



**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2678  
17 April 1986

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED  
AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 17 April 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. de KEMOULARIA

(France)

Members: Australia  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
Denmark  
Ghana  
Madagascar  
Thailand  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela

Mr. COLOTT  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. LI Luye  
Mr. DOUMA  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. DUMEVI  
Mr. RAKOTOND RAMBOA  
Mr. KASEMSARN  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. DUBININ  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. MAXEY  
Mr. OKUN  
Miss PULIDO SANTANA

---

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table. I also invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table;  
Mr. Nengrahary (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Ogouma (Benin), Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Velazco San Jose (Cuba), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Hucke (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Endreffy (Hungary), Ms. Kunadi (India), Mr. Damavandi Kamali (Islamic Republic of Iran),

Mr. Somvorachit (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Nyandoo (Mongolia), Mr. Al-Ansi (Oman), Mr. Shah Navas (Pakistan), Mr. Noworyta (Poland), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) and Mr. Sekulic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/18006, letter dated 16 April 1986 from the Chargé d'Affairs ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/18009, letter dated 16 April 1986 from the Chargé d'Affairs ad interim of the Permanent Mission of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/18010, letter dated 16 April 1986 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Viet Nam to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/18012, letter dated 16 April 1986 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

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

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): Allow me at the outset to extend to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for April. Given your experience as a professional diplomat, you will certainly be able to conduct the Council's work successfully.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our congratulations to the Permanent Representative of Denmark on the manner in which he conducted the Council's deliberations last month.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

Only a few days ago the Council considered the deteriorating situation in the Mediterranean region, and in particular in the Gulf of Sidra following the act of aggression by American imperialism against the Libyan Arab Jamahariya. Once again the Council is meeting in response to the request of Libya, which has fallen victim to an act of banditry and savage aggression perpetrated by the same arrogant Power, the United States Administration, which scorns the appeals and requests of peace-loving mankind.

American aggression against Libya, a Member of the United Nations, hardly came as a surprise to the international community, since that source of aggression is all too familiar and imperialism's attitude towards independent progressive countries is no longer a secret to anyone. Nor is it a secret that American imperialism has chosen to pursue a policy of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of independent countries that resolutely refuse to bow to the dictates of imperialism.

It has become standard practice for the United States Administration and its imperialist reactionary allies to train mercenaries and terrorists, equip them with the most sophisticated weapons and send them to certain countries that have chosen to pursue their own independent economic policies, where they destroy schools, hospitals, mosques, transportation networks and other public institutions, as well as terrorise men, women and children of every class and social stratum. That is the policy of the American Administration and its imperialist, reactionary allies. The attack on civilian targets in the towns of Tripoli and Benghazi caused the death of dozens of innocent civilians, wounding hundreds of others. Residential neighbourhoods have been destroyed, and a hospital and a centre for the handicapped are in ruins after the raid by the American aggressor. There are reports that many of the victims were children and elderly persons.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

Libya's constant and firm opposition to the scheming of the imperialists and Zionists against the Palestinian and Arab peoples and its steadfast support for the forces of liberation and independence in the Middle East are well known. That policy has, of course, made the White House furious. Accordingly, the brutal act of aggression perpetrated by the United States against Libya is obviously a premeditated act and part of the world-wide policy of banditry and State terrorism practised by the United States.

United States imperialism, in an effort to justify its criminal act against the people and land of Libya, has advanced specious arguments which are convincing only to the American Administration itself. We must vigorously reject and condemn the desperate efforts of the White House, which is trying to mislead world public opinion by misinterpreting Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Indeed, to tyrannize small nations of the world, as the United States has been doing with impunity, shows an almost complete lack of any sense of morality. The act committed against Libya is nothing but a flagrant act of aggression, a serious violation of all the principles and norms of international law governing relations among States and an affront to all mankind, which is striving to strengthen international peace and security. The facts are clear and the aggressor is well known. The Security Council must urgently take the appropriate measures. The time has come for the Council to act in a clear manner in accordance with its mandate, which is the maintenance of international peace and security. The barbaric act of the United States deserves vigorous condemnation by the Security Council and by the international community as a whole.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

The communiqué adopted at an Emergency Session of the Ministerial-level Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi on 15 April 1986, expresses strong indignation with respect to the armed attacks launched by the United States of America with the support and collaboration of the United Kingdom, its North Atlantic Treaty Organisation ally. Furthermore, it unequivocally condemns that act of aggression against Libya, a sovereign and non-aligned country.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan unreservedly condemns the American aggression against Libya and calls for an immediate end to that brutal act.

In conclusion, I should like to say that, while expressing our fraternal solidarity with the people and the leadership of Libya and our condolences to the families of the victims during this difficult period in their history, we hope that the Security Council will act in accordance with the dictates of justice, condemn the aggressor for its totally unjustifiable act against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and demand appropriate compensation for the losses in human life and material damage inflicted on Libya.

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

The next speaker is the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SOMVORACHIT (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to begin by congratulating you most cordially, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. My delegation is convinced that, thanks to your diplomatic skills and your wisdom, the work of the Security Council will be crowned with success.

I wish to take this opportunity also to convey our sincere thanks to Ambassador Bierring of Denmark, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the Council's work as President last month.

Lastly, I thank all the members of the Council for giving my delegation an opportunity to come once again before the Council this time to speak on the barbarous aggression committed by the American imperialists against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Acting under the fallacious pretext of the struggle against terrorists, whereas they themselves, since their dirty war of aggression against the three peoples of Indo-China, are the true terrorists. There is certainly an abundance of evidence to support this contention. These cynical acts of aggression have been condemned by the international community as a whole, with the exception of the cousins of the United States, who helped them in their acts of barbarity, and the Zionists, the former victims of the Nazis, and the neo-Nazis, who applauded them, thus unmasking their cruel, bloodthirsty and savage nature for the whole world to see.

In connection with the question of the deteriorating situation in the central Mediterranean in general and the American acts of aggression against Libya in particular, my Government has already placed its views on record in the statement made by the spokesman of its Foreign Ministry, dated 26 March 1986, which was

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

conveyed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in document S/17967, and in another statement, also by the Lao Foreign Ministry, date-lined 15 April 1986 Vientiane, which I now have the honour to read out, as follows:

"Following the provocations committed by the United States of America last March and in pursuit of its policy of State terrorism, early on 15 April 1986, the Government of the United States ordered its planes to bomb the capital, Tripoli, and the city of Benghazi in the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, causing considerable loss of life and injuries, including many women and children, and much material damage. This brazen act of aggression committed by the United States is a flagrant violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Libya, and has trampled underfoot the elementary principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. It is also a contemptuous challenge hurled by the United States at Libya, a non-aligned country member of the Organization of African Unity and Member of the United Nations, and indeed at peace-loving and justice-loving forces throughout the world. There can be no justification for that act of aggression.

"The Lao People's Democratic Republic and its people, having been victims of American aggression in the past, wish to express their deep sympathy and understanding to the Libyan people, its cherished comrade-in-arms. The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Lao people vigorously condemn that act of aggression and demand that the United States of America immediately and unconditionally put an end to its aggression, for

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

which it must bear full responsibility, as well as any other hostile acts against Libya deriving from its policy of State terrorism.

"The Lao Government and people unreservedly support the just struggle of the Libyan people against American aggression and are convinced that the just cause of the Libyan people will enjoy broad and powerful support from international public opinion and that it cannot fail to triumph. At the present time, no imperialist and reactionary force could possibly smash the determination of a people seeking to attain and defend its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity."

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

My delegation fully associates itself with the position taken at the Emergency Session Ministerial-level Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi on 15 April 1986, as contained in a communiqué adopted on that date and read out here by the representative of India the day before yesterday.

In conclusion, my delegation urges the Security Council to take the necessary measures under the Charter to condemn these acts of aggression and ensure that they do not occur again.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic for his kind words addressed to me.

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

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Bellorini de Parrales (Nicaragua) and Mr. Birido (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia): I should like at the outset, Sir, to wish you success in the discharge of your extremely difficult task of President of the Security Council for the month of April. I wish also to express appreciation for the work accomplished in that office by your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Denmark.

The statement I had originally prepared, following upon last Saturday's Security Council meeting, elaborated on the fairly uncommon opportunity presented to the Security Council to adopt effective measures to prevent the use of military force against a State Member of the United Nations. However, the armed aggression that has now been carried out by the United States has made it impossible to achieve that most desirable goal. The Security Council is thus compelled to consider an act of armed aggression carried out by the United States - one of the Council's permanent members - against a Member of the United Nations, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. When on 14 December 1955 Libya was admitted to the United Nations, it could hardly have expected that a permanent member of the Security Council - the host country to the Organization of which it was becoming a Member - would attack it in such an atrocious and cynical manner.

The act of aggression conducted by the United States against Libya was, as stated by the highest representatives of the United States, intentional and premeditated; moreover, it was carried out at a time when the Security Council was already discussing the possibility of preventing the use of force. I wish to recall the Council's meeting last Saturday when the delegation of Malta urgently called for a peaceful settlement of the problem, referring to Articles 33 and 34 of the Charter. The United States aggression is a manifestation of its cynical disregard for the entire United Nations, for the mechanism of its functioning and for the Charter. It is yet another manifestation of the policy of double-dealing:

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

while United States representatives to the United Nations seek to convince Member States of their commitment to multilateralism, showing concern for increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations, at the same time they engage in open defiance of the United Nations Charter and international law.

The United States Administration has openly cast aside all scruples and decided to teach Libya a lesson, which, within the meaning of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, amounts to a manifestation of State terrorism. State terrorism has become in the 1980s an integral part of United States foreign policy. A number of developing countries, such as Grenada, Nicaragua and now Libya, have fallen victim to that policy. The United States has arrogated to itself the right to use military force wherever and whenever it deems appropriate. It has been securing its so-called vital interests by exerting political and economic pressure, practising blackmail and, increasingly, using force. In so doing, the United States has been undermining the United Nations Charter, trying by a hypocritical application of Article 51 to make of it a universal instrument in defence of its acts of armed aggression.

As a non-aligned Arab developing country pursuing a progressive foreign policy, Libya is one of the foremost anti-imperialist forces, thus constituting in many respects an obstacle to the implementation of the political intentions of the United States in the region. On the eve of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on the critical economic situation in Africa, the action of the United States towards Libya is a telling example of the United States Administration's concept of political and economic relations with the developing countries.

(Mr. Cesur, Czechoslovakia)

The facts are clear, and not much can be added. The attack against Libya was an eloquent lesson on the methods of the current United States foreign policy. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic unequivocally condemns the United States armed aggression against Libya. The Security Council is called upon to condemn the aggressor. The authority of the United Nations requires that it proceed unambiguously in accordance with the United Nations Charter and make the United States Government recognize the fact that the obligations inherent in its membership of the United Nations and of the Security Council are incompatible with a policy of State terrorism, armed attacks and aggression.

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

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

Mr. OGOUMA (Benin) (interpretation from French): Let me begin, Sir, by offering you my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. Your abilities as a skilled and seasoned diplomat, your wealth of experience in international affairs and your wisdom are guarantees to us that our present deliberations will lead to decisions whereby the Council will effectively discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

Through you, Sir, I thank all the members of this Council for acceding to our request to speak on this urgent matter.

I also wish to congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Bierring, Permanent Representative of Denmark, on the most effective way in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

We are meeting once again at the request of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Burkina Faso, Syria and of the Chairman of the Arab Group in order to consider the grave situation resulting from the acts of aggression committed by American armed forces against Libya in the intensive bombing of the towns of Tripoli and Benghazi at dawn on 15 April 1986. This serious situation is a source of grave concern to the Government and people of my country, since on 26 March the ruling organ of my country had met specially to consider the extremely disturbing situation prevailing in the Gulf of Sidra, characterized at that time by acts of blatant provocation through the deployment of armed forces against the Libyan Arab people in time of peace.

In its public declaration (A/41/271; S/17978) the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin deplored this extremely disturbing situation and stated that the United States Administration had not shown the kind of wisdom or prudence which should be characteristic of the actions of a great Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, bearing responsibility for the noble and important mission of safeguarding international peace and security. That Declaration also contained an appeal to all peace- and freedom-loving peoples to oppose resolutely the attempts to destabilize the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

Need one recall that the Security Council held several meetings in March to consider the extremely tense and dangerous situation in the Mediterranean. None the less, that was the context in which the most recent events occurred, events in connection with which the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin published the following Declaration on 15 April 1986:

"Today, 15 April 1986, at zero hours, a new dangerous turning point has been reached in the confrontation which has existed for some time between the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the American Administration.

"United States strategic bombers, operating from American bases in the United Kingdom, have carried out murderous raids on the Libyan cities of Tripoli and Benghazi, brutally destroying civilian and military targets and causing considerable material damage and loss of life.

"Given this grave situation and its unpredictable consequences, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin, meeting today, 15 April, in emergency session under the presidency of our great militant comrade, Mathieu Kerekou, firmly and unconditionally condemns this ignoble and barbarous act of aggression perpetrated by one of the greatest Powers of our age, the United States Administration, against a small country, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and its valiant Arab people, in utter contempt for international morality and the right of peoples to self-determination.

"The Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin urges the international community to become aware of the real danger posed by this military escalation which could lead to a world-wide conflagration with incalculable consequences.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

"That is why the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin solemnly and urgently appeals to all countries and peoples which cherish justice, freedom, dignity, peace and social progress, and calls upon them resolutely to oppose the bellicose scheming of American imperialism which still clings to the notion that might makes right.

"Consequently, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin invites the entire Party, all the mass organizations of the Party, all militant men and women of the Revolution, to mobilize as one in order to convey to the United States Administration our invincible revolutionary people's unanimous and total disapproval of United States action, and to the intrepid Libyan Arab people and the Al-Fatah revolution our solid, unswerving support in their heroic struggle to defend their independence and national sovereignty."

By speaking in this debate, my delegation has sought to uphold one of this Organization's cardinal principles: the need to refrain in international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

The Government of the People's Republic of Benin for its part will in its foreign policy always adhere to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful settlement of disputes. That is why our Government and our people resolutely oppose any policy based on the threat or use of force in international relations.

What will happen if the mighty are allowed to ride roughshod over the weak and to usurp their most valued possession, freedom and national sovereignty?

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

What will happen if the small and the weak countries must bear the burden of the world economic crisis, not to mention the security crisis caused by the great Powers?

What a state of affairs when yesterday's victors, now the principal guarantors of international peace and security, are the very ones who have been imposing their diktat on others by the force of arms.

We hope that our Council will keenly heed the demands of the peoples of the world for peace, security, stability and development.

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

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

Mr. DJAVANDI KAMALI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and to wish you all the best and all success in the difficult task of directing the Council's work and its debates. I wish also to thank you and the other members of the Council for having given me this opportunity to speak before the Council on this grave occasion.

I have the pleasant duty, Sir, of thanking your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Denmark, His Excellency Ambassador Ole Bierring, with whom I had the great pleasure of consulting during the month of March.

Once again, a war machine was used against a small nation whose population is but 1 per cent of that of the United States. They despatched Third Air Force F-111s more than 2,800 nautical miles from their bases in England, and they used carrier-borne attack bombers and carrier-based attack aircraft in strikes against Libya.

Muslim countries will remember that France did not grant permission for those planes, which took off from their bases in Britain, to fly over the Channel and France so as to save a total traveling distance of 2,400 nautical miles round trip during those attacks. If one cannot stop the aggressor or assist the victim of aggression, it is a sound policy to remain neutral. In this particular case, Mr. President, we appreciate the position of your Government.

It is amusing that there should be an attempt to justify all the advance preparations, rhetoric, name-calling and military operations against the small nation of Libya as "self-defence", and to allege that they are in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Where is the legality of that nonsensical reasoning? Are we to call these long-distance operations self-defence?

This act of aggression is itself a kind of State terrorism, and is an act of war. Therefore, a country cannot talk about combating terrorism so long as it resorts to wars and hostile acts in its international relations. The United States

(Mr. Damavandi Kanali, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

action is in violation of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, which calls for the peaceful settlement of disputes. That act is similar to those of the Zionist régime occupying Palestine, which repeatedly attacks Palestinians in the occupied territories, in Lebanon and in Tunisia. It constitutes a policy of aggression and pure gunboat diplomacy. It reminds us of an arrogant Power which uses its power to suppress the oppressed peoples of the world in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

So long as the question of Palestine remains unsolved, there will be resistance by the people of Palestine, by all the Arabs, by all the Muslims and, obviously, by the majority of the world's population, deprived of their rights by imperialism and colonialism.

Terrorism is condemned in all its forms. Nobody condones terrorism. As a matter of fact, that ugly phenomenon was brought to the Middle East by the very aggressors who now occupy Palestine and whose leaders have become Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the Zionist régime.

Last Tuesday, in his message to the leader of Libya, the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran said:

"The United States air attacks on Libyan cities were not the first aggression by the United States against the Islamic world; nor will they be the last. The United States aggression against Libya is aggression against the Islamic world and a link in the chain of planned United States and Zionist aggression against the Islamic community."

We strongly condemn this act of aggression by a big Power against the independent country of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We call upon the world community strongly to condemn this air raid and to take appropriate action to prevent further aggression.

(Mr. Danavandi Kamali, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

On 15 April the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran issued the following statement:

"Reaction to this inhuman and illegal act cannot be limited to verbal condemnation. An extensive political and economic boycott of the United States must be implemented. All countries and international organisations, particularly the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States, the Non-Aligned Movement, and the Organization of African Unity, must adopt practical measures in the face of these barbaric United States crimes.

"United States aggression against a Muslim Arab nation is a violation of all laws and human principles, and takes place on the eve of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers' meeting. The order to attack Libya opens a new round of aggression against an Islamic country, aimed at the suppression of all opposition to United States and Zionist expansionism in the region.

"There is no doubt that the attack on the Libyan Republic and the massacre of innocent people is a clear example of State terrorism; it will not be the last."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): First, on behalf of the delegation of Sudan, I express to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for April. I am sure that with your wisdom and tact, which are widely recognized, you will be able to conduct the Council's deliberations effectively and successfully. We also praise the wise and courageous position of your country, France, with which we have excellent relations of friendship and close co-operation.

I extend hearty congratulations also to Ambassador Bierring, the Permanent Representative of Denmark, on the very competent way in which he conducted the Council's deliberations last month.

The peoples of the world are committed to the attainment of certain noble objectives. To that end they have decided to mobilize and close ranks in order to safeguard international peace and security. By accepting certain principles, they have affirmed that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.

The Security Council is meeting now at the request of the delegations of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Syrian Arab Republic and Burkina Faso, and the delegation of Oman on behalf of the Arab Group. I need not recall that the requests by those delegations for the convening of the Security Council confirm the international community's growing concern as well as the general interest in the item now under discussion. A major Power - a Power that is, moreover, a permanent member of the Security Council - has committed an act of aggression against a small country thousands of miles away from it. That is a serious threat to world and regional peace and security. It can only have a harmful effect on the situation in the area.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

It is disturbing indeed that the events of a few days ago occurred at a time when Arab territories are still under occupation, when the calvary of the Palestinian people is intensifying and when the States in the area continue to be victims of Israeli aggression. Only recently the Security Council had to consider the question of the invasion of Libya as well as acts of air piracy by Israel against a civilian Libyan aircraft over the Mediterranean.

All those facts testify to an extremely dangerous phenomenon: the recourse to force to settle disputes. They also show that the international Organization, its Charter and the principles of international law are being undermined.

On 15 April the United States attacked Libya. That has added a very dangerous dimension to the situation in the area. Moreover, this most recent act of aggression is another element in the long series of similar acts and in the campaign of disinformation and the continuing economic boycott. Thus, the recent military events in the area cannot be viewed in isolation from those facts.

In its preamble the United Nations Charter affirms that the peoples of the United Nations are determined not to use force in international relations. Article 2, paragraph 4 specifically sets forth a golden rule: that all the Members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force.

Since the establishment of the United Nations, the world has undergone major changes. During the past 40 years we have witnessed the birth of a new phenomenon: the interdependence of peoples. Precisely because of that interdependence, it is indispensable to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. That is why Article 2 of the Charter states that international disputes must be settled by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

The Charter grants other rights as well to the peoples of the world - in particular, the right of self-defence. But that right can be exercised only in exceptional circumstances. The Charter does not state that it is an absolute right. Indeed, it is surrounded by conditions to ensure that it will not serve as a pretext for the use of unjustified force, particularly by a major Power.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

It is not my intention to give a detailed account of all the conditions associated with the exercise of the right of self-defence. However, it should be recalled that the principles of international law require that the right of self-defence be exercised immediately after a country falls victim to an act of armed aggression. An act of self-defence must also be proportional to the act of aggression that has been committed.

Sudan, like other small nations, is well aware that in today's world some countries have more power and influence than others, that all States are not the same. That is undeniable. But we are opposed to the unwise use of force. Force must be used prudently and responsibly, in keeping with the sublime purposes and principles of the Charter. Otherwise recourse to the use of force will only lead to disasters and repeated acts of violence, thus imperiling international peace and security.

The acts of aggression committed by the United States against Libya cannot be justified by any means. They certainly cannot be justified under Article 51. To the contrary, they flagrantly violate the provisions of the Charter and the principles of international law. Indeed, they violate many international principles adopted by the peoples of the United Nations for the sake of achieving the purposes of the Charter. Suffice it here to cite respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of other States, the non-use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of all disputes.

Guided by that conviction, Sudan condemned in a Government communiqué the brutal act of aggression committed by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, an act that claimed dozens of victims, including women, children, the elderly and the handicapped. Our communiqué also reaffirmed the solidarity of the people of Sudan with the Libyan people, and pledged our backing for them.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

The Non-Aligned Movement has always taken a firm stand against all forms of aggression, occupation, hegemony, intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and the use of any form of pressure. The communiqué adopted at an Emergency Session of the Ministerial-level Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in New Delhi on 15 April, a meeting in which Sudan took part, clearly reaffirmed the Movement's condemnation of America's aggression against Libya. The communiqué also reaffirmed the solidarity of the members of the Movement with Libya.

Similarly, the Organization of African Unity, in a resolution adopted on 15 April, strongly condemned the most recent United States attack on Libya and reaffirmed its full solidarity with the fraternal people of Libya.

Finally, we hope that the resolution to be adopted by the Council on the item under discussion will reflect the international community's rejection of aggression and its abiding desire for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, and with the available procedures set forth in the Charter, which we all have endorsed.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its 2675th meeting under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.

I invite Mr. Maksoud to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSOUD: I wish to take this opportunity, Sir, to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council, for the kind invitation extended to me, as Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to take part in the Council's consideration of the item before it.

Needless to say, Mr. President, relations between your great country and the Arab nation not only are historic, economic and intellectual, but constitute an axis for world peace and human development. Our admiration for you as a diplomat and as President of the Council has always been such that we regard you as a model of discipline, firmness, elegance and real diplomacy. We cherish your friendship and the friendship of your great country.

The Council is meeting in the aftermath of an episode that many of my colleagues in the Arab world and the non-aligned world have described as an act of aggression against Libya. All the reasons for the outrage over that act have been spelled out and articulated, and perhaps this is not the time - as the debate is coming to a close perhaps today or tomorrow - to paraphrase what has been said. Rather, it is perhaps a time to try to spell out future conduct in international relations. That act may be a precedent for a pattern of behaviour that would introduce a dimension of international anarchy into the world situation.

(Mr. Maksoud)

Perhaps, on the other hand, it can provide the stimulus for the world community not only to come to grips with what is at the surface - violence - but also to address the causes and the roots of that violence at a time in history when science and the technological and communications revolution make it imperative that we come closer to each other, understand each other and not be satisfied with mere coexistence among nations but attempt to discover together what unites us in order to enjoy the diversity in mankind's unity.

We have been compelled in the last few days to witness a situation in which name-calling has transfixed us with the notion of the sanctity of the world. Name-calling is the precedent for a looseness not only of the tongue but of decision-making processes. And when it emanates from a super-Power entrusted with global responsibilities regarding international peace and security, then the responsibility of the world becomes even more precise. And that is why one of the immediate outcomes of this debate as well as of the whole tragic episode of the last few days should be that we realize that, instead of talking at each other, this is the time to introduce the method of talking to each other, because talking at each other makes us no longer sense the necessary accountability we owe each other - and not only as regards what we think and what we say and how we act. Talking to each other introduces the elementary element this world body has sought to promote: dialogue, and dialogue of consequence.

As I have said, when a super-Power talks at the world instead of to it, talks at Libya and the Arab world instead of to them, we are brought to a point of tremendous historical significance: a super-Power can easily exhibit its power, and everybody recognizes its power. It is visible, it is actual, it is power. But the challenge is not to exhibit power when you have it as much as it is to constrain it and communicate to the world that despite the fact that you do

(Mr. Maksoud)

have the power you can constrain it wisely. This is what distinguishes a big Power from a great Power.

We who have learned at many American universities and experienced the historical and intellectual development of the United States, we who have achieved a basic and fundamental empathy with the pluralistic society of the United States, feel a moment of embarrassment at this time, when we find ourselves compelled to deal with it more as a big Power than the great Power we have been historically and intellectually associated with.

The act itself was not precise. The act itself was not necessary. On second thought, even the United States is beginning to realize the loopholes in its decision, because the act of aggression that has been carried out against Libya and its people tends to unleash forces that should be manageable in the world community. That is why our resentment and perhaps our outrage are directed against the act in itself inasmuch as it tends to reinforce the element of anarchy in international relations and tends to lead to the dethronement of reason in the conduct of world affairs. Perhaps this is the moment when the enthronement of reason should be reintroduced into our dialogue, into our relations.

That is why this debate is not only an attempt at legalism, however important that is. It is not only a debate on the concept of self-defence. It is not only a debate on the question of what is termed terrorism. There must not be a permissiveness regarding loose talk that debases our debates, whether publicly or within the confines of the United Nations.

Perhaps this is the moment when the United Nations mechanism, its Secretariat and its resolutions should reacquire effectiveness and credibility, to make the Security Council and its resolutions develop an aptitude for implementability, because the world community is beginning to lose faith in the important mechanism the United Nations can provide for problem-solving.

(Mr. Maksoud)

The European Community has stated that it wants to discuss with the Arab League and the Arab States the issue of international terrorism. Perhaps this is the moment for more than that. We should like to modify the agenda if such a dialogue is to take place and discuss the whole range of issues that breed violence in the Middle East.

As for the permissiveness that the United States has allowed itself towards Israel, after the United States comes back from the excitement of pride to the pride of wisdom - despite the wound it has inflicted on our people and despite the provocation of its licensing Israel's attacks on Palestinian camps and on south Lebanon - perhaps this is the moment for a profound reassessment that could move the world body and the United States in particular to even-handedness in approaching the Middle East issues that we have long sought, and lead the United States to moderate its well-established bias and to realize that its strategic alliance with Israel is more of a provocation than a stabilizing factor, that this is a moment to restore to the historical dialogue between the Americans and Arabs the rationality that has long eluded that dialogue. Perhaps this is the moment for the United States, which has bilateral relations with many Arab countries that are friendly with it, not to think that we say one thing in public and another in private.

(Mr. Maksoud)

It must realize that the controversiality of one political leadership in an Arab country with other Arab States is always subordinate to the national security of the entire Arab nation; that when we express the solidarity of the Arab people and the Arab States with Libya in confronting the attack against it, that is not a solidarity that is pre-emptive of our fears, but an articulation of our commitment and of our national unity in times of crisis. Perhaps we in the Arab world do not find that the resilience of our unity is sufficiently structured, but in the final analysis the controversiality on an ideological or political basis is always subordinate to the resilience of the cultural and national unity that binds the Arabs into one destiny.

Furthermore, the violence preached by some Americans, and now the British, as we heard this morning, which we deeply deplore and regret, is the outcome of a looseness that is taking place in the conduct of political objectives and of the types of State terrorism that have gone unpunished, such as in camps in Beirut, in the south of Lebanon, in the West Bank, where people who have experienced a measure of hopelessness and helplessness are transformed into desperadoes who think that the international community is now oblivious to their suffering and their internationally recognized aspirations and rights. They are people who have given up; and they too are willing to give up their own personal and moral accountability. That is why the entire Arab world denounces terrorism. Terrorism starts with violence and is an explosion of frustration. It is an abdication of optimism. Arab resistance to occupation - whether in the south of Lebanon or in the occupied Palestinian territories or in the Golan Heights - is legitimate, because resistance is an optimistic attitude and a historical commitment to the

(Mr. Maksoud)

inevitability of freedom and independence. Resistance starts with civil disobedience, with petitioning, with demonstrations, and ends up as a matter of last resort with violence. It responds to the coercive violence of occupation.

Terrorism, at best, is the consummation of pessimism. It is the abandonment of all moral constraints because international morality is perceived to have abandoned those people. For that reason it is necessary at this historical moment to enthrone reason, to restore to dialogue its consequence and to give back to the world its sanctity. We must not allow the super-Powers at all times to exhibit their muscle as much as their wisdom. Then greatness can be restored and perhaps peace would have another chance.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Clovis Maksoud for the singularly friendly words that he addressed to my country and to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place this afternoon at 3 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.