

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).

aggression against that State. He appealed to the **Council** to carry out its responsibilities under the Charter and to put an end to the threat of force by the United States on the pretext of protecting American interests. Although members of the Council knew in advance that the Council would not arrive at the containment of American military might, the Syrian delegation was confident that the discussions were useful because they promoted an understanding of the greatest problem since the Second World War, namely, the denial by the United States of the principle of the supremacy of law in international relations and its adoption of force as an instrument of foreign policy. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was the target of an all-out American threat in contravention of the Charter and United Nations resolutions and of the most rudimentary principles of international conduct. That threat was an escalation of provocations that had begun in 1969 out of opposition to the principles of the revolution of 1 September. The latest threats to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the bolstering of the rapid deployment force in the area had come in the wake of the failure of the Israeli-American alliance to impose the agreement of 17 May 1983 on Lebanon. There was every indication that the United States was seeking to consolidate its military presence in the region. The speaker called upon the members of the Council to do their utmost to put an end to the United States military presence in all parts of the Arab region.³

The representative of Malta reminded the members of the Council that, irrespective of their ideological orientation or geographical location, they all had to abide strictly by the obligations they had freely assumed when they had joined the United Nations and the respective regional organizations to which they might belong. It was the collective duty of the Council to reduce tension and military confrontation.⁷

At the 2523rd meeting, the representative of the Soviet Union said that his delegation had supported the timely request of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for an urgent meeting of the Council. For a number of years, notwithstanding generally recognized international norms and the Charter, Washington's policy towards independent Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had consisted of overt military preparations, economic blockade, gross provocations and military brinksmanship. Those actions had been accompanied by constant anti-Libyan campaigns and by a flood of allegation concerning the internal and external policies of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The actions of the United States in that region could not be seen in isolation from the general policies of imperialist forces seeking hegemony in international affairs. All the attempts to achieve hegemonial objectives were cloaked in a hypocritical propaganda campaign about their fight against "international terrorism". But the principal culprit was to be found not among the developing countries but in quite different quarters. The United States was pursuing its policy towards developing countries under the cover of continuous propaganda about a "Soviet military threat" but what was hiding behind that smokescreen was an American attempt to justify its own arbitrariness and violence in the international arena by references to the "East-West conflict". For its part, the Soviet Union had ceaselessly favoured an end to intervention in the internal affairs of young independent States so that their peoples could develop in freedom

and independence in accordance with their own aspirations.⁷

The representative of Viet Nam declared that the Council should condemn the provocative acts of the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya as well as the manoeuvres designed to exploit the internal problems of the Sudan and to cause divisions between various African and Arab countries. The Council should demand an immediate halt to the dispatch of planes and weapons to States bordering on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, as well as to all provocative acts and threats against the sovereignty of the Jamahiriya and the peace and security of the whole region.⁷

Mr. Gora Ebrahim spoke of the detrimental effect of the American involvement in Africa on the cause of liberation. He said that if the United States Administration was concerned about peace and stability in Africa, it should direct its attacks against the enemies of peace in Africa, the racist colonial régime of South Africa, and not against independent African states.⁷

The representative of Ethiopia stressed that the imperatives of international peace and security dictated that in the north-east of Africa all States should exercise maximum restraint and reject foreign intervention. Nothing should be done to aggravate the already tense and difficult situation. The introduction of massive and sophisticated military hardware coupled with the active military intervention of the United States in the region was a source of great concern to Ethiopia. The speaker emphasized the need for caution and for any action by the Council to be based on adequate and verifiable data.⁷

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that in 1982, the Council had held 29 meetings, 18 of which had been related to direct or indirect involvement of the United States, which meant that more than 62 per cent of the Council's work had consisted of consideration of the foreign policy of the United States. In 1983, 23 out of 32 meetings had been related to such American involvement; in other words, 71.85 per cent of the cases referred to the Council in 1983 had concerned American foreign policy. Then he indicated that with the present composition of the Council it was far from practical to anticipate any constructive action by the Council to prevent American intervention and provocations in the Middle and Near East.⁴

The representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic declared that the speedy dispatch of sophisticated aircraft to carry out espionage activities over the territory of a State Member of the United Nations was a violation of the Charter and would only further exacerbate the tension prevailing in that part of the world. In support of the Libyan struggle, he asked the Council to take appropriate action to put an end to the imperialist United States machinations.⁵

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterated his country's willingness to engage in a dialogue and to establish sound relations with all in accordance with principles and mutual respect. He invited the Council to shoulder its responsibilities and tell the United States to desist from violating the Charter and to stop interfering in the affairs of other States.⁶

NOTES

¹ S/ 1643 I, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl.* for Jan.-March 1984.

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

² 2522nd mtg.

³ 2523rd mtg.

⁴ *Ibid.* Similar statements in support of the Libyan position were made by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (*ibid.*) and by the representatives of Nicaragua, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, Cuba and Hungary (2526th mtg.)

⁵ 2526th mtg.

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

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

Decision of 4 April 1984 (2529th meeting): rejection of a Nicaraguan draft resolution

By letter dated 29 March 1984, the representative of Nicaragua requested a meeting of the Council as a matter of urgency and immediacy in order to consider the escalation of acts of aggression against his country.

At its 2525th meeting, on 30 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 Guyana and Honduras; and, at the 2527th meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Mexico and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2528th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Seychelles and Viet Nam; and, at the 2529th meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Yugoslavia.² The Council considered the item at its 2525th, 2527th, 2528th and 2529th meetings, from 30 March to 4 April 1984.

At the 2525th meeting, the representative of Nicaragua stated that his country had come to the Council to denounce further acts of aggression, which, owing to their level of sophistication, the equipment used and techniques employed, represented a qualitative leap forward in the covert operations against the Nicaraguan people. International concern and repudiation had helped avoid a confrontation with unpredictable consequences for Central America. Regrettably, the efforts of the international community, as expressed in the Council, the General Assembly, the Contadora Group and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, had not been sufficient to prevent resort to military solutions in the region.

He expressed his country's concern and alarm in the face of the increased military presence of the United States in a neighbouring country, where it was building an infrastructure for aggression; the large-scale military manoeuvres, which had been going on uninterruptedly in the territories and waters of Central America and the Caribbean; the criminal mining of the Nicaraguan ports, endangering international navigation and in fact amounting to full economic blockade; and the constant efforts of the United States Administration to obtain funds neces-

sary to finance the mercenaries of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

He gave a detailed account of the United States military presence in Honduras. He said that the various naval and military manoeuvres and exercises by the United States and Honduras, which had aimed at intimidating the Sandinist popular revolution and the Central American revolutionary movement, and the construction of military bases and training centres for the Salvadorian army and counter-revolutionary gangs all revealed the interventionist policy of the United States in the region. His Government would continue to believe in the active neutrality of the Government of Costa Rica and, for that reason, would maintain its understanding that the camps located on Costa Rican territory did not have the official support of its Government but that, on the contrary the CIA and its mercenaries were trying to create political problems between the two countries.

The speaker gave a detailed list of the locations of the various mercenary camps on Honduran territory and described the specific acts of aggression against his country since the last Council meeting on the subject early in February 1984.³ The account revealed not only the growing number of military camps on Honduran territory, but also attacks and violations of Nicaraguan territory, its airspace and its territorial waters. Nicaragua was aware of increasingly direct participation of the Honduran army in those attacks, sometimes even acting alone in support of the counter-revolutionary groups. Sophisticated equipment, aircraft and boats far exceeded the technical capacity of the counter-revolutionary elements, as well as the Honduran army and documented the involvement of the United States.

The latest American actions suggested that the Reagan Administration intended to proceed with a military blockade of Nicaragua. The international community had to restrain a Government that was resorting ever more openly to force to resolve international conflicts. The Administration's decision to appropriate \$21 million for the mercenaries of the CIA disclosed not just its determination to press ahead with its criminal plans against Nicaragua, but also its disregard for the American people, International public opinion and the peace-making efforts of the Contadora Group.

The international community could not remain passive in face of the build-up of the United States military presence in El Salvador. The only reasonable solution was a dialogue between all the representative forces, the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMNL), the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR) and the Government, which should aim at the formation of a broadly representative national government. The speaker deplored that the Contadora Group's work had been seriously impeded because certain Central American countries had refused once and for all to remove the spectre of war that had afflicted the region in recent years. But the main obstacle to its quest for peace was the United States Government. The situation had led Mr. D. Ortega Saavedra, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, to visit the President of Mexico, whose help he had requested in the implementation of urgent measures by the Contadora Group to prevent war in Central America. Similar missions had been sent to the other members of the Contadora Group-Panama, Colombia and Venezuela-as well as to other countries of the