United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-SECOND SESSION
*Official Records**

SIXTH COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 28 October 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/42/SR.34
2 November 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 126: MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT HUMAN LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES, INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES (continued) (A/42/564; A/C.6/42/L.2 (see also A/C.6/42/L.1, pp. 2-3))

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/42/519 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

(b) CONVENING, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEFINE TERRORISM AND TO DIFFERENTIATE IT FROM THE STRUGGLE OF PEOPLES FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION (continued) (A/42/193 and Add.1-3)

1. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen Arab Republic) said that document A/42/519, in dealing with acts of terrorism by individuals, had not addressed the motives underlying the terrorist actions of certain Governments against other Governments and peoples. The actions of the racist Governments in Palestine and South Africa could not be ascribed to frustration or despair. Their objective was to occupy territory, violate sovereignty, kill innocent citizens and destroy industrial and residential centres.

2. The phenomenon of terrorism could be traced back to the colonial era. As subjugated peoples fought for and achieved their independence, the colonizers sought to compensate for their losses by referring to the heroic actions of national liberation movements as terrorism. In view of the international nature of the problem, and the threat which it posed to international stability and security, there was a need to study its underlying causes and to define terrorism in preparation for the adoption of effective measures against it.

3. The proposal of the Syrian Arab Republic to convene an international conference for that purpose enjoyed his delegation's full support, not least because the time had come to differentiate between real terrorists and real freedom fighters. The struggle of the Palestinian people against the Zionist invaders could in no circumstances be described as terrorism since it was that people's right to defend itself by all the legitimate means at its disposal. The American people's struggle against British colonialism had been seen as legitimate, as had been those of various European peoples against the Nazi and Fascist régimes. It was astonishing that States whose peoples had resorted to armed struggle against those forms of oppression should continue to apply different standards to the Palestinian people's struggle against zionism.

4. If the intention was to achieve consensus in the battle against terrorism, it was difficult to understand why co-operation towards a definition of terrorism through an international conference under United Nations auspices should be rejected. His country, for its part, supported all efforts to combat the phenomenon through the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism.

5. Mr. SELVA (Nicaragua) said that his country was a party to most of the international conventions on the various forms of terrorism, which was a growing phenomenon - resulting from the lack of the necessary political will on the part of some States - and could thus lead to further wars.

6. Under the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, every State had the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular forces or armed bands, including mercenaries for incursion into the territory of another State, as well as the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts. He also wished to refer to article 3 (g) of the Definition of Aggression in that connection.

7. The undeclared war against Nicaragua, the acts of aggression against the Palestinian people and other Arab States, South Africa's acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring countries and the reign of terror to which the black population of South Africa and Namibia were being subjected were but a few examples of acts of State terrorism.

8. The question of international terrorism and its underlying causes was of great importance to Nicaragua, which for the past seven years had been a victim of State terrorism. In that connection, he wished to refer to General Assembly resolution 39/159, paragraph 1. It was hard to know how to classify the acts of aggression committed against Nicaragua by bands of mercenaries. In 1981, a sum of $19 million had been approved for the establishment of mercenary forces. In 1982 "covert operations" directed against Nicaragua had been authorized and a relevant Security Council resolution had been vetoed. In the same year the international airport at Managua and fuel storage-tanks at Corinto had been attacked and a CIA handbook on operations against Nicaragua had been prepared. In 1984 CIA commandoes had mined Nicaragua's principal ports. Faced with those military and paramilitary activities directed against its sovereignty and territorial integrity, Nicaragua had taken the matter to the International Court of Justice. However, in 1985 and 1986 the aggressor Government in question had set aside considerable additional amounts for the mercenary forces. Unfortunately, the United States Administration planned to increase yet further the funds it was channelling to the terrorist forces, thus openly demonstrating that its support for the relevant agreements signed by the five Central American Presidents was merely rhetorical and that it would continue to flout the principles and norms of international law. The Judgment delivered by the International Court of Justice in June 1986 had condemned the country in question for its conduct.

9. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, requested the Chairman to read out the full title of the item before the Committee.

10. The CHAIRMAN read out the title of the item under consideration.

11. Mr. SELVA (Nicaragua) said that Nicaragua had consistently sought, by all the peaceful means at its disposal, to end the war of aggression that had been imposed on it.

(Mr. Selva, Nicaragua)

12. His delegation supported the initiative taken by the Syrian Arab Republic concerning the convening of an international conference, under United Nations auspices, on the question of international terrorism. All forms of international terrorism were to be condemned and fought, and appropriate measures that were in accordance with international law must be adopted. Nicaragua recognized the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and racist régimes or other forms of foreign domination, as well as the legitimacy of all national liberation movements. Lastly, it believed that the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism should resume its work.

13. Mr. SKIBSTED (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community, said that the upsurge of terrorism during the past decades represented an alarming development on the international scene, leading to loss of human life and constituting a threat to orderly and friendly relations between nations. The role of the United Nations in dealing with terrorism was set out clearly in General Assembly resolution 40/61, whose adoption by consensus had been a significant step forward in international co-operation against terrorism and which, in the view of the Twelve, should form the basis for future work on the issue. That resolution, like Security Council resolution 579 (1985), was fully consistent with the view held by the Twelve and set out in document A/42/201 that no cause, however legitimate, could ever justify resorting to acts of terrorism and that such acts damaged whatever cause the perpetrators claimed to be pursuing.

14. Referring to the proposal for the convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation (A/42/193 and Add.1-3), he said that the ability of peoples to exercise their right to self-determination would be ill-served if that right were discussed at an international conference to define terrorism. Such an exercise would give further credit to the false idea that a link existed between that right and terrorism. Moreover, as experience had shown and as the representative of Canada had explained in his statement at the 28th meeting of the Sixth Committee, the difficulties of defining terrorism were insurmountable and attempts to reach consensus on a definition were bound to fail. Ready as they were to take part in constructive and practical international co-operation in eradicating terrorism and eliminating its underlying causes, the Twelve were convinced that the negative consequences of holding such a conference would be overwhelming and that to embark upon the exercise would destroy the consensus constructed with much difficulty in 1985. They consequently opposed the proposal.

15. Inviting the Committee to approve draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.2, of which all the member States of the European Community were sponsors, he referred in particular to operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 and to the sixth preambular paragraph. It was the considered view of the Twelve that the best results were achieved by avoiding generalities and focusing on specific acts of terrorism. The international conventions listed in the sixth preambular paragraph were examples of that approach. The ongoing work within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO), referred to in operative paragraphs 7 and 8 was also to be welcomed as a positive response to

(Mr. Skibsted, Denmark)

the request contained in General Assembly resolution 40/61. It was particularly encouraging to note that the work in question had proceeded by consensus. After drawing attention also to operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, he expressed the hope that the consensus reached at the fortieth session would be preserved and that the General Assembly would once again take a unanimous stand against international terrorism.

16. Mr. MIRZAIE-YENGEJEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his country, which had been the target of terrorist attacks and had lost a number of its prominent revolutionary figures through such attacks, shared the international community's increasing concern over international terrorism carried out by individuals or States. It condemned all such attacks and had taken the necessary steps towards curbing and combating terrorism, inter alia, by ratifying the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions relating to the safety of civil aviation and the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. All those instruments were applicable in his country as domestic legislation; moreover, since the item had last been considered by the General Assembly the hijackers of a foreign aircraft had been tried there and had been sentenced to imprisonment. It was encouraging to note that the number of parties to the aforementioned conventions as well as to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages had increased, and the ICAO and IMO were to be commended for their continuing efforts in the field of prevention of terrorist acts. It was regrettable, however, that existing conventions, resolutions and declarations dealt only with specific acts of terrorism and that no serious institutional attempt had so far been made to study the phenomenon of terrorism in general or its underlying causes.

17. In the past two decades, international terrorism had assumed new dimensions and emerged in new forms, of which State terrorism was the most harmful and deadly. Certain States committed terrorist acts on a large scale and employed modern means for purposes of domination of other countries or interference in their internal affairs. While acts of individual and group terrorism had rightly been condemned, due attention had not been given to their underlying causes. Those omissions needed to be remedied. A distinction had to be drawn between the punishment of perpetrators of terrorist acts and the eradication of international terrorism. The prosecution and punishment of offenders, important as it was a preventive measure, could never suffice to eliminate international terrorism unless its social, economic and political causes were also taken into consideration. The identification and removal of the underlying causes would reduce the number of acts of terrorism and hence the need for enforcement actions.

18. For those reasons, his delegation supported the proposal for the convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation. To combat a phenomenon in the absence of a clear and well-established definition seemed neither logical nor possible; moreover, it was a fundamental principle of criminal law that every offence, including all its constituent elements, should be precisely characterized. Under Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Charter, the United Nations was mandated to serve as a centre for the consideration

(Mr. Mirzaie-Yengejeh, Islamic Republic of Iran)

of global problems such as that of international terrorism. From the legal point of view, several elements for a definition of international terrorism which differentiated it from national liberation movements were already established. His delegation could not agree with the view that the proposed conference would fail to yield positive results and would merely reopen an inconclusive debate. The task of defining international terrorism would doubtless not be easy, but once a generally accepted definition was available it would facilitate the adoption of effective measures to combat terrorism, as opposed to measures against peoples fighting for national liberation. In that connection, it should be recalled that the United Nations had, after long and patient discussion, succeeded in producing a Definition of Aggression. To arrive at a definition of international terrorism should therefore not be impossible.

19. Zionists, racists and the oppressors were, as usual, making every effort to distort the facts and mislead world public opinion so as to distract attention from the just and heroic struggles of the peoples of Palestine, South Africa, Namibia and Nicaragua and to disguise their true goals.

20. Mr. VENKATRAMIAH (India) said that his country's deep concern at the growing incidence of terrorism was reflected in a number of actions it had undertaken at the regional and international levels. A chapter on terrorism had been included at India's initiative in the declaration adopted by non-aligned countries at the New Delhi meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement in April 1986. At the United Nations, India had played an important role in the drafting of General Assembly resolution 40/61, adopted by consensus in 1985, and within the Commonwealth, concern at terrorist activities had been reflected in the Nassau declaration of 1985. India was a party to the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions relating to the safety of civil aviation and to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, and was actively participating in the ongoing work within IMO. At the regional level, the member countries of the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation, of which India was one, were currently engaged in negotiations on a draft regional convention on terrorism and had already reached agreement on a definition of extraditable terrorist offences, an agreement which represented a unique achievement. At the bilateral level, India had entered into arrangements with a number of countries to facilitate the extradition and prosecution of fugitive offenders alleged to have committed acts of terrorism. At home, too, India had enacted legislation proscribing acts of terrorism.

21. While supporting the implementation of measures aimed at curbing terrorism, his Government firmly believed that if the menace was to be completely eliminated, it was essential to study and address the underlying causes. A clear distinction existed between terrorism on the one hand and the legitimate struggle of peoples under colonial and racist régimes for self-determination and independence, on the other. India believed that certain acts carried out with a view to undermining the political territorial sovereignty of States also constituted terrorist acts. The activities of mercenaries and acts which fell under the heading of State

(Mr. Venkatramiah, India)

terrorism could not be condoned; they were in no way less serious than terrorist acts committed against innocent individuals, and all States had a responsibility to refrain from them.

22. Within the United Nations, India was participating in negotiations aimed at concluding an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries and was a member of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations, which had recently completed a draft declaration on that subject. His Government regarded co-operation among Member States as the key element in combating international terrorism and considered that such co-operation should take the following forms: Member States which had not become parties to the various international conventions dealing with terrorism should do so and should implement those conventions through appropriate national legislation; terrorists should be punished and given severe penalties; States should refrain from acts of terrorism and should not sponsor or support such acts; acts of terrorism should not be treated as political offences; and, lastly, judicial assistance between States should be expanded and strengthened so that terrorists might be brought to book as early as possible. The principles of peaceful coexistence, non-intervention and non-interference had to be recognized and upheld in practice by all nations if terrorism was to be eradicated. The Committee should direct its efforts at strengthening and preserving the firm foundation which had been laid by the adoption without a vote of resolution 40/61. Any attempt to tamper with that foundation would be counterproductive.

23. Mr. VITO (Albania) said that in the 15 years since the item had first appeared in the Committee's agenda, terrorism had continued to spread and had assumed alarming proportions. A striking feature was that the loudest protestations of horror came from the camp of United States imperialism. The problem of terrorism certainly had its legal aspects and there was no shortage of international legal instruments on the subject, although not all those instruments were respected. But in his delegation's view the problem was, above all, a political one. Terrorism was a social phenomenon rooted in the system of oppression and exploitation and in the unjust relationship between production and distribution. In order to discuss the problem, it was necessary to study its true causes and to identify those responsible. The general decay of bourgeois society, widespread unemployment, misery and despair had given rise to an increase in all forms of criminal behaviour; banditism of the mafia type had deeply penetrated into the State apparatus of some countries and organized terrorism was used as a means of depriving citizens of their democratic rights. Under such circumstances, it was hardly surprising that the forces of reaction should seek to deceive the working masses and try to deflect their fear and hatred from the oppressive system, which was the real culprit, to its victims.

24. His delegation took the view that the struggle against terrorism should not be confined to acts committed by individuals or groups but should extend to State terrorism, which constituted the most dangerous form of the phenomenon as well as a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of international law. The acts of

(Mr. Vito, Albania)

aggression of United States imperialism against Viet Nam, Iran, Grenada, Lebanon and Nicaragua and Soviet occupation of Afghanistan were typical examples of State terrorism, as also were Israel's policies in respect of the Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab peoples and the systematic acts of terror perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa against the Azanian and Namibian peoples and the neighbouring countries.

25. His delegation was opposed in both theory and practice to all forms of terrorism, wherever, by whomever and for whatever motive they were committed, but it also forcefully condemned the demagogic campaign conducted by bourgeois reaction in order to discredit national liberation struggles by identifying them with international terrorism and by branding freedom fighters as terrorists. A clear distinction should be drawn between wars of national liberation on the one hand and terrorism on the other. The struggle of the Palestinian people to recover its land had nothing in common with the terrorist acts of Israeli Zionists against Palestinian camps. The same was true of the struggle of the Afghan people against Soviet occupation, that of the Azanian and Namibian peoples against apartheid, and that of the people of Nicaragua against the incursions of United States imperialism. His country's resolute rejection of all forms of terrorism was enshrined in its Constitution and its laws. Above all, however, it was the socialist order itself which had done away with the political, social and economic conditions conducive to terrorism. Socialist Albania would never permit its territory to be used for terrorist acts against other countries, and called upon all other States to follow its example.

26. Mr. ZURITA (Venezuela) said that, although all Member States were of the view that terrorism had a negative effect on friendly relations between States and on world peace and co-operation, there was considerable disagreement on the issue of international terrorism and its underlying causes, particularly in the context of the exercise of the right of peoples to independence and self-determination. There were still situations, such as colonialism and racism, the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and foreign occupation, that lent force to the arguments of those who practised violence. Measures to eliminate the underlying causes of international terrorism must be adopted at the international level but must not be permitted to interfere with State sovereignty. It was therefore to be hoped that all States involved in situations that might give rise to international terrorism would comply with paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 40/61.

27. Identification of the possible causes of terrorist violence did not appear to give rise to the same difficulties as those encountered in the endeavour to define terrorism. Acts of terrorism themselves were classified as offences by the legislation of all States that sought to eliminate terrorism and such offences were subject to severe punishment. The international community was aware of those difficulties and had therefore chosen to identify certain offences in the overall category of terrorism and to deal with each offence by means of specific multilateral agreements. All the relevant international instruments were the product of the international co-operation that was required in order to make the condemnation of terrorism effective. His delegation welcomed the efforts made by

(Mr. Zurita, Venezuela)

ICAO and IMO in that connection. The chief problem did not lie in the drafting of domestic or international legal norms or in the lack of a definition of international terrorism but, rather, in the lack of the necessary political will.

28. Venezuela's foreign policy was based, inter alia, on the principles of self-determination and the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms. While strongly condemning violence as a way of combating violence, Venezuela did not believe that it was reasonable to regard the exercise of the right to liberation and independence as a form of terrorism. Member States, which must seek to strike the proper balance between those two apparently conflicting positions, had taken major steps in the right direction.

29. Mr. AL-ADHAMI (Iraq) said that early attempts by the League of Nations to counter terrorism had foundered because of a failure to adopt a satisfactory definition of the term, whereas the past 40 years had seen the adoption of a number of international conventions addressing various aspects of the problem. Although the contribution of those instruments was positive, the need remained for a specific definition. Particularly in recent years, there had been a tendency to confuse acts of terrorism with the independence struggles of national liberation movements against colonialist and racist régimes. Such confusion was not new: during the Second World War, the Nazi régime had levelled the charge of terrorism and subversion against individuals struggling for the freedom and independence of their peoples. More recently, certain régimes had adopted terrorism as an instrument of policy while continuing to describe the actions of their opponents as terrorism. Examples could be seen in the aggression of the Zionist entity against Lebanon and its attacks on the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981 and on the city of Tunis in 1985.

30. His delegation, which condemned terrorist activities, supported the sacred right of peoples to self-determination and independence, as enshrined in the Charter, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the many resolutions of the General Assembly. That sacred right applied to the struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and that of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO.

31. In the late 1970s, another régime had adopted terrorism as its official ideology. The Iranian régime, which believed in the divine authority of the so-called Imam over all Muslims, believed that the export of the Islamic revolution was a binding obligation on the constitutional authorities of the Iranian State. That revolution was a guise by which the régime hoped to achieve the occupation of parts of the Arab world, particularly Iraq, and to bring them under Iranian control.

32. Mr. MIRZAIE-YENGEJEH (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on a point of order, said that the Sixth Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to discuss the imposed war.

33. Mr. AL-ADHAMI (Iraq) said that former Iranian President Abolhasan Bani Sadr, reviewing the Iranian régime's role in the internal affairs of Iraq in May 1980, had stated that Khomeini was the religious leader of both the Iranian and the Iraqi peoples and that when he took action on behalf of the Iranian people against the people of Iraq, it was a question of internal rather than external affairs. It was on the basis of that belief that the Iranian régime had initiated terrorist military action against Iraq, culminating in the armed aggression of 4 September 1980. The scope of such terrorist action had subsequently expanded to include offences against other countries, particularly in the Arabian Gulf, the dispatch of Iranian subversive elements to the holy city of Makkah, repeated attacks against Kuwait and subversion sponsored by Iranian embassies in the Arab countries of North Africa. Even when added to the terrorist acts of Iranian agents in non-Muslim countries and the use of hostages for blackmail, those offences represented only a fraction of the catalogue of crimes committed by the Iranian régime in violation of the principles of international law.

34. Despite the extremely complicated nature of the problem, it was essential that terrorism should be defined and that clear criteria should be established to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation.

35. Mrs. SILVERA NUNEZ (Cuba) said that most countries rejected acts of terrorism. Since 1959, the year in which its revolution had triumphed, Cuba had consistently and unequivocally condemned acts of terrorism and had taken specific steps through the conclusion of bilateral agreements with a view to eliminating such acts, particularly those involving international civil aviation.

36. It was common knowledge that Cuba had been the victim of acts of terrorism, sabotage and assassination attempts on its leaders. Particular reference should be made in that connection to the sabotage of a Cuban airliner in Barbados by terrorists of Cuban origin working for the CIA, as a result of which 73 people had lost their lives. The United Nations must take specific steps in the field in question, on the basis of the recommendations made in due course by the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism. Unfortunately, some representatives had been endeavouring, since 1972, to extend the scope of the definition of international terrorism so as to include the struggles waged by peoples for their national liberation.

37. Terrorism as a State policy provided an ideological and political justification for imperialism, and the phenomenon of terrorism had developed in such a way as to become a foreign-policy tool of some States. The approach taken in draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.2 was narrow and unbalanced. It was important to take account of the underlying causes of international terrorism. A new climate was developing in international relations, which gave reason to hope that there would be a new period of international détente and that policies based on the use of force, blackmail and interference in the internal affairs of States would be eliminated once and for all from international relations. The acts of aggression committed against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples constituted State terrorism and were a gross violation of the norms of international law. Furthermore, Cuba rejected any endeavour to equate acts of terrorism with the just and legitimate

(Mrs. Silvera Nunez, Cuba)

struggles waged by national liberation movements for self-determination and independence. Lastly, Cuba wished to express its support for the initiative taken by the Syrian Arab Republic concerning the convening of an international conference on the question of international terrorism and to reaffirm its willingness to co-operate in any negotiations that were held, as a contribution to United Nations efforts to eliminate terrorism.

38. Mr. NUGDALLA (Sudan) reiterated his country's commitment to the principles of the United Nations as enshrined in the Charter and to the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence from colonial, racist and other forms of oppression. The Sudan, which had always opposed all acts of terrorism, supported the United Nations resolutions and other instruments adopted in that connection. It condemned any policy or practice involving terrorism in relations between States and any action by States designed to undermine the social and political system of other sovereign States. It likewise condemned all attempts to equate terrorism with the legitimate struggle of peoples for national liberation.

39. Terrorism, which had eluded definition, was a term used to refer to a wide variety of individuals and groups, including liberation movements whose struggle was justified by the validity of their cause. The people of Palestine and the occupied Arab territories and also of South Africa, for example, were consistently denied their right to self-determination, subjected to widespread harassment and to genocide, and lived in constant terror. In such cases, a legitimate struggle was acceptable as a last resort. The Sudan therefore agreed with the League of Arab States, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that terrorist acts committed by extremist groups or individuals should be differentiated from the legitimate struggle of national liberation movements against oppression. Accordingly, it favoured the convening of an international conference on the subject.

40. Lastly, inasmuch as the Sixth Committee was required to provide support for the innocent victims of terrorism and oppression, the underlying causes should be treated on an equal footing with prevention.

41. Ms. LENGALENGA (Zambia) said that her country was greatly concerned at the deteriorating situation with regard to international terrorism, which had spread rapidly in recent years to become the scourge of modern times.

42. Zambia was among the countries of southern Africa which had been victims of terrorist attacks by the racist Pretoria régime. South Africa's persistent acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, the purpose of which was to force them to abandon their struggle against apartheid, were conducted either by the South African armed forces or by mercenary bandits such as the Uniao Nacional para e Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) in Angola and the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR) in Mozambique. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its refusal to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained a matter of great concern to Zambia and the international community as a whole.

(Ms. Lengalenga, Zambia)

43. Her delegation agreed that the underlying causes of terrorism should be studied with a view to eradicating it. It favoured a clear definition of terrorism to differentiate it from the legitimate struggle of peoples for national liberation, although certain régimes which supported policies of colonialism and foreign occupation had attempted to give definitions of terrorism that portrayed legitimate struggles for national liberation as terrorist acts. At the same time, Zambia attached great importance to the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and believed that force should be used only as a last resort. Zambia's willingness to co-operate with all peace-loving nations in combating international terrorism was attested to by the fact that it was a signatory to three out of the five international conventions on terrorism and was taking steps to become a party to the other two. Lastly, her delegation, which called upon the international community to intensify the fight against international terrorism, unequivocally condemned as criminal all acts of terrorism which caused misery and loss of innocent human lives and disrupted international relations.

44. Mr. BOUABID (Tunisia) said that the unequivocal condemnation, by General Assembly resolution 40/61 of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed was a positive development in the fight against terrorism and part of the vigorous action undertaken since the beginning of the 1960s to cope with an increasingly disturbing phenomenon. The five international conventions drawn up between 1963 and 1979, which dealt with specific acts of terrorism, attested to the will of the international community to put an end to the scourge, and the status of the implementation of those conventions, as reflected in the annex to the report of the Secretary-General (A/42/519), revealed a genuine determination to take action to prevent and eliminate terrorism in all its forms. Wider acceptance of those instruments would undoubtedly strengthen the fight against terrorism but could not alone provide a solution to the problem. Also, the solutions adopted thus far were purely sectoral for, while international terrorism took many forms, international law in its existing state dealt with only some of them. While his delegation was pleased to note the two diplomatic conferences to be convened in 1988 under the auspices of the ICAO and IMO respectively, it considered that the general approach still remained a selective one and that in future it would be advisable to give attention to any initiative likely to lead to a more comprehensive approach to the task of codification.

45. Noting that the emphasis thus far had been more on punishment than on prevention, he said that some might argue that it would dissuade any potential perpetrator of a terrorist act if provision were made for severe punishment and its implementation in close co-operation between States. However, while the doctrine of dissuasion had been regarded as appropriate in certain other cases, it could not be endorsed when the circumstances were entirely different. It would be pointless to threaten, even with the direst punishment, those who were so affected by misery and despair that they were ready to lay down their lives in carrying out such acts. No matter how severe such a system of punishment might be, therefore, it lost much of its significance in view of the sensitive and special nature of the issue. For those reasons, he advocated careful consideration of the question of the punishment of acts of terrorism and, above all, of the means of preventing them.

(Mr. Bouabid, Tunisia)

46. The role of an organization such as the United Nations should be one of prevention rather than condemnation and punishment. It was not possible, however, to prevent acts of terrorism without resolving the underlying causes, for often, if not always, very bitter reasons lay behind the outward manifestation of a terrorist act. The time had therefore come to undertake a detailed consideration of the root causes of the problem with a view to finding a radical solution, rather than accusing the authentic and legitimate representatives of peoples whose only aspiration was to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination of being terrorists. It was also time to cease responding to violence by violence and to lay down the bases for genuine co-operation with a view to wiping out terrorism altogether. In that connection, the Syrian proposal merited consideration since it would encourage States to join efforts in arriving at a definition of international terrorism. Also, since the proposed international conference was not subject to any time-limits, it could be carefully prepared to ensure that it had every chance of success.

47. Mrs. IBRAHIM (Nigeria) said that Nigeria upheld the rule of law and was unequivocal in its condemnation of international terrorism. However, despite the many resolutions and conventions adopted in that connection, terrorism continued unabated.

48. The greatest terror to which man was subjected occurred when he was denied his dignity on the ground of colour. It was therefore appropriate that action against terrorism in Africa should start with the liquidation of a scourge which had taken the form of aggression against the peoples and countries of southern Africa. The apartheid régime of South Africa spread terror not only within its own enclave but in all the neighbouring States; its criminal invasion of Angola, its sponsorship of the UNITA renegades and its supply of weapons to RENAMO bandits in Mozambique were the most serious acts of terrorism committed in Africa since the Second World War. The time had therefore come to deal a severe blow to State terrorism in South Africa and Namibia. A minority had argued that liberation forces were terrorists: it was strange that the self-same people who had rid themselves of the colonial yoke now denied others the right to liberation.

49. Her delegation was pleased to note that since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 40/61 there had been a marked increase in the parties to the relevant conventions on terrorism. It also welcomed the decision by ICAO to convene a diplomatic conference in 1988, at which an instrument on the suppression of unlawful acts of violence at airports would be adopted, and that ICAO had also adopted a model clause on aviation security for inclusion in bilateral agreements.

50. The problem of international terrorism required a long-term solution, and the emphasis should therefore be on the root causes of the problem rather than on measures to combat it. In the absence of effective enforcement machinery, punishment could not be an effective deterrent. The Committee should therefore submit recommendations to the General Assembly with a view to the elimination of the underlying causes of terrorism. In that connection, her delegation recommended that the United Nations should introduce a programme of action for the elimination of all forms of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid.

51. Mr. AL-ABSI (United Arab Emirates) said that international customary law and the law of treaties provided States with sufficient judicial authority to enact laws to combat terrorism. However, the question of judicial authority in the application of such laws encountered certain difficulties when co-operation among a number of States became necessary. Extradition, for example, was not always a satisfactory expedient for bringing those accused of terrorism to justice because of frequent lack of agreement. The matter became even more complicated when it was a question of co-operating with certain régimes whose very existence was contrary to international humanitarian norms and customs.

52. The position of his Government on the subject of terrorism was unequivocal. It strongly supported all of the resolutions and conventions on the matter adopted or sponsored by the United Nations and other international organizations, as endorsed by the League of Arab States, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It also supported the measures adopted by ICAO and the efforts made by other international organizations to combat terrorism directed against civil aviation and other modes of transport.

53. In its concern to promote co-operation in the application of existing conventions and resolutions and with a view to making them stronger and more effective, his delegation called for greater clarity and precision and for a greater effort to implement recommendations in their entirety.

54. By virtue of the wording of agenda item 126, the international community had acknowledged that acts of violence could be committed by persons acting out of misery, frustration, grievance and despair caused by the oppression to which they were subjected. The United Nations should combine warning and condemnation with a more active role, and it should undertake to define the underlying causes of acts of violence and strive to eliminate them. While his delegation was pleased at the progress made in combating terrorism on certain fronts, it was concerned that, after nearly 15 years of discussion of the item, the causes, effects and motivations that were the principal elements of terrorism and acts of violence remained to be addressed.

55. In considering the problem of terrorism, the same word was often used to refer to different concepts, and conflicting criteria were applied to the same thing or the same incident. Accordingly, the call for the convening of an international conference to define terrorism and differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation was worthy of careful consideration. The struggle for national liberation had been legitimized by numerous United Nations resolutions and by the experience of the States of Western and Eastern Europe, which had struggled against Nazi occupation of their territories during the Second World War. The proposed conference should also address the issue of State terrorism, from which many third world countries suffered.

56. In making its modest contribution to the endeavour, his country would prefer that the work of the Committee should proceed on the basis of consensus so that its final outcome would be free of loopholes and intentional or unintentional omissions. Rejection of the proposed conference meant that each party would adhere

(Mr. Al-Absi, United Arab Emirates)

to its own view and its own conviction, while its acceptance implied a readiness, to whatever degree, to enter into discussion and achieve a harmonization of views. It was essential that the consensus on the matter should be maintained and that all should be fully convinced that the international community had made a concerted effort in the noble endeavour to free humanity from terrorism.

57. Mr. GALVEZ (Peru) said that his country viewed the escalation of terrorism throughout the world with growing concern and considered that its effects and underlying causes should be dealt with in a spirit of international co-operation and understanding. His delegation was therefore grateful for General Assembly resolution 40/61 which unequivocally condemned as criminal all acts, methods and practices of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed.

58. Although Peru rejected terrorism, together with the proposition that the end justified the means, it was well aware that terrorism and subversion fed on the poverty and despair of peoples. It also considered that the approach to terrorism at the international level should not jeopardize the legitimate objectives of liberation movements struggling against colonialism, apartheid and foreign occupation.

59. Peru had enacted laws, within its constitutional and democratic framework, to combat terrorism. It had also acceded to a number of multilateral conventions on various aspects of terrorism and was considering shortly becoming a party to other international instruments.

60. Paradoxically, despite the determined and genuine concern with which Governments were tackling international terrorism, some democratic societies, where terrorist and subversive groups had found the climate propitious, were conducting campaigns to promote, and even defend, terrorism, under the cloak of academic, cultural or political events. His delegation therefore reiterated the appeal made by the Peruvian Minister for Foreign Affairs before the General Assembly that all such attitudes be rejected forthwith.

61. His country trusted that the General Assembly would reaffirm the terms of resolution 40/61 while also taking decisive steps to broaden the scope of the international community's rejection of terrorism.

62. Peru favoured the moves to differentiate terrorism from the legitimate struggles of liberation movements. It also considered that the members of the international community should assume their obligations to prevent all activities that encouraged terrorism in their territories.

63. Mr. DROUSHIOTIS (Cyprus) said that Cyprus unequivocally condemned all acts of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed. It had taken due note of Security Council resolution 579 (1985) and of the statement by the President of the Council on 30 December 1985 expressing the hope that General Assembly resolution 40/61 would be followed by a determined effort on the part of all Governments and authorities concerned to put an end to terrorist acts and practices in accordance with established principles of international law.

(Mr. Droushiotis, Cyprus)

64. General Assembly resolution 40/61 formed the bedrock for future work on prevention of terrorism. In that connection, special note should be taken of the work being carried out by ICAO, IMO and the Council of Europe, as also of the regional co-operation among States and of the work of political organizations.

65. Cyprus was a party to four out of the five international conventions listed in the Secretary-General's report and was taking steps to submit the fifth one - the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages - to the House of Representatives for ratification.

66. Terrorism would only be eradicated when the underlying causes had been removed. Every effort to that end should therefore be made and the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, should seek just solutions to the problems before them in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

67. Cyprus favoured international co-operation, with a view to the prevention of terrorist action, based on the principles of the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the non-use of force in international relations. In that connection, a meeting of Ministers of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in October 1979, had emphasized that the legitimate struggle of liberation movements against oppression was not to be equated with terrorism, and had supported the idea of an international conference to differentiate terrorism from the struggle of peoples for liberation. Also, a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Mediterranean members of that Movement, held in June 1987, had expressed its readiness to contribute fully to international action against international terrorism, emphasized the need to eliminate the causes of terrorism, underlined the unacceptability of equating the struggle of liberation movements with terrorism and undertaken to contribute practical ideas for the convening of an international conference on the subject. A definition of terrorism which distinguished it clearly from the struggle of peoples for national liberation would indeed be a major step forward in the attempts to combat terrorism.

68. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that terrorism was undermining confidence in international relations. His delegation was convinced of the need to combat the phenomenon and had both supported all General Assembly resolutions which condemned international terrorism and acceded to the relevant international conventions. Despite individual and collective measures aimed at its prevention or the formulation of legislation against it, the international community had not yet been able to counter the phenomenon effectively. One reason for that failure was that many forms of international terrorism had not yet been addressed. If it was right to express concern over terrorist action against individuals, it was even more important to draw attention to terrorism perpetrated against entire peoples. Also, the illegal action of a State or a régime was likely to be far more harmful than that of an individual. In that connection, the treatment meted out to the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Palestine must be considered as one of the most evil forms of international terrorism.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

69. Despite frequent condemnations of their action by the United Nations, the racist régime in Palestine had proceeded to annex the Golan Heights and Jerusalem, while its counterpart in South Africa practised terrorism on a daily basis against the black majority. Events in Palestine and southern Africa were more horrifying than those which had occurred under the Nazis in Germany. The determination of certain States - including some super-Powers - to seek to undermine the stability and security of smaller States, to spread misinformation, to impose economic sanctions against them and to mine their harbours was itself a dangerous form of international terrorism.

70. A deliberate attempt to confuse terrorism with the right of peoples to struggle for their national liberation resulted in the application of hypocritical standards. Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese fighting against occupation forces were described as terrorists, whereas the régimes which killed the innocent citizens of Palestine and South Africa were spared that description. His delegation, representing a people which had fought against Italian fascism and joined in the condemnation of State terrorism by the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, was frustrated by such hypocrisy.

71. The representative of the Zionist entity, who had himself killed many Palestinians, insulted the international community when he spoke on the subject of terrorism. Were the murder of over one hundred Libyan passengers in a civilian aircraft, the killing of Count Bernadotte and the massacre of thousands of Palestinians in Sabra, Shatila and Deir Yassin not acts of terrorism? Small peoples which faced a veto in the Security Council when protesting against such crimes were at a loss as to what to do.

72. The absence of a clear definition of terrorism had allowed the term to be used as a propaganda weapon against certain States and peoples which were fighting to achieve their freedom and self-determination or simply to maintain the political, social and economic systems which they had chosen in preference to remaining dependent on other States. Even the judgments of such an august body as the International Court of Justice on that subject had not been respected.

73. Those who dared to accuse Israel of crimes were dubbed anti-Semitic. His delegation was not anti-Jewish but did believe, in accordance with a decision by the General Assembly, that zionism was a form of racism. Meanwhile, attempts had been made to link international terrorism with Islam, despite the evidence that Islam was a religion of peace in which the path to godliness lay through wisdom and good deeds. Such attempts to confuse the issue made it essential that international terrorism be properly defined.

74. Sufficient attention had not been paid in the past to the underlying causes of terrorism and acts of violence, with many preferring to concentrate their efforts on pre-emptive measures. However, it had since become clear that it was essential to study those causes in order to identify effective solutions to the problem. It was only by the establishment of specific criteria to cover all forms of international terrorism, whether committed by individuals or States, that the

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

phenomenon could be eradicated. It was difficult to understand why certain countries feared further debate on the issue, unless they deliberately intended to maintain the confusion for their own purposes. His delegation fully supported the call for an international conference and hoped that those States which opposed the proposal would come to realize that the conference was not an end in itself but an endeavour to give impetus to international efforts to eradicate terrorism. Those who, for various political reasons of their own, could not bring themselves to condemn the actions of Zionist, colonialist and racist régimes might come to regret such hesitation in the future.

75. If certain members of the Security Council were to concentrate less on their own short-term interests, that body could play a positive role in eliminating the principal causes of international terrorism. Members of the Sixth Committee might take note of the fact that the Security Council was, simultaneously with their current meeting, discussing the situation in Namibia, an instance of State terrorism which enjoyed the full support of a well-known non-peace-loving State. It was to be hoped that that State and other States would eventually come to recognize the right of all peoples to determine their own future and to adopt the political and social systems which they chose. Small peoples, which constituted an overwhelming majority in the Organization and had suffered much in the past as a result of terrorism, colonialism and racism, wanted to be neutral and free. Was that not their right?

76. Mr. LOULICHKI (Morocco) said that, in keeping the item under discussion on its agenda, the General Assembly was simply reflecting international concern at the continued perpetration of acts of terrorism, which did not spare any region of the world. That concern was all the greater owing to the impact of new technology on acts of terrorism. There was an urgent political need to define more precisely the contemporary forms of terrorism, which were no longer dealt with adequately by the existing international instruments. The problem was extremely complex and was further exacerbated by differences of opinion on the subject and the fact that solutions called not only for time but, above all, for the political will to accept compromises.

77. There had, however, been no lack of efforts to respond both to the emergence and to the resurgence of acts of terrorism, as demonstrated by the adoption of a number of relevant legal instruments, among the most important of which were the five Conventions against the Taking of Hostages and the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions. The most recent effort undertaken under United Nations auspices in the area in question had been the adoption in 1979 of the 11 recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism relating to practical measures of co-operation for the speedy elimination of the problem of international terrorism, an effort that was currently being continued by ICAO and IMO. That step-by-step approach had led to a more precise definition of some aspects of terrorism and had provided partial solutions that had been laid down in conventions whose scope was virtually universal. It had also meant that it had been possible to leave aside fundamental differences of opinion. Both those who were endeavouring to equate national liberation struggles with acts of terrorism and

(Mr. Loulichki, Morocco)

those who were trying to give a semblance of legitimacy to mercenary bands were harming international efforts to eliminate terrorism. There must be no doubt about the right of peoples to self-determination, and a clear distinction must therefore be made between indiscriminate violence and legitimate struggles waged by authentic and recognized liberation movements, in accordance with international law.

78. His delegation wished to reaffirm its unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed. The elimination of terrorism should not be used as a pretext for repression of the activities of national liberation movements. His delegation had therefore supported the adoption of General Assembly resolution 40/61 and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and hoped that at the current session the relevant resolution would be adopted by consensus.

79. Any attempt to solve the problem of international terrorism must take account of the underlying causes of the phenomenon. However, terrorism was also used as an instrument of international intrigue and masked aggression and subversion with a view to thwarting initiatives designed to guarantee the exercise of the right to self-determination. Particular attention should therefore be devoted to the duties of States in that connection, especially the duty of every State to prevent the commission of harmful acts within its territory directed against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

80. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Israel, at the 33rd meeting of the Committee, had again resorted to falsification and distortion of facts and had even denied the right of peoples to self-determination. It was Israel, however, which had introduced terrorism into the Middle East by hijacking a Syrian aircraft in 1954. Israel had shot down a Libyan aircraft in 1973, resulting in 100 deaths, and had destroyed cities in Lebanon. Its Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir was one of the world's leaders of terrorism.

81. The Syrian Arab Republic had called for the convening of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation. His country was one of those most exposed to terrorism; for example, a Syrian diplomat had recently been assassinated in Brussels. Israel and some other countries, however, continued to accuse the Arabs as a whole, and the Syrian Arab Republic in particular, of being terrorists, without any evidence. The incident at the London airport had been blamed on his country but later evidence had shown that the real culprit had been Israel, which had staged the incident with a view to embarrassing and destabilizing the Syrian Arab Republic.

82. Mr. ARMALI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had made a statement that morning which had been perplexing to his delegation.

83. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that observers had the right of reply only after members of the Committee had exercised their right of reply.

84. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that the point of order was not justified. He recalled General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), in which the Palestine Liberation Organization had been invited to participate in the work of the General Assembly as an observer.

85. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that the point of order raised by Israel should be ruled upon without debate. It was not necessary to remind the Committee that the Palestine Liberation Organization was an observer.

86. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that he was not contesting the Chairman's right to rule on a point of order. However, the point of order was unjustified because, as the United Kingdom and other States had agreed, the Palestine Liberation Organization had all the rights of Member States except the right to submit resolutions and to vote. In practice, observers were often given the right to reply before Member States.

87. The CHAIRMAN cited rule 109 of the rules of procedure, which stated that "the Chairman shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak". Since the Palestine Liberation Organization had requested the floor before Israel, it had the right to reply first.

88. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel) requested an opinion from the Legal Counsel as to whether observer groups took precedence over Member States on a list of speakers for rights of reply. It had never been the practice, when a Member State insisted, to deny its request. The Chairman's ruling created a new precedent.

89. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Sixth Committee itself was a legal body, and said that the Palestine Liberation Organization might continue with its statement.

90. Mr. ARMALI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that he wondered whether the representative of the Zionist entity had been sincere in his statement that morning, or whether he had merely repeated the same speech with which all members of the Committee were familiar. He had gone against all rules of international law in expressing aversion to the inalienable right of people struggling for national liberation. At a seminar organized at the instigation of the Israeli representative himself to teach the West how to win the war against terrorism, the representative had denounced those who had said that terrorism was born of frustration, and he had defined terrorism as the deliberate use of murder or threat of murder against persons to instil fear for political purposes. By using the word "deliberate", he had differentiated terrorism from "accidents of war", such as when the Israeli army had shot unarmed students or raided Palestinian refugee camps. In those cases, in Israel's view, the attacks had not been acts of terrorism because Israel had not intended to kill.

(Mr. Armali, Observer, PLO)

91. Israel was promoting State terrorism as a means to perpetuate its occupation of Palestinian lands, while it accused Arabs of terrorism in order to justify its continued persecution of them. Israel's statement not only had indicated its future intentions but also had been a declaration of war against the rules of international law. The members of the Committee should decide whether such dangerous ideas should be allowed to be developed with impunity.

92. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel) said that the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism had been established originally in response to the murder of Israeli athletes by the Palestine Liberation Organization. Rather than doing something about terrorism, the Ad Hoc Committee had sought to legitimize it by focusing on its underlying causes. Since 1972, the Ad Hoc Committee and the General Assembly had served as a springboard for terrorism. The Palestine Liberation Organization was the paramount terrorist group of the present time, and it would not have been able to carry out its terrorist acts had it not had the support of certain Member States. The patron Governments which had moulded the debate on terrorism had lost ground when it had been found out that they were engaging in acts of terrorism themselves. Their attempts to justify their actions by discussing underlying causes had done grievous damage to the United Nations.

93. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic, the so-called champions of the cause of anti-terrorism, were really the godfathers of terrorism. It was well known that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had paid cash bonuses to the terrorists at Munich. While the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya accused Israel of racism and fascism, it was occupying a good part of Chad and had called the people of Chad "monkeys and slaves". Libya had also fought on the side of the Nazis during the Second World War.

94. The actions of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya were matched by those of the Syrian Arab Republic. In the valise bomb incident in London, Syrian diplomats had congratulated Nizar Hindawi before they knew that the bomb had been found. The Government official who had co-ordinated the action had had his post upgraded and was currently co-ordinating all the terrorist groups in the Middle East. Moreover, as reported in The New York Times of 28 October 1987, an Amnesty International report had described in detail the torture of political prisoners by Syrian security forces.

95. The two godfathers of international terrorism had attempted to hijack the Ad Hoc Committee and twist the definition of terrorism to suit those kinds of practices. He wondered whether that meant that the United Nations was sinking into absurdity.

96. Mr. MIRZAIE-YENGEJEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the Sixth Committee was not the proper place to open a debate on political issues. However, since Iraq and the Zionist entity had made accusations against his country, he wished to point out that Iraq had invaded the Islamic Republic of Iran in order to overthrow its revolutionary Government. Iraq continued to commit crimes against the peace and security of mankind, including using chemical weapons, bombing civilian areas and

(Mr. Mirzaie-Yengejeh, Islamic Republic of Iran)

attacking civil aviation. It had also sponsored individual terrorist activities, such as the recent killings in Pakistan of three members of the Al-Da'wah party by an Iraqi agent.

97. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity, himself a terrorist, had poisoned the atmosphere of the meeting with his misleading statements. Such an attitude was not unexpected, since it conformed with the Zionist régime's policy of blurring the true nature of terrorism. The reasons for the Zionist representative's anger at the Arab delegations' call for an international conference on terrorism were obvious. His régime did not want the international community to adopt a clear definition of the phenomenon because it wished to continue to categorize activities in accordance with its own whim. Thus, any terrorist action against innocent Palestinians was described as self-defence while any Palestinian act of heroism was described as terrorism. However, try as devils might to pass themselves off as angels, credence could not be given to the words of racists.

98. The Washington Times of 10 November 1986 had quoted the French Prime Minister as saying that the Israeli intelligence service was responsible for acts of terrorism in Europe. The Zionist representative had, whether deliberately or not, ignored the actions of his régime against innocent Palestinians, the judgements of British courts against leading Zionist terrorists and the entire history of Zionist terrorism in occupied Palestine. The crimes of the Nazis paled before such a catalogue of slaughter. The killing of innocent individuals ranged from the massacres at Deir Yassin to those in the Sabra and Shatila camps, and the records of the United Nations were filled with crimes committed by that racist régime.

99. With regard to the murder of diplomats, his delegation associated itself with the remarks on the killing of Count Bernadotte made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. The Zionists also played a leading role in the hijacking of aircraft and threats to the safety of civil aviation. They had destroyed Lebanon's fleet of civilian aircraft - an action which had been condemned by the Security Council in resolution 262 (1968), shot down a Libyan aircraft and killed its innocent passengers and, in the course of the past year, hijacked a Libyan civilian aircraft over the Mediterranean Sea. Resenting the achievement of progress by any Arab country, they had bombed Iraq's nuclear reactor and launched a savage attack on Tunisia. A régime which proved willing to commit all forms of terrorism in such a manner would never accept a ruling by the international community on a definition of the term and so was not worthy to participate in the affairs of the international community.

100. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he took it as a personal compliment to be lectured by such paragons of virtue as the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic. If the terrorist incidents in Europe mentioned by the Libyan representative were indeed all the responsibility of the Mossad, then Qaddafi's

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

money and other support for terrorists had been in vain. Iraq, which criticized Israel, was responsible for having aided Abu al-Abbas after the Achille Lauro outrage. In 1986, he had questioned the head of the Iranian mission about the fate of the hijackers of the civilian airliner who had been taken to the Islamic Republic of Iran, and why there had been no evidence of the swift and mighty hand of Iranian justice. Although a reply had been promised, there had not yet been any word of a trial or punishment. Consequently, he wished to convey his question once again to Ambassador Rajaie-Khorassani. In the Syrian Arab Republic, Abu Nidal, another so-called freedom fighter, was working on a time-sharing basis for that country and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, bases from which he was being sent on such missions as the Rome and Vienna massacres.

101. Such people were henchmen who worked for terrorist régimes, which by supplying weapons, money, and safe havens, had made international terrorism possible. Without their support, the whole scaffolding of international terrorism would collapse, and the recent dramatic decrease in terrorist acts was a direct result of sanctions applied against those régimes. Some countries were attempting to stop the application of those sanctions. Therefore, the issue facing the Sixth Committee was whether that body was capable of doing the right thing, i.e. retaining the sanctions, the most important being the moral and political condemnation of terrorism.

102. Mr. AL-ADHAMI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, quoted from a statement made by Ariel Sharon after the massacres at Sabra and Shatila, which proved that terrorism was practised by the Zionist entity. As for the Islamic Republic of Iran, the crux of its policy was to use the Iranian revolution as a cover for the annexation of parts of the Arab homeland, beginning with Iraq. Even before his rise to power, Khomeini had stated in 1978 that he considered the overthrow of the Iraqi régime to be among his priorities (Time Magazine, 26 July 1982). Tracing the history of the expansionist policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, he referred to that country's disregard for the 1975 Treaty between Iraq and Iran, followed by the restoration of the Barzani clique in the latter country, along with other acts, all of which were designed to achieve one aim: threatening the sovereignty and security of Iraq and imposing Iranian hegemony on that country. In 1979 and 1980, the Islamic Republic of Iran had waged a media and political campaign aimed at overthrowing the political and social structure in Iraq. During that same period, it had stepped up its aggression, using armed force against Iraq, finally forcing that country to defend itself on 22 September 1980.

103. The Iranian régime had a very peculiar concept of aggression, at variance with that agreed to by the rest of the international community. According to that régime, aggression meant any attempts to restrict that country from intervening in Iraq's internal affairs, from violating the norms of international law, and from imposing its hegemony on the countries of the region. Furthermore, in referring to the civilian population, the Iranian representative had forgotten the recent killing of scores of children in Baghdad by an Iranian missile, the abuse of Iraqi prisoners of war in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the forced conversion of prisoners to Islam.

104. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Zionist entity had tried to distract the Sixth Committee and get it to talk about irrelevant issues. The dimensions of the so-called Hindawi Operation, had become clear: its objective had been to undermine his country's reputation and to force that country to change its policy against zionism and racism. Such plans had naturally been aborted. Israel's history was tarnished with the blood of victims of terror, and the Arab inhabitants under Israeli occupation suffered daily from all kinds of terror and oppression. In case the representative of Israel had forgotten his country's history, he could refer to document A/42/564 for examples of Israeli terrorism.

105. Mr. MIRZAIE-YENGEJEH (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he did not want to reply to Iraq since the Committee was not the proper place to deal with the war imposed upon his country. His delegation would reply in the right place to the remarks of Iraq. With respect with the remarks made by the representative of the Zionist régime, he wished to point out that the Sixth Committee was currently discussing the proposal by the Syrian Arab Republic for the convening of an international conference to define terrorism. That proposal was logical and based on a process of negotiation. Consequently, it was not surprising that the representative of the Zionist entity, whose very foundation was terror, opposed it by repeating baseless accusations.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.