

<sup>6</sup> 2422nd mtg.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* See also the statement by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

<sup>8</sup> 2423rd mtg.

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

<sup>10</sup> 2424th mtg.

<sup>11</sup> 2425th mtg.

<sup>12</sup> 2426th mtg.

<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup>

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

that the Council must exert maximum efforts towards negotiated and peaceful solutions to the problems. He believed that the first positive step in that direction was for the Council to adopt a resolution giving the Secretary-General authority to initiate without delay good-offices efforts, preferably in co-ordination with the Contadora group. The Council should also warn all concerned, and especially States outside Central America, to refrain from any interference or intervention.<sup>7</sup>

At the 2433rd meeting, on 16 May 1983, the representative of Nicaragua described new acts of aggression against Nicaragua and reviewed the attempt to establish with Honduras a joint patrol plan for their joint border. He blamed Honduras for the failure of that initiative and stressed the need for direct dialogue with Honduras in the presence of the representatives of the Contadora Group.\*

Rejecting the Nicaraguan accusations, the representative of Honduras stated that Honduras had kept its word not to interfere in Nicaragua nor to mobilize its troops and that its suggestion to establish a demilitarized zone on the Atlantic and the Pacific was still pending. Honduras was ready to arrive, in collaboration with the Contadora Group, at an agreement as a result of a regional consensus involving not only Honduras and Nicaragua but also Costa Rica, El Salvador and Guatemala.<sup>9</sup>

At the 2436th meeting, on 18 May 1983, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that judging from some of the speeches, his delegation felt that the Council should reaffirm the principles set out in the Contadora Group bulletin of 12 May and support the multilateral efforts of the Group with bilateral talks on the side.<sup>10</sup>

The representative of China said that meddling by outside forces, and especially the attempts of the super-Powers to extend their rivalry to Central America, had multiplied the complexity of the issue and constituted an underlying cause of the present tension in the region. It was imperative to stop all outside intervention, especially super-Power intervention or intimidation. Reaffirming the expectation that differences and disputes among various Central American States would be settled peacefully and without outside intervention, he said that China hoped that the Latin-American countries, especially those of the Contadora Group, would achieve positive results. China also lent its support to all United Nations efforts conducive to the easing and elimination of tension in the region.<sup>10</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out that the statement of Nicaragua showed incontrovertibly that a second, more dangerous phase had begun in the armed intervention against Nicaragua. The fact that the United States had discussed exclusively the internal affairs of Nicaragua, cast doubt on the legitimacy of the Nicaraguan Government and made pluralism and a mixed economy preconditions for negotiations with Nicaragua, was a clear example of direct interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. The Soviet Union supported the Nicaraguan demand that the United States cease its undeclared war against that country and advocated a just settlement of international disputes at the negotiating table. He concluded by saying that it was the duty of the Council to follow closely the development of the situation and to take all necessary measures to

safeguard the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua.\*

The representative of Poland said that the Council should undertake decisive efforts to bring about a negotiated, peaceful solution of the problems that had been created on Nicaragua's borders. The first step would be to adopt a resolution reaffirming the right of Nicaragua to live in peace and security, free from outside intervention and the threat or use of force. The Council should warn all concerned to refrain from open or covert interference in Nicaraguan internal affairs. New possibilities should be opened for dialogue and a negotiated solution, with the assistance of the Contadora Group and the United Nations.<sup>10</sup>

At its 2437th meeting, on 19 May 1983, the Council had before it a draft resolution<sup>11</sup> sponsored jointly by Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe.

The representative of Yugoslavia said that the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Security Council complemented the efforts of the Contadora Group: it neither condemned nor recriminated, and deserved the support of the Security Council. He urged that at a certain point in the future it might be necessary to draw upon the knowledge, authority and wisdom of the Secretary-General.<sup>12</sup>

The representative of Malta, a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, announced that the sponsors had agreed to replace "13 May 1983" in the sixth preambular paragraph by "12 May 1983", and to replace the opening words of operative paragraph 4—"Calls upon"—by "Urges". Noting that the draft resolution was the outcome of a sustained collective effort, taking into account all the views expressed, he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.\*

The draft resolution as orally amended was adopted by 15 votes in favour as resolution 530 (1983).<sup>13</sup> The resolution reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Having heard the statements of the Minister for External Relations of the Republic of Nicaragua,*

*Having also heard the statements of the representatives of various States Members of the United Nations in the course of the debate,*

*Deeply concerned, on the one hand, at the situation prevailing on and inside the northern border of Nicaragua and, on the other hand, at the consequent danger of a military confrontation between Honduras and Nicaragua, which could further aggravate the existing critical situation in Central America,*

*Recalling all the relevant principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly the obligation of States to settle their disputes exclusively by peaceful means, not to resort to the threat or use of force and to respect the self-determination of peoples and the sovereign independence of all States,*

*Noting the widespread desire expressed by the States concerned to achieve solutions to the differences between them,*

*Commending the appeal of the Contadora Group of countries, Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, in its 12 May 1983 communiqué, that the deliberations of the Council should strengthen the principles of self-determination and non-interference in the affairs of other States, the obligation not to allow the territory of a State to be used for committing acts of aggression against other States, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the prohibition of the threat or use of force to resolve conflict,*

*Considering the broad support expressed for the efforts of the Contadora Group to achieve solutions to the problems that affect Central American countries and to secure a stable and lasting peace in the region.*

1. **Reaffirms** the right of Nicaragua and of all the other countries of the area to live in peace and security, free from outside interference;

2. **Commends** the efforts of the Contadora Group and urges the pursuit of those efforts;

3. **Appeals urgently** to the interested States to cooperate fully with the Contadora Group, through a frank and constructive dialogue, so as to resolve their differences;

4. **Urges** the Contadora Group to spare no effort to find solutions to the problems of the region and to keep the Security Council informed of the results of these efforts;

5. **Requests** the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed of the development of the situation and of the implementation of the present resolution.

After the vote, the representative of Nicaragua stated that the very fact that the United States had not opposed the resolution was seen by Nicaragua as a **manifestation** of its will to put an end to armed aggression against Nicaragua and to respect the right of its people to live in peace and security free from any foreign interference. He said that if it proved otherwise, it would be Nicaragua's duty once again to come back to the Council.\*

The representative of the United States said that Nicaragua had maligned and misrepresented the policies of the United States and of Honduras and that once Nicaragua was **willing to fulfil** its obligations and promises to its neighbours and its own people, there would be no further problems between the United States and Nicaragua.\*

#### NOTES

S/15746. *OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983.*

<sup>1</sup> For similar charges and counter charges, see S/15742 and S/15745, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>3</sup> 2431st mtg. Similar views were expressed by Ethiopia (2432nd mtg.), Syrian Arab Republic and Cuba (2433rd mtg.).

<sup>4</sup> 2431st mtg.

<sup>5</sup> 2432nd mtg. Similar views were expressed by Panama (2434th mtg.) and Venezuela and Colombia (2435th mtg.).

<sup>6</sup> 2432nd mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by Seychelles and Algeria and at the 2433rd meeting by Mauritius. See also the letter dated 13 May 1983 (S/15762, *OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983*) from the representative of Panama transmitting the information bulletin issued at the conclusion of the meeting held on 11 and 12 May 1983 at Panama City by the Ministers of External Relations of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela (known as the Contadora Group).

<sup>7</sup> 2433rd mtg.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* Similar views were expressed by Guatemala (*ibid.*), Costa Rica (2435th mtg.) and El Salvador (*ibid.*).

<sup>9</sup> 2436th mtg.

<sup>10</sup> S/15770, subsequently adopted as resolution 530 (1983).

<sup>11</sup> 2437th mtg.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* For the vote, see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*

19. LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1983 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CHAD TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

#### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 2 August 1983, the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations requested an urgent **meeting** of the Council to consider the grave situation in Chad resulting from open Libyan aggression against that country.

At its 2462nd meeting, on 3 August 1983, the Council included this question in its **agenda**. Following the adoption of the agenda, the **Council** invited the following, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion: the representatives of Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; and at the 2463rd meeting, the representatives of Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Ivory Coast, Liberia and the Sudan; at the 2465th **meeting**, the representatives of Benin, Guinea, Kenya, the **Niger**, Senegal and the United Republic of Cameroon; at the 2467th **meeting**, the representative of Somalia; and at the 2469th **meeting**, the representative of the Congo.<sup>2</sup> The **Council** considered the question at its 2462nd to 2465th, 2467th and 2469th meetings, from 3 August to 31 August 1983.

Opening the discussion at the 2462nd meeting, the representative of Chad accused the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of stepping up its **aggression** against his country. He charged that since 31 July 1983, when the **Chadian** National Armed Forces had retaken the town of Faya-Largean in the north of Chad, the Libyan Air Force had been massively bombing the town, causing many casualties among the civilian population. Chad had come before the Council today to allow it to assume its responsibilities with regard to that situation, which undoubtedly threatened international peace and security.

The speaker recalled the previous discussions in the Council relating to the border dispute between the two countries. He charged that **within** two days of the Council's adoption, on 6 April, of a **statement**<sup>3</sup> calling for a peaceful settlement of the conflict and urging the parties to refrain from any action that **might** exacerbate the situation, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had flouted that statement. In a **message**<sup>4</sup> dated 24 June 1983, the President of the Republic of Chad had informed the Council of a subsequent escalation of Libyan aggression. However, thanks to the energetic reaction of the government forces, backed by logistical support from countries responding to a **Chadian** appeal, the Libyan forces had been routed and the central authorities had again taken control of the entire eastern part of the country.

Successive Governments of Chad had held talks with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in an effort to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the dispute, and Chad remained willing to **negotiate**.<sup>5</sup> However, the Libyan intention **continued** to be to destabilize the government regime in order to set up another **régime** that would be of its own persuasion. Thus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would be able to perpetuate its occupation of the Aouzou Strip, to annex the entire country and to use it as a base for aggression against neighbouring countries, and finally to carry out its dream of creating the "United States of the Sahel".

The representative of Chad accused the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. He urged the Council to condemn the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for its bombing of **Chadian** townships, to order an end to such bombings and to order the withdrawal of Libyan occupation forces from **Chad**.<sup>6</sup>

The representative of the Libyan Arab **Jamahiriya** denied the allegations contained in the letters dated 1 and 2 August 1983 from **Chad**.<sup>7</sup> He said that the