



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2933
6 August 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 6 August 1990, at 1.35 p.m.

President: Mr. MUNTEANU

(Romania)

Members: Canada
China
Colombia
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Malaysia
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Yemen
Zaire

Mr. FORTIER
Mr. LI Daoyu
Mr. PEÑALOSA
Mr. ANET
Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
Mr. TADESSE
Ms. RASI
Mr. BLANC
Mr. RAZALI
Mr. LOZINSKY
Sir Crispin TICKELL

Mr. PICKERING
Mr. AL-ASHTAL
Mr. LURABU Khabouji N'ZAJI

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 1.50 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF KUWAIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21423)

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21424)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2932nd meeting, I invite the representatives of Iraq and Kuwait to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/21441, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zaire.

I should like to draw the attention to the members of the Council to the following documents: S/21426, letter dated 2 August 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21427, letter dated 2 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21428, letter dated 2 August 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21429, letter dated 3 August 1990

(The President)

from the Permanent Representative of Uruguay to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21430, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Oman to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21432, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21433, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21434, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21435, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Madagascar to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21436, letter dated 3 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21437, S/21438, S/21439 and S/21440, letters dated 4 and 5 August 1990, respectively, from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/21443, letter dated 6 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Members of the Council have also received photocopies of a letter dated 6 August 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General. That letter will be issued as a document of the Council under the symbol S/21444 at 0600 hours tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Kuwait, on whom I now call.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): The convening of this meeting today and the intensive efforts that have been exerted by the Council during the past three days are a reflection of the sincere international commitment to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Council is meeting today five days after the adoption of resolution 660 (1990). That resolution was an expression of the fact that the Council defends international peace and security, represents the conscience of the world and indeed protects the small nations. The Council adopted this resolution because it believes that brutal, unwarranted aggression has been inflicted on one of the members of the international community. The aggressor did not confine itself to violating the territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait: indeed, it has occupied the entire sacred soil of Kuwait. This aggression has been inflicted on a peaceful country, which has always desired peace. All the international relations of that State have been based on the principles of Islam, of the United Nations Charter and of good-neighbourliness. It is a State that has chosen to settle its disputes with other States by peaceful means.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

We have mediated in all regional conflicts. The policies of our State are based on the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Though now in a state of crisis with brotherly Iraq - and even until the last moment before the invasion of our dear land - we have announced that we are ready to go to Baghdad and to receive Iraqi officials in Kuwait in order to negotiate in peace and in such a way as to safeguard the legitimate rights of both countries.

Despite what has been inflicted on my beloved country, despite the violations of its sovereignty and territorial integrity that have taken place and the occupation of all its sacred soil, despite the killings and other brutal inhuman practices inflicted on our citizens - despite all this, we had hoped that the brutal invading Power would heed the will of the international community and particularly the unprecedented unanimous and strong international condemnation. The Council has never been seized of any question that has inspired almost full and complete unanimity. It is a denunciation and condemnation that what has taken place is a violation not only of one country or one territory, but a violation of sovereignty and of peace throughout the world. After such a violation, no small nation anywhere in the world can feel safe or immune from such aggression.

We had hoped that the international rejection of the situation would induce the invading Power to implement Security Council resolution 660 (1990) and that the Iraqi troops would unconditionally and immediately withdraw. However, the invading Power's premeditated aim of its aggression was the overthrow of the legitimate Government of the State of Kuwait. We are supported not only by the citizens and residents of Kuwait but also by the whole world. Iraq's aim is to install a new Government in Kuwait. The aggressor was not able to announce the installation of

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

that Iraqi Government until several days after the invasion, which reflects the total failure of the occupying troops, despite their oppression of Kuwaiti citizens.

No one has agreed to co-operate with the usurper and aggressor. The aim of this invasion can also be seen in hegemony over Kuwait's resources, their domination, plunder and looting. The objectives of the invasion are based on expansionism, as seen in Iraq's threats and consequent attacks against neighbouring countries following its threats and its blackmail. Iraq is thus threatening the strategic interests of all the countries of the world, of which the Gulf region is one of the most vital regions. All those objectives in their totality actually threaten international peace and security.

It is a source of agony that the invasion and overall planned aggression should have led to diverting attention from so many decisive issues concerning peoples that continue to suffer.

Relying on the aforementioned principles, the invading Power does not want to implement Security Council resolution 660 (1990), despite its statement that it intended to begin withdrawing its troops. That statement was conditional in form and insincere in content. It flouts the operative paragraphs of Security Council resolution 660 (1990).

I would like here to confirm a fact that has become apparent to all: no withdrawal has taken place. On the contrary, all the information we have received, as well as definite indications, tell us that Iraq is increasing its military presence and consolidating the direct presence of its invading troops. The Iraqi forces are expanding throughout Kuwait, as is the indirect military presence through the formation of the so-called Popular Army, which is actually a cover for the occupying forces already present. This confirms once again that the invading occupying forces have no intention of withdrawing.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Yesterday, the visual mass media transmitted pictures via Iraqi television of the withdrawal of some military vehicles. This is a charade that no one can believe, not to mention the fact that some of those vehicles are Kuwaiti ones taken over and stolen by the invading forces.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

We reached the conclusion that Iraq was not committed to resolution 660 (1990), either in form or in content. It is committed neither to its letter nor to its spirit. Thus it is your turn, your role, your historic responsibility to prove to the whole world that the security of nations, whether large or small, is not a commodity that can be bought or sold or used for terrorism or threats. By taking a position vis-à-vis this draft resolution which is before us now, you are recording a historic shift in the work of the Security Council and demonstrating its influence in ensuring that the will of the international community is exerted, through the imposition of sweeping sanctions - an overall embargo against a country that has refused to heed the will of the international community and has, in an unprecedented manner, flouted all principles and values and international norms - not to mention the principle of good-neighbourliness, which has actually been inspired by the religion of Islam.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of August. I should also like to express my appreciation of the excellent way your predecessor, Ambassador Razali, conducted the work of the Council last month.

The position of my Government can be summed up as follows: The draft resolution before the Council was submitted as being necessary in order to implement resolution 660 (1990) of 2 August 1990. But this draft resolution contradicts resolution 660 (1990). Indeed, the draft resolution contradicts certain facts.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

On 3 August my Government announced that it intended to start the withdrawal of its forces on 5 August. My Government in fact started to withdraw its troops at 8 o'clock local time. All those who follow the media in the United States know that 27 vehicles were withdrawn - Kuwaiti ones made in the Soviet Union. In fact, the draft resolution that has been submitted does not help at all to resolve the crisis, nor does it help the Iraqi troops to withdraw.

On the contrary, this draft resolution exacerbates the crisis in the Gulf region and impedes the withdrawal of forces. Consequently, this draft resolution has certain unavowed objectives. Furthermore, because of some of its provisions, it goes beyond resolution 660 (1990). In fact, in the second paragraph of the preamble it speaks about "the invasion by Iraq". This term was not used during the United States invasion of Panama or Grenada, nor was it used when Israel invaded its neighbours. We therefore believe that this term allows for aggression to be committed by a third State in the region.

With all due respect for the Council and for the States that are sponsoring the draft resolution, I cannot fail to stress one fact that is known to everyone: This draft resolution was prepared by a single State. Pressure was exerted on all the other States to go along with this. That makes the draft resolution null and void, because anything imposed by force and threat is not legitimate under the principles of the Charter.

We had hoped that after the end of the cold war we would see a new climate in international relations, a climate marked by a greater role played by the United Nations and the Security Council with regard to the maintenance of peace and security in the world. However, we regret to note a super-Power trying to use the United Nations and the Security Council in order to achieve its objectives - as if

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

the Security Council were simply its Foreign Ministry. All this arises from the fact that that State owes the United Nations \$675 million and it is using this as a means of exerting pressure on the United Nations. This already happened in 1975 when General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) was adopted.

Apart from the illegality of this draft resolution and because of its contents and the way in which it was submitted, we believe that it constitutes regression, a negative trend for the developing countries in view of its influence on the price of oil exported to the developing countries.

In other words, this draft resolution will have a negative impact on the economic affairs of the developing countries. That is why I expect the Security Council to annul it.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): My Government has joined nine other countries in sponsoring the draft resolution before us today. The draft resolution is in response to Iraq's blatant aggression against Kuwait, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, and Iraq's unacceptable failure to comply with resolution 660 (1990), a mandatory resolution which is binding on all Member States. By his actions, Saddam Hussein has plunged into crisis the strategically critical area of the Persian Gulf. Thirty per cent of the region's oil production is now under Iraqi control, thus threatening international economic health and stability.

We have just heard a startling statement on the part of the representative of Iraq. He announced that Iraq was going to start withdrawal on 5 August. Even if that were true, it would be a startling statement. Resolution 660 (1990) asked for immediate and unconditional withdrawal. He has just told us that Iraq managed to withdraw 27 vehicles yesterday of all the hundreds and thousands of vehicles that took part in the Iraqi invasion. If 27 vehicles a day is the pace, it would take 40 days just for the first thousand vehicles to be withdrawn. This is not what the Council has asked, it is not what the world demands. And the idea that this Council has somehow become the United States foreign ministry is an insult to the members of the Council and to their determination to resolve this issue. We all speak for our own countries and we all speak, I hope, with one voice on this particular question.

These actions follow Iraq's declarations 11 days ago that it would not invade Kuwait. Events have proven this untrue. Friday, Radio Baghdad announced Iraq would withdraw from Kuwait on Sunday. This, too, was false, as we have seen. Today, Iraqi troop deployments in Kuwait are enhanced, consolidated and dangerously

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

provocative to other States in the region. The family of nations has come to the point where it cannot believe anything the Baghdad régime has to say on this matter.

The international community, by this draft resolution, demands immediate implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 660 (1990). The many statements from individual States around the world, the European Community, the Gulf Co-operation Council, the Arab League and the non-aligned States condemn the Iraqi invasion and demand withdrawal. We will, by our draft resolution today, give effect to their condemnations of this invasion and to all our calls for immediate and unconditional withdrawal.

This is only the second occasion on which we, in this Council, will have taken such a sweeping and weighty step. It will reflect a new world order of international co-operation in the Council and elsewhere.

There are some who hope that Baghdad's purported promises to withdraw immediately and unconditionally will be implemented without international insistence. Unfortunately, insistence is necessary. Reality indicates the contrary of Baghdad's promises. Promises not to invade and subsequent promises to withdraw already have been proven to be mendacious. In a matter of six hours, Iraq took over Kuwait; in a matter of 24 hours, Iraq established a marionette "provisional government"; in a matter of 48 hours, Iraqi troops - more than 100,000 strong - were "volunteered" to serve quickly as puppets and move south to the Saudi border. Moreover, Iraq has effectively held hostage and threatened over 1 million foreigners, and Iraq's puppets in Kuwait have declared that they will not behave honourably should the international community seek to respond to Iraqi aggression.

We will, of course, want to respect the rights of all States to continue to maintain necessary contacts with the Baghdad régime effectively to protect their

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

own citizens. However, Iraq, through its actions has rejected United Nations Security Council resolution 660 (1990) and the calls from its own region and from the non-aligned States. Its response to the world community has been scorn. The United Nations Security Council states unequivocally today that the family of all nations will not tolerate this behaviour. By this draft resolution, we declare to Iraq that we will use the means available to us provided in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to give effect to United Nations Security Council resolution 660 (1990), which we adopted on 2 August. Iraq must learn that its disregard for international law will have crippling political and economic costs, including, but not limited to, arms cut-offs. Our concerted resolve will demonstrate that the international community does not - and will not - accept Baghdad's preference for the use of force, coercion and intimidation.

Today's draft resolution is binding upon all States Members of the United Nations. As operative paragraph 5 also makes clear, the draft resolution speaks to all States, Members and non-members alike. As the Council knows, my Government acted swiftly to freeze all Iraqi and Kuwaiti assets and barred all trade with Iraq, and we welcome the issuance of many Governments' decisions to cease all arms transfers to Iraq. Today, the Council acts to consolidate and enforce all of our actions. Iraq's aggression must be - and will be - stopped, lest Iraq, or others, conclude that its will can prevail. Our obligation to Kuwait, a sovereign State Member of this body, is to implement United Nations Security Council resolution 660 (1990), and to restore Kuwait's legitimate authority, sovereignty and territorial integrity. By our action today, we pledge to the legitimate Government of Kuwait that there will be international redress for the Iraqi invasion. And, by our action today, we will declare for all that we will not countenance the continuation or repetition of this aggression.

Ms. RASI (Finland): We have now convened a Security Council meeting four days after adopting resolution 660 (1990), which called upon Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait without any conditions.

Finland has throughout its membership of the United Nations supported the goals and objectives of the United Nations Charter and worked towards strengthening our Organization. We have emphasized the importance of implementing Security Council resolutions. Indeed, we had hoped that resolution 660 (1990) would be implemented. However, as of now, unfortunately, nothing indicates the speedy implementation of that resolution. On the contrary, the situation in the area remains alarming. In our view, very few choices are actually left to the Security Council, the main United Nations organ responsible for international peace and security.

For those reasons, my country has decided to co-sponsor and support the draft resolution now under consideration. We again urge Iraq to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Kuwaiti territory and the two parties to seek a peaceful and negotiated settlement to their differences.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France gave unreserved support to resolution 660 (1990), adopted on 2 August by the Security Council.

At the national level, it condemned the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops. It also decided to freeze Iraqi assets and confirmed that it would continue not to deliver arms to Iraq.

Within the framework of the Twelve, it contributed very actively to the drafting of a very strong Declaration, adopted in Rome the day before yesterday by the Political Committee, a Declaration that, inter alia, decides on an embargo on the import of oil originating in Iraq and Kuwait and on a halt of arms sales and military and scientific co-operation with Iraq.

The magnitude of these measures is justified, in the view of my Government, because of the unacceptable nature of Iraq's military aggression, which is a major violation of international law and a serious threat to international peace and security.

Iraq is now required to implement without delay or condition Security Council resolution 660 (1990) which, adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter, is binding on all States. It is up to us all to take appropriate steps to ensure compliance with the text of that resolution. This is why we believe that the draft resolution that has been distributed is fully justified and we have decided to sponsor it.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): Although Malaysia actively supported the adoption of resolution 660 (1990) on 2 August, our decision now to support the adoption of this draft resolution has not been an easy one.

We are only too aware of the hardship that the broad sanctions called for in the draft resolution will impose on Governments and on the helpless individuals and victims of the consequences of this tragedy, including the peoples of Kuwait and

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Iraq. Our hope is that the broad sanctions envisaged in the draft resolution will be of short duration, given prompt compliance by Iraq with resolution 660 (1990).

There is evidence now of a strong will within the international community, as reposed in the United Nations Security Council, strongly to uphold the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. This is a welcome development that should augur well for the future work of the United Nations and the Security Council. Resolution 660 (1990), and the draft resolution which the Council will adopt today, must be recognized as embodying that collective determination.

Malaysia values deeply its close relations with Iraq, as much as it values its relations with Kuwait. All of us are active members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement.

Malaysia's support for the draft resolution is not in any way designed to join in a punitive act, but to be part of the international community's resolve and determination to ensure that disputes between States are not settled on the basis of the use of force. Malaysia's support for the draft resolution is predicated on the premise that it will remove the prospect of any unilateral military or quasi-military action in the region by outside Powers. There should not be any justification to utilize the provisions of the draft resolution to take military action.

At a time when there are high hopes for a more effective role for the United Nations in maintaining peace and security around the world, the Security Council has a particularly heavy and serious responsibility in ensuring an early and peaceful end to the conflict. In this context, it is also the duty of the Council to ensure that the efforts to bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait are taken under the ambit of the United Nations and not unilaterally, to avoid escalation and greater turmoil.

Mr. FORCIER (Canada): It is with a deep sense of regret that we find ourselves meeting here today to consider once again the armed Iraqi aggression against Kuwait.

When we met last Thursday morning, the Council was clear and unequivocal in its condemnation of the totally unacceptable and illegal Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. We then made it clear that the international community stood united in its demand that Iraq immediately and unconditionally withdraw its forces from Kuwait.

Therefore, we have been dismayed to learn that Iraq has not complied with Security Council resolution 660 (1990); that its forces remain in Kuwait; that they appear to be consolidating their position; and that Iraq has moved large numbers of troops near the border with neighbouring Saudi Arabia. This has increased the tensions and concerns in what was already a very volatile region.

(spoke in French)

The decisions of the Council are binding on all Member States, including Iraq. Failure to comply with the terms of resolution 660 (1990) leaves this Council with no alternative but to consider what further measures can be applied to give effect to the resolution.

Canada has already imposed several bilateral measures against Iraq to show our unqualified opposition to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait and to demonstrate the consequences of failure to comply with resolution 660 (1990). We have also been working closely with the other members of the Council since last Friday to develop a package of comprehensive collective sanctions against Iraq.

(continued in English)

The rare imposition of sanctions by the Council is not something that we take lightly. However, faced with the total intransigence of the Iraqi régime and the extremely serious nature of its invasion and occupation of Kuwait, there can be no

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

other alternative but to act under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations. My Government would have hoped that these measures would have extended further, for example, to include more explicitly financial and other services.

The draft resolution now before us, once adopted by the Council, would nevertheless impose one of the broadest set of sanctions ever put in place against a State Member of the United Nations. It covers all aspects of military, economic and financial relations with Iraq and occupied Kuwait. We recognize, as other colleagues have mentioned, that these sanctions will impose hardships on many countries, on public and private organizations, and indeed on individuals throughout the world. But sacrifices are necessary to maintain the peace and security of States and the integrity of the international system.

The Iraqi régime has shown itself to be unmoved by the universal condemnation and the unusual diplomatic efforts undertaken so far. We must now take the extraordinary steps provided for in Article 41 of the Charter to exert the necessary additional pressure on Iraq to end forthwith its aggression and occupation of Kuwait. We in Canada take these steps only after the most grave and serious consideration. These measures are essential to safeguard the rule of law and to deter future aggressors. We must discharge our responsibilities to all States Members of the United Nations. We owe this responsibility particularly to the small and vulnerable States, such as Kuwait, which look to the Council for protection and support, as well as all other States in this volatile region. Most of all, we owe this responsibility to the people of Kuwait, who have been aggressed against so blatantly by the Baghdad régime.

Therefore, my delegation participated actively with other colleagues on the Council in the drafting of resolution 660 (1990) last Thursday morning, and with the drafting of the present draft resolution. We have co-sponsored the present draft resolution and will support it.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): Over five days our hopes of Iraqi compliance with resolution 660 (1990) have been disappointed. Indeed, far from seeing an unconditional withdrawal, as so often trumpeted, we have seen instead the further entrenchment of Iraqi forces in Kuwait. There have indeed been mild movements of tank transporters, but they have carried in many cases, I believe, the loot from a city which has been despoiled rather than indicating a serious withdrawal of Iraqi forces.

I was interested to hear from the Ambassador of Iraq that we were a kind of sub-post office of the State Department. More important, in his statement he gave no justification whatever for the aggression which his Government has committed. Indeed, we see concentrations of battle-trained Iraqi soldiers to the south, ready and equipped with essential supplies. In Kuwait itself we have had threats from the puppet government against the citizens and assets of those countries which might dare to vote for economic sanctions. We even heard this morning in London from the Iraqi Embassy that the legitimate Government of Kuwait was "finished" and that it would be unwise - indeed, an illusion - for Governments to continue to deal with it.

There has also been the small matter of the volunteers. We have heard from Iraqi radio that some 150,000 volunteers are being assembled to provide a new army for Kuwait. I fear that they are indeed Iraqi soldiers who have conveniently changed their hats, shirts and trousers at the frontier.

What should the international community do in such circumstances? Some Governments have already taken action. The 12 member countries of the European Community have already done so. But individual action by States or groups of States is not sufficient; we need a framework for international action, and we have it today in the form of the draft resolution.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,
United Kingdom)

There are two points I want to emphasize. The first is that the draft resolution will remain in effect only so long as resolution 660 (1990) is not complied with. Secondly, economic sanctions should not be regarded as a prelude to anything else. Here I obviously refer to military action. Rather, economic sanctions are designed to avoid the circumstances in which military action might otherwise arise.

We attach great importance to the role of the Arab States in promoting a solution to the problem. Here I recall paragraph 3 of resolution 660 (1990), which

"Calls upon Iraq and Kuwait to begin immediately intensive negotiations for the resolution of their differences and supports all efforts in this regard, and especially those of the Arab League".

All I can say is how much my Government endorses those words and hopes very much that Arab leaders will not give up hope, but will continue to play the role which is theirs in securing Iraqi compliance with resolution 660 (1990).

I stand open to correction, but I believe that the Iraqi invasion is the first in modern times in which an Arab State has invaded and occupied the territory of a brother Arab country.

We do not despair. Communications must remain open. We shall use our diplomatic and other resources, based on our long association with Iraq, to persuade the Government of Iraq to - and I quote once more from resolution 660 (1990), this time from paragraph 2 -

"withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990".

(Sir Crispin Tickell,
United Kingdom)

Today the Security Council faces its responsibilities. It must succeed this time where the League of Nations failed and where it itself has faltered in the past. It has a particular responsibility for small and vulnerable States. It should focus universal feelings of outrage not just in rhetoric worked out between us, but in practical action designed to support real measures against this robber State. It should make of the Council what the Founding Fathers intended it to be, and it should set a new precedent for the further and better management of a world order based on respect for law, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I wish to make a statement to explain my Government's position on the question before the Council.

First, it is our consistent position that relations between States must be based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, that the principles of the United Nations Charter and the norms governing international relations must be maintained and that resort to force or the threat of force by any country to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another country must be opposed. We believe that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait must be respected, and that Security Council resolution 660 (1990) must be implemented immediately, effectively and in real earnest.

In keeping with that position and taking into consideration the pressing demand of many Arab countries, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution now before the Council.

Secondly, it is our hope that the Arab countries will continue making mediation efforts with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the differences between the Arab States. We shall support those efforts. We believe that the Security Council should also encourage, support and facilitate such efforts.

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

Thirdly, we call upon all parties concerned to abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter and norms governing international relations and to refrain from taking steps that would aggravate the situation, so as to safeguard peace and security in the Gulf region.

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has been following with concern the recent exacerbation of relations between Iraq and Kuwait. We in the Soviet Union were deeply concerned by the news that on the morning of 2 August Iraq's troops had invaded Kuwaiti territory. The Soviet Union believes that no matters in dispute, however complicated they may be, can justify the use of force. This development goes radically against the interests of the Arab States and creates further obstacles to the settlement of conflict situations in the Middle East. It also goes against the positive international trends and the improvement in international life.

In its statement dated 2 August, the Soviet Government expressed the conviction that the elimination of the tension and danger in the Persian Gulf would be facilitated by the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwaiti territory.

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

It stressed that the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait should be fully restored and safeguarded.

We should like to recall the speedy and multifaceted reactions by the Soviet Union to the events in the Persian Gulf, calling for the immediate cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the establishment of the status quo ante.

In the light of the invasion of Kuwaiti territory by Iraq, the Soviet Union took a decision to halt the delivery of arms and other matériel to Iraq. The Soviet Union, together with the United States, took the unusual step of issuing a joint appeal to the entire international community to join with them in halting all arms deliveries to Iraq. The Soviet Union also called upon regional organizations, particularly the League of Arab States, but also the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to take all possible steps to ensure the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait. We made a direct appeal to the Iraqi Government to heed the voice of the international community.

In this situation, the Soviet Union actively facilitated the adoption of resolution 660 (1990) by the Security Council. The Soviet Union believed it important that the Security Council immediately and decisively condemn the gross invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces. Now it is very important that the Security Council resolution be fully and immediately implemented.

On that basis, the Soviet Union will support the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of 10 countries in document S/21441.

The decision to vote in the Security Council today to support this draft resolution on sanctions was a very complicated matter for the Soviet Union. It was a difficult decision, because the draft resolution directly affects a whole set of relationships between us and Iraq that have been developing over many years now.

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

We value the relations of co-operation with Iraq that have developed over many years. We could not, however, fail to make a principled evaluation of what had occurred. Neither our principles nor the new political thinking allow us to use double standards here. We do not advocate hasty decisions, but we must face the fact that the pace of the events taking place - events which started with the sudden invasion of Iraqi forces into Kuwait - dictates that we take the necessary steps immediately, including steps by the Security Council, in accordance with the direct requirements of the United Nations Charter. We fully realize this, and we therefore have supported the co-ordinated action which the international community has been forced to take by the situation that has developed. We base ourselves on the fundamental principles of international law, total compliance with which is indispensable if we are to have a civilized system of law and order.

This situation can be changed in only one way: immediate and full implementation of the requirement that Iraq withdraw its forces from Kuwait. We are counting on the Iraqi Government to do everything possible not only to fulfil that requirement effectively but also to convince the world that its deeds match its words.

An important role in resolving the Iraq-Kuwait crisis will be played by the Arab countries, acting individually and through the machinery of the League of Arab States. We have welcomed, with hope, the news that the Arab countries will continue to make efforts to find the way to a political solution to the conflict. The Soviet Union is prepared to co-operate actively with all countries that desire stability and peace to be restored speedily to that region.

Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of August. At the same time, I congratulate the Ambassador of Malaysia on the great diplomatic skill with which he presided over the Council's meetings in July.

My delegation continues to believe that the mechanisms established by the United Nations Charter, as well as other legal texts, must be the only framework for the settlement of disputes that arise between members of the international community. That is why my delegation worked towards the adoption by the Council on 2 August last of resolution 660 (1990). There can be no reason, no pretext - whether increases or decreases in the price of oil - that can justify recourse to the occupation, by brutal force, of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations and a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which has included among its objectives the peace and security of mankind.

Zaire regards the occupation, by force, of Kuwait by Iraq as a clear-cut negation of all the principles of international law. That invasion constitutes a violation of the United Nations Charter and of the fundamental principles on which the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is based. My country rejects with scorn the fait accompli with which the international community has been confronted. Zaire vigorously condemns Iraq's occupation of Kuwait. We denounce the Iraqi manoeuvres designed to change Kuwait's legitimate institutions and to replace them by institutions to Iraq's liking.

The vote that my delegation will cast should be seen as a warning to all those who might be tempted to use their military force in the future to bring about institutional changes in other countries whose only fault is to be small or militarily weak.

(Mr. Lukabu Khabouji N'Zaji,
Zaire)

Zaire demands strict respect, immediately, for the provisions of resolution 660 (1990), particularly its paragraph 2. My country still hopes that all the peace-loving countries will induce Iraq, a full-fledged member of our community, to withdraw from Kuwait rapidly and unconditionally, in order that the Kuwaiti people may decide on its own future.

That is why Zaire, a co-sponsor of the draft resolution now before the Security Council, will vote in favour of it.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zaire for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ANET (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): At the outset, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of Côte d'Ivoire and on my own behalf, to congratulate you, Sir, upon the diligent fashion in which you have presided over the work of the Council and to thank Ambassador Razali for his work in July.

There are principles concerning which my Government cannot compromise: respect for the territorial integrity of States, be they large or small, poor or rich; non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; and the principles of non-aggression, good-neighbourliness, the non-use of force and the use of dialogue to resolve all conflicts, whatever their nature may be.

My Government believes that all Member States of our Organization should scrupulously respect the cardinal principles of international relations set forth in the Charter, which bind Member States. It is in the name of those principles that, as one of the sponsors of Security Council resolution 660 (1990), my Government is in favour of all other measures adopted for the implementation of that draft resolution. It is also sponsoring the new draft resolution, which it hopes will restore the dignity of the little land of Kuwait and its worthy sons and enable them to re-establish peace, which the Gulf region so sorely needs.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Côte d'Ivoire for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): We are deeply dismayed that Iraq has failed to comply with the requirements of the provisions of Security Council resolution 660 (1990). The invasion is not only a violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait. Continued Iraqi non-compliance causes a grave threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

As a country in close proximity to that region, Ethiopia is concerned that the situation could be further exacerbated by failure to heed the call of the international community for immediate withdrawal of the occupation forces and for the restoration of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

Ethiopia is a strong believer in the viability of international co-operation within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. The timely and swift action the Security Council must take now, within the purview of Chapter VII of the Charter, we maintain, should send an unequivocal message to Iraq. In that regard, we strongly support the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution as a measure necessary to stem the consequences of the Iraqi invasion.

We have joined the sponsors in order to demonstrate clearly to Iraq that its behaviour and actions are unacceptable. It is also aimed at bringing relief to those whose national and individual rights are trampled upon and their nation occupied by the Iraqi war machine.

We are hopeful that, at least for once, Iraq will yield to reason and good cause.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you upon your work as President of the Council and to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Malaysia, for the way in which he carried out similar tasks last month.

To Cuba, the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, no matter what reason, of the non-use of force in international relations, of the peaceful settlement of disputes between States and of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations are essential principles of our international order. It is in defence of those principles that we have expressed our disapproval and condemnation of the entry of Iraqi forces into the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

territory of Kuwait a few days ago and that we have declared that that state of affairs must be ended with the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwaiti territory and the full restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty.

As far as we are concerned, these are two States and two Governments with which we continue to maintain relations of friendship that cause us to feel particular concern at the situation that has arisen between them. That is why my delegation cast its vote in favour of Security Council resolution 660 (1990). Nevertheless, my delegation wishes to explain the reasons why it is unable to support the draft resolution now before the Council.

First of all, it seems to us that, far from contributing to progress in the settlement of the conflict, the text and the imposition of the proposed sanctions at this time would instead tend to complicate the situation even more at a time when Iraq has begun withdrawing its troops, as the representative of that country has reaffirmed here. Similarly, the draft resolution would facilitate the interventionist actions taking place in the region and being openly promoted and proclaimed by the United States Government. The draft would also impede the current actions and efforts of the Arab States to arrive at a solution.

Furthermore, the draft resolution suffers from other defects that my delegation feels obliged to mention. To begin with, we are asked to approve specific sanctions that have already been imposed unilaterally by the principal developed Powers of the world. We are also presented with a situation in which a number of States - particularly the main promoter of the draft, the United States of America - seem to have suddenly discovered the value of those fundamental principles that I mentioned a few minutes ago.

Reference is frequently made in our debates to the changes taking place in the international arena. I wonder whether anyone really believes that what we have here is also the expression of a change, of something new in international life.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Is the United States really concerned with defending the rights of weak States, of small countries? Is this really a defence of the principle of non-intervention? Are we really talking about defence of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations? Is it really the need to promote respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States that motivates the United States to urge these sanctions against Iraq? Is that really the reason?

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Is the defence of the legitimate interests of the Kuwaiti Government really the concern that has led the United States delegation to act as it is doing now, or is it the hegemonist and interventionist ambitions of the United States in the Middle East? My delegation has no doubt as to what the answers to those questions would be, but the Council and the international community have no reason for any doubt in that regard either.

The draft resolution before us was originally received by all of us in an almost identical version when it was faxed to us from the United States Mission at 5.48 p.m. on Friday, 3 August. Now an attempt is being made to justify this on the ground that Iraq has failed to carry out the withdrawal of its forces from Kuwaiti territory or by interpreting various statements made at Baghdad on Sunday or what has been said here by the Permanent Representative of Iraq. But that is not the truth.

The plan to impose sanctions on Iraq actually existed before we entered this new phase of Security Council deliberations, at a time when no one even knew about the statement made by the Iraqi Government, also on 3 August, to the effect that it was going to commence the withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait. But apart from this, while we were discussing or negotiating or holding consultations on this draft resolution, the United States Government sent a contingent of marines to the territory of Liberia. I do not recall any consultations held on that subject. I am not aware of any Security Council resolution or request made by any group of States to invite United States marines to enter the territory of Liberia without permission. Yet there they are and the United States has said, there they will remain for as long as they consider necessary.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

To justify this draft resolution, reference is now being made to the positions taken by various States or groups of States concerning this lamentable conflict between Iraq and Kuwait. But we cannot help recalling that for 23 years all the States of the region - Iraq, Kuwait and all the other States - all the non-aligned States and the General Assembly, almost unanimously, have condemned Israel's occupation of the territories which we have come to describe, by diplomatic tradition, as the occupied territories. Apparently those territories can be occupied for ever. There seems to be no need to impose sanctions against the occupier when it is Israel. Was any account taken of the opinions of the non-aligned countries and the countries of the Middle Eastern region, with proposals for more effective actions to compel Israel to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories and recognize the rights of that other Arab people, the people of Palestine?

But all of us also know that some six months ago this same Security Council considered in informal consultations a draft resolution on the latest developments with respect to the occupied territories. What did the Council do? Was it able to act? Why was it not able to act? Is there anybody who does not know the reason? We all know that it was the opposition of the delegation of the United States of America even to a declaration that the occupation was illegal, let alone to sanctions or to more effective measures against the occupying State.

The territory of Angola - part of it - was occupied for some 15 years by the South African régime's troops. My delegation does not recall any occasion when anybody discovered the principle of non-interference and respect for territorial integrity, let alone urged the imposition of effective sanctions upon South Africa to compel it to abandon Angolan territory.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

The territory of Lebanon - or part of it - has been occupied by Israel for 12 years, and on the eve of this deplorable and regrettable conflict between Kuwait and Iraq, as we all know, the Council had to consider once again the situation concerning the United Nations force in southern Lebanon. We had to confine ourselves to renewing that force's mandate and to issuing a terse and carefully worded presidential declaration which made no reference to strong sanctions against Israel, notwithstanding the fact that Israel, as the Secretary-General's own report stated, is not complying with the relevant Security Council resolution, is not co-operating with the United Nations force in the area and, even worse, is attacking it.

Worse still, we had to learn from the report that two Nepalese soldiers had lost their lives in unprovoked incidents. They were the victims of Israeli weapons. Since we did not adopt sanctions, did we at least express the Security Council's condemnation of that situation? Did we even state that we deplored the fact that after 12 years of the occupation of southern Lebanon, Israel still was not expressing any willingness to leave the territory? Did we even express concern? Was there any initiative faxed to our missions for an immediate meeting of the Council to adopt such decisions? Evidently that was not the case.

Seven months ago the territory of another small and weak country was invaded by the military force of a great Power and in a matter of hours that Power, the United States, took possession of that country. There was one innovation in that case which was perhaps without precedent: it installed a new Government, perhaps the first in the world in which the President, the Head of Government, took the oath of office at a United States military base, naturally in the presence of the commanding general of the occupying forces. That happened seven months ago. There was, of course, no United States draft resolution calling for the imposition of

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

sanctions against the United States, but beyond that - regrettably I must say this - there was likewise not much sentiment in favour of such a proposal among the other members of the Council, and consequently the Security Council did not even make a statement on the matter. The General Assembly did do so; on that occasion it voted to adopt a resolution, and the vote showed that four of the countries sponsoring the draft resolution now before us voted against the General Assembly's resolution concerning the illegal United States invasion of Panamanian territory.

It has been said by some in our consultations that our inability to adopt positions consistent with the defence of those principles in other cases should not make us fail to do so now. In other words, we should let the United States choose how, where and when those principles should be applied. However, we are not talking about past history now. The Council can, if it wishes, adopt effective measures with respect to the Power which continues to occupy the "occupied territories". The Council could take effective decisions concerning the Power which continues illegally to occupy southern Lebanon, and of course against the Power which continues to occupy Panama seven months after its invasion. Then, if there were the slightest intention of being consistent, we could begin here and now to rectify this contradiction which arises when, in a selective fashion, an attempt is made for the second time, as Ambassador Pickering has reminded us, to institute such drastic sanctions against a country.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I can recall another occasion which may be the one that the representative of the United States was referring to: the decision taken by the Security Council concerning the illegal régime of Rhodesia when it unilaterally declared the independence of that Territory, for the purpose, as we all remember, of preventing the people of Zimbabwe - which, fortunately, lives in an independent, sovereign land today - from achieving genuine independence.

But the authorities of that racist minority régime in Rhodesia took that unilateral decision in 1965. The General Assembly immediately adopted a resolution, with extensive support from the overwhelming majority of its members, calling for effective steps against that régime to restore legality and to make possible a real decolonization process that would lead, as it eventually did, to independence. When did the Security Council act? In October 1965, in November, in December? Did it act in less than 48 hours? Or did it wait days, or weeks, or months? Notwithstanding the fact that all the States in the region - the African countries - all the non-aligned countries and the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly were urging the Council to carry out its task and adopt effective measures against Rhodesia, the Security Council acted in 1967, two years after that attempt to deprive the people of Zimbabwe of its inalienable national rights.

My delegation has no doubt that the adoption of this draft resolution, far from helping to bring a speedy solution to this conflict - which we believe must be achieved through the withdrawal of Iraqi forces and the full restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty - will, we are convinced, serve or be used, as part of the designs of the United States to intensify its intervention in a part of the world which it appears to regard as its own property.

I am grateful to Ambassador Pickering for something which, it seems to me, is quite illuminating. I listened very carefully to his statement, as I always do,

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

and, at the same time, I was following the text of the press release circulated by the United States Mission and containing the text of his statement. There were a number of additional paragraphs, additional ideas, which he inserted during his statement. However, there was one phrase which he left out, which is in the press release but was not spoken by Ambassador Pickering. I can understand his reasons for not wanting to pronounce it, and I am grateful to him for having spoken as he did.

The second paragraph on page 2 of the text circulated by the United States Mission contains a reference to Security Council resolution 660 (1990), and thereafter it is stated that the Security Council must unequivocally establish today that the family of civilized nations will not tolerate such behaviour, that is, the behaviour of a State which, according to the text of the statement, fails to comply with the Council's decision. After this comes a phrase which disappeared from the statement as spoken by the representative of the United States. It is very short, containing just four words, and I shall quote it: "not here, not ever."

That phrase could not be uttered because it highlights that inconsistency and that unacceptable selectivity of approach which the United States adopts with respect to this resolution. The United States really is not in a position to have these principles applied not merely here but also there and everywhere, not merely today but always, without fail. The reasons for this are, I think, more than evident, and there is no need to labour the point.

Because we are convinced that the draft resolution presented here does not really help to settle the conflict and because, moreover, we believe that it is based on an approach which should not be espoused by the international community, one which is motivated not by a desire to restore legality or to safeguard the legitimate rights of the Government of Kuwait but by a desire to foster the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

strategic interests of a great Power which considers itself the master of the Middle East - for those reasons, my delegation cannot support this draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Cuba for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Since the earliest days of the creation of the United Nations, States have expressed their concern for the defence of life, liberty and independence and the preservation of human values from the use of force; they have recognized the need to maintain international peace and security and to establish an organization based upon the principle of the sovereign equality of peace-loving States. It was in that spirit of peace that the United Nations was founded, and it is that abiding spirit which has brought us here today.

Nevertheless, more than four decades have passed since that time, and the world has witnessed many instances of international conflicts, occupation and military confrontation, resulting in millions of deaths and incalculable material damage, which we were unable to prevent or resolve. On various occasions the Security Council expressed its condemnation but was unable to impose sanctions upon those responsible for the violation of the principles which we ourselves had formulated and respect, or upon those who refused to comply with the decisions of this Council.

In such situations the so-called veto power has prevailed, for reasons of a political nature. Had this not been the case, we could have created solid precedents which might have prevented the recurrence of the type of situation we are dealing with today. Colombia has, since the founding of the United Nations, pointed out the harm caused by the exercise of that discriminatory veto power, and we wish to take this opportunity to urge respect for and compliance with the

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

principles of international law, the primacy of which underlies coexistence, harmony and universal peace.

We note with satisfaction and a sense of optimism that on this occasion the five permanent members of the Security Council are acting unanimously to condemn and impose sanctions against the use of force, the violation of Kuwait's sovereignty and territorial integrity by a State Member of the United Nations.

Colombia has supported and joined in sponsoring this draft resolution, which establishes such measures, a development of resolution 660 (1990), adopted last week. We have done so because we regard those measures not only as just but also as constituting a historic precedent and a warning for the future course of relations in the international community.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

Success in the implementation of today's measures will affect the future of many States and millions of human beings around the world, all the more so because, with the changes in international politics, there are increasing possibilities of regional confrontation. It is in a positive spirit that we view the negative consequences which may result for the world from the imposition of these sanctions, which are bound to have an impact upon vast areas of international economic life and development, for they simply have to be adopted for the sake of peace and future generations.

Mr. AL-ASH TAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to put before the Council some comments concerning the draft resolution before us. Since the outbreak of the present conflict between Iraq and Kuwait, the Republic of Yemen has not ceased to exert continuous efforts to contain the conflict between these two brotherly countries. We have tried to discuss and deal with all issues in a spirit of understanding and within the framework of the one Arab family in a way that would consolidate Arab solidarity, keep the region free from foreign intervention, guarantee the consolidation of national Arab security, and spare it from danger.

In this respect, brother Ali Abdulla Saleh, President of the Republic of Yemen, has undertaken during the last three days visits to Iraq, Egypt and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. He met with the leaders of these three countries to discuss the prevailing conflict. He also received brother Taha Yassin Ramadhan, member of the Revolutionary Command Council and the Deputy Premier of Iraq, to whom he delivered a letter to his brother, President Saddam Hussein. President Saleh confirmed the need for the speedy withdrawal of Iraqi forces from the territory of brotherly Kuwait.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

I should like to reiterate here that the Yemeni leadership will continue to exert efforts to contain this conflict between the two brotherly countries, despite the many difficulties besieging such efforts, because we believe that the brotherly Arab means of containing the conflict is the valid and effective way of dealing with it and bringing it to a desirable end. The Republic of Yemen believes that, despite the fact that the Arab Summit Conference, which was scheduled to meet in Jeddah, was not convened, Arab efforts to contain the conflict between the two brotherly countries have not stopped. The doors are not closed yet on such efforts. This is clearly mentioned in paragraph 4 of the resolution of the Council of the Arab League adopted at its meeting in Cairo when the matter was referred to Their Majesties and other Heads of State of Arab countries to discuss the means of reaching a negotiated permanent settlement between the two parties concerned. Contacts among Arab leaders are still under way up to this very moment.

The delegation of the Republic of Yemen confirms our keen interest in maintaining peace and stability in the area of the Gulf and the Arab peninsula. Hence, we totally reject any foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the region. We note that while we are discussing the topic there are military movements. We hope that the draft resolution to be adopted will not be a pretext for intervention in the area.

In the normal course, this conflict will eventually come to an end, and we hope that the confrontation in the area will also. Then, when the circumstances are propitious for negotiation and a peaceful settlement, the Republic of Yemen will be more than ready to follow up and continue its efforts. Therefore, we will not adopt any attitude at this meeting that would negatively affect the efforts undertaken by the Republic of Yemen to find a solution to the conflict.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Romania.

Romania pledged its full support for Security Council resolution 660 (1990). In the same spirit, my country is fully in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/21441.

The Romanian Government has expressed its deep concern from the very beginning over the armed conflict between Iraq and Kuwait, countries which are situated in an area that for a long period of time has known war, confrontation and tension.

In our opinion, no reason can justify the use of force against an independent and sovereign State. The Charter of the United Nations and the unanimously accepted principles of international law prohibit the use of force as a means of settling disputes between States. It is obvious that the penetration of Iraqi troops into Kuwait, in violation of the unanimously accepted principles of international law, has exacerbated the situation in the area, endangered international peace and security, and brought about losses in human life and suffering for the people of the two countries.

My Government reiterates its stand that the only way to settle disputes and iron out misunderstandings among States lies in negotiations and in resorting to the procedures provided by the Charter of the United Nations.

Romania calls again for the withdrawal without delay of the Iraqi military forces beyond the internationally recognized boundaries between the two countries and for the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait.

It is also our conviction that, under the given circumstances, it is necessary for all States to display moderation and responsibility and to undertake nothing which may further aggravate the situation.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

(The President)

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/21441.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland,
France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United
States of America, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Cuba, Yemen

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in
favour, none against and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution has thus been adopted
as resolution 661 (1990).

(The President)

The representative of Iraq has asked to speak, and I call on him.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq): I simply wanted to make a point of clarification, as I heard the representative of the United States refer to me as having said that Iraq had withdrawn 72 tanks. I did not say that. I was referring to the type of tanks that had been withdrawn, but I gave no specific number.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Kuwait has asked to speak, and I call on him.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): By adopting the draft resolution, the Council has earned the gratitude of Kuwait, its Government and its people for a courageous position designed to restore peace and to defend the principles of protecting and preserving security. His Royal Highness the Amir of the State of Kuwait, Sheikh Al-Sabah, who is in the best position to thank the Council, has already expressed his feelings and the feelings of his people in the statement he made yesterday addressed to his courageous people, who are under his leadership and under his command. In that statement, which was also addressed to the world, being broadcast by the mass media throughout the globe, he said:

"Dear brothers, know that we are not alone in facing aggression. We have with us the Arabs and the Muslims, and by our side we also have the States of the world, which have not hesitated a single instant to raise their voices to deplore and condemn aggression. In addition to this, we are the champions of law. We must rebuff aggression against our territory and preserve our honour and our dignity. We must defend our sovereignty and our independence."

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

At this time we are expecting the continued close and sincere co-operation of the Council and the entire international community to implement the resolution as a whole. The resolution addresses an abnormal situation. Therefore, its implementation must be guaranteed in a way that demonstrates solidarity and a collective spirit.

May God assist and support the Council.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.