THIS OBSERVATION, MR CHAIRMAN, LEADS ME TO MAKE SOME BRIEF OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROPOSAL THAT HAS BEEN MADE TO CONVENE A CONFERENCE TO DEFINE TERRORISM AND TO DISTINGUISH IT FROM THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS. MR CHAIRMAN, ANYONE WHO LOOKS AT THE HISTORY OF THE CONSIDERATION OF TERRORISM BY THE UNITED NATIONS, ANYONE WHO HAS PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THOSES DISCUSSIONS KNOWS THAT THOSE QUESTIONS HAVE CONSISTENTLY PROVEN INTRACTABLE. WE ARE QUITE CONVINCED, REGRETTABLY,AS WE WERE TWO YEARS AGO, THAT IRRESPECTIVE OF THE GOOD INTENTIONS OF THOSE WHO HAVE MADE THOSE PROPOSALS, SUCH CONFERENCE COULD NOT SERVE A USEFUL PURPOSE AND COULD BE DAMAGING BY CREATING NEW, UNNECESSARY DIVISIONS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT A NEW ATTEMPT TO DEFINE TERRORISM TODAY CAN BE ANY MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN ATTEMPTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE TO DO SO IN THE PAST. WE HAVE HAD MORE EVIDENCE OF THIS IN SOME OF THE STATEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE SO FAR. THE HISTORY OF THE ISSUE IS SIMPLY TOO CHARGED. ALSO, WE MUST REITERATE THAT, WHETHER A PARTICULAR ACT IS OR IS NOT AN ACT OF TERRORISM DOES NOT DEPEND ON WHO COMMITS IT. IT IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND TODAY, MR CHAIRMAN, WHY THERE IS A NEED TO DISTINGUISH THE STRUGGLE OF LIBERATION MOVEMENTS FROM TERRORISM, WHEN MAJOR LIBERATION MOVEMENTS HAVE TAKEN THE LEAD IN RENOUNCING TERRORISM AS PART OF THEIR ACTION. THIS PROPOSAL CULTIVATES AN AMBIGUITY WHICH IS UNNECESSARY AND, IN OUR VIEW, BENEFITS NO ONE.