

20. **LETTER DATED 8 AUGUST 1983 FROM THE CHARGÉ 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**

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By a letter¹ dated 8 August 1983 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya requested an urgent meeting of the Council in order to consider the situation resulting from the intensification of the United States intervention in the affairs of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and Africa and from acts of intimidation and provocation directed against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Charging that the United States had dispatched forces and military equipment to the sard region, he asked the Council to put an end to the acts of provocation and hostility by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

At its 2464th meeting, on 11 August 1983, the Council included the item in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic; and, at the 2466th meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Sudan and Viet Nam; and at the 2468th meeting, the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic and India.² The Council considered this item at its 2464th, 2466th and 2468th meetings, from 11 to 16 August 1983.

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that international security in the Arab region and Africa was threatened as a result of the landing of United States forces in the area, some of them on the borders of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; the presence of those forces constituted a direct threat to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which was compelled to defend itself. He said the United States Administration had persisted in its aggressive policy against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and had escalated the tension in the area, using all means and designs in order to create the pretexts for an attack against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and cited numerous examples demonstrating the United States aggressive policy against his country. Such aggressive practices violated the Charter and international Law, especially the principles prohibiting the use or threat of force and calling for non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. They were also a violation of United Nations resolutions aimed at turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was ready to enter into dialogue with the United States to consider any problems. He concluded by saying that the Council should discharge its responsibilities in full, condemn and put an end to American provocations if it really wished to preserve the prestige of the United Nations as well as its reputation.³

The representative of the United States said that the gravest threat to international peace and security came in fact from the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which was engaged in flagrant, unprovoked aggression against the legitimate Government of the sovereign nation of Chad. He termed joint training exercises in the Middle East in which the United States forces

were engaged as a peripheral issue, injected into the debate as a deliberate diversion; those exercises posed no threat to the security of any country in the African/Middle Eastern region.' His Government also rejected as an utter fabrication the allegation that the United States had intervened in northern Africa, as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya bore the responsibility for tension and conflict in and around Chad. He urged the Council to label the unprovoked, flagrant Libyan aggression a direct challenge to the Charter and a grave threat to international peace and security. Once the Libyan aggression was ended, the enduring problems of Chad could be addressed in a spirit of reconciliation that would promote international peace and security.³

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic said that training American soldiers in desert fighting on the eastern borders of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and sending AWACS spy planes over Libyan territory posed a great threat to the people of the African continent, to the Arab people as a whole and, indeed, to international peace and security. The seriousness of those events justified the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's recourse to the Council. The baseless American charges that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had intervened in the internal affairs of Chad had paved the way for more AWACS spy planes as well as F-15 fighter aircraft and increased military assistance to Chad in an attempt to tighten the vise around the young Libyan revolution. The dispatch of American military experts to Chad was an overt, flagrant challenge to OAU, which was still in control of the situation and exerts all possible efforts to find the appropriate African solution to the situation in Chad.³

The representative of Democratic Yemen said that the provocative policies and practices of the United States were creating hotbeds of tension and entailed threats of the use of force and of intervention in the internal affairs of peoples and States throughout the world. The policies pursued by the American Administration were in contravention of the Charter and of the principles of international law and posed a threat to international peace and security.³

The representative of the Soviet Union said that the anti-Libyan nature of all the United States military manoeuvres was quite clear. These military preparations were accompanied by a systematic campaign of threat and intimidation by the American Administration against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and its leadership. Events in and around the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya proved that what was involved was in essence an attempt by imperialist forces to carry out their neo-colonialist plans against developing States and against the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries as a whole. United States claims of a role of international "policeman" were in flagrant contradiction of the main principles of the Charter and of the obligations of the United States as a permanent member of the Council. That clearly explained why the United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) had voted against the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States which the General Assembly had adopted in its resolution 36/103 of 9 December 1981. The Soviet delegation supported the appeal by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Council for the protection of its sovereignty and national independence against imperialistic meddling.³

At the 2466th meeting, the representative of Afghanistan stated that if the Council were to tolerate the American actions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other States Members of the United Nations, the confidence of the international community in the Council would soon inevitably vanish. He reminded the Council that very often it had become totally paralysed whenever it had had to discuss a situation involving the United States. For the sake of the **credibility** of the United Nations and especially that of the Council, the speaker called for prompt action to discourage the United States from its activities that endangered peace and security in various parts of the world.⁵

The representative of Guyana remarked that in that situation, it behoved the Council to seek ways of exerting maximum influence for the exercise of restraint and for the promotion of inter-State relations firmly rooted in the rule of law and the principles of the Charter.⁵

The representative of the Sudan called the request of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for an urgent meeting of the Council an attempt to deceive the Council as well as the international community and to divert attention from the prevailing situation. He supported that attention should be focused on the aggression perpetrated by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against the people and Government of Chad, and that the Council should continue to consider Chad's complaint against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. **Regarding** the military exercises in the area, he stressed that they were not directed against any neighbouring States but that their purpose was to train the Sudanese armed forces and to raise the level of their ability and readiness to defend themselves.⁵

At the 2468th meeting, on 16 August 1983, the representative of India pointed out that the world was witnessing a sharp escalation of tension and conflict in the Mediterranean and North African regions, as the result of an increasing recourse to the use or threat of force and to military intervention in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. There was an urgent need for the exercise of restraint on all sides so that the fighting which threatened to engulf the whole area could be ended immediately and the process of dialogue in search of peace and reconciliation begun without delay. He supported all efforts to promote a solution within the framework of OAU and in the light of the decisions taken at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU held at Addis Ababa in July 1983.⁶

At the end of the 2468th meeting the President announced that the next meeting of the Council to continue consideration of the item would be scheduled after consultations with the members of the Council.⁶

NOTES

¹ S/15914, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983.

² For details, see chap. II of the present Supplement.

³ 2464th mtg.

⁴ See also the letter dated 22 July 1983 from the representative of the United States to the President of the Council. S/15887, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983.

⁵ 2464th mtg.

⁶ 2468th mtg.

21. **LETTER DATED 1 SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM THE ACTING PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**
22. **LETTER DATED 1 SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM THE PERMANENT OBSERVER FOR THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**
23. **LETTER DATED 1 SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM THE CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF CANADA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**
24. **LETTER DATED 1 SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF JAPAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**
25. **LETTER DATED 2 SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM THE ACTING PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 1 September 1983, the representative of the United States requested, in association with the Republic of Korea, an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the shooting down on 31 August 1983 of a Korean Air Lines commercial air liner which had strayed into Soviet airspace.

By note² dated 1 September 1983, the President of the Council transmitted a letter of the same date from the Permanent Observer for the Republic of Korea to the United Nations requesting an urgent meeting of the Council in accordance with Article 35 of the Charter. In a letter³ of the same date the representative of Japan also requested an urgent meeting of the Council, and by letters dated 1 and 2 September the representatives of Canada and Australia, respectively, associated their Governments with the request made by the Government of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

At its 2470th meeting, on 2 September 1983, the Council included the letters in its agenda, and considered the matter at its 2470th to 2474th and 2476th meetings, from 2 to 12 September 1983. In the course of its meetings the Council invited the representatives of the following Member States, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2470th meeting, Australia, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and New Zealand; at the 2471st meeting, Bangladesh, Belgium, Italy, Liberia, Nigeria, the Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain and Sweden; at the 2472nd meeting, Colombia, Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Malaysia; at the 2473rd meeting, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Ireland, Kenya and Singapore; at the 2474th meeting, Chad, Paraguay and Thailand; and, at the 2476th meeting, the Ivory Coast, the Sudan and Venezuela.⁶ The representative of the Republic of