

of Grenada as a violation of the principles of the Charter and the rules of international law, in particular in respect of the non-use of or threat of use of force and of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Jordan could not accept the occupation of an independent State, a Member of the United Nations, under any pretext whatsoever. The military activities against Grenada constituted a **grave danger**, for that precedent could be invoked to justify similar occupation operations in the **future**.⁹

The representative of the Soviet Union said that his delegation would vote in favour of a **draft** resolution calling for a **halt** to the abrupt and unceremonious high-handedness in international affairs, a halt to the military intervention by the United States.

At the **end** of the 2491st meeting, on 28 October 1983, the three-Power **draft** resolution was put to the vote and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the **Council**. The result of the voting was as follows: 11 votes in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions."

NOTES

¹ S/16067, OR. 38th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*; See also S/16072, *ibid.*

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

³ S/16091, incorporated in the record of the 2491st meeting. For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

⁴ 2487th mtg.

⁵ General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV).

⁶ General Assembly resolution 36/103.

⁷ S/16077, OR. 38th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*. Zimbabwe joined subsequently as a sponsor of the draft resolution.

⁸ 2489th mtg.

⁹ 2491st mtg.

¹⁰ S/16077/Rev.1, OR. 38th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*.

¹¹ For the vote, see 2491st mtg.

28. LETTER DATED 3 FEBRUARY 1984 FROM THE **CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS** ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By **letter**¹ dated 3 February 1984, the representative of Nicaragua requested the President of the Council to convene an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation created **by** a new escalation in acts of **aggression** by Somoza and mercenary **counter-revolutionary** forces trained and financed by the United States.

At its 2513th meeting, on 3 February 1984, the Council included the item in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representative of Honduras, at his **request**, to participate in the discussion without the **right to vote**.² The Council considered this item at the same meeting.

At that meeting, the representative of Nicaragua stated that he had come to the Council greatly alarmed **by** the most serious events over the past two years involving attacks against Nicaragua by Honduran military planes. Those events could be the precursors of a war between Honduras and Nicaragua provoked by the United States to justify inter-

Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

vention and constituted the greatest threat to peace and security yet in the region as it was the first time that warplanes had been used to continue the chain of acts of aggression against Nicaragua. He charged that at the present time American and Honduran troops were carrying out a joint military manoeuvre with the objective of making war against Nicaragua. He also charged that the two countries undermined the peace efforts of the Contadora Group while they created the impression that they supported them.²

The representative of Honduras rejected as completely unfounded allegations of its complicity in the events referred to by Nicaragua and charged that Nicaragua had once again tried to involve Honduras in Nicaragua's internal problems through false information harmful to neighbouring States and aimed at **provoking** confrontations to divert attention from those problems. Refuting the Nicaraguan charge that his Government obstructed the efforts of the **Contadora Group**, he hoped that Nicaragua would not continue to foster a climate of distrust which affected the Contadora process. He reiterated his **Government's** full support for that process.*

Responding to the Nicaraguan accusations, the representative of the United States said that **his** Government had not engaged in aggression against Nicaragua. He added that the **United States** did intend to continue to co-operate with its friends in Central America in **defence** of freedom, self-determination and democratic pluralism. He charged that it was the Sandinist **régime's** betrayal of those principles that had caused substantial numbers of **Nicaraguans** to take up arms against that **régime**. He further accused Nicaragua of exporting revolutions and of destabilizing free and democratic Governments throughout Central America and said that so long as such a situation persisted, so would tension persist in the **region**.²

The President of the Council announced that the next meeting of the Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda would be fixed in consultation with members of the **Council**.²

NOTES

S/16306, OR. 39th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1981*.

² 2513th mtg.

29. LETTER DATED 18 MARCH 1984 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SUDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS **ADDRESSED** TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By a **letter**¹ dated 18 March 1984 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Sudan requested that the Council **be** convened in order to consider the aggression committed by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against the Sudan on 16 March 1984, which constituted a blatant attack against the sovereignty, security and integrity of the territory and people of a State Member of the United Nations and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, regional charters and the principles of international law, and posed a serious threat to the peace and security of the countries of the region and to international peace and security. Charging that a

Libyan bomber had carried out an air raid against the town of Omdurman, he asked the Council to take all measures pursuant to its **responsibility** for the maintenance of the security of States **Members** of the United Nations and of the security and peace of the region and of the world as a whole.

At its 2520th meeting, on 27 March 1984, 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: the representatives of Benin, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Oman, the Sudan and Zaire; and, at the 2521st meeting, the representatives of Chad and **Indonesia**.² The Council considered the item at its 2520th and 2521st meetings, on 27 March 1984.

At the 2520th meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Sudan reported in detail about an air raid **allegedly** carried out by the Libyan air force on 16 March 1984. The raid had resulted in the death of **five** citizens inside their houses, the wounding of a great number and the destruction of parts of a public broadcasting station, some private houses and several vehicles. The Sudan viewed the Libyan air raid as a **flagrant** act of aggression against the sovereignty of the Sudan and a **heinous** attack against civilian targets, as well as one more link in an uninterrupted chain of aggression, sabotage and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the Sudan.

He enumerated the various acts of aggression and subversion by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against his country. **Wondering** about the reasons that had prompted the Libyan regime to persist in its acts of aggression and intervention against the Sudan, he emphasized that his country had no dispute with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya over borders or underground natural resources. The common links and the **intellectual** and cultural bonds that united the Libyan and Sudanese peoples went without **saying**, they could have served to strengthen good, **fruitful** relations between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan, had it not been for the interference of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the internal affairs of the Sudan? its denial of the Sudan's legitimate right to sovereignty over its own territory and to adopt policies emanating from the ambitions and hopes of the people, and its rejection of the principles of **good-neighbourliness**, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations.

The reason behind the repeated **Libyan** acts of aggression against the Sudan was the wish to impose its tutelage and hegemony upon the Sudan and to deprive it of its **right** to adopt independent positions. The air raid had **been** a deliberate act of aggression which could not be condoned. In view of that the Council should condemn the Libyan act and call upon the **Libyan** Arab Jamahiriya to respect the **sovereignty**, independence and territorial integrity of the Sudan.³

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya declared that the allegation by the Sudan was unfounded and that not a single Libyan aircraft had participated in any raid against the Sudan. He charged that the incident had been fabricated to **justify** American intervention and the dispatch of **AWACS** and that the real culprit was the United States.³

The representative of Egypt said that the whole series of acts of aggression carried out against the Sudan had but one basis, namely, the uncontrollable desire to destabilize the Sudan and to interfere in its internal affairs. He underlined that the Sudanese Government and people had been subjected to shameful acts of aggression and had the right to strengthen their **self-defence** capacity and to ensure their **security**.³

The representative of Zaire stated that the Sudan had fallen victim to a barbaric and dastardly act of aggression, which flagrantly violated the Charter and the generally accepted principles of international law. The Governments of Africa had the right and the duty to unite their forces to guarantee the security of the States of the region against the barbarism that would replace the sacred principles of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The speaker said that his country expected the international community to denounce strongly such barbaric acts.⁷

At the 2521st meeting, the representative of France said that his country could not but condemn the act of violence, which could indeed affect peace and stability in the Sudan. Such use of force, which was totally unjustified, could only lead to a very dangerous deterioration of the situation in an already troubled part of the **world**.⁴

The representative of Upper Volta denounced the use of force in international relations. The Charter had laid down the procedures to be scrupulously followed by all States in settling disputes. For that reason his country condemned the bombing on 16 March 1984 of the town of Omdurman as well as the ensuing loss of human life. Yet there remained doubts about the accuracy of these assertions regarding the **supposed** aggressor. There were far too many **questions** that remained unanswered. Therefore, the **Council** should refrain from any hasty decisions and should denounce any foreign intervention that might inflame passions.⁷

The representative of the United States said that ample evidence was available to support the fact of the unprovoked attack against the Sudan on 16 March, which had been witnessed by several qualified observers. Outlining the American views on Libyan foreign policy, she said that the world should take note of the words and acts of the Libyan Government as they clarified the threats to peace, independence and self-government with which so many countries had to live. The Council should offer the Sudan protection against aggression, to which it was entitled under the **Charter**.⁴

The representative of Nigeria appealed to both the Sudan and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to seek solutions to their immediate differences within the established and recognized principles of international relations as well as in accordance with the Charters of the United Nations and OAU. He **urged** both countries to avail themselves of the **existing** mechanism for the peaceful settlement of intra-African disputes as established by OAU. He also appealed to the international community not to exacerbate the tension between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan by further exploiting and magnifying the differences that had given rise to **it**.⁴

The representative of the Netherlands strongly condemned the bombing attack on Omdurman and stated that his country considered all outside intervention in the Sudan's internal affairs as contrary to

the principles of the Charter and completely unacceptable. Referring to the Libyan allegations that the decision of the United States Government to send aircraft and weapons to a country adjacent to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya constituted a violation of the Charter and represented a threat to international peace and security, he stated that the complaint did not seem justified. The Charter specifically mentioned the right of individual or collective self-defence if a State was the object of armed attack-as had been the case on 16 March-until the Council had taken measures to maintain international peace and security. Regardless of the nature of the political dispute that had pitted two countries against each other, they were duty bound by the Charter 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 to refrain from threats or the use of force and to settle their disputes by peaceful means. It was the duty of the Council to infuse these principles with meaning by prevailing on the parties concerned to cease immediately all forms of outside intervention. In the interest of regional peace and stability, all parties should carefully avoid fanning the flames of conflict with inflammatory statements and strive to solve their disputes in a spirit of good neighbourliness and mutual respect.⁴

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that the Western press reports had called into question quite clearly the version of the events put forward by the country that had originally brought the matter to the Council. The events had been immediately seized upon by those who were anxious to step up their military presence and political control in that part of the world in order to interfere in the affairs of sovereign States. The Soviet Union would like to see the fraternal Arab countries settle their disputes and differences first and foremost in the framework of regional organizations and, naturally, without any imperialist intervention from outside."

The representative of the United Kingdom condemned the incident as a most deplorable act of violence. The applicability of Article 2 of the Charter in such a case was self-evident. The speaker said that his delegation had sought to encourage an exchange of views between the Sudan and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya through quiet diplomacy and through the President of the Council. His Government considered that in that case, as in all others, it was the duty of States Members of the United Nations to uphold the Charter.⁴

The representative of Chad declared that denial of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of responsibility was nothing but diversionary tactic. The Council should adopt appropriate measures under the Charter to ensure the effective maintenance of peace and security in the region.

30. LETTER DATED 22 MARCH 1984 FROM THE CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By a letter dated 22 March 1984 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the deteriorating situation resulting from hostile and provocative American acts against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which represented a serious threat to the peace and security of the region and of the world.

At its 2522nd meeting on 28 March 1984, 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: the representatives of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Democratic Yemen, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam; and, at the 2523rd meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Sudan and Mongolia; and, at the 2526th meeting the representatives of Cuba and Hungary.² At the 2523rd meeting, in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, an invitation was extended to Mr. Gora Ebrahim. The Council considered the item at its 2522nd, 2523rd and 2526th meetings on 28 March and 2 April 1984.

At the 2522nd meeting, the Secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya gave a detailed analysis of the reasons for the differences between the United States and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya were rooted in its position on the Palestinian question. The hostile United States policy against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had been manifested in the dispatch of AWACS aircraft to the region. The policy of the United States Administration was based on confrontation, aggression and the deployment of missiles and might lead the world to war. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wanted a dialogue with the United States and wished to establish balanced relations on the basis of mutual interest. He called upon the Council to shoulder its special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; it should not allow one of its permanent members to pursue a policy of aggression against small countries. If that law of the jungle was allowed to continue, a very dangerous precedent would be established and it would lead to nothing but war and destruction.³

The representative of the United States declared that the actions of the United States had been wholly consistent with international law and the provisions of the Charter. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's neighbours had the right to defend themselves; their friends had the right to help them as long as their actions were consistent with the Charter and international law.³

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic expressed grave concern at the threats to which the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had been exposed because of the United States military movements and provocations designed to create a climate conducive to

NOTES

¹ S/16420, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1984.

² For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

³ 2520th mtg.

⁴ 252 I st mtg.

⁵ S/16425 and 16431 OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1984.

⁶ General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV).