

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya indicated that as President of the Council the representative of the United States should have summoned the **Chadian** representative, as well as the Libyan representative. However, she had not done so, in disregard of the most rudimentary rules of **objectivity**. He asked to put on record that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would not recognize what had been stated by the United States representative beyond the text of the statement.*

NOTES

¹ S/I 5643, OR. 38th yr., *Suppl.* for Jun.-March 1983.

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

² 2419th mtg.

³ 2428th mtg.

⁴ 2429th mtg.

⁵ S/I 5672, OR. 38th yr., *Suppl.* for Jan.-March 1983.

⁶ S/I 5688, *ibid.*, *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983*.

⁷ 2430th mtg.

17. **LETTER DATED 22 MARCH 1983 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL'**

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By **letter**² dated 22 March 1983, the representative of Nicaragua requested an urgent meeting of the Council in view of the grave increase in acts of aggression against Nicaragua.

At the 2420th meeting on 23 March 1983 the Council included the letter on its agenda. At the same **meeting following** the adoption of the agenda, the **Council** invited **the following**, at their request, to participate in the discussion of the question, without the right to vote: the representatives of Honduras, Mexico and Panama; and, at the 2421st meeting, the representatives of Barbados, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Grenada, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Spain; at the 2422nd meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Mauritius, the Philippines, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Viet Nam; at the 2423rd meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Peru and Yugoslavia; at the 2424th **meeting**, the representatives of Bulgaria, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, Mongolia and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2425th meeting, the representatives of Cyprus, Czechoslovakia and Hungary; at the 2426th meeting, the representative of Ghana; and at the 2427th **meeting**, the representatives of Guatemala and Uruguay.³ The Council considered the item at its 2420th to 2427th meetings, from 23 to 29 March 1983.

At the 2420th meeting, the representative of Nicaragua said that his country was facing a new **escalation** of United States aggressive acts by way of massive infiltration of **military** units of Somoza counter-revolutionaries from Honduras. The **Somozist** groups existed only because of the financial assistance and direction by the United States. According to Nicaraguan intelligence sources, **thou-**

sands of additional counter-revolutionaries planned to infiltrate the country from Honduras in the next few days. Nicaragua appealed to the United States to cease its attempts to destroy the Sandinist People's Revolution, and to end the "secret" but widely recognized war against Nicaragua. The United States should renew all peace initiatives, such as those made by Mexico and Venezuela on the **Honduras-Nicaragua** border problem., and the proposal by Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama on negotiated solutions to the main elements of the Central American crisis. The Council members and the **international community** should strive to develop a policy towards the Central American region conducive to peaceful negotiated **solutions**.⁴

The representative of Honduras stated that Nicaragua had attempted to involve his country in events relating to internal uprisings against the Sandinist **régime**. The current situation in Nicaragua was **related** to increasing political and social tensions between the Sandinist Government and opposition **groups**. The situation must be resolved by the Nicaraguans themselves. Honduras had presented to the Organization of American States (OAS) a proposal for **general** disarmament in the region. It would result in the reduction in the number of foreign advisers who, in Nicaragua's case, were extra-continental. The mobilization of Honduran forces within its territory to defend its democratic system was in exercise of its sovereign right. Honduras adhered to the principle of non-intervention and was prepared to submit to international controls to verify whether various countries had a defensive or offensive capability.⁵

The representative of the United States said that the people of Nicaragua had longed for a democratic revolution and had fought against the **dictatorship** of Anastasio Somoza because they had been **promised** democracy. The Sandinist National Liberation Front (FSLN) had committed itself to respect human rights and the freedom of all **Nicaraguans**, including minorities. It had committed itself to free elections and a rule of regular civil law. The Council could not be indifferent to what had happened to those commitments. Nicaragua had been claiming for some time that an invasion **by** the United States was imminent. On the contrary, **Nicaragua** was the country involved in a major effort to destabilize other Governments in Central America, like those of El Salvador and Honduras. Nicaragua had violated Costa Rica's border. It had also violated Costa Rica's rights by attempts to deny it use of the San Juan River. The United States was prepared to join with other members of the Western hemisphere, or the Council, or to stand aside while other members of that hemisphere—and of Central America **specifically**—worked out solutions which provided for those **guarantees** that had been promised by the Sandinista **Government** to its people; respect for human rights, good-neighbourliness and for the right of peoples to choose **their** own Government through competitive and free elections.⁶

The representative of Nicaragua proposed to Honduras that the proposal of peace and negotiation presented by the Governments of Mexico and Venezuela in October 1982 be taken up and that the process of discussion between the two countries might thus begin. He repeated that Nicaragua was developing its defenses **in** an eminently defensive manner in order to ensure the independence and

territorial integrity and the very existence of its revolution.⁴

At the 2421st meeting, the representative of Mexico said that the current conflicts in Central America could be settled only by means of political negotiations, dialogue and economic and social development. Any attempt to impose a strict ideological strategic strait jacket on what was happening in Central America was anachronistic. All those involved in the incursion, which had just begun, should immediately suspend their support and sponsorship of such a dangerous enterprise. The General Assembly's decision that it was necessary to end all military assistance to El Salvador must be reflected in the Council and be made to encompass the entire Central American region.⁵

The representative of Cuba said that the United States was trying to use Honduras as an outpost for American intervention to put down the Nicaraguan revolution. The Council should ensure the prevention of any complication of the conflict, which could lead to a larger conflict. The aggressive acts against Nicaragua were part of a premeditated plan to destabilize it.⁵

The representative of Panama detailed the outcome of the Contadora meeting, and said that the recent events in Nicaragua had confirmed the assessment of the situation by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983. Panama had made every effort to restore peace in Central America and had affirmed the full applicability of the right to self-determination of peoples, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, non-use of the threat or use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes, as well as the right of all people to decide and freely to pursue their political, economic, social and cultural systems. Current events in Nicaragua did not constitute an internal affair of that country, as claimed by some, but were a clear case of foreign intervention against Nicaragua. Panama appealed to all States to refrain from any act that might contribute to a further worsening of the already critical situation.⁵

At the 2422nd meeting, the representative of Spain said that his Government viewed with great concern the escalation of conflicts in the Central American region and particularly in Nicaragua. The armed actions taking place inside Nicaraguan territory were aimed at destabilizing the Government of that country. The Government of Spain considered that neither aggression nor armed intervention could be accepted and that in no case could they constitute a solution to the grave problems afflicting the Central American region.⁶

The representative of Zimbabwe recalled the grave concern expressed by the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua. He stressed that Nicaragua did not need intervention and interference in its internal affairs, but it needed financial, material and technical assistance and support from the international community.⁷

The representative of Colombia said the influence of "military apparatuses" that had been involved in Central America should be eliminated. At the meetings of foreign ministers at which it had participated,

a request had been made on a Colombian initiative for the withdrawal of all military and security advisers in the region, especially from El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua.⁶

The representative of China said that an important cause of the current tension around Nicaragua and, consequently, the deteriorating situation in all Central America, lay in the intervention by a super-Power. Such intervention was firmly opposed by the countries of that region; to diminish and remove tension in Central America it was essential that the super-Power should cease its intervention there. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua and other States of Central America should be respected. Central American problems should be solved by the peoples of the region themselves.⁶

At the 2423rd meeting, the representative of Guyana underlined that no State had the right to dictate to the people of Nicaragua how they should organize their internal affairs. In relations between States, the principles of international law should be inviolate and scrupulously respected. That was the only guarantee of peaceful and stable inter-State relations. The people of Nicaragua were striving for nothing more than their political, economic and social advancement. Appealing for full respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua, he referred to the proposals of the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela and expressed support for that initiative.⁸

The representative of Pakistan said that Nicaragua deserved help and support to complete the process of change in peace and to consolidate the foundations of a better life for their present and future generations. The Council might consider, as a first step, sending a fact-finding mission to the region to assess the situation on the ground and to report its findings to the Council. The dispatch of such a fact-finding mission would in itself serve to reduce tension and would be in conformity with the recommendation in the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session on the work of the Organization.⁹

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that the numerous facts demonstrated that the prime mover behind the direct armed intervention against Nicaragua was the United States. The situation in that area posed a direct threat to international peace and security. The Soviet Union supported the appeal of Nicaragua to the Council to call upon the United States to put an end to acts of provocation against Nicaragua and to halt the undeclared war being waged against that country by the United States Administration.⁸

The representative of France said that his Government was appealing for moderation. It rejected recourse to force and wanted to see the establishment of a climate of understanding, which would make it possible to resolve all the problems of the region by dialogue and negotiation. He welcomed the Contadora Declaration and supported its principles, in particular its condemnation of interference in Latin American disputes.⁸

The representative of India emphasized that Nicaragua had a rightful expectation that the Council would help it preserve its independence and territorial integrity. The Council should not lose time in endless debate but should find ways and means of

preventing a deterioration of the situation and a deepening of the conflict. It was imperative that all armed intervention and action be halted **immediately**. Any attempt to involve extraregional or global **forces** could result only in **exacerbating** an already difficult situation in Central America.⁸

At the 2424th meeting, the representative of Honduras said that his Government had **proclaimed** its complete neutrality in the internal **conflicts** afflicting neighbouring countries and its sincere interest that those fraternal peoples would enjoy the precious gift of peace and democracy through dialogue, understanding and mutual **respect**.¹⁰

The representative of Nicaragua presented to the delegation of Honduras an **official** proposal of his Government for the President of Honduras and the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of Nicaragua to **meet**, preferably in the presence of the Presidents of **Mexico** and Venezuela, to discuss relations between Nicaragua and Honduras. The Government of Honduras should choose a place in Mexico or Venezuela and the date for the meeting. The speaker also proposed that the United States and Nicaragua **immediately** begin direct talks in a third country to be chosen **by common consent**.¹⁰

At the 2425th meeting, the representative of Venezuela said that the peace efforts initiated by the Foreign Ministers of Panama, **Colombia**, Mexico and Venezuela were hampered by the participation of other interests that were more concerned with their own **hegemonic** positions than with the establishment of peace. Moreover, interests of the **super-Power** inhibited Council action, and viewed the Central American problem as an element of their East-West confrontation. The mutual accusations in the Council were not a path towards the establishment of a dialogue. He invited Nicaragua and Honduras, along with other Central American countries, to begin a frank **dialogue** that would enable the restoration of trust, the **only** effective path towards the achievement of peace. Latin American problems must be resolved by its own people, without foreign interference.]

The representative of the Dominican Republic said it had **offered** its territory as the site for a meeting of all Central American countries. **It** would be folly for the parties involved in the dispute not to **negotiate**. He also appealed to the **countries** concerned **with the strengthening** of peace to exercise their good offices towards attaining that goal. The situation should not be allowed to escalate further, thereby making it impossible for reason, good judgement and **civilized** coexistence to prevail. The Dominican Republic called for an immediate meeting of all the **parties**.¹¹

At the 2426th meeting, the representative of Peru made a formal proposal, which he said could provide a reasonable and acceptable basis for the parties directly concerned in the dispute to initiate negotiations. It would include the following elements:

(a) A commitment to avoid in talks to be agreed upon any ideological and **political** polarization in the general consideration of **all** the problems confronting Central America;

(b) The exclusion of all interests foreign to the subregion and alien to its overall problems, with the focus on the well-being of the region's peoples through a genuine process of development in a climate of peace and democracy;

(c) Strict respect for the principles and norms of international law enshrined in the Charter and other international instruments;

(d) An immediate cessation of all acts of hostility between Honduras and Nicaragua by a **Council** decision that could be implemented through machinery established in Chapters VII and VIII of the Charter;

(e) The Council **might** wish to adopt provisional measures concomitantly contributing to such a cessation of hostilities and making **possible** an effective dialogue between all the parties **concerned—Honduras** and Nicaragua to begin with, and then the five Central American nations;

(f) With the prior consent of the parties, the Council might decide to send a Commission to supervise the cessation of hostilities in the border region;

(g) Agreement on immediate measures to curb the arms race and the growing militarization of the region's countries.¹²

The representative of Argentina said the **Contadora** initiative constituted the basis for settling a conflict which, should it worsen, would have unpredictable consequences that would seriously affect the situation in Latin America and possible **beyond**.¹²

At the 2427th meeting, the representative of Guatemala said the five Central American countries attached the greatest significance to unity but that unity had been broken and must be restored. Guatemala offered to host a conference of all Central American countries to seek a solution to their problems. Guatemala would not intervene in the **internal** affairs of other countries or promote associations for that purpose. However, it demanded the same treatment in **return**.¹³

The President of the Council drew attention to the serious situation and appealed to delegations, both Council members and non-members, to exercise due restraint in their interventions. The work of the Council would achieve success only if the Members applied themselves constructively to the problems.

Then, speaking in his capacity as representative of the **United Kingdom**, he suggested that the Council could recommend additional measures for resolving the problems of the region, for instance a dialogue among the States of the region, perhaps in form of a conference to consider the problems of Central America, bilateral as well as multilateral, in which other Latin American States might be asked to participate. The Council's assistance and the good **offices** of the Secretary-General could be an effective means towards that end. If a conference were to emerge as the most promising route, a number of questions, such as its terms of reference, its date and place, its composition, and the status of the participants, would need to be resolved. The **Secretary-General** should discuss those questions with the States **concerned**.¹³

NOTES

¹ No decision other than invitations issued in accordance with the procedural rules of procedure was taken by the Council.

² S/15651, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983.

³ For details, see chap. III of the present **Supplement**.

⁴ 2420th mtg.

⁵ 242 I st mtg.

⁶ 2422nd mtg.

⁷ *Ibid.* See also the statement by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

⁸ 2423rd mtg.

⁹ GAOR. 37th sess., Suppl. No. I (A/37/1).

¹⁰ 2424th mtg.

¹¹ 2425th mtg.

¹² 2426th mtg.

¹³ 2427th mtg.

18. **LETTER DATED 5 MAY 1983 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

Decision of 19 May 1983 (2437th meeting): resolution 530 (1983)

By letter dated 5 May 1983, the representative of Nicaragua requested an urgent meeting of the Council in view of what he described as the launching of a new stage of the invasion of his country by counter-revolutionary Somozist forces operating out of Honduras and financed, trained and supported by the United States.²

At its 2431st meeting, on 9 May 1983, the Council included the item in its agenda and invited the following, at their request, to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the item: at the same meeting, the representatives of Grenada, Honduras, Mexico and the Syrian Arab Republic; and at the 2432nd meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Guatemala, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali and Seychelles; at the 2433rd meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain and Venezuela; at the 2434th meeting, the representatives of Columbia and Viet Nam; at the 2435th meeting, the representatives of the Congo and Uganda; at the 2436th meeting, the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Greece; and, at the 2437th meeting, the representatives of India and Yugoslavia.³

At the 2434th meeting, the Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Ahmed Gora Ebrahim, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.³ The Council considered the question at its 2431st to 2437th meetings, from 9 to 19 May 1983.

At the 2431st meeting, the representative of Nicaragua stated that he had come before the Council to inform its members of the ever-increasing magnitude of the aggression against Nicaragua, which had begun in late 1982, and of the grave damage, suffering, death and destruction caused by that aggression, which was directed, financed and armed by the United States. He asked that the Council adopt all necessary measures to halt the aggression and reiterated his Government's willingness to hold an immediate, unconditional dialogue with the United States in order to find genuine solutions to the critical situation caused by the aggression against his country.⁴

The representative of Honduras said that once again Nicaragua had given the Council distorted and tendentious information with regard to what it called a new stage of the invasion of Nicaragua by forces

acting from the territory of Honduras, that Nicaragua had not presented any clear evidence to prove the allegations and that those fighting were Nicaraguans on Nicaraguan territory trying to obtain justice. He stated that Honduras had a long list of violations of its sovereignty and territorial integrity by Nicaragua. Those problems could be resolved once and for all if the Honduran proposal calling for international supervision and monitoring of border and strategic areas were accepted. The Council should recommend that Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, at the foreign ministers level, with other Latin American countries present and collaborating, should begin a dialogue covering regional problems as a whole and resulting in solutions to the serious problems of Central America.⁵

The representative of the United States stated that it was an extraordinary experience to hear Nicaragua invoke the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs and to accuse the United States of invasion inasmuch as the Sandinistas had been busy fomenting war in the region, destroying the peace and the possibility of progress in El Salvador, Honduras and other neighbouring States and forcing militarization on the region. She referred to a magazine article showing the routes for arms traffic, and the regular flow of arms from Nicaragua through Honduras into El Salvador. Reviewing the charges regarding Nicaragua's infiltration of neighbouring Honduras and Guatemala, she stated that the United States Government had repeatedly sought to establish constructive relations with Nicaragua and to achieve regional peace through peace proposals based on an end to Nicaraguan support for guerrillas in neighbouring countries. She affirmed that the United States would support any agreement among Central American countries for the withdrawal of all foreign military advisers as well as any verifiable reciprocal agreement among Central American countries on the renunciation of support for insurgent Governments.⁵

The representative of Nicaragua stated that his Government had asked the Council to consider exclusively the grave problems and the consequences of the aggression to which his country was a victim. He also pointed out that no proof whatever had been produced of routes for a traffic in arms being used by Nicaragua through Honduran territory in order to send arms to El Salvador.⁶

At the 2432nd meeting, on 13 May 1983, the representative of Mexico stated that, together with Colombia, Panama and Venezuela, Mexico had stepped up contacts aimed at the reduction of tension and the search for practical mechanisms acceptable to all parties which could lay the groundwork for peace. He added that Mexico and the United States had agreed to promote dialogues and negotiations in order to avoid armed conflict and to advance peaceful conditions and economic development. The climate of threats and verbal aggression, however, had intensified and the centres of confrontation had multiplied, therefore, the Council was duty bound to offer a rapid and effective response to the problem brought before it and to contribute resolutely to a negotiated settlement.⁶

The representative of Zimbabwe stated that unless immediately checked, the build-up of tensions on the Nicaraguan-Honduran and Nicaragua-Costa Rican frontiers would soon lead to open military conflicts in the area. Welcoming the Contadora initiatives by Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Columbia, he said