaty for

^a United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, p. 43.

all Parties thereto in so far as the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is concerned, Egypt wishes to refer to the provisions of article V of the Treaty, which states that potential benefits from any peaceful applications of nuclear explosions will be made available to non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty. Though such applications pose at present certain difficulties, particularly in view of their detrimental effects on the environment, Egypt nevertheless is of the firm view that the nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty should not be relieved of their responsibility to promote research and development of these applications in order to overcome all the difficulties presently involved in such applications.

Egypt wishes to express its strong dissatisfaction with the nuclear-weapon States, in particular the two super-Powers, because of their failure to take effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. Although it welcomes the 1972 and 1979 strategic arms limitation treaties known as SALT I and SALT II, Egypt cannot but underline the fact that the treaties have not only failed to bring about an effective cessation of the nuclear arms race, quantitatively and qualitatively, but have also permitted the development of a new generation of weapons of mass destruction.

Moreover, and in spite of the fact that more than 17 years have elapsed since the conclusion of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, the nuclear-weapon States allege that various difficulties still stand in the way of an agreement on a permanent ban on all nuclear weapon tests; what is required, in fact, is the need for a political will to achieve that end.

Consequently, Egypt avails itself of this opportunity, namely the deposit of its instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to appeal to the nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty to fulfil their obligation whereby the nuclear arms race will be stopped and nuclear disarmament achieved.

Egypt also calls upon all nuclear-weapon States to exert all possible efforts so as to achieve a permanent ban of all nuclear weapon tests at an early date. This will bring to an end the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, in as much as the cut-off of fissionable material for military purposes will curb the quantitative increase of nuclear weapons.

As regards the security of non-nuclear weapon States, Egypt is of the considered view that Security Council resolution 255 (1968) does not provide non-nuclear-weapon States with a genuine guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon States. Egypt, therefore, appeals to the nuclear-weapon States to exert their efforts with a view to concluding an agreement prohibiting once and for all the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against any State.

The undertaking of these steps is consistent with the letter and spirit of the basic guiding principles formulated by the General Assembly for the conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, in particular the principle of balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, and the stipulation that the Treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, in particular, nuclear disarmament.

Based on Egypt's firm conviction that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world shall be instrumental in enabling the Non-Proliferation Treaty to achieve its goal, it has exerted great efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East as well as in Africa.

In this respect, Egypt expresses its satisfaction with resolution 35/147, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, inviting the countries of the Middle East, pending the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area, to declare solemnly their support for the achievement of this objective, that they would refrain on a reciprocal basis from producing, acquiring or possessing nuclear weapons, and to deposit such declarations with the Security Council.

In conclusion, Egypt wishes to point out that it has ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, out of the strong belief that this step conforms with its vital national interests, in so far as the Treaty succeeds in curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world, particularly in the Middle East—a region which should remain completely free of nuclear weapons if the Treaty is effectively to contribute to peace, security and prosperity for its people as well as for the world at large.

**Letter dated 25 February 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines
to the Secretary-General**

[Original: English]
[2 March 1981]

On behalf of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, I have the honour to request that the attached text of two paragraphs on Kampuchea contained in the final declaration adopted at the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981 be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Carlos P. ROMULO
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Philippines

ANNEX

Paragraphs on Kampuchea contained in the final declaration adopted at the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981

Reviewing the situation in South-East Asia, the Ministers expressed grave concern over the continuing conflicts and tensions in the region, particularly as some of the States are members of the non-aligned movement. They reaffirmed their support for the princi-

* Incorporating document S/14388/Corr. 1 of 5 March 1981.

** Circulated under the double symbol A/36/113-S/14388 and Corr. 1.

ples of non-interference in the affairs of sovereign States and the inadmissibility of the use of force against sovereign States. They warned that there was a real danger of the tensions in and around Kampuchea escalating over a wider area. They were convinced of the urgent need to de-escalate these tensions through a comprehensive political solution which would provide for the withdrawal of all foreign forces, thus ensuring full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States in the region, including Kampuchea.

The Ministers reaffirmed the right of the people of Kampuchea to determine their own destiny free from foreign interference, subversion and coercion and expressed the hope that through a process of negotiations and mutual understanding a climate conducive to the exercise of that right would be created. The Ministers also agreed that the humanitarian problems resulting from the conflicts in the region required urgent measures which would need the active cooperation of all parties concerned. They urged all States in the region to undertake a dialogue which would lead to the resolution of differences among themselves and the establishment of durable peace and stability in the area as well as the elimination of involvement and threats of intervention of outside Powers. In this context, the Ministers noted with approval the efforts being made for the early establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in the region and called upon all States to give those efforts their fullest support.^a

^a A/36/116, annex, paras. 84 and 85.

DOCUMENT S/14389*

**Letter dated 27 February 1981 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights
of the Palestinian People to the Secretary-General**

[Original: English]
[2 March 1981]

On behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I feel bound to convey to you our serious concern over Israel's continued confiscation of Arab land in occupied Palestinian territory.

According to *Ha'aretz* of 9 February 1981, about 15,000 dunums (4 dunums equal 1 acre) have just been declared "State land" and designated for settlement (in the region of Nablus) by the military Government. Last week, the village mukhtars in the area of Tubas and Kheres were sent notifications to this effect.

Al-Fajr reported on 6 January that the Military Governor of Ramallah notified the chairman of the local council of Silwad on 5 January that the Israeli authorities had decided to expropriate 200 dunums of land owned by inhabitants from Silwad and Ain Yabrud. The said lands would be given to the Jewish settlement of Ofrah.

Al-Fajr also reported on 20 January that the Israeli radio announced, on 19 January, that the military authorities at Al-Khalil (Hebron) confiscated Palestinian Arab lands which are known as Wa'r al-Shayib (Tallat al-Ja'abirah) in order to expand the Jewish town of Kiryat Arba.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/114-S/14389.

It further reported, on 26 January, that the settlers of Giv'on had seized 150 dunums owned by inhabitants of the Palestinian Arab villages of Al-Jib and Al-Nabi Samuel.

Finally, *Al-Fajr* further reported on 31 January that the military authorities had declared 7,000 dunums of land as "State land". These lands are owned by the inhabitants of the village of Tarqumya, located to the west of Al-Khalil (Hebron).

These actions, which follow other similar decisions taken in the past by the Government of Israel, are further steps towards strengthening its annexation of the occupied Palestinian territories in flagrant violation of international law, world public opinion and General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

The Security Council has adopted resolutions on this matter, particularly resolutions 446 (1979) and 465 (1980), which determined that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof, had no legal validity and that Israel's policy and practices of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constituted a flagrant violation of the

Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constituted a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It also called upon the Government and people of Israel to rescind those measures, to dismantle the existing settlements and in particular to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

The Committee feels that further urgent action needs to be taken by the United Nations, and in par-

ticular by the Security Council, to call the attention of Israel to the danger inherent in such policies of annexation and the necessity for its immediate and complete withdrawal from the illegally occupied territories.

I request that this letter be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Raúl ROA-KOURI
Acting Chairman of the Committee on the
Exercise of the Inalienable Rights
of the Palestinian People

DOCUMENT S/14390*

Letter dated 1 March 1981 from the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[2 March 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you, on behalf of the Group of African States, the resolution on Namibia adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in its thirty-sixth ordinary session at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981, and to request you to have the text of the resolution circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Martin CHUNGONG AYAFOR
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent
Mission of the United Republic of Cameroon
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Resolution on Namibia

The thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, meeting at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 23 February to 1 March 1981.

Gravely concerned at the deteriorating situation in Namibia resulting from the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by the South African racist régime,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence,

Reaffirming the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay,

Recalling United Nations Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) which, *inter alia*, call for the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations,

Further recalling the relevant resolutions and decisions of the seventeenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government,

Reiterating the legal responsibility of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the sole legal Administering Authority over the Territory,

Strongly deploring South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and, in particular, its deliberate wrecking of the Geneva meeting convened by the United Nations Secretary-General to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia as embodied in resolution 435(1978),

Commending SWAPO for its statesmanship, political acumen and constructive approach demonstrated repeatedly to facilitate a politi-

cal solution to the Namibian problem on the basis of resolution 435 (1978), and for its willingness at the outset of the Geneva meeting to sign a cease-fire agreement and to agree to a target date for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group with a view to Namibia attaining independence in 1981.

Welcoming the resolution and the plan of action on Namibia adopted at its thirty-sixth ordinary session by the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, meeting at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, from 19 to 23 January 1981,

Welcoming also the section on Namibia of the declaration of the Ministerial Conference of the Non-aligned Countries held at New Delhi, India, from 9 to 13 February 1981.

1. Condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, and for its persistent and systematic violations of the United Nations decisions and resolutions on Namibia, including its calculated defiance of the United Nations plan on Namibia as manifested in its deliberate wrecking of the Geneva pre-implementation meetings;

2. Deplores the apparent unwillingness and half-hearted attitude of the Western contact group to exert concerted pressure on the Pretoria racist régime to co-operate with the United Nations Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations decolonization plan for Namibia;

3. Considers that in view of the extensive economic and other links that these countries have with the régime, and bearing in mind their own involvement in the negotiations leading to and after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435(1978), the Western Five (United Kingdom, United States of America, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Canada) have a particular responsibility to put pressure to bear on the South African racist régime with a view to securing the implementation of the United Nations decisions and resolutions on Namibia;

4. Endorses the resolution and the plan of action on Namibia adopted by the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, meeting at its thirty-sixth ordinary session at Arusha from 19 to 23 January 1981;

5. Urges all States members of the Organization of African Unity to work for the implementation of the Arusha resolution and plan of action and in particular to contribute urgently to the emergency Namibian Liberation Fund established thereunder;

6. Requests all States and, in particular, the non-aligned countries and other friendly States, as well as the United Nations and its family of organizations, non-governmental organizations and solidarity groups, to provide or intensify moral, political, and material assistance to SWAPO in order to enable it to prosecute more effectively the Namibian armed liberation struggle;

7. Further requests all States and the United Nations system to render effective assistance to the African front-line States whose territorial integrity, security and national economies continue to be

* Circulated under the double symbol A/35/794-14390.

endangered by the unprovoked military attacks and other acts of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa;

8. *Expresses* once again complete solidarity with SWAPO and reiterates the total commitment of States members of the Organization of African Unity to increase material, military, financial, political and diplomatic support to the heroic people of Namibia through SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, in order to further intensify the armed struggle in Namibia;

9. *Commends and supports* the continuing efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to mobilize international support for a speedy achievement of Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations resolutions and decisions;

10. *Endorses* the call of the New Delhi Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries for the convening of the Security Council to consider the situation in Namibia with a view to adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against racist South Africa in order to ensure the

implementation of the United Nations decisions and resolutions on Namibia;

11. *Invites* the African Group at the United Nations to call for the convening of the afore-mentioned Security Council meeting by the middle of April 1981;

12. *Mandates* the current chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, the Foreign Ministers of the front-line States, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Niger, Tunisia and Uganda, to participate in that Security Council meeting;

13. *Reiterates* the call by the New Delhi Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that, in the event of failure by the Security Council to adopt the appropriate measures as provided for in paragraph 10 of the present resolution, an emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly should be convened to review the question of Namibia and take appropriate measures in this regard, so as to expedite the independence of Namibia;

14. *Urges* all African Foreign Ministers to participate in the afore-mentioned emergency special session.

DOCUMENT S/14391

Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[3 March 1981]

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to request you to call a meeting of the Security Council to address itself to the continuing problem of repeated Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

(Signed) Fakhri SAGHIYYAH
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Lebanon
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14392*

Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[4 March 1981]

In response to the letter dated 13 February 1981 from the Permanent Representative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam addressed to you [S/14374], I have the honour, upon instructions from my Government, to forward herewith relevant excerpts from the press release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand on 27 February and to request that the text of this letter and its annex be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) M. L. Birabhongse KASEMSRI
Permanent Representative of Thailand
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Excerpts from the press release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand on 27 February 1981

On 11 February 1981, the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry spokesman issued a statement citing incidents which had occurred recently between Thailand and Laos. The Vietnamese Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York then requested the

Secretary-General of the United Nations to circulate the said statement to all United Nations Members. In so doing, the Vietnamese authorities arrogate to themselves the task of speaking for the Lao People's Democratic Republic. This Vietnamese statement contains the usual misrepresentation about the situation and can only serve to heighten tensions in the area.

It should be noted in particular that the incidents that occurred between Thailand and Laos have been satisfactorily resolved by the two countries through the means and machinery at their disposal. The incidents were not, as the Vietnamese propaganda stated, initiated by the Thai side. There is a body of evidence which strongly suggests that the Lao side was also essentially free from blame. Instead, the incidents—these and numerous others in the past—have been the result of deliberate acts of sabotage by a third party to disrupt the relations between the two countries and to sow discord between them.

There have also been violations against Thailand's sovereignty. Some of the most serious ones occurred in June 1980 and January 1981, when a significant number of Vietnamese troops made deliberate incursions deep into Thai territory from Kampuchea. Those incidents have been fully reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the relevant facts have been circulated as official documents of the United Nations General Assembly as well as the Security Council. All this proves yet again that the peace and stability of South-East Asia are in jeopardy because Vietnam continues to pursue a policy of adventurism and domination in Laos and Kampuchea.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/118-S/14392.

Thailand once again urges Viet Nam to abandon such a policy because it does not serve the cause of peace and stability in the South-East Asian region and because such a policy is in clear contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, its relevant resolutions, and the acceptable norms of international behaviour. Furthermore, it is a policy which further intensifies big-Power rivalry to the detriment of all the smaller countries in the region.

Thailand and the countries of the Association of South-East Asian

Nations (ASEAN) reaffirm their desire to restore peace and stability to South-East Asia and to transform the region into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, free from all manners and forms of external interference. These are objectives which can become a reality if, as a first step, Viet Nam terminates its illegal occupation of Kampuchea and ceases to interfere in the affairs of the neighbouring countries and, secondly, the Kampuchean problem is resolved by peaceful means in accordance with United Nations resolution 35/6.

DOCUMENT S/14393

Letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of the United States of America to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[5 March 1981]

I have the honour to transmit the following message from the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Alexander Haig:

"I have reference to the message delivered to you from President Carter on 19 January 1981 [S/14338] regarding the agreement of that date on the release of the 52 American nationals held hostage in Iran.

"That message includes a sentence stating that 'with the release of our hostages, the United States considers that Iran has complied fully with Security Council resolutions 457 (1979) and 461 (1979) and with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice of 24 May 1980'. I should like to clarify that this sentence referred only to the requirement of release contained in these instruments. It will be understood, therefore, that the United States does not consider that Iran had responded fully to the letter or spirit of other requirements of the foregoing Security Council resolutions or of the Judgment of the International Court of Justice. For example, the

Government of Iran has not returned to the United States the premises, property, archives and documents of the United States Embassy at Teheran and of its consulates in Iran, as ordered by the Court in its Judgment.

"I should like to extend once again my Government's deepest gratitude to all those who sought to gain the release of our diplomats and other American citizens and to restore the rule of law to its rightful place in the protection of diplomats.

"I should be most appreciative if you would transmit this message to the members of the Security Council and the representatives of Member States. We will be communicating directly with the President of the International Court of Justice."

(Signed) JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK
Permanent Representative of the
United States of America
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14394

Letter dated 8 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[8 March 1981]

I should like to draw your urgent attention to two attempts made yesterday, 7 March 1981, by PLO criminals to fly from Lebanon into Israel on terrorist missions.

The attempts were made in single-seater gliders with auxiliary engines. One terrorist brought his plane down north of Rosh Hanikra and was captured. The other terrorist landed his craft early in the morning in western Galilee near Kibbutz Afek. He took a young man hostage and after wandering around for several hours he eventually reached the village of Tamra, where he first broke into a house and was subsequently captured. The terrorist told the people in the house that his mission was to take hostages and demand the release of other terrorists detained in Israeli gaols.

The so-called "Front for the Liberation of Palestine", a group belonging to the PLO, immediately took responsibility for these attempts in statements which

were broadcast yesterday on the PLO radio in Lebanon.

As is well known, the PLO has for years made repeated attempts to send its criminals by land and sea from Lebanon on brutal terrorist missions against Israel's civilian population. These attempts have of late been largely foiled by the measures taken by the Israel Defence Forces. Thus the attempts to fly into Israel represent a new departure with potentially serious implications. The Government of Israel views this development with the utmost gravity, and is therefore duty-bound to take all appropriate measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

Letter dated 6 March 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[9 March 1981]

At the request of the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, the Honourable R. F. Botha, I am enclosing a letter he addressed to you on 6 March 1981.

I should appreciate it if this letter could be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) J. Adriaan EKSTEEN
Permanent Representative of South Africa
to the United Nations

LETTER DATED 6 MARCH 1981 FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INFORMATION OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

When future generations analyze the demise of the United Nations Organization, the reckless disregard by the General Assembly, one of the principal organs of the United Nations, of its own rules of procedure and of the Charter of the United Nations itself, will be singled out as one of the major contributing factors which precipitated that demise.

It is also a certainty that the unjust treatment which South Africa had continually suffered at the hand of the General Assembly and its institutional collaborators will be cited as the best example of the disregard, which had become so characteristic of the General Assembly's actions, for the most fundamental rules of simple justice and for the legal instrument from which the United Nations derives its existence.

In this context, reference will be unavoidable to the regrettable events which occurred on 2 March 1981 during the 102nd and 103rd plenary meetings of the General Assembly at its resumed thirty-fifth session.

In the interest of leaving a clear record and in acknowledgement of the position of the few nations which steadfastly observed the dictates of law as opposed to considerations of political expediency, I wish to refer to what happened on that occasion and to set out my Government's standpoint.

As you know, the debate concerned the South West African/Namibian issue, a matter in which South Africa is not only directly involved but in which it has a fundamental interest—a fact which is equally well recognized by the various organs of the United Nations, including the Secretariat. In view of this vital interest and of the important contribution that South Africa could make to the debate and indeed was obliged, because of its responsibilities, to make so that the international community should have the benefit of a balanced viewpoint—South Africa decided to participate in the debate. South Africa's credentials, nominating its delegation to participate in the proceedings of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, were then submitted to you. This was not done with any ulterior motives, as was subsequently alleged by the President of the General Assembly. The first rea-

son is that South Africa's decision to participate was taken in the light of the most recent prevailing circumstances—the date of the debate and of the resumed General Assembly session itself had been fixed at short notice—and, secondly, South Africa is well aware, from bitter experience, of the hostile manoeuvring that inevitably follows any advance notice of a decision by it to participate.

In terms of the operating procedures of the General Assembly, a member of the South African delegation consequently requested the Secretariat official to place South Africa's name on the speakers' list. This he refused to do. This was the first violation of South Africa's rights as a Member State.

In the meantime, the personnel of the President of the General Assembly were informed that the credentials naming the South African delegation to participate in the proceedings of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly had been submitted to you, that South Africa intended to place its name on the speaker's list and that South Africa would want to address the Assembly should the South African delegation's presence in the Assembly Conference Hall be queried on a point of order. They were requested to inform the President accordingly.

Very shortly after the members of the South African delegation had taken their seats, the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon raised a point of order, drawing attention to what he described as the "illegal presence" of the South African delegation. He then requested the President to advise the delegation to leave the hall and to instruct the Credentials Committee to convene and report to the General Assembly as soon as possible.

Despite the South African delegation's clearly-expressed wish to address the point of order, not only already relayed as described above, but also by vigorously seeking to attract his attention visually and orally, in the customary manner, the President steadfastly, in the words of *The New York Times* of 3 March, "ignored" them and proceeded to request the Credentials Committee to convene specifically to consider South Africa's credentials only, and then adjourned the General Assembly.

In the light of the illegal and unwarranted treatment meted out to South Africa and not, as subsequently alleged by the President of the General Assembly, in terms of some prior strategy, the South African Permanent Representative requested the Chairman of the Credentials Committee to meet with him or to allow him to address that Committee,⁴ an eminently reasonable request which he copied to the President of the Assembly. Without responding to the Permanent Representative's letter, the Chairman of the Credentials Committee proceeded to preside over a meeting of the Committee, which found South Africa's credentials not to be in order by a vote of 6 to 1, with 2 absten-

* Circulated under the double symbol A/35/802-S/14395.

⁴ A/35/795.

tions, despite the fact that the credentials submitted complied with the requirements of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and your report on them to the Committee did not fault them. The Permanent Representative also addressed a letter to the President of the Assembly⁵ requesting him to allow South Africa to make a statement in the Assembly when the report and recommendation of the Credentials Committee should come before it, i.e., immediately after the resumption of the Assembly debate. He addressed a further letter⁶ to the President in which he protested at the latter's refusal to grant South Africa the opportunity of addressing the Assembly on the point of order of Cameroon. All of these letters flowed from the President's high-handed and unconstitutional actions.

Prior to the resumption of the Assembly debate, the South African Deputy Permanent Representative personally requested the President to allow South Africa to address the Assembly. The President undertook to inform him of his decision but subsequently refused to do so. It is common that after the resumption of the Assembly debate, Cameroon proposed, on a point of order, that the South African Representative not be granted the opportunity to address the Assembly before the Assembly had dealt with the report of the Credentials Committee. This proposal was put to the vote and supported by all but a limited number of, albeit important, States, and South Africa was consequently once again refused the floor. The Credentials Committee's rejection of South Africa's credentials was thereafter endorsed by the Assembly and the South African delegation had no choice but to leave the Conference Hall. In addition, the South African Permanent Representative addressed a further letter⁷ to the President of the Assembly in which he expressed his general objections concerning the manner in which the President had conducted the 102nd and 103rd plenary meetings.

The course of events which I have related above involved very serious transgressions of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the provisions of the Charter. The Government of the Republic of South Africa certainly has no intention of simply ignoring these transgressions and of accepting them resignedly. On the contrary South Africa placed on record its firm condemnation and rejection of these blatant illegalities which make a mockery of any United Nations claims to be a responsible organization commanding respect. These lamentable failures of the Organization will not be erased by the mere passage of time, but will remain a blot on its reputation.

I now propose to deal with these transgressions seriatim, not because I expect that this will persuade the United Nations to abandon its chosen course of illegality and irrelevance but because we do not want to afford those with ulterior motives the opportunity to interpret our silence as constituting consent or resignation.

1. The refusal of the responsible Secretariat official to put South Africa's name on the speakers' list was, to say the least, irregular. This is a function entrusted to him in terms of the General Assembly's

operating procedures. By refusing inscription, the official, apart from other considerations, became directly involved in a political issue before the Assembly. It should be noted that Article 100(1) of the Charter provides, *inter alia* as follows:

"They [the Secretary-General and his staff] shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization."

In the light of the wrongs that have been perpetrated against my country, I may refer you also to the provisions of Article 100(2):

"Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities."

South Africa has a legal right to have its name included in the speakers' list. In this connection I refer you to the provisions of rule 29 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure:

"Any representative to whose admission a Member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Assembly has given its decision."

If one bears in mind the provisions of the Charter relating to the powers and functions of the General Assembly (Articles 10 to 17), it must surely be quite clear that States have a right to address the Assembly and therefore a corresponding and implied right to be included in the speakers' list. No member of the staff of the Secretary-General has the right to deny a Member State the basic right to which it is entitled in terms of the Charter and the rules of procedure.

In view of these considerations, you are now formally requested to determine whether the Secretariat official acted on his own authority or not, and if not, on whose authority he acted, and to inform me accordingly. You are also requested to inform the South African Government of the steps that you intend taking to rectify the matter and to prevent a recurrence.

2. The refusal of the President of the General Assembly to allow South Africa to address the Assembly on a point of order was a manifest violation of the express provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure, to say nothing of the fundamental principles of justice recognized by civilized nations. You are referred to the fact that South Africa was, as of right, entitled to request information and clarification regarding the point of order raised by the Permanent Representative of Cameroon. This right is explicitly recognized in paragraph 79 of the report of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly.⁸ To allow South Africa the opportunity to request such clarification was not only the President's duty, it would also have been equitable and just.

You are also informed that, once the President had made a ruling on the point of order, South Africa wished and had the right to appeal against that ruling in

⁵ A/35/796.

⁶ A/35/797.

⁷ A/35/798.

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 26.*

terms of Rule 71 of the rules of procedure. It reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure. A representative may appeal against the ruling of the President. The appeal shall be immediately put to the vote, and the President's ruling shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the members present and voting."

You are again referred to the provisions of rule 29, which make it quite clear that despite the fact that South Africa's presence in the General Assembly had been questioned, South Africa was nevertheless entitled to the same rights as other States.

Despite this, South Africa was not permitted to speak to the point of order questioning its own right to participate, nor to appeal against the President's ruling on the matter. South Africa had the same undiluted rights when the second point of order was raised when the Assembly resumed.

In view of these considerations, it is submitted that the President's actions were not only arbitrary and irregular, but that they were also unworthy of the high office he holds, unfair, discriminatory and a renunciation of the sense of justice which is expected of him. His actions are therefore rejected by the South African Government as having been *ultra vires* and unpardonable.

3. Previous experience leaves no doubt that convening the Credentials Committee and its predictable, but nonetheless deplorable recommendation was simply a device to deprive South Africa of its right to participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly. The fact that it is not novel or original does not detract from the fact that it is patently unlawful. As you know, your own Legal Counsel pronounced on the illegality of this method as long ago as 11 November 1970.⁹ The decision of the Credentials Committee is as invalid today as it was 1970.

The bona fide purpose of the Credentials Committee is to examine the credentials of delegations and to report to the General Assembly on whether or not they are, on the face thereof, formally in order. I submit that it is common cause that South Africa's credentials have never been anything else but formally in order, as your reports to the Committee have testified.

For these reasons I now reaffirm my Government's standpoint that the recommendation of the Credentials Committee and the subsequent acceptance thereof by the General Assembly were *ultra vires* those organs and are consequently rejected as being null and void.

4. In effect, the underhand method by which South Africa has been denied the right to participate in the discussions of the General Assembly and, as a consequence thereof, its subsidiary organs encompasses several other violations of the Charter as well as the spirit of that document.

The first provision of the Charter which has a direct bearing on the circumstances I am concerned with here is contained in Article 2(2). It determines that all

Members of the United Nations, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter. (It is common cause and trite law that in law the word "shall" has a mandatory meaning, resulting in a legal obligation). The General Assembly resolution to deny South Africa participation in its deliberation is clearly a breach of this Article since South Africa is being denied what is perhaps the most fundamental right of membership, namely, the right to be heard.

Another provision which is being violated is postulated in Article 9 (1), which determines that the Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations. By virtue of the fact that South Africa became a Member in accordance with the relevant provisions of Article 3, read with Article 110, and is consequently an original Member of the United Nations, and by virtue of the use of the word "shall" in Article 9 (1), South Africa clearly has a legal right to participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly.

Furthermore, Article 18(1) states that each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote. It is therefore obvious that any actions—other than those provided for in the Charter—which are designed to deny a Member State the right to vote would be in contravention of the unambiguous provisions of the Charter. The Charter does in fact provide for the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership. Article 5 lays down that a Member against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Council. However, the procedure provided for in this article was not followed when the Assembly *de facto* suspended South Africa's rights and privileges. It is submitted that, in accordance with the well known canon of construction, *inclusio unius, exclusio alterius*, the fact that the Charter expressly provides for a specific procedure to be followed in order to suspend a Member's rights and privileges, leads to the conclusion that no other procedure—especially not a procedure which contravenes other provisions of the Charter—may be followed to achieve the same or a similar result. It would be fair comment to say that Article 5 deliberately designed to make it difficult to suspend a Member's rights, for very sound reasons, *inter alia*, those postulated in the Preamble and Article 1. Simply to disregard Article 5 and to achieve the result it was designed for, by different means, is legally untenable.

As regards the requirements contained in Article 5, it is axiomatic, and publicists on international law are *ad idem* on this score, that a Security Council recommendation is a *conditio sine qua non* for a General Assembly resolution in terms of this Article. This view is supported by the fact that the Article also determines that the Council, by itself, can restore the suspended rights and privileges and consequently does not require the co-operation of the Assembly. (Even extreme teleological methods of construction require a point of departure. To regard Article 5 as the point of departure for an argument which leads to the conclusion that the General Assembly resolution pertaining to South Africa falls within the ambit of Article 5

⁹ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, Agenda item 3, document A/78160.

would be disregarding all fundamental rules of construction.)

It is furthermore submitted that, not only were the procedures that were followed to reduce a Member State to something less than Observer status contrary to the provisions of the Charter, but the reasons for doing precisely that are also not catered for in the Charter.

It should be readily appreciated that the General Assembly resolution amounts not only to a contravention of the Charter, vis-a-vis South Africa, but also to a contravention as against the Security Council, since the latter's rights have been usurped, as well as against those Member States which, in accordance with consideration of law are opposed to considerations of political expediency, have opposed the measures against South Africa.

It is often not appreciated that the Charter is both the constitution of the United Nations, as well as a multilateral treaty. Contraventions of its provisions are, therefore, also breaches of the treaty obligations it imposes on the signatories thereof. Thus the Organization qua organization acted unconstitutionally when it suspended South Africa's rights, and the individual Members which initiated or supported the measures against South Africa committed a breach of their treaty obligations vis-a-vis South Africa and the Member States which opposed those measures.

When a Member's right to participate in meetings of the General Assembly is impaired, the fact necessarily also deprives that Member, *inter alia* of the right to:

(a) Participate in the election of the President of the General Assembly in accordance with the provisions of Article 21;

(b) Participate in the election of the non-permanent

members of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of Article 23;

(c) Bring a dispute to the attention of the General Assembly in accordance with the provisions of Article 35(1);

(d) Participate in the election of members of the Economic and Social Council in accordance with the provisions of Article 61;

(e) Participate in proceedings to amend the Charter in accordance with the provisions of Article 108;

(f) Participate in the election of members of the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

It must also be appreciated that the very reason which gave rise to the suspension of South Africa's rights also gives rise to the denial of other rights which should come into play when a particular set of circumstances prevail.

It should be apparent to the unbiased legal mind, as well as to that of the layman, that, for more reasons than one, the General Assembly's resolution to deny South Africa the right to participate in its deliberations was, and still is, beyond a shadow of doubt, *ultra vires* that body and consequently null and void *ab initio*. Coupled with the fact that the action perpetrated against South Africa also violates one of the most fundamental rules of all civilized systems, viz *audi alteram partem*, it must surely amount to one of the most blatant incidents of disregard for what is not only unquestionably right, but what is indeed law, ever perpetrated by an institution with an already disastrous track record.

(Signed) R. F. BOTHA
Minister of Foreign Affairs and
Information of South Africa

DOCUMENT S/14396*

Letter dated 6 March 1981 from the representative of Cyprus to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[9 March 1981]

It was with deep regret that we have noticed that Turkey, by its letter dated 23 February 1981 [S/14382], has again resorted to the old practice of acting as a vehicle for the dissemination of misinformation harmful to the ongoing intercommunal talks in Cyprus and at the same time abusing established procedures of the United Nations.

Faithful to our intent not to indulge in polemics so long as the dialogue still offers even a glimmer of hope, and despite our disappointment resulting from the stalling practices of the Turkish Cypriots at the talks, we shall merely refute all the allegations contained in the aforesaid letter and simply add that even the most fertile imagination should normally stop short of the interpretations ascribed to paragraph 89 of the New Delhi declaration.¹⁰

Our objective at New Delhi was to be constructive, as we were, and to enlighten the movement of non-

aligned countries on recent developments in Cyprus, particularly on the intercommunal talks presently carried out and to which the non-aligned countries reiterated their support as well as their intention to keep the situation under constant review.

Our constructive attitude throughout the Conference was favourably commented upon, and paragraph 89, introduced by the chairman of the contact group mandated by the movement to deal with the question of Cyprus and readily adopted by consensus, is ample proof thereof.

To enable any impartial observer to form an objective opinion on the subject, we cite herein below, *in toto*, the text of paragraph 89:

"On the situation in Cyprus, the Ministers reaffirmed their support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and reiterated their solidarity with its Government and people. The Ministers welcomed the resumption of intercommunal

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/120-S/14396.

¹⁰ A/36/116, annex.

talks under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General and expressed the hope that those talks would be conducted in a meaningful and constructive manner, in order to bring about an early solution of the problem in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, the non-aligned decisions and declarations, and the high-level agreements. The Ministers requested the contact group of the non-aligned countries to have the situation under constant review."

Could any person of *bona fides* argue that the above

text is anything but helpful and constructive? It is to be hoped, in the circumstances, that we are not faced with yet another effort to look for pretexts in order to undermine the intercommunal talks.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Andreas V. MAVROMMATIS
Permanent Representative of Cyprus
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14398

Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]
[10 March 1981]

Further to my letter of 8 March 1981 [S/14394] and in the context of the deliberations which were held in the Security Council yesterday, 9 March [2265th meeting], I wish to draw your attention to the indiscriminate shelling of towns and villages in northern Israel carried out on 2 and 3 March by PLO terrorists operating from Lebanon.

On 2 March, civilian centres in both western Galilee and in the "Galilee panhandle" were subjected to three barrages of Katyusha rockets fired across the border with Lebanon by the PLO. As a result, four civilians in the northern town of Kiryat Shmona were injured.

On 3 March, the PLO bombardments from Lebanon were renewed and two barrages of Katyusha rockets were fired at civilian centres in western Galilee, causing damage to property.

It is clear that these bombardments and those which have preceded them over the last year (as reported in my various letters to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General) are related to the steady build-up of the PLO's offensive capacity in southern Lebanon, based largely on the introduction of sizeable quantities of armour and artillery of Soviet manufacture.

I should like to take this opportunity of updating my letter to the President of the Security Council of 15 April 1980 [S/13895], in which I detailed 44 acts of PLO terror from Lebanese territory from mid-June 1978 until the murderous attack of 6/7 April 1980 on the children's nursery in Kibbutz Misgav Am. I accordingly attach a schedule setting out in detail 26 further acts and attempted acts of terror which the PLO has perpetrated from Lebanese territory against targets in Israel since that date.

All these acts of terror have been aimed against civilian targets in northern Israel. Thirty-two towns and villages have been attacked or shelled, some of them several times. They are as follows: Amir, Ayalon, Beit Hillel, Betzet, Dafna, Even Menachem, Fasuta, Goren, Huleh, Idmit, Jurdah, Kfar Blum, Kfar Giladi, Kfar Szold, Kfar Yuval, Dan, Kiryat Shmona, Ma'ayan Baruch, Manara, Margaliot, Metulla, Metzuya, Misgav Am, Nahariya, Ne'ot Mordechai, Netu'a, Sasa, She'ar Yashuv, Shlomi, Shnir, Shtula, Ya'ara.

I have the honour to request that this letter and its annex be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

ANNEX

PLO terrorist activity emanating from Lebanon since 7 April 1980

1. 14 May 1980. Three PLO terrorists killed in attempting to cross from Lebanese territory near Kibbutz Hanita.
2. 17 May. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
3. 16 June. Israel naval vessel intercepted and destroyed a terrorist vessel opposite the village of Achziv on the Mediterranean coast.
4. 20 July. An abortive attempt made by PLO terrorists to cross from Lebanese territory into Israel by balloon.
5. 14 August. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
6. 20 August. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
7. 23 August. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
8. 17 September. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
9. 6 November. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle". Five civilians wounded at Kiryat Shmona.
10. 13 November. Two PLO terrorists killed in attempting to cross from Lebanese territory near Kibbutz Misgav Am.
11. 14 December. Unsuccessful attempt by a PLO terror squad to cross from Lebanese territory west of Kibbutz Zar'it.
12. 19 December. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
13. 25 December. Five terrorists killed in attempting to cross from Lebanese territory near Kibbutz Hanita.
14. 28 January 1981. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
15. 28/29 January. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle". Seven civilians, including four children, wounded at Kiryat Shmona.
16. 29/30 January. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
17. 29/30 January. Two hours later, a second barrage of Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian centres in the "Galilee panhandle".
18. 30 January. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at Kiryat Shmona. Three civilians wounded.

19. 30 January. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

20. 30 January. A second barrage of Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

21. 2 March. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at Kiryat Shmona. Four civilians wounded.

22. 2 March. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

23. 2 March. A second barrage of Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

24. 3 March. Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

25. 3 March. A second barrage of Katyusha rockets fired from Lebanese territory at civilian targets in western Galilee.

26. 7 March. Two PLO attempts to fly from Lebanese territory into Israel on terrorist missions.

DOCUMENT S/14399*

Letter dated 9 March 1981 from the representative of Cyprus to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[11 March 1981]

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to bring to your attention, as well as to that of the members of the Security Council, a new provocative act by the Government of Turkey, directed against the unity, independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus, while at the same time it undermines the negotiating process currently carried out under the aegis of your Special Representative in Cyprus.

Thus, in its 1981 list of foreign diplomatic missions at Ankara, the Turkish Foreign Ministry includes the so-called "Mission of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris" and cites as "National Day", the 13th of February, i.e., the day when the "Turkish Federated State of Cyprus" was declared in 1975. It may be recalled that the Security Council, in paragraph 2 of its resolution 367 (1975), regretted "the unilateral decision of 13 February 1975 declaring that a part of the Republic of Cyprus would become 'a Federated Turkish State' as, *inter alia*, tending to compromise the continuation of negotiations . . .".

It is to be deeply regretted that the Government of Turkey opted to resort to an act so obviously aimed at creating the impression that in Cyprus there exists another recognized State entity, besides that of the Republic of Cyprus.

One can only hope that the fact that this unaccept-

able action occurs at such a crucial stage of the intercommunal talks is not, as it appears, indicative of the real position of Ankara towards the talks and the objective sought thereby, for it will be no doubt acknowledged that the Turkish Government hardly aims at progress in the ongoing intercommunal dialogue by an action which so manifestly runs counter to the agreed basis of the talks and so blatantly contradicts a specific and binding decision of the Security Council. You may wish to recall, in this connection, that the Council, in addition to paragraph 2 of its resolution 367 (1975) quoted above, in paragraph 1, called upon all States "to refrain from any action which might prejudice [the] sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment [of the Republic of Cyprus], as well as from any attempt at partition of the island or its unification with any other country".

It is my sincere hope that you will find it possible to take appropriate measures for Turkey to correct the above action, in compliance with the said Security Council resolution, and also to exercise influence so that Turkey may be positive and forthcoming with reference to the intercommunal talks.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Michael E. SHERIFIS
Acting Permanent Representative of Cyprus
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/123-S/14399.

DOCUMENT S/14400*

Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[11 March 1981]

I have the honour to convey, at the request of His Eminence Rabbi Moshe Hirsch in his letter to me dated 8 March 1981, the enclosed message addressed to you on behalf of Neturei Karta of Jerusalem, on the brutal and sacrilegious manner by which the Zionist security forces, on 7 March, committed an unprovoked and grave assault against hundreds of defenceless Orthodox Jews within the sanctity of their

synagogue and Yeshiva Toldos Aharon, in the ancient Me'ah She'arim-Batei Ungarin quarter, a fraternal quarter adjacent to several Arab quarters.

Many citizens of Jerusalem, including myself, have always had the affinity, esteem and respect which rightfully belong to the genuine adherents of Judaism and their unswerving dedication to their great religion and traditions, by words and deeds. They are and have always been for countless generations the residuary legatees of the true Judaic tradition.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/125-S/14400.

Having frequently walked the roads and alleys of this venerable quarter, shopped at its marketplace as a youth and kindled sabbath lights whenever requested because religious ritual prevented the inhabitants from doing so, and having been offered their matzo bread, it is in deep sadness and dismay that I find myself impelled to convey to you the complaint and the news of harassment and the desecration of the holy synagogue of true believers in God and humanity.

The tragedy which has befallen Jerusalem and the Holy Land stems directly from a relentless process of politicizing religious faith according to one's conscience by a power-hungry and ruthless zionization of Judaism, whose cause it claims to espouse and defend. There are numerous boulevards in the world but there are few Me'ah She'arims in which abound a priceless legacy of true faith.

I request you to initiate an investigation of the heedless acts committed against Orthodox Jews at Jerusalem.

I also request you to circulate this message as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hazem NUSEIBEH
Permanent Representative of Jordan
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Text of the letter dated 8 March 1981 from Rabbi Moshe Hirsch to the Secretary-General

On behalf of thousands of Orthodox Jews at Jerusalem, we beg you please to come to our rescue and save us from the Zionist régime that would want to destroy through their lawless police all and any peaceful opposition to their sacrilegious State.

We beseech you to please note the following. This past Saturday evening, 7 March 1981, hundreds of Zionist police forces surrounded the synagogue and Yeshiva Toldos Aharon while the sabbath eve prayers were being recited. Police loudspeakers then demanded everyone in the building to come out with hands raised. Close to 1,000 men and children were in the synagogue at the time. Within minutes after the police announcement, 12 tear-gas bombs were shot through the windows of the synagogue, causing many children and

old men to faint and lose consciousness, and when ambulances arrived to render first aid and take those children and elderly in need to hospitals, the Zionist police did not permit the first aid crews entry, nor did they allow anyone be carried out of the synagogue.

Suddenly, at a pre-arranged signal 300 helmeted police stormed the Yeshiva and synagogue, broke every window, door, table and bench in the four-storey edifice and tore Bibles, prayer-books and other religious texts, trampling them with their feet and then throwing them out the windows.

This unprovoked, completely pre-arranged attack continued until 1 o'clock in the morning. This was not an act by Palestinian "terrorists" but by a "State" that calls itself the only democracy in the Middle East.

Saturday night's program at Jerusalem against hundreds of defenceless Orthodox Jews is but the culmination of months of harassment, jailings and the hospitalization of many victims injured by the club-wielding hooligans of Jerusalem Zionist Mayor Teddy Kollek.

The past few months have seen the water supply of thousands of men, women and children at Me'ah She'arim cut off. Teddy Kollek's municipality, which continuously seeks to close ritual slaughterhouses with the excuse that it detracts from the beautification of the Holy City, refused for an entire month to collect the garbage at Me'ah' She'arim-Batei Ungarin, causing disease and near epidemic.

Forty-one people, including Rabbi Uri Blau, were hauled off to Zionist dungeons. The prisoners are not allowed food, nor the use of toilet facilities; they are forced to sleep on bare floors.

These latest actions leave no doubt as to the intentions of the Zionist régime: to stifle the cries of defenceless Jews who have never recognized the Zionist occupation of the Holy Land and especially Jerusalem. The Zionist State has clearly demonstrated their determination to abrogate the civil liberties and religious rights of the Orthodox Jews.

We fear that this is but the beginning of a reign of terror that the Zionists mean to implement against all those who reject their claim to the land and name of Israel, as demonstrated by the recent wanton destruction of the Yeshiva and synagogues.

We therefore beg you:

(a) To declare immediate United Nations sovereignty over Jerusalem—holy to all mankind;

(b) To appoint a responsible person or persons from among the Members of the United Nations whose duty it will be to protect the rights and interests of Orthodox Jews, Arabs, and all other inhabitants of our Holy City.

We would appreciate it if you brought this appeal to the attention of the members of the Security Council, and the General Assembly.

DOCUMENT S/14401

Letter dated 10 March 1981 from the representative of Iraq to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[16 March 1981]

I have the honour, upon instructions from my Government, to refer to document S/14379 dated 19 February 1981, containing a letter addressed to you by the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iran, and its annexes, namely the two notes dated 1 December 1980 and 14 January 1981 respectively, addressed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iran to the Embassy of the Republic of Iraq at Teheran.

I should like to point out that the texts of the two above-mentioned notes were also addressed by the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran at Baghdad to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq. Both of these notes were promptly answered by the two notes enclosed herewith.

I should like also to point out that the substance of the two Iranian notes is not new. To begin with, the Iranian Government continues with its deception. In the first note, it has deemed it appropriate to refer to article 4 of the defunct Treaty concerning the State frontier and neighbourly relations 1975¹¹ but with the omission of the most fundamental obligation assumed by the parties thereunder, which read as follows:

"Accordingly, a breach of any of the components of this over-all settlement shall clearly be incompatible with the spirit of the Algiers agreement."¹¹

¹¹ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1017, No. 14903.

In the second note, however, no reference whatsoever was made to the said article.

Moreover, once again the Iranian Government attempted to dilute the legal situation by reference to articles 5 and 6 of the Treaty. Iraq has already had the occasion to deal with this question both in the General Assembly during the last session and in the Security Council. To repeat, articles 4 and 6 are mutually exclusive in the sense that the application of article 6 presupposes the existence of the Treaty through the non-violation of any of its indivisible elements. Article 6, in other words, could only operate when the Treaty still exists, and when the parties disagree on the interpretation or application of technical details thereof. When article 4 is violated, this means that the whole Treaty becomes terminated, as the said article represented the politico-juridical aspects of the package-deal on which the agreement of the parties was based. Any argument to the contrary makes the provisions of these two articles contradictory and impossible to apply. The continuous Iranian violations of the elements of the Algiers agreement and the Treaty, mentioned in paragraph 4 and article 4 thereof respectively, left Iraq, in fact, with no treaty to implement.

In this connection, it is significant to recall once again that if the Iranian Government really believes in the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the defunct Treaty, then why did it not have resort to such a mode of settlement with Iraq and opt, instead, to commit aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, despite Iraq's repeated reminders regarding the 1975 Treaty?

The outrageous charge contained in the Iranian notes that Iraq committed aggression and inhuman acts against Iran is another allegation to which the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Iraq responded in detail in the General Assembly and the Security Council on 3,¹² 15 [2250th meeting] and 17 October 1980 [2251st meeting]. A detailed reply is not called for on this occasion because the facts speak for themselves. As for the allegation that Iraq has violated the internal security of Iran and done harm to good neighbourly relations between the two States, it is pertinent to recall two concrete facts. First, what the Iranian Government calls a violation of internal security is, in fact, an attempt to blame Iraq for the struggle of the national Iranian minorities to achieve their national rights in return for their patriotic role against the Shah. Sec-

¹² Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 22nd meeting.

DOCUMENT S/14402*

Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[12 March 1981]

I wish to refer to the note verbale dated 24 February 1981 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic addressed to you [S/14383]. In that note verbale it was alleged that Israel was compelling the Syrian nationals residing in the Golan Heights "to renounce their original Syrian nationality and forcing them

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/126-S/14402.

only, if good neighbourly relations are so dear to the Iranian Government, then it is legitimate to wonder whether continuous shelling and bombardment of Iraqi towns and villages were in accord with that principle.

Finally, I should like to emphasize that although the untenable arguments and false accusations contained in the Iranian notes have already been refuted on numerous occasions, yet it would seem that the Iranian Government believes that repetition of the same arguments and accusations would, perhaps, make it nearer to the truth. This is, indeed, a mirage, and the Iranian Government should realize by now that its position is neither legally plausible nor helpful for the prevalence of peace in the area.

I should be grateful if you would arrange for the text of this letter and the attached notes to be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Salah Omar AL-ALI
Permanent Representative of Iraq
to the United Nations

ANNEX I

Note sent on 6 December 1980 by the Foreign Ministry of Iraq to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran at Baghdad and, with reference to the Embassy's note No. 1158 dated 3 December 1980, has the honour to reaffirm what was stated in its note sent to the Embassy dated 16 November 1980 [S/14272, annex II] and to state the following.

What is stated in the Embassy's note referred to above is not new and has no value from a juridical standpoint after the termination, in word and deed, by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran of the Algiers agreement and the Treaty of 1975. The Government of the Republic of Iraq has stated and reaffirmed its position on numerous occasions in diplomatic notes and international organizations and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran bears the full international responsibility for the consequences of its aggression on Iraq.

ANNEX II

Note sent on 31 January 1981 by the Foreign Ministry of Iraq to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran at Baghdad and, with reference to the Embassy's note 1206 of 23 January 1981, has the honour to inform it that the Ministry rejects what is stated in the above-mentioned note and has nothing to add in this connection to its previous notes.

to obtain an Israeli one. Those Syrian citizens filed suits against these measures to the Israeli Supreme Court."

I have the honour to inform you that the allegations contained in the Syrian note verbale are complete fabrications. No Syrian citizen has been forced to renounce his Syrian nationality or to acquire Israel nationality; consequently, no suit has been filed in this regard with the Israel Supreme Court.

As is well known, Syria is a country which regards itself as being in a state of war with Israel. The Syrian note verbale in question must be viewed against this background. It is, in fact, no more than the product of the fertile and malevolent imagination of its authors. At the same time, it constitutes yet another manifestation of the willingness of Israel's enemies to abuse the means and machinery of the United Nations in their relentless campaign of vilification against my country.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

*(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations*

DOCUMENT S/14403*

**Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Israel
to the Secretary-General**

*[Original: English]
[12 March 1981]*

I wish to draw your urgent attention to a cowardly attack by two PLO terrorists, on 9 March 1981, on the driver of an Israel civilian bus.

The bus, belonging to the Egged Bus Company, was on the return leg of its regular route from Jerusalem to the Tomb of Rachel, a Jewish holy place between Jerusalem and Bethlehem. At the time, the only passengers on the bus were the two PLO terrorists who attacked the driver viciously with knives near the village of Sur Bahr. The driver resisted and the terrorists fled, but not before they had wounded him severely in the face and chest.

As is its custom, the PLO bragged of its responsibility for this outrage in a statement on 10 March broadcast by its radio in Lebanon.

As I have repeatedly pointed out in previous letters, the mindless murders and attempts at murder of innocent civilians have been characteristic of the PLO since its inception. Its designs, whether successful or not, are those of a group of international criminals and not, by any stretch of the imagination, of a national liberation movement.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

*(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations*

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/127-S/14403.

DOCUMENT S/14404*

Letter dated 11 March 1981 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General

*[Original: English]
[12 March 1981]*

Upon the instructions of my Government and further to my letter dated 2 February [S/14356] and to the letter of the Permanent Representative of Israel, dated 18 February 1981 [S/14376], in which he alleged

that my information was without foundation, I have the honour to convey the following information from my Government concerning the persecution of Islamic religious dignitaries in the occupied West Bank.

My Government's message, dated 2 February 1981, reads as follows:

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/128-S/14404.

"The Israeli occupation authorities have latterly launched a ruthless campaign against Islamic *ulemas* (religious leaders) in the occupied territories. The occupation authorities have detained:

"(a) His Eminence Sheikh Muhammad Fuad Abu Zeid, Inspector of Religious Instruction in the northern region of the West Bank;

"(b) Sheikh Yousef Abu Assallah, a preacher at the Sharia Institute at Jerusalem;

"(c) Sheikh Sa'eed Ahmad Belal, the Inspector of Mosques at Nablus;

"(d) Sheikh Jamal Attiyya, the Islamic Instructor in the Nablus region;

"(e) Sheikh Tawfiq al-Kurd, Chairman of the Reform Society in Gaza.

"Those and others detained have been subjected to the most brutal forms of persecution and torture. They are being held incommunicado and no one is permitted to see them or inquire about their fate.

"The practices of the Israeli occupation forces against these Islamic *ulemas* can only be construed as yet a further chain in the Israeli policy of intellectual terrorism and religious persecution, in addition to the many other terrorist acts which the Israeli occupation is perpetrating in other parts of the occupied territories.

"In the light of the above, we request you to submit a message to the Secretary-General, in the hope that it may lighten the agony of persecution and torture to which they are being subjected, and to dissuade the occupying enemy from the continuance of these tyrannical practices. Awaiting the results of your intercession."

One of the latest incidents, though ostensibly insignificant, was the burning of the car of His Eminence Sheikh Sa'dudeen al-Alami, the Mufti of Jerusalem and chief of the Sharia courts at Jerusalem, as it was parked at night in front of his house in the Bab al-Sahira district. But this act of arson and hooliganism is significant in that it is designed as an act of terror to intimidate religious dignitaries.

It is the earnest hope of my Government that an investigation will be carried out in the occupied territories with a view to eliciting further information on these ominous developments as a prelude to remedial action.

I request you kindly to circulate this message as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hazem NUSEIBEH
Permanent Representative of Jordan
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14407

Special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

[Original: English]
[16 March 1981]

The following statement was made today by the Secretary-General during consultations of the Security Council:

"I regret to inform the members of the Council that, even as they were considering the complaint brought by the Government of Lebanon on the violence of 2 and 3 March 1981, further hostilities have broken out in southern Lebanon.

"This morning, at 0955 hours (GMT), a position of the *de facto* forces located south of the village of Ett Taibe fired 24 tank rounds into the village of Al-Qantara, in the Nigerian battalion sector of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). A Nigerian captain and a corporal were killed and 11 Nigerian soldiers were injured, according to first reports. The figure may well be higher. Two Lebanese soldiers were also injured. The dead and wounded have been evacuated.

"In the course of the morning there were threats from the *de facto* forces that unless the platoon of Lebanese soldiers was withdrawn from Al-Qantara by 1600 hours GMT (1000 hours New York time), shelling would be resumed. This threat was carried out at 1615 hrs GMT (1015 hours NYT), when 10 tank rounds were fired into the village of Yatar in the Netherlands battalion area, causing damage to property. The situation in the UNIFIL area is, at the moment, extremely tense.

"I think it is important that members of the Council be informed of the background of these latest developments.

"On 10 March, a platoon of the Lebanese army, which was already serving under the command of the Nigerian battalion, was redeployed in the village of Al-Qantara.

"On 12 March, the *de facto* forces issued threats to the Nigerian company at Al-Qantara that the village would be harassed if the Lebanese army personnel were not removed from there.

"On 13 March, at 1015 hours (GMT), four Lebanese army medical personnel (a doctor, his two assistants and an ambulance driver) were kidnapped from outside the clinic in Al-Qantara—they were in fact giving vaccinations to the civilian population at the time. Their kidnappers drove them into the enclave controlled by the *de facto* forces, crashing through check-points manned by Nigerian soldiers on the way.

"During the morning of 14 March, the *de facto* forces fired six tank rounds from south of Ett Taibe to an area east of Al-Qantara, the rounds impacting close to a Nigerian patrol. In the early afternoon, seven more tank rounds were fired, which also impacted east of Al-Qantara. These hostile acts continued into 15 March, when 13 mortar rounds were fired into the same village from the position of the *de*

facto forces south of Ett Taibe. Three civilians were wounded.

"I wish to inform the Council that, throughout the incidents of the past days, the Commander of UNIFIL has made clear to the *de facto* forces that there is no question of withdrawing the Lebanese platoon from Al-Qantara. They are part of the Lebanese battalion serving in the UNIFIL area for almost two years. As members of the Council are aware, resolution 425 (1978), which established UNIFIL, expressly called upon the Force to assist the Government of Lebanon 'in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area'.

"I wish also to add that, throughout this period, the United Nations has been in touch with the Israeli authorities, urging them to make all possible efforts to bring an end to the irresponsible behaviour of the *de facto* forces. These efforts continue. The Chief of Staff of the Israel Defence Forces, General Eitan, has sent a message to the Commander of UNIFIL expressing his shock and sorrow at the casualties suffered by UNIFIL today. He indicated that he will do everything possible to avoid a recurrence of such a tragedy.

"I am deeply concerned at the tragedy which today has cost the lives of two Nigerians and wounded 11 more. As I have indicated, and it bears repeating, under the mandate as set out in resolution 425 (1978), one of the main functions of UNIFIL is to assist 'the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area'. The deployment of a battalion of Lebanese troops in the UNIFIL area was an initial step in this process which cannot be validly challenged by anyone, no matter what their motivation. Moreover, the Lebanese battalion in question has been in the UNIFIL area since April 1979.

"Before concluding my statement, I feel obliged to comment that the challenge to the status and functioning of UNIFIL is not confined to the forces of Major Haddad, although today's incident is a particularly gross example of this challenge to UNIFIL. In the past months, UNIFIL has also had to contend with constant efforts to infiltrate its area of operation by various factions of the armed elements to the north and west of its area and, in the process, has, to my deep regret, also sustained casualties, including the death of one Fijian soldier in an incident on 17 January 1981.

"One of the most important principles upon which UNIFIL was established was the full co-operation of all the parties concerned. It has been all too clear throughout the history of UNIFIL, and is again underlined by the tragic events of today, that that co-operation is not forthcoming. In other circumstances, this fact might lead to the conclusion that, since the conditions under which it was set up do not exist in reality, UNIFIL should be withdrawn. I do not propose this drastic step because I am convinced that the withdrawal of UNIFIL would lead to an immediate and violent escalation of the conflict in southern Lebanon, with disastrous consequences and unpredictable and widespread repercussions which would constitute a major threat to international peace and security.

"All possible efforts must, therefore, be made to impress upon those concerned that provocation, harassment and military offensives against UNIFIL cannot and will not be accepted. It is essential that all armed groups in the area extend to UNIFIL the co-operation that is required for the fulfilment of its mandate.

"I am sure that the Council will decide upon the steps necessary to deal with the present unsatisfactory situation."

DOCUMENT S/14409*

Letter dated 16 March 1981 from the representative of Israel
to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[17 March 1981]

Further to my letter of 11 March 1981 [S/14403], I wish to draw your urgent attention to yet another cowardly attack of a similar kind by PLO terrorists on an Israel civilian bus.

On Saturday evening, 14 March, three PLO terrorists ambushed a bus on its regular route between the Jerusalem suburb of Ramot and the city centre. The terrorists first threw a hand-grenade at the bus and then pelted it with machine-gun fire, wounding one person.

Yesterday, 15 March, the PLO in Lebanon took responsibility for this outrage.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/132-S/14409.

DOCUMENT S/14410*

Letter dated 17 March 1981 from the representative of Mauritania to the Secretary-General

[Original: French]
[19 March 1981]

On instructions from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, and further to the conversation we had today, I have the honour to give you an account of the events which took place in Mauritania yesterday morning:

1. In the morning of Monday, 16 March 1981, at approximately 10 a.m., several commandos attacked Nouakchott at different points, taking some hostages, killing seven persons and wounding several dozen others.

2. Shortly before midday, and thanks to the prompt and effective intervention of the Mauritanian armed forces, the commandos were completely put out of action, being either killed or captured.

3. This group of mercenaries, consisting mostly of Mauritians, was led by two traitors—former officers of the Mauritanian army who have been convicted of desertion and treason—namely, Lieutenant-Colonels Mohamed Ould Bah Ould Abd el-Kader and Ahmed Salem Ould Sidi.

4. The group, which crossed the Sénégal river, went to Nouakchott with the intention of assassinating the leading public figures of Mauritania and immediately broadcasting an appeal by radio to the Kingdom of Morocco requesting the intervention of the air force and army of the Royal Armed Forces.

The first confessions made by the commando leaders show that this act was staged by the most prominent Moroccan authorities.

In fact, in their expansionist mania and territorial greed, the Moroccan leaders mistook a dram for reality, underestimating with typical arrogance the vigilance of the Mauritanian people, their leaders and their armed forces.

However, for more than two years, the Military Committee and Government of Mauritania, true to their conviction that only a peaceful and fraternal Maghreb can effectively meet the challenges of our age, have continued to place their faith, come what may, in the moderation and common sense of those

who are responsible for leading the destinies of the peoples of the region.

Neither the ostentatious proclamation made at Rabat, in defiance of the most elementary rules of friendship, not to mention good-neighbourly relations, by a front of so-called "free" officers, nor the thinly veiled support given to the so-called "Alliance for a democratic Mauritania", nor the statements, full of ill-considered threats, made by the most authoritative Moroccan spokesmen, nor the provocations and intimidations in the form of air raids have caused the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to swerve from its genuine and sincere determination to maintain a strict neutrality in the face of a murderous and fratricidal war between the Royal Armed Forces of Morocco and the Sahraoui people's liberation forces.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania has now decided, in view of the recent serious escalation by Morocco, to sever diplomatic relations with that country, a severance for which Rabat ultimately bears full responsibility.

It calls your attention to the gravity of this destabilizing operation undertaken by Morocco, in view of the dangers it entails for the western Maghreb and West Africa.

It assures you, however, that this aggression will not deflect the country from its stated national objectives: the quest for peace in the Maghreb, the democratization of national public life and the rehabilitation of the economy.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, while reserving the right, in future, to take any appropriate action at the United Nations level, is now confining its action to informing you, and, through you, the international community of this matter.

I would accordingly request that you kindly arrange for this letter to be issued as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mohamed Said Ould HAMODY
Permanent Representative of Mauritania
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/133-S/14410.

DOCUMENT S/14411*

Note verbale dated 17 March 1981 from the Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[19 March 1981]

The Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and, with reference to its note dated 24 February 1981 [S/14383], has the honour to inform him of the following.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/134-S/14411.

The Israeli occupation authorities practised different measures of terrorism towards the Syrian Arab population of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights; one among those measures is the destruction and demolition of their cities and villages, expropriation of their properties with the objective of compelling the remaining citizens to abandon their land in order to

change the physical character of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights.

In addition to the above-mentioned measures, the Israeli occupation authorities undertook other methods aiming to change the institutional structure of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights by replacing the Syrian Arab curriculum with an Israeli one, and by the teaching of Hebrew while reducing the hours allocated to the teaching of Arabic. The final objective of those different methods and measures implemented through different steps is the annexation of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights to Israel. Those steps are:

1. The expulsion of the Syrian Arab population of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights, reducing their numbers from 120,000 to 13,000.

2. The establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights. The number of those settlements as it stands now is 30, populated by 7,000 Israeli settlers aiming to change their demographic composition.

3. The last step, comprised of different measures aiming at the final annexation of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights, was manifested in:

(a) Compelling the Syrian labour force to join the Israeli Histadrut;

(b) The nomination of local councils;

(c) Compelling the Syrian Arab citizens of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights to obtain Israeli citizenship (see annex).

Those different measures and methods were met by the refusal of the Syrian inhabitants of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights to renounce their Syrian citizenship. Lately the Israeli occupation authorities increased their policies of repression by threats of firing Syrian Arab citizens, workers and teachers who refused to accept the Israeli identity card and by imposing high taxation and cutting telephone lines and water supplies to houses and lands of the other Syrian citizens who took a similar stand.

The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic strongly protests against these measures and practices that constitute a blatant violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, principles of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 1949 and requests that the Secretary-General take appropriate measures in this regard.

The Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic kindly requests the Secretary-General to circulate the present note and the annex as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

ANNEX

Questions and answers quoted from the Israeli Newspaper *Al-Hamishmar* dated 16 January 1981 under the title: "A case of the national identity of the Druzes in the Golan Heights: Who needs the Israeli nationality?!"

The following quotations are excerpts from a report filed to *Al-Hamishmar* by an Israeli reporter who travelled around, met with and talked to various Syrian ordinary citizens and notables inhabiting the occupied Golan Heights:

"On 18 August 1980, the Israeli Parliament enacted a law which entitled the Druze sect of the population of the Golan Heights to obtain Israeli identity cards; this law was put into effect on 18

November 1980. The amendment of the Israeli nationality law of 1952 states the following: 'Every person inhabiting the occupied territories who may request the Israeli nationality and proves that his services have contributed to the benefit of the State of Israel, its security and economic progress; or that the State of Israel needs his services may, according to his request, be able to obtain the Israeli nationality.'

"The Israeli identity card would enable that person to register his children on his identity card, and accordingly, all the members of his family would obtain the Israeli nationality. This new identity card will grant its holder freedom of movement within Israel proper and offers him the opportunity to change his residence; it would permit him as well to be recruited in any governmental post in any part of the land; it also enables him to obtain an Israeli passport with all the rights granted in this case concerning visas to States all over the world.

"The Israeli law also states that everyone who obtains the Israeli nationality should abandon his previous nationality especially if that nationality is of a State considered anti-Israel. As regards the case of the Druzes, especially in the present circumstances, the Government would not insist on the abandonment of the former nationality."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS *The Israeli identity card*

"I asked Mr. Kinge (a notable Syrian Druze) whether he would like to obtain an Israeli identity card. He replied angrily: 'I did not ask for it and will neither accept nor receive it. I am a Syrian citizen whose territory has been occupied by Israel since 1967. I have expressed my opposition to obtaining Israeli nationality through every channel during the last 13 years. We, from the national view, consider ourselves Syrian Arabs; our land is Syria's land. We consider those who requested Israeli identity cards as traitors and I oppose them. We have not hidden this stand from the authorities; we even submitted a petition to various international organizations and to the State of Israel explaining our refusal to obtain Israeli nationality.'

"I had a long talk in the office of the Military Governor with the leaders and notables of the Druzes.

"In reply to a question about who called for the meeting—they or the Military Governor—they stated that the Military Governor requested the meeting when he could not convince them to obtain Israeli identity cards.

"In reply to another question about the motives behind Israel's interest and insistence that they should obtain Israeli identity, they told me that Israel wanted to bargain on the Golan Heights, it wanted them to sustain its claim as if the Golan Heights belonged to it. If they agreed to obtain Israeli identity, then Israel would tell the Syrian authorities in any possible negotiation that all those inhabiting the Golan Heights area were now Israeli citizens and could not return back to any other sovereign State.

"In reply to my question why they opposed that, they answered that they did not want to remain under Israeli occupation because they were Syrian nationals and would like to remain so.

"In reply to the question about those who requested the identity card, they answered that there were only a few people who had obtained identity cards but even those few did not acknowledge that or admit it openly. They were either teachers or government employees; if they refused to obtain identity cards, the Israeli authorities would dismiss them.

"I asked whether they had been pressed to obtain identity cards. Their reply was affirmative. The Military Governor was using pressure. There were many ways and means of pressure, such as in the following cases:

"1. One person tried to obtain a driving licence, but the Military Governor refused to give him this unless he obtained Israeli identity.

"2. They threatened a teacher with dismissal if he did not obtain Israeli identity.

"3. During the last period, a summons was issued to 50 inhabitants, accusing them of construction violations and threatening them with the demolition of their homes. When these owners reported to the Military Governor, he told them that if they obtained Israeli identity cards he would help them.

"4. The Israeli authorities resorted to increasing income tax, and orders were issued to confiscate money and properties, such as tractors and furniture, from every person who did not pay the tax imposed on him, but it would be possible to get rid of this problem if . . .

"5. They were threatening the elderly and the disabled who lived on pensions and government assistance that if they did not obtain identity cards then . . .

"Mr. Kinge estimated that the number of Druzes who might apply for Israeli identity cards would not exceed 200 people; he said if Israel wanted to add those 200 persons to its population, then it should take them to its land. He affirmed that there were many who didn't want Israeli identity cards but how could they resist the pressure, especially when some of them were officers employed by the Government. Nevertheless, any one who surrendered to those pressures could not be a national faithful to the Druze sect.

"Mr. Kinge stated: "We reject one thing, i.e., the Israeli nationality. We would prefer death rather than abandon our Syrian nationality and our hope to live with it; for Syria is part of us. My share in Syria is equal to the share of President Assad."

The Jewish settlements in the Golan Heights

"Mr. Kinge stated that those practices will not provide peace; on the contrary the desire to buy more land for the establishment of Jewish settlements increased the pressure practised by the Government against the population; part of that pressure was increasing taxes, but nevertheless money would not make him change his opinion."

Local (municipal) councils

"A Syrian notable whom I talked with claimed that it was the Israeli Military Governor, not the citizens, who nominated the local municipal councils in the Druze villages. The Israeli military rule is using every possible pressure through these local councils to force the population to obtain Israeli identity cards. The belief is that this pressure will continue, especially against teachers and local employees who earn their livings through municipal councils. This pressure has been intensified since Begin became Prime Minister."

DOCUMENT S/14412

Telegram dated 18 March 1981 from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique to the Secretary-General

*[Original: English]
[19 March 1981]*

Following the information we gave you yesterday, 17 March 1981, on the aggression by racist South Africa to the People's Republic of Mozambique, we have the honour to add more details.

At 8 o'clock yesterday morning, a Mozambican navy patrol stationed at Ponta do Ouro spotted South African troops and alerted the region. The border guards moved to the area where the infiltration had taken place, a mile on the border between Mozambique and South Africa near the town of Ponta do Ouro.

The South African military contingent, composed of about 50 soldiers, crossed the border into our country and, at 8.54 a.m., they opened fire against a unit of our border guards stationed at Ponta do Ouro. As a result a Mozambican border guard was seriously injured. Responding to the fire, the Mozambican force killed two South African soldiers.

Our forces recovered the body of one of the South African soldiers, who, at the moment he was hit, was carrying an FN rifle, seven cartridge clips, binoculars and compass.

The body of another South African soldier (a radio operator) was taken back to South Africa by the enemy group. Confronted with a fierce resistance from our armed forces, the enemy received reinforcement in men and assault cars.

They tried to cut the access to the airstrip at Ponta do Ouro and on the Catembe road, leading to Maputo, but they were forced back.

The fight ended at about 3 p.m., when the South African troops withdrew. However, large numbers of South African troops are still positioned along the border on the South African side.

As we have already stated before, South Africa is intensifying its attacks against the People's Republic of Mozambique in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of most elementary norms of international law.

South Africa is seeking to generalize the conflict in the region, and, as such, it must be held responsible for the escalation of war in the region which can seriously threaten peace and security in the region and in the world in general.

The People's Republic of Mozambique reserves its right to take appropriate measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to defend and preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The People's Republic of Mozambique is sure that you will take the necessary measures in order to avoid further deterioration of the situation.

We request that this letter be circulated among all Member States as a document of the Security Council.

DOCUMENT S/14415

Letter dated 20 March 1981 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General

*[Original: English]
[20 March 1981]*

Upon instruction from my Government I have the honour to bring to your attention the text of the following message which the South African Department

of Foreign Affairs and Information today dispatched to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Mozambique concerning the incident which oc-

curred near Ponta do Ouro in the People's Republic of Mozambique on 17 March 1981:

"The Department of Foreign Affairs and Information of the Republic of South Africa presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Mozambique and has the honour to state that, owing to a navigational and map-reading error, a small South African border unit accidentally strayed across an unmarked portion of the South African border with Mozambique at Ponta do Ouro at 1000 hours on 17 March. The Ministry is no doubt aware that the international border in this area is demarcated by way of beacons which are located considerable distances—up to 8,000 metres—from each other. The possibility that either party might unwittingly stray across the border cannot, in practice, be completely avoided. In fact, as the Ministry knows, Mozambican soldiers have, in the past, crossed into South African territory.

"Owing to the vagueness of the border at this point, a member of the unit, Corporal P. J. Viljoen, proceeded to a higher vantage point to establish his unit's precise position. At that stage, two armed Mozambican border guards appeared from the west along the beach. Two members of the South African unit approached them, with the purpose of establishing from them the location of the border to avoid

the unit's crossing into Mozambican territory. Owing to a language barrier, they failed to make themselves understood. While they were still trying to communicate with the Mozambicans, several other guards appeared. At that stage, the leader of the unit summoned Corporal Viljoen back. As Corporal Viljoen descended from his vantage point, the Mozambican border guards opened fire and shot him. Thereupon the South African unit returned fire while withdrawing south along the beach.

"In the past, when Mozambicans have crossed the border into South Africa, the South African authorities have avoided such drastic action. They must, therefore, strongly protest against the attack on Corporal Viljoen, which, according to reports, resulted in his death.

"If these reports are correct, the South African authorities would be grateful to learn what arrangements can be made to return Corporal Viljoen's body."

I should appreciate it if this letter could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) D. W. STEWARD
*Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of South Africa
to the United Nations*

DOCUMENT S/14416*

Letter dated 23 March 1981 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[24 March 1981]

I have the honour to refer to the letter from the Permanent Representative of Jordan dated 10 March 1981 and addressed to you [S/14400]. In that letter he tried with characteristic sanctimoniousness to take advantage of a distorted version of measures which would have been taken by any responsible police force against law-breakers.

The concern which Mr. Nuseibeh expressed for the Me'ah She'arim quarter of Jerusalem is indeed most touching. This is especially so as it comes from the representative of a State which from 1948 to 1967 gave concrete evidence of its profound concern and respect for Jews and Judaism. Fifty-eight ancient synagogues in the Jewish quarter within the Walled City of Jerusalem were wantonly destroyed by the Jordanian aggressors. Hundreds of holy Torah scrolls and religious works reverently preserved for generations were reduced to ashes. All the Jews in the Walled City of Jerusalem were driven out, as they were from all the areas invaded by Jordan in 1948. On the Mount of Olives, the ancient Jewish cemetery was sacrilegiously desecrated. There can be little doubt that Me'ah She'arim, its synagogues and its residents would have been treated to the same expressions of affection, had that section of Jerusalem been captured by Jordan in 1948.

Mr. Nuseibeh's tender feelings for Judaism, as now expressed in his letter, are particularly moving and reassuring in the light of the sentiments which he has expressed so freely in the United Nations.

Three pearls from recent speeches by Mr. Nuseibeh will suffice to demonstrate what, in his letter, he terms his "affinity, esteem and respect" for Judaism and the Jewish people.

In the Security Council, on 16 March 1979 [2128th meeting], Mr. Nuseibeh remarked:

"Has the world been polarized into an omnipotent race and subservient Gentiles born into this world to serve the aims of the 'master race'? We, the Gentiles, are several billion human souls, and yet how much weight, I wonder, do we carry in the councils of some of the mighty?"

Speaking in the General Assembly on 8 December 1980, Mr. Nuseibeh claimed that there is a Jewish cabal "which controls, manipulates and exploits the rest of humanity by controlling the money and wealth of the world". In the same diatribe Mr. Nuseibeh disclosed: "People like Lord Rothschild every day, in ironclad secrecy, decide and flash round the world how high the price of gold should be".¹³

Given these insights into Mr. Nuseibeh's Wel-

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/137-S/14416.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 86th meeting, para. 93.

tanschauung, so clearly evocative of certain European régimes in the 1930s and 1940s, his letter will no doubt be seen in its proper context and be treated in the manner it so richly deserves.

I have the honour to request that this letter be cir-

culated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. BLUM
Permanent Representative of Israel
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14417*

Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[26 March 1981]

I wish to transmit to you the text of my statement on the so-called elections in Kampuchea which was issued today in my capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN):

"1. The ASEAN member States cannot recognize the validity of any elections which would compel the Kampuchean people to endorse candidates foisted on them by foreign forces. Under the shadow cast by the presence of 200,000 Vietnamese troops, the Kampuchean people cannot pursue their national interests, form a government of their own choice or freely elect their leaders.

"2. The ASEAN Governments denounce the so-called elections that are being conducted by the Heng Samrin régime in Kampuchea. These elections contravene the provisions of United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/6 which call for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea and for United Nations-supervised elections to allow the Kampuchean people to determine for themselves their own future, free from outside interference, subversion or coercion. The elections are being staged in an attempt to confer a false legitimacy upon the Heng Samrin régime in the face of the firm

and just demand by Kampuchean nationalists for the removal of foreign forces from their country. The world is aware that Vietnamese forces are in Kampuchea against the will of the Kampuchean people. These forces overthrew the legitimate government of Democratic Kampuchea and imposed a régime which later claimed to have invited the Vietnamese forces. The Heng Samrin régime has been rejected by the international community.

"3. The ASEAN Governments call upon the world community to denounce these fraudulent elections. They also call upon the United Nations Secretary-General to reject these so-called elections and to expedite the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/6, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority last year to find a comprehensive and durable political solution to the Kampuchean problem which would be acceptable to the Kampuchean people and to all parties concerned."

I would appreciate it if this letter could be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Carlos P. ROMULO
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of the Philippines

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/139-S/14417.

DOCUMENT S/14418

Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English/French]
[26 March 1981]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter from Mr. Zehdi Labib Terzi, Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I should be grateful if you would have this letter distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Ali TEKAIA
Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Tunisia
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Text of the letter dated 17 March 1981 from the observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization addressed to the Secretary-General

I am requested by Chairman Yasser Arafat to draw your attention to the recent Israeli attempts to consolidate their illegal presence on

occupied Palestinian lands. Two so-called local governments were established at Maale Ephraim, north of Jericho, and at Ariel and Elkana. Similar bodies are shortly to be established in Kiryat Arba adjacent to Hebron and in Zionist settlements north of the Dead Sea.

There is a blatant attempt under the auspices of the chairman of the ministerial settlement committee, Ariel Sharon, and Matityahu Drobles, co-chairman of the World Zionist Organization's settlement department, to convert the illegal Zionist settlements into "self-governing" townships. The primary aim is the speedy expansion of settlements and the enlargement of the Jewish population in order to create "facts" that a Labour Government could not very well reverse should it be elected into office in June. According to Drobles, 400 new housing units will be built in the settlements to increase the Israeli Jewish "inhabitants" in the occupied Palestinian territories by an additional 4,000.

The military government claims that only "State"-owned land will be utilized for these purposes; however, over 1,000 acres of Palestinian-owned land has been seized. While the illegal seizure is

being challenged in the Supreme Court by Palestinian land-owners, it is highly probable that the Israeli Government will engage itself in a variety of foot-dragging tactics to circumvent any decision, and will, as in the past, continue to encourage confiscation and expansion into additional Palestinian-owned lands.

The simple truth remains that the acquisition of land in Palestine has always been a central objective of the Zionist movement. There is no Zionist settlement and there is no Zionist State without confiscating Palestinian land.

This latest affront to the efforts and decisions of the United

Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 465 (1980), is in direct violation of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which is applicable to all Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967. While the General Assembly agreed by its resolution 34/65 B of 29 November 1979 that the Camp David accords "have no validity", it is obvious that these latest Israeli measures are a direct consequence of the said accords.

In drawing your attention to this gravely worsening situation I am requested to call upon you to take whatever action you may deem necessary to put an end to Israel's illegal land-grabbing.

DOCUMENT S/14419*

Letter dated 26 March 1981 from the representative of Morocco to the Secretary-General

[Original: French]
[27 March 1981]

I have the honour to refer to the letter addressed to you on 17 March 1981 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania [S/14410], in which he presented to you what he considered to be an account of the events that took place in Mauritania on 16 March, and in connection with which I wish to make the following clarifications.

The version of the facts reported in the letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania contains a number of groundless and gratuitous accusations against the Kingdom of Morocco, in support of which the Mauritanian Government has not provided the slightest proof. Moreover, it has thoughtlessly attributed to my country intentions which are amply belied by the sincerity, depth and scope of the very friendly relations which Morocco and Mauritania enjoyed for many years.

Diplomatic and press reports from Mauritania concur in confirming, quite on the contrary, that the events of Monday, 16 March, brought only Mauritanian factions into conflict with each other in a quasi-insurrectional climate.

The Mauritanian letter itself refers to Mauritanian "mercenaries", led by two Mauritanian officers, acting on behalf of an organization which, as the Nouakchott régime admits, is purely Mauritanian and which moreover announced its responsibility for the action undertaken on 16 March against the Nouakchott authorities.

It should be clarified that one of the two officers in question was a former Vice-President of the Council and the other a former Minister of the Mauritanian Government, and that they used to enjoy considerable support in the Mauritanian army and among the country's political figures.

Although some officers had fled their country's régime and had stayed in Morocco, where they had been granted the right to political asylum in accordance with international law and custom and on condition that they refrain from engaging in any political activity against Mauritania, the Moroccan Government challenges the Mauritanian authorities to present any proof whatsoever that the operation which occurred on 16 March was carried out from Moroccan territory.

The very specious argument that the instigators of

the putsch had intended to appeal to Morocco requesting military intervention cannot in any way imply responsibility on the part of my country, which has remained totally apart from this operation.

It should be noted that for the past month international public opinion in general, and Mauritanian public opinion in particular, have been subjected to a shrill campaign orchestrated by the Mauritanian authorities to camouflage the continual deterioration of the domestic situation and the current disintegration of the Mauritanian army. The Mauritanian authorities, who were perfectly aware of this situation and who felt overwhelmed by the ever-growing tide of controversy, then tried to galvanize public opinion around the imminent possibility of imaginary foreign aggression with a view not to remedying a situation which was already beyond their control but so as to make it easier to attribute responsibility for any popular uprising or action of their armed forces, which by then seemed inevitable, to alleged foreign intervention.

Accordingly, long before the events of 16 March 1981, the Mauritanian régime, grappling with both domestic and foreign difficulties, which it had helped to create, had tried to find a scapegoat, and the Algerian and Libyan information media had gladly pointed one out: Morocco was to be crushed in the over-all destabilization operation under way in the region.

The Mauritanian Government had then met on 12 March to "examine" the situation and had issued a communiqué in which it had attempted to redeem the serious liabilities the current régime had incurred. Envoys had also been sent to Algiers, Tripoli and Bamako to request support against what was referred to as imminent aggression by Morocco against Mauritania.

However, it should be remembered in this connection that the Kingdom of Morocco, which had kept more than 8,000 soldiers of the Royal Armed Forces on Mauritanian territory for months under a joint defence agreement and which had withdrawn them at the mere request of the Mauritanian Government, has never interfered in the internal affairs of Mauritania or tried to take advantage of that situation for dishonest purposes.

Such exemplary conduct in connection with other situations in Africa reveals the quality of the relations which the Moroccan Government enjoyed and hopes still to enjoy with the brotherly people of Mauritania.

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/151-S/14419.

Ever since Morocco recognized the Islamic Republic of Mauritania as an independent and sovereign State, it has never ceased to offer the Mauritanian people proof that its disinterested feelings are genuine or to provide them with tokens of its friendship and solidarity, particularly when Mauritania was faced with adversity and was in the most dire need of them.

In this light, the Moroccan Government has announced the forthcoming publication of a white paper on Moroccan-Mauritanian relations and on the extent of the co-operation existing between the two countries, co-operation which Morocco considered it important to protect despite serious lapses in commitments to observe strict neutrality, good-neighbourly relations and mutual loyalty which the Mauritanian authorities had assumed but which they were violating more and more brazenly under pressure and with the support of foreign Governments hostile to my country.

If Mauritania, since the first coup d'état, bringing down President Moktar Ould Daddah, has experienced a period of manifest instability during which there have been both successful and aborted putsches—sometimes with the acknowledged participation of certain countries that were too quickly exonerated—the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco cannot be held responsible for this regrettable situation of instability, which seems likely to continue.

Morocco has always wanted to be bordered by a stable, free and prosperous Mauritania which would ensure the inviolability and respect of its territorial integrity in a sovereign manner and would echo purely and sincerely Morocco's profound desire to develop and deepen the fruitful co-operation already established between our two countries, despite the hegemonic stubbornness of other neighbouring countries that are constantly sowing hatred and preaching violence, of which Mauritania is now the victim.

I would request that you kindly arrange for this letter, and the annexes thereto, to be issued as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mehdi MRANI ZENTAR
Permanent Representative of the
Kingdom of Morocco
to the United Nations

ANNEX I

Statement by Mr. Maati Bouabid, Prime Minister and Minister of Justice of Morocco

Early yesterday evening at Marrakesh, Mr. Bouabid, the Prime Minister, made a governmental statement.

His Majesty King Hassan II had instructed him to reply, on behalf of his Government, to the fallacious accusations made against Morocco by the Mauritanian leaders following the abortive coup d'état which took place in Mauritania on Monday.

Here is the full text of this statement:

"Yesterday we heard the news of an attempted coup d'état at Nouakchott, the capital of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

"As everyone knows, it is unfortunately not the first time that Mauritanian senior officers have embarked on a desperate struggle to seize power, since the first coup d'état, which overthrew President Moktar Ould Daddah.

"Moreover, some attempts to overthrow the régime in Mauritania, where the perpetrators were arrested *in flagrante delicto*, were nipped in the bud and ended with the release of the culprits and the return to normal of relations with the State which

was the instigator of the attempt. Those relations were even greatly improved, for reasons which are clear to all.

"The announcement of this new attempted coup d'état would have been perfectly innocuous if it had not been accompanied by an attempt to involve Morocco in this purely internal problem by making direct accusations against it and then by announcing the severance of diplomatic relations.

"I wish, first of all, to affirm and proclaim here, on the instructions of His Majesty the King and on behalf of his Government, that all the statements by the Mauritanian leaders are no more than gratuitous, mendacious allegations directed against our country, that they are devoid of any foundation and that, as such, we reject and denounce them just as we have previously had to reject and denounce other fabrications whose fallacious character was subsequently to become clear to international public opinion.

"I shall mention by way of example the story about the violation of Mauritanian airspace by the Moroccan air force and its bombardment of the town of Nouadhibou.

"Everyone knows that Moroccan policy is based, both at home and abroad, on constant principles and on an ethical code from which it never departs, whatever the circumstances, and we place at the head of our ethical rules adherence to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

"With regard to Mauritania in particular, our bilateral relations have remained normal ever since we recognized that State in 1969 on the occasion of the convening of the first Islamic summit conference at Rabat.

"A crisis might have arisen between the two States when Mauritania revealed its territorial pretensions to the Sahara, but my country insisted on avoiding a dispute and preferred to ally itself with Mauritania against the colonial Power, and, when the Government of President Ould Daddah was overthrown, Morocco could have given a broad interpretation to the Moroccan-Mauritanian joint defence agreement, but it insisted on refraining from any intervention, in accordance with the principles of its ethical code.

"Relations between the two countries remained solid in all areas up to the signature of the 'Agreement of Algiers' between the Polisario mercenaries and the Mauritanian party, which thus sought to usurp Morocco's indisputable historical rights. Since then, Mauritania has embarked on an anti-Moroccan escalation process.

"This process has passed through various stages, the first of which was Mauritania's proclamation of its withdrawal from the conflict and observance of strict neutrality with regard to it. It then underwent a steady evolution ending in the participation of high-ranking Mauritanian officials in the events staged at Tindouf and the reception of mercenaries at Nouakchott with official honours. Then came the episode of the fabrication out of thin air of the alleged Moroccan threat to Mauritania, and this episode was crowned by the serious accusations made against us yesterday and by the decision to break off diplomatic relations.

"At all events, Morocco has decided to issue a publication describing in detail the various aspects of Moroccan-Mauritanian co-operation in the past and giving all pertinent details about the tremendous sacrifices made by my country for the sake of its neighbour, inspired by its faith in the joint destiny of the two fraternal peoples.

"Going back to the recent attempted coup d'état, it should be known that Colonel Ould Abd el-Kader requested political asylum in Morocco, like many other dissidents of various nationalities. This right was accorded him within the framework of the international principles in force and, in particular, his commitment not to engage in any political activity hostile to the Government of his country.

"You perhaps do not know that the Mauritanian Government had asked the Moroccan authorities to extradite Colonel Abd el-Kader, but that request was rejected because the Colonel had in no way broken his commitment.

"Moreover, we challenge the Nouakchott rulers to cite any tract or communiqué published by Ould Abd el-Kader in Morocco, just as we challenge them to produce any evidence that the authors of the attempted coup d'état were operating out of Moroccan territory, and you know that even the late President Boumediene

ANNEX II

never dared to ask us to extradite one of his opponents, whether at a time when relations with Morocco were at their peak or when they were at their lowest ebb.

"It goes without saying that the virulent campaign of denigration waged by Morocco's adversaries, whose ranks Mauritania has just joined, is increasing following the spectacular successes achieved by Morocco, both on the battlefield and in the diplomatic sphere. Now that the Royal Armed Forces have become the uncontested master of the territory, so that any operation attempted by the mercenaries would be suicidal, the representatives of Europe in their parliament are placing the problem in its true context as a bilateral Moroccan-Algerian dispute.

"It is clear that one of the objectives of this campaign is to seek a revival of sympathy among international public opinion by representing Morocco as an aggressor, in order to refurbish our adversaries' image now that their lies have been exposed. However, the attempts will be doomed to failure, because international public opinion will not allow itself to be hoodwinked by crude manoeuvres.

"With regard to the irresponsible actions of the Mauritanian leaders and their flagrant bad faith, there is one thing which we deeply regret, namely the negative repercussions which this ill-considered attitude will inevitably have on the fraternal Moroccan and Mauritanian peoples, who are linked by human, religious, linguistic and cultural bonds. In this regard, I can only state that the Mauritanian leaders and those who manipulate them bear the sole and entire responsibility for the deterioration of the situation in the region and for such developments as may result therefrom in the future.

"No one can deny that Morocco has shown a great deal of patience and sufficient wisdom and calmness in the face of the multiple provocations. This has been in order to preserve as far as possible the links of good-neighbourliness and to safeguard as far as possible the future of fraternal relations between the Moroccan and Mauritanian peoples."

Telegram dated 25 March 1981 from Mr. Maatl Bouabid, Prime Minister and Minister of Justice of Morocco, addressed to Mr. Sid Ahmed Ould Bneljara, Prime Minister of Mauritania

Guelta Zemmur, located near the Moroccan-Mauritanian frontier, was attacked at 6 a.m. on 24 March 1981 by a column of mercenaries totalling an estimated 3,000 men.

From the information available to us, we can state without risk of error that the assailants crossed the Mauritanian frontier, starting out from Bir Moghrein, situated in Mauritanian territory.

This attack was preceded by a tendentious campaign directed from Nouakchott against the Kingdom of Morocco. The Government of His Majesty the King at the time denounced all those slanders and mendacious allegations and drew the attention of international opinion to the real plot being hatched in north-west Africa and having as its purpose the destabilization of the region.

The events of 24 March corroborated my country's point of view and showed that the Mauritanian Government has departed from the position reiterated and declared by it on many occasions, both in the United Nations and in the Organization of African Unity, of observing strict neutrality in the north-west African conflict.

This new situation thus created in our relations is extremely grave. Moreover, it expressly gives the lie to the statements which you made to His Majesty the King at your meeting at Taif in the presence of Mr. Sékou Touré, President of the Republic of Guinea.

Morocco, which intends to exercise its natural right of self-defence, will not remain inactive. It will utilize all legal means in its possession to ensure the safeguarding of its sovereignty and its territorial integrity.

We venture to hope that you will weigh the consequences of any collusion between Mauritania and the bands of mercenaries and that you will be able to draw conclusions from them and see the responsibilities which derive from them before it is too late.

DOCUMENT S/14420*

Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of Thailand to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]
[27 March 1981]

Upon the instructions of my Government and further to my letter of 27 January 1981 [S/14345], I have the honour to inform you of the latest serious violations of Thai sovereignty and territorial integrity by Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces.

On 17 March, from 9.20 to 9.25 a.m., Vietnamese-Heng Samrin forces attacked with heavy weapons a marine unit stationed at Ban Hadlek, Khlong Yai district, Trat province. On the same day, at 2 p.m., at Ban Khodsai in the same district, a car carrying Thai naval officers returning from inspecting the damages to the said Thai marine unit was driven along a coastal road inside Thai territory, near the Thai-Kampuchean border, when it was attacked by Vietnamese-Heng Samrin force's firing heavy weapons from the Banthad moun-

tain range. Two Thai naval officers were killed and four others, including a rear admiral, were seriously wounded.

This unprovoked armed attack not only caused a serious loss of lives but also constituted yet another blatant violation of Thai territorial integrity and sovereignty. The Royal Thai Government strongly condemns this act of aggression and reserves its legitimate right to take all necessary measures to protect the lives of Thai nationals as well as to safeguard Thailand's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

I have the honour to request that the text of this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) M. L. Birabhongse KASEMSRI
Permanent Representative of Thailand
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/152-S/14420.

DOCUMENT S/14421

Letter dated 25 March 1981 from the representative of the Netherlands to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[27 March 1981]

I have the honour to inform you that the heads of State and Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the 10 States members of the European Community, meeting as the European Council, issued at Maastricht on 24 March 1981 the following statement on the situation in Lebanon:

"The European Council notes with great concern the latest developments in southern Lebanon, which have led to the tragic deaths of three Nigerian soldiers of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, stationed there in the cause of re-establishing peace and security in the region.

"As the European Council has stated on many occasions, the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be fully respected.

"The European Council considers that only the complete implementation of the Force's mandate can create the conditions necessary for a progressive return of the south of the country to Lebanese sovereignty.

"In order to enable the Force to carry out its mandate in its entire area of operation up to the internationally recognized boundaries, the 10 States members of the European Community, some of which contribute troops to the Force, call for the immediate and full co-operation of all interested parties.

"In this connection, the European Council supports the statement made on 19 March 1981 by the President of the Security Council [2266th meeting] warning against the placing of any obstacle in the way of the efforts of the Force to discharge its mandate in full."

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) H. SCHELTEMA
Permanent Representative of the Netherlands
to the United Nations

DOCUMENT S/14422*

Letter dated 26 March 1981 from the representative of the Netherlands to the Secretary-General

[Original: English/French]
[30 March 1981]

I have the honour to inform you that the heads of State and Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the 10 States members of the European Community, meeting as the European Council, issued at Maastricht on 24 March 1981 the following statement on the situation in Afghanistan:

"1. The European Council notes with grave concern that the military operations by Soviet troops against the Afghan people, who are resisting this external interference, continue without interruption. The tragic course of events in Afghanistan constitutes a severe ordeal for the Afghan people and expresses itself in the form of a massive flood of refugees who are a heavy burden for neighbouring countries, in particular for Pakistan. The developments in Afghanistan remain a threat to the stability of relations in the region and worldwide.

"2. In face of the situation resulting from the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the European Council has called many times, and in particular at its

meeting at Venice in June 1980 [S/14003], for respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and for an end to all interference in the internal affairs of that country. The Council has stated on many occasions the need for a solution which entails the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and which permits the Afghan people to exercise freely their right to self-determination, and for Afghanistan thus to return to its traditional status as an independent State, neutral and non-aligned.

"3. The European Council supports any initiative which could lead to the desired result and welcomes in particular the initiative which was the subject of United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/37 of 20 November 1980, and that put forward recently by France."

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Signed) H. SCHELTEMA
Permanent Representative of the Netherlands
to the United Nations

* Circulated under the double symbol A/36/153-S/14422.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу : Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
