

the matter, it had been found that no member of the Council had any objection to the Commission's request, and that the Chairman of the Commission had been informed that the Council agreed to an extension of two weeks until the middle of November 1982.

On 17 November 1982, the Commission submitted its supplementary report to the Council,⁴⁶ pursuant to paragraph I2 of resolution 507 (1982).

In a letter dated 24 June 1983⁴⁷ addressed to the President of the Council, the Permanent Representative of Seychelles to the United Nations requested that the Council: (a) terminate the work of the Commission; (b) keep the Special Fund operational; and (c) in keeping with past practice, maintain the item of Seychelles on the Council's agenda.

In a note dated 8 July 1983,⁴⁸ the President of the Council stated that the members of the Council had taken note of the letter and had agreed, in consultations held on that day, that the Commission had fulfilled its mandate.

NOTES

¹ S/14783, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

*For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

³ S/14769 and Corr.1, letter dated 26 November 1981 from the representative of Seychelles, and S/14777, letter dated 1 December 1981 from the same, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

⁴ S/14793, adopted without change as resolution 496 (1981).

⁵ 2314th mtg., paras. 8-18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 20-32.

⁷ For the vote, see 2314th mtg., para. 33.

⁸ 2314th mtg., paras. 46-54.

⁹ *Ibid.*, statements by China, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Spain, Tunisia and the United Kingdom.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 81-85.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 119-126.

¹² S/14816, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

¹³ S/14850, *ibid.*, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982.

¹⁴ S/14905/Rev.1, *ibid.*, Special Supplement No. 2.

¹⁵ 2359th mtg., paras. 10-39.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 42-52.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 55-64.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 67-74.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 78-94.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 96-101.

²¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 194-207.

²² 2361st mtg., paras. 4-14.

²³ *Ibid.*, paras. 17-27.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 50-57.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 62-83.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 101-110.

²⁷ 2365th mtg., paras. 27-40.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 42-56.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 59-71.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 91-101.

³¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 104-113.

³² *Ibid.*, paras. 190-206.

³³ General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV).

³⁴ 2367th mtg., paras. 14-29.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 120-133.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 136-141.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 165-170.

³⁸ S/15127, adopted without change as resolution 507 (1982).

³⁹ 2370th mtg., paras. 16-25.

⁴⁰ For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 26.

⁴¹ 2370th mtg., paras. 28-36.

Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

⁴² *Ibid.*, paras. 38-45.

⁴³ St 15138, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.

⁴⁴ St 15359, *ibid.*, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982.

⁴⁵ S/15473, *ibid.*, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982.

⁴⁶ S/15492 and Corr. 1 and 2, replaced by S/15492/Rev.1, *ibid.*, Special Supplement No. 3.

⁴⁷ S/15845, *ibid.*, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983.

⁴⁸ S/15860, *ibid.*, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983.

9. LETTER DATED 19 MARCH 1982 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

Decision of 2 April 1982 (2347th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution submitted by Guyana and Panama

In a letter dated 19 March 1982,¹ the representative of Nicaragua transmitted the text of a note dated 18 March from the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, who requested an urgent meeting of the Council in view of what he described as the worsening of tension in Central America and the increasing danger of a large-scale military intervention by the armed forces of the United States.

In a letter dated 25 March 1982,² the representative of El Salvador, referring to the letter of 19 March from the representative of Nicaragua, cited Chapter VIII of the Charter, recalled existing international instruments with respect to inter-American matters and maintained that the problems of international relations and disputes in the Latin American region in general and Central America in particular should be solved through recourse in the first instance to appropriate procedures within the inter-American system.³

At the 2335th meeting, on 25 March 1982, the Council included the letter dated 19 March 1982 from the representative of Nicaragua in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion on the item: at the same meeting, the representatives of Angola, Argentina, Cuba, Honduras, Mexico and Nicaragua; at the 2337th meeting, the representative of Viet Nam; at the 2339th meeting, the representatives of Grenada, India, Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Nigeria, Seychelles and Yugoslavia; at the 2341st meeting, the representatives of Benin, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia; at the 2342nd meeting, the representatives of Chile, Colombia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe; at the 2343rd meeting, the representatives of Algeria, the Congo and Costa Rica; and, at the 2347th meeting, the representative of Iraq.⁴ The Council considered the item at its 2335th to 2337th, 2339th, 2341st to 2343rd and 2347th meetings, from 25 March to 2 April 1982.

At the 2335th meeting, the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua presented an extensive and detailed account of Nicaragua's troubled relationship with the

United States and warned that the recent escalation in the United States endeavour to undermine and overthrow the Sandinista Government constituted a growing threat for peace and security in Central America. He summed up his **presentation** by pointing out that (a) neither Nicaragua nor any other Central American or Caribbean country could be considered as a **geopolitical or strategic** preserve of the United States; (b) Nicaragua could not represent a threat to the security of the United States; (c) Nicaragua stood ready to improve relations with the United States on the basis of mutual **respect** and unconditional recognition of the Nicaraguan right to self-determination; (d) Nicaragua was willing to begin immediately direct talks with the Government of the United States with the **objective** of reaching concrete results; (P) the Farabundo **Martí** Front for National Liberation (FMLN) and the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDK) of El Salvador had authorized him to transmit their willingness to **begin** immediate negotiations without pre-conditions; (f) the **Government of Cuba** had authorized him to communicate to the Council its willingness also to **begin** negotiations immediately; (g) the Governments of Nicaragua and Cuba as well as the Salvadoran FMLN-FDK backed the Mexican initiative for negotiations proposed on 21 February at Managua; (h) Nicaragua was willing to **sign** immediately non-aggression pacts with all neighbouring countries; and (i) Nicaragua had to reject the attempt by the United States to impose humiliating restrictions on its prerogatives regarding national **defence**.

He also conveyed his Government's demand that the United States Government put a **halt** to its **destabilization** plans and the organization and **financing** of paramilitary forces advised and trained by United States military **personnel**; put a stop to the use of Honduran territory as a base for armed aggression against Nicaragua; put a stop to the **traffic** in arms and counterrevolutionaries between the territory of the United States and Honduras; **put a stop** to the existence of **counterrevolutionary military** training camps on United States territory; put a stop to the participation of the United States intelligence community in the financing, training and organizing of forces and clandestine plans against Nicaragua; **put a stop** to the presence of **United States warships** in the **waters** of Central America and off the coasts of Nicaragua; and put a stop to overflights by spy-planes violating the airspace of Nicaragua.

In conclusion, he requested that the United States **Government officially** and explicitly voice its commitment not to attack Nicaragua and not to initiate or promote any direct, indirect or covert intervention in Central America and called upon the Council to pronounce itself regarding the obligation to seek by peaceful means a solution to the problems of Central America and the Caribbean, to refrain from **acts** of force or threats and to repudiate any intervention in Central America.!

The President, speaking in her capacity as representative of the United States, rejected the charges by the Nicaraguan spokesman and accused the **Government of Nicaragua** of oppressive policies against its own population and of aggressive moves against its neighbours, in particular **El Salvador**. She pointed out that her Government had not attempted to prevent the Sandinista rise to power and its consolidation of power and that the United States had initially provided extensive economic assistance to

the new regime. She **acknowledged that** the United States had started to undertake flights **over Nicaraguan** territory after it had become aware of the **actions** and intentions of the Sandinistas towards their **own** citizens and neighbours. She accused the Nicaraguan authorities of abusing the Council's meeting to **air** baseless charges against the United States and asked why Nicaragua had not responded to repeated American initiatives for the reduction of tensions.

She stated categorically that her Government was not about to invade any country and instead sought peace in Central America. She reiterated **five points** that could serve **as** the basis for a substantial improvement of American-Nicaraguan relations, including a commitment **through** reassertion of the **Rio Treaty** engagements to non-intervention and non-aggression; a United States commitment concerning the **activities** of Nicaraguan **exiles and the enforcement of the Neutrality Act**; a **regional undertaking** not to import heavy offensive **weapons** and to reduce the number of foreign military and security **advisers** to a reasonably **low level**; a **proposal to the United States Congress** for renewed United States aid to Nicaragua; and actions by the **Nicaraguans** to terminate their military involvement in El Salvador.

In **concluding her** statement, she noted that the Government of Nicaragua, in submitting its appeal to the Council, had ignored procedures well established in the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS).⁶ She referred in that connection to Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations **and to article 23** of the OAS charter and argued that regional disputes should be submitted **to regional** bodies for **discussion** and settlement before referring them to the Council. She recalled the various occasions when OAS had been seized of the matter and underlined her Government's viewpoint that OAS **was the appropriate** and primary forum for the consideration of the **matters addressed by Nicaragua**.⁷

At the 2336th meeting, on 25 March 1982, the representative of Cuba, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries at the United Nations, referred to the Political Declaration of the Heads of **State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries** at its Sixth Conference, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979,⁸ in which it had recalled the long **struggle** of the peoples of Latin America for their independence and sovereignty and urged all States to respect **fully** the principles of **self-determination, non-intervention and territorial integrity**. He further expressed the satisfaction of the Movement at the victory of the Nicaraguan **people over** the Somoza dictatorship and transmitted its appeal to all States to **adhere scrupulously** to the **principles** of non-use of force or of threat **offorce** and non-interference in the internal **affairs** of the **States** of the region. He underlined the seriousness of the **situation** in Central America and called upon the **Council to state** its opposition to threats and hostile acts directed **against Nicaragua** and the other peoples of the region.⁹

The representative of Honduras suggested that matters such as the Nicaraguan request should, for procedural reasons and in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter, have been brought before OAS. He **recalled** the numerous complaints and protests submitted by his Government to the Nicaraguan side, **to OAS** and to the United Nations, but **reiterated his**

Government's wish for a peaceful solution of the regional problems and for the internationalization of peace. He quoted from the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras on 23 March before the Permanent Council of OAS,¹⁰ in which proposals had been made for basic steps towards general disarmament in the region, for a reduction of foreign military and other advisers, for a scheme of international supervision and monitoring to verify the compliance with obligations entered into by the Central American Governments, for procedures to halt the arms traffic in the region, for absolute respect for the borders in the region and for a framework for a permanent multilateral dialogue leading to a solution of the international issues and to a strengthening of democracy and pluralism within the various States. He issued anew an invitation to the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua for a wide-ranging exchange of views with his own Government and other parties in Central America."

At the same meeting, the representative of Angola expressed deep regret that after the victory of the Nicaraguan people over the repressive Somoza régime the liberated country had become the target of the wrath and intimidation of the United States, the imperialist Power of the region whose claim that its security was threatened by that small Central American country was plainly ludicrous. He emphasized that Nicaragua, as a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, merely wished to pursue its own economic, social and political development and favoured a negotiated solution to settle any differences with other States in the region and with the United States. It also agreed with the proposal to declare the area a zone of peace. He called upon the Council to prevent a wider conflagration in Central America and to pay close heed to the Nicaraguan position stated at the meeting in the morning.¹²

In response to Nicaraguan accusations, the representative of Argentina stated that his Government's relations with El Salvador and Honduras accorded with the normal rules of international relations, in particular the principle of non-intervention in the Internal and external affairs of other States. Charges that it was directly or indirectly interfering in the affairs of Nicaragua were completely unfounded."

At the 2337th meeting, on 26 March 1982, the representative of Cuba, speaking in that capacity, rejected charges that the political and social upheaval in various Central American countries had been instigated and controlled by the Governments of Cuba and Nicaragua and quoted a United States viewpoint, according to which the United States had disregarded the origin of Central American insurgency, arising from decades of economic inequality and political oppression. He asked that the United States Government abandon its ambivalent policy of on the one hand proclaiming the wish to negotiate with Cuba and Nicaragua, while on the other refusing to rule out the use of force against them.

He categorically denied that Cuba had supplied weapons to the Salvadoran revolutionaries and fully supported the Nicaraguan request that the Council take up the growing threat of an American intervention in Central America. He rejected the attempt to interpret Article 52 of the Charter as limiting the sovereign right of Member States and underlined the supreme authority of the Council in the maintenance of international peace and security. He called upon the Council to reiterate the basic principles governing

the Organization and to emphasize negotiation as the only tool in the settlement of the Central American differences.¹⁴

The representative of Mexico emphasized his country's vital concern with the developments in the neighbouring countries in Central America and pointed to the timely and urgent search for negotiated alternatives to the worsening crisis. He testified to the nature of the struggle for change, which was geared towards the elimination of centuries-old poverty and exploitation, and mentioned the Mexican wish to help prevent a new American intervention in the area and to contribute to a solution that would safeguard the rights of all parties. He referred, in particular to proposals of 21 February 1982 in which the President of Mexico had set out steps that would favour a relaxation of tensions, stability and development in Central America and the Caribbean. He added that the solution could not be built upon the attempt to exclude Cuba and viewed El Salvador as the most searing regional problem.

Mexico had further suggested that the United States should rule out any threat or use of force against Nicaragua and that a system of mutual non-aggression pacts should be created between Nicaragua and the United States on the one hand and between Nicaragua and its neighbours on the other. The call for high-level talks had resulted in the agreement for a meeting of Mexican and United States officials at Mexico City in April. The path of confrontation and the path of negotiation were incompatible, and his Government hoped and expected that the two parties would opt for the chance to come to an understanding. He invoked the principles of the Charter giving the Council jurisdiction in the matter and, in referring to Article 52 of the Charter, suggested that every State had the right to choose for itself whether to appeal to the supreme authority of the Council or to use the mechanisms of a regional organization. He urged the Council to promote a climate of dialogue that would encourage a negotiated solution to the Central American conflict.¹⁵

At the 2339th meeting, on 29 March 1982, the representative of Panama endorsed the view that the struggle of the peoples of Central America to overcome exploitation and to win social justice was the characteristic feature of the process of change in that region. He expressed strong support for the Mexican peace initiatives and recommended that the proposals of Honduras and Nicaragua also be considered in the pursuit of a negotiated solution. It was essential to negotiate a system of non-aggression and non-interference with all Central American countries participating without exception. A corollary accord should envisage the transfer of resources devoted to the arms buildup towards economic and social development needs in all the countries. The solution should also entail the existence of a democratic pluralistic multi-party system with periodic popular elections. Panama would be ready to serve as the venue of a conference devoted to a framework of peace, security and co-operation for Central America.¹⁶

The representative of France recalled a number of steps that his Government had taken in conjunction with Mexico and other Latin American countries regarding various aspects of Central America and endorsed negotiation and the reduction of military forces, together with economic assistance and struc-

tural reforms to benefit a more cooperative atmosphere in the area. He proposed that the **Secretary-General** follow the developments, investigate the charges by Nicaragua and the United States and report back to the Council within two or three weeks.¹⁷

The representative of the Soviet Union expressed full support for Nicaragua's request to bring the tense situation in Central America to the Council's attention. He also underlined the fact that the **Co-ordinator** of the Nicaraguan junta had unambiguously stated his readiness to seek a political settlement to the dangerous situation in the area. He observed that the representative of the United States had devoted himself extensively to thoughts about purely internal affairs of Nicaragua and expressed hope that the United States would eventually turn to peaceful means to remove discord. The Soviet delegation supported the specific proposals submitted by Nicaragua and the initiatives put forward by the President of **Mexico**.¹⁸

The representative of Togo joined in the request that the Council urge the parties to search for a negotiated solution in Central America. He observed that Article 33 in conjunction with Article 52 of the Charter envisaged that regional organizations would endeavour to **initiate** the peaceful settlement of a dispute or situation before the Council got involved; but he acknowledged that Articles 34 and 35 provided for direct access to, and an immediate role of, the Council regardless of the activation of the regional mechanism. He expressed hope that the Council would act in accordance with its **responsibilities**.¹⁹

At the 2341st meeting, on 30 March 1982, the representative of the United Kingdom asked whether the airing of the issues involving many extravagant charges would really help to promote peaceful solutions and suggested instead that the parties concerned engage in negotiations on a bilateral or regional basis, or in co-operation with other States in the region. He added that the Nicaraguan leadership should take note of the assurances given by the United States that it had no intention of invading Nicaragua and he emphasized that all the countries in the region should abide by the principle of **non-interference**.²⁰

At the same meeting, the representative of El Salvador stressed that the problem of **El Salvador** was a matter of its exclusive purview and within its internal jurisdiction, that the international relations in the inter-American sphere should be solved through the organs created by the regional system, that the Salvadoran Government maintained **co-operative** relations, based on international norms and instruments, with countries that found that consistent with their interests, that El Salvador did not constitute a threat for anybody, that it had been the victim of acts of intervention but had not submitted any formal complaints to competent international bodies, and that El Salvador would be compelled to activate the machinery of the inter-American regional system if those interventionist and aggressive acts continued.²¹

At the 2343rd meeting, on 31 March 1982, the representative of Chile invoked Articles 33, 52 and **51**, affirmed that in case of a dispute between American countries a solution should be sought through the available means of the regional organization before the issue was brought to the attention of

the Council, and reviewed instances of successful handling of such situations within **OAS**.²²

At the 2347th meeting, on 2 April 1982, the President drew the attention of the Council to the text of a draft **resolution**²³ submitted by Panama and Guyana.

Under the draft resolution, in its preambular part, the Council would, *inter alia*, have expressed grave concern at the deterioration of the situation in Central America and the Caribbean, taken into account Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter and other relevant provisions of the Charter concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes, considered that the ongoing crisis in the region of Central America and the Caribbean affected international peace and **security** and that all Member States had an interest in the solution of the crisis by peaceful means, and recalled General Assembly resolutions 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965 on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty, and 2160 (XXI) of 30 November 1966 on strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, and the right of peoples to self-determination.

In the operative part of the draft, the Council would have (a) reminded all Member States of their obligation to respect the principles of the Charter, and in particular those relating to the following: (i) non-intervention and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States; (ii) self-determination of peoples; (iii) non-use of force or threat of force; (iv) the territorial integrity and political independence of States; (v) **pacific** settlement of disputes; (b) reminded all Member States that resolution 2131 (XX) condemned the use or threat of force in relations between States as acts contrary to the purposes and **principles** of the Charter; (c) appealed to all Member States to refrain from the direct, indirect, overt or covert use of force against any country of Central America and the Caribbean; (d) appealed to all parties concerned to have recourse to dialogue and negotiation, as contemplated in the Charter, and called upon all Member States to lend their support to the search for a peaceful solution to the problems of Central America and the Caribbean; and (e) requested the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed concerning the development of the **situation** in Central America and the Caribbean.

At the same meeting, the representative of the United States reaffirmed her Government's commitment not to invade Nicaragua, not to intervene in the internal affairs of other States, and to respect the peaceful settlement of disputes and the principles relating to the use and non-use of force. She further pointed out that although Nicaragua had exercised its right to appeal directly to the Council, Article 52 together with Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter constituted an obligation to seek the resolution of regional disputes first of all in the relevant regional organization, an obligation that Nicaragua had deliberately ignored.*²⁴

The representative of Costa Rica, in a detailed analysis of Articles 52, 54 and 103 of the Charter, as seen in relation to the provisions of the OAS charter, arrived at the conclusion that while the Charter of the United Nations clearly envisaged the primacy of the regional approach in inter-American **disputes**, the legal principles of the OAS charter made it **mandato-**

ry to seek recourse at the regional level before appeal to the Council.*⁷

The representative of Guyana emphasized the conciliatory character of the draft resolution which it had co-sponsored with Panama, summarized the basic elements of the text and expressed hope that the Council, by consensus, would endorse the attempt to bring the parties to the negotiating table.²⁶

Following the suspension of the meeting for consultations,* the President put the draft resolution to the vote. It received 12 votes in favour and 1 against, with 2 abstentions, and failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.**

After the vote, the representative of the United States indicated that his delegation had not been in a position to vote for the draft, since it had failed to be supportive of the Council as well as of the regional structure of OAS and had disregarded certain key elements of the Central American problem, namely, the intervention of the Sandinista junta in the affairs of its neighbours.²⁹

The representative of the United Kingdom explained his abstention by noting that the draft referred to two General Assembly resolutions that his Government had not supported when they were adopted and about which it maintained its reservations.³⁰

The President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Zaire, invoked Articles 52 and 33 of the Charter and regretted that the Council seemed not merely to disregard but even to reject the approach to regional agencies for the Central American situation.⁸

The representative of Nicaragua charged that the United States had vetoed fundamental principles of the Charter.³²

NOTES

¹ S/1491 3, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. fir Jan.-March 1982*.

² S/14927, *ibid.*

³ In a letter dated 30 March 1982 (S/14936, *ibid.*), the representative of Nicaragua challenged the position taken by Honduras and conveyed his Government's views on the competence and jurisdiction of the Council under the Charter of the United Nations *vis-à-vis* matters within the Organization of American States (OAS).

⁴ For details, see chap. III in the present *Supplement*.

⁵ 2335th mtg., paras. 7-88.

⁶ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119.

⁷ 2335th mtg., paras. 91-147.

⁸ A/34/542, annex.

⁹ 2336th mtg., paras. 3-14.

¹⁰ S/14914, annex.

¹¹ 2336th mtg., paras. 16-21.

¹² *Ibid.*, paras. 25-40. For similar statements, see 2337th mtg.: Viet Nam, paras. 83-93; 2339th mtg.: Lao People's Democratic Republic, paras. 84-96; Mozambique, paras. 98-116, and Poland, paras. 71-82; 2342nd mtg.: the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, paras. 86-99; and 2347th mtg.: the German Democratic Republic, paras. 83-93.

¹³ 2336th mtg., paras. 42-49.

¹⁴ 2337th mtg., paras. 6-34.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 37-62. For similar statements, see *ibid.*: Guyana, paras. 65-80; 2339th mtg.: China, paras. 130-135; 2341st mtg.: Spain, paras. 6-13; 2342nd mtg.: Ireland, paras. 23-52, and Zimbabwe, paras. 73-81; and 2343rd mtg.: Madagascar, paras. 83-101.

¹⁶ 2339th mtg., paras. 6-30.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 38-44.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 45-56.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 59-68.

²⁰ 2341st mtg., paras. 17-22.

²¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 91-104.

²² 2343rd mtg., paras. 38-70.

²³ S/14941, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1982*. The draft resolution was subsequently put to the vote and failed of adoption, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

²⁴ 2347th mtg., paras. 5-48.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 51-78.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 133-138.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 139.

²⁸ For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 140. See also chap. IV in the present *Supplement*.

²⁹ 2347th mtg., paras. 142-148.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 149-152.

³¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 154-158.

³² *Ibid.*, paras. 160-163.

10. LETTER DATED 1 APRIL 1982 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Decision of 3 April 1982 (2350th meeting): resolution 502 (1982)

By letter dated 1 April 1982 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the United Kingdom requested an immediate meeting of the Council as his Government had good reason to believe that the armed forces of the Argentine Republic were about to attempt to invade the Falkland Islands.

At the 2345th meeting, on 1 April 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: at the same meeting, the representative of Argentina; at the 2349th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Canada and New Zealand; and at the 2350th meeting, the representatives of Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay and Peru.² The Council considered the item at its 2345th, 2346th, 2349th and 2350th meetings, from 1 to 3 April 1982.

Opening the discussion, the representative of the United Kingdom declared that there had been differences for many years between his Government and the Government of the Republic of Argentina concerning the Falkland Islands. The United Kingdom had exercised sovereignty over the Falkland Islands since early in the nineteenth century and continued to do so today.

For several years, the question of the Falkland Islands had been discussed by the General Assembly. In accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly, the British Government and the Government of Argentina had held a series of meetings to discuss the situation in the Falkland Islands. Representatives of the two Governments had confirmed in New York at the end of February their wish to continue their discussions within the negotiating framework. But the Argentine Government appeared to have decided, following those discussions, that it did not wish to continue on that course.