



Security Council

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2703  
31 July 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 31 July 1986, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. KASEMSRI

(Thailand)

Members:

Australia  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
Denmark  
France  
Ghana  
Madagascar  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela

Mr. HOGUE  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. LI Luye  
Mr. MOUSSAKI  
Mr. BRUCKNER  
Mr. de KEMOULARIA  
Mr. DOMEVI  
Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. SAFRONCHUK  
Mr. SHIKIR  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
MR. WALTERS  
Mr. FABON GARCIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 22 JULY 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19230)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this subject, I invite the representative of Nicaragua to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtai (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Meza (El Salvador), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Gorajewski (Poland), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Honduras, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's

(The President)

agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nengrahary (Afghanistan), Mr. Rendon Barnica (Honduras), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/18250, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Arab Emirates.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/18248, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 July 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the representative of Bulgaria, upon whom I now call.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the legitimate request of the Government of Nicaragua for the convening of the Security Council in connection with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice dated 27 June 1986 in the case Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Article 94 of the United Nations Charter provides the Government of Nicaragua not only with political and legal grounds but also with procedural justification to have recourse to the Security Council.

The President of Nicaragua, His Excellency Daniel Ortega Saavedra, addressing the Council the day before yesterday, left no doubt whatsoever as to the reasons which led the Government of Nicaragua to request the convening of the Council and the root causes of the dispute. As President Ortega said on 28 June last, the day after the Judgment of the International Court of Justice was handed down: "In fact, the United States Government has declared war on Nicaragua."

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

The overwhelming majority of the international community has long been concerned about this course of policy pursued by the United States towards the people and Government of Nicaragua.

My Government fully shares this deep concern, not only because it poses a direct threat against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Nicaragua but also because United States policies towards Nicaragua and Central America threaten international peace and security.

The Judgment of the International Court of Justice of 27 June 1986 clearly shows that, when placed in juxtaposition with the tenets and norms of international law, the policy, plans and concrete actions of the United States Administration with regard to Nicaragua constitute violations and breaches of obligations under customary international law.

The international community, however, does not need the International Court's Judgment to decide who is the guilty party in the dispute. The Court's Judgment corroborates through the prism of international law what everyone has known to be true from the very beginning: that the United States Administration has begun an ever expanding campaign of covert and overt CIA-directed and master-minded large-scale actions against the people and the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua because the Nicaraguan revolution is not to the liking of the United States.

Now, the International Court of Justice, having examined the evidence presented, decided that the United States was in breach of its obligations under customary international law because it had been training, arming, equipping, financing, supplying and supporting the contras, because it had launched attacks on Nicaraguan territory in 1983 and 1984, because it had mined Nicaraguan ports, directed or authorized illegal overflights across Nicaraguan territory, and so on.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

The Court also rejected the United States claim that in carrying out its military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua it had had the justification of collective self-defence.

The Court's Judgment is yet further proof that the United States is pursuing a very dangerous aggressive militaristic policy towards Nicaragua, a policy fraught with serious repercussions for international peace and security.

The danger is first and foremost to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Nicaragua, a State Member of the United Nations. There is also a danger to the whole of Central America, where Washington does not want political settlement and is in fact enlarging the material base for a large-scale military conflict.

True, the matter before this Council is also one of human lives and destinies; it is, indeed, one of human rights. The people of Nicaragua and its Government are firmly determined to pursue their freely chosen path of independence, social progress and development, having put an end to a decades-long history of oppression and social injustice. In just a few years, and in extremely difficult conditions, the people and Government of Nicaragua have achieved a lot in combating hunger, poverty, disease, illiteracy and backwardness. It is precisely because of this that the Nicaraguan people has had to defend itself against the same old blind hatred that has always been the trademark of imperialism wherever and whenever a people has dared to strive for and achieve success in a field in which imperialism itself, for all its wealth and might, has been and remains a proverbial failure.

This United States position contrasts with the policy of the Government of Nicaragua. The latter is directed towards meeting the aspirations of the peoples for peace, national independence, independent development and social progress. As early as in 1984 the Government of Nicaragua expressed its willingness to sign immediately the Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America drawn up by the

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Contadora Group. Last June, Nicaragua responded positively to the appeal of the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora Group and the Support Group for a speedy conclusion of the process of negotiations on establishing peace in Central America. Nicaragua's constructive policy and approach were reaffirmed by President Ortega before this Council.

On the other hand, the United States policy towards Nicaragua is creating another hotbed of tension, adding another highly destabilizing factor to the overall context of the political climate of today's world. Everyone is aware that the United Nations has proclaimed 1986 the International Year of Peace. The United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, escalating its devastating, if undeclared, war against Nicaragua this year, as in previous years, offers little if any ground for relief to anyone in the world sincerely devoted to peace.

The current United States policies are also well known. The United States Congress has just allocated \$100 million to the contras with the aim of toppling the Government of Nicaragua; much more in the way of funds is being provided by the CIA in covert operations; and counter-revolutionaries, mercenaries and others are being employed with the aim of sabotaging, murdering innocent people, sowing destruction, invading - all in an attempt to bring back the former reactionary régime in Nicaragua.

My country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, has always supported the struggle of the people of Nicaragua in defence of its national independence and its inalienable right to determine for itself its road of social, economic and political development.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria has always been in favour of a political resolution of the conflict in Central America and to this end has welcomed the efforts of the Contadora Group and the assistance of the Support Group.

We firmly believe that the road to a peaceful solution should be followed.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset I should like to repeat our congratulations to you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. I am pleased, as this month draws to a close, to express to you our deep appreciation for the skill, competence, wisdom and objectivity with which you have been conducting the work of the Council despite all the difficulties and obstacles you have faced. It is no longer sufficient to delete this or that word, to add a letter here or there or to add or delete a comma somewhere in a text. The difficulties have gone beyond that: you have had to cope with constant and deliberate attempts to abort this or that draft resolution and to annul or pre-empt it, as one permanent member of the Council has constantly acted like judge and defendant at the same time.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

If we discuss the provocations, threats and acts of aggression against Nicaragua or the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and if we speak about the racist colonial occupation in Palestine or Namibia, we always find that the United States is a direct adversary in those conflicts. At the same time it is a sitting judge in this Council having the prerogative of the veto by which it can forestall any resolution condemning its aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, or its conspiracy against Nicaragua, or its strategic alliance with the Zionist enemy, or its constructive engagement with the racist régime in South Africa and thus prevent the Council from adopting any resolution that would put an end to the racist in southern Africa.

Every time a draft resolution condemning the policy of the United States is submitted to this Council, the Permanent Representative of the United States hastens to use the privilege of the veto to abort it. That is exactly what the United States did when a draft resolution condemning its barbaric air raid against residential neighbourhoods and civilian targets in the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi was submitted to the Council; that raid took the lives of innocent people - children, women and the elderly - while they were asleep in their homes.

The United States has vetoed all draft resolutions that condemned its strategic alliance with the racist régime in occupied Palestine and its "constructive engagement" with the racist régime in South Africa, as well as draft resolutions that condemned its constant aggression and conspiracies against peoples.

For three years now the situation in Central America has been on the agenda of the General Assembly. Reflecting the grave concern of the international community regarding the volatile situation in Central America, the General Assembly has adopted several resolutions regarding the situation in Central America. This Council, for its part, has adopted a clear and explicit resolution - 562 (1985) -

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

which emphasizes the inalienable right of Nicaragua and of other countries to choose their political and economic systems, free from foreign interference or subversion, direct or indirect. Despite that resolution, Nicaragua continues to be the target of constant aggression and subversion by the bands that receive full support from the United States.

Indeed, it is ironic that the United States not only violates the principles of customary international law and of the Charter, but flouts the resolutions of this Council under the pretext of collective self-defence. It is the same pretext reiterated by the United States in every part of the world and against any State that opposes the United States policy of hegemony.

The United States is in a perpetual state of self-defence. It is in a state of self-defence when its military aircraft bombed the residential neighbourhoods of the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. It is in a state of legitimate self-defence when it directs its missiles against civilian targets on the Libyan coastline or against coast guard boats operating in Libyan territorial waters. It is in a state of self-defence when it invades Grenada and when it invades Lebanon. It is in a state of self-defence when it mobilises its military forces on the borders of Nicaragua and provides the most modern weaponry to the insurgent contras there.

The United States would like us to accept its argument that it is in a state of self-defence whenever it invades another country or maintains a presence in it or acts against peoples. The fact is, however, that the United States is in a state of self-defence in one place only - right here in this chamber, where the acts of aggression of the United States Administration and its accomplices are repeatedly condemned, and where their acts of provocation are constantly deplored. Against this collective international condemnation of its practices, the United States resorts to the veto to abort any draft resolution that condemns it.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The United States claim of collective self-defence has no legal or jurisdictional foundation; it has been refuted by the highest legal authority in the world, the International Court of Justice, which, in one of its most important judgments, emphasized its absolute rejection of the American claim as a justification for United States military activities against Nicaragua.

The International Court of Justice also decided that the United States training, arming, equipping and financing of contra bands fighting against Nicaragua is not only a violation of United States commitments under international customary law but interference in the affairs of another State.

Despite that Judgment by the highest international judicial body, the United States persists in acting as if it were the world's policeman. That explains why the United States rejected the Judgment of the International Court, as well as the Court's compulsory jurisdiction, and why it continues to reject the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's request to investigate United States aggression against Libya.

The role assumed by the United States for itself throughout the world lacks legal authority. It violates the Charter principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for State sovereignty, and non-interference in States' internal affairs. The international community has pronounced itself in no uncertain terms in Security Council resolution 562 (1985), in resolutions of the General Assembly and in the Judgment of the International Court of Justice.

Latin America is no longer afraid to raise its voice: it has called for and to interference in its internal affairs; many other States - in Africa and the Middle East - have done the same.

When will the United States heed Security Council resolutions? When will the United States heed General Assembly resolutions? When will the United States comply with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice? When will the

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

United States listen to the voice of reason and logic? Those are the questions we now raise before the Council.

Unfortunately, all those questions will remain unanswered because of the policy of arrogance and the hysteria of power. The decision by the United States House of Representatives on 25 June last to provide \$US 100 million to the mercenary bands in Nicaragua is but one more chapter in the policy of aggression actively pursued by the United States Administration against Nicaragua.

The United States has appropriated many millions more to finance activities to topple the legitimate Governments of Nicaragua, Angola and other countries. Those appropriations were termed "humanitarian assistance", a euphemism to hide the true objective of the United States Administration: subversion.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya feels that such United States practices - which are contrary to customary international law, the provisions of the Charter and the Judgment of the International Court of Justice, as well as against the wishes of the Central American and other peoples - pose a threat to peace and security in Central America. In our view they represent acts of aggression against the peoples of Central America and acts of State terrorism against small and non-aligned peoples. Those practices and pressure tactics are part of the over-all policy of the United States, which aims at spreading terror and intimidation throughout the world and jeopardizing the peace and security of third world countries. Those measures taken by the United States Administration against Nicaragua, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Angola and Cuba, or any other progressive, non-aligned country, are but another aspect of the policy of aggression pursued by the United States in order to bring peoples to their knees.

When the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya speaks about the United States practices here or there it does not speak in the abstract, but from real experience, since my country, like Nicaragua, continues to be a target of threats, provocation and conspiracy. We in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya have been the target of more than one act of direct United States aggression: the interception and shooting down of Libyan military and civil aircraft flying over our own territorial waters, the firing of missiles against coast guard vessels and civilian targets along the Libyan coast, and the barbaric raid on residential neighbourhoods in Tripoli and Benghazi.

The United States Sixth Fleet continues to be deployed off our coast ready for a fresh act of aggression. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya recognizes, perhaps more than other States, the gravity and seriousness of the threat facing Nicaragua. Hence we appeal to this Council to exercise its responsibilities under the Charter

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

so as to put an end to the policy of arrogance, terror and blackmail pursued by the United States Administration in every part of the world - Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Mediterranean. We appeal to this Council to adopt the draft resolution. The United States must be made to respect international law.

In conclusion, I declare our full support for the Judgment of the International Court of Justice and for the Government and people of Nicaragua.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. CHAGULA (United Republic of Tanzania): First of all, Sir, on behalf of my delegation I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. We are all confident that you will effectively guide the deliberations of the Council at this session.

My delegation would like also to extend to your predecessor, Ambassador Blaise Rabetafika, the Permanent Representative of Madagascar, a neighbouring and friendly country, its sincere congratulations on the excellent and efficient manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month of June.

At the request of Nicaragua this Council is now meeting to consider the 27 June 1986 Judgment of the International Court of Justice in the case entitled Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua, the defendant being the United States of America. The decision of the World Court, a highly revered legal body of the United Nations, was based on Nicaragua's charge against the United States of America for violating customary international law by openly creating, arming, training and directing the contras and committing other acts of aggression against Nicaragua.

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic of Tanzania)

My delegation could not possibly summarize the decision of the World Court on this case better than was done by the President of Nicaragua himself when he addressed the Council at the first of these meetings. However, to put it briefly, the World Court found the United States of America to have violated the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Nicaragua through direct attacks on Nicaraguan oil installations, the mining of harbours, ports and shipping lanes, as well as through violation of its airspace. The actions of the United States of America, which pose a great threat to international peace and security, have been rejected by the International Court of Justice in accordance with the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. In this connection, my delegation fully concurs with what was stated earlier during these meetings of the Council by the Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries.

The decision of the United States House of Representatives to approve \$100 million in the form of military aid to the so-called contras, former members of the discredited Somoza National Guard, must be viewed in its proper context. We hold the view that the escalation of military confrontation in the region is not the right approach to resolve the present conflict in Central America. The most logical and rational thing to do is for the parties concerned, and in particular the Government of the United States of America, to adhere strictly to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. In fact, Article 2 (4) of the United Nations Charter states that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic of Tanzania)

Under the circumstances there can be no doubt that the United States of America is flouting the basic principles of the United Nations Charter by its overt support of the contras, who, according to irrefutable evidence, have been carrying out attacks against Nicaragua and in the process have cost Nicaragua the lives of many innocent civilians and incurred incalculable damage to property. It is for this reason that my delegation totally disagrees with the present United States Administration's decision to arm the so-called freedom fighters - or more correctly, rebels - with the sole purpose of overthrowing the legally constituted Government of Nicaragua. We have seen this happen not only in Nicaragua, but in Africa as well. I will not go into detail.

It is an open secret that the United States Administration has decided to adopt this iniquitous policy simply because it is opposed to the political system chosen by Nicaragua. It is, we believe, the right of each country to choose its own political system in accordance with its national interests without any outside interference. What we see now in Nicaragua is quite the opposite. The suffering and damage that the people of Nicaragua has been subjected to since the dawn of its revolution in 1979 have been of astronomical proportions - far too great for a poor, weak and developing country like Nicaragua with a population of only 3.5 million. My delegation wishes to associate itself with the decision of the International Court of Justice in rejecting the unwarranted and unprovoked aggression committed against Nicaragua in defiance of the principles governing international law and friendly relations among States.

(Mr. Chaqula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

We are also in agreement with the decision of the World Court that the non-participation of the United States as well as its rejection of the Judgment of the World Court brings in an element of contempt for an organ of the United Nations entrusted with the preservation of justice in the world. There is a great danger that such a practice could become a habit, which would be detrimental to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and could sound the death knell for customary international law on which so many international relations depend. It is thus incumbent upon the Council to request the United States to desist from further attacks on Nicaragua and to stop the military and economic blockade of Nicaragua. These punitive and coercive measures by the United States Administration are no doubt aimed at destabilizing and finally overthrowing the Sandinista Government, an objective which my delegation deplores.

It will also be recalled that the World Court rejected the United States claim of invoking the principle of collective self-defence in countries neighbouring Nicaragua - that is, El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica - on the pretext that Nicaragua is harbouring and supporting dissident groups against those countries. The World Court alluded to the fact that such aid had been stopped in 1981.

The International Court of Justice has simplified the Council's task and it is now the duty of the Council to shoulder its responsibility by requesting the United States, a founder Member of the Organization, and a permanent member of the Security Council, to uphold the basic and primary principles of the Charter in the interest of peace and security in the region. We should like to reiterate that the use of force would not eliminate the inherent problem of Central America and that the escalation of the military situation correspondingly reduces the chances for a peaceful negotiated solution to the problem.

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

The situation in Central America has raised concern in many quarters. For example, the foreign ministers of the non-aligned countries, while meeting in New Delhi last April, issued an appeal to the countries in Central America to solve the problem through peaceful means along the lines proposed by the Contadora process. The foreign ministers of the non-aligned countries in addition condemned the escalation of the problem on ideological lines, which subjected the people of Nicaragua to unnecessary suffering. This appeal was based on the indefatigable efforts of Mexico, Colombia, Panama and Venezuela - known as the Contadora Group - and the Support Group, consisting of Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay. It is the conviction of my delegation that the Contadora process provides the most acceptable solution to the problem in Central America. In this respect, we appeal to the United States to lend its support to that body and resume bilateral talks with Nicaragua. The cycle of violence engulfing the region is a serious threat to peace and security. In this connection, it is gratifying to note that Nicaragua is fully prepared to participate in the Contadora process.

It cannot be overemphasized that the situation in Central America has been aggravated by the recent decision of the United States House of Representatives to approve the colossal sum of \$100 million for the contras in utter defiance of resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly. We still hope that wiser counsels will prevail so that this very significant overt support to the contras by the United States will not in fact be given. It is therefore incumbent upon the Council to assume its responsibilities to defuse this explosive situation. Last year the Council passed resolution 562 (1985), in which it reaffirmed the sovereignty and the inalienable right of Nicaragua and other States to decide their own political, economic and social systems and to promote international relations in accordance with their interests. We would like a similar reaffirmation by the Council at this series of meetings.

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

At these meetings, it would be fitting and desirable if the Council endorsed the Judgment of the International Court of Justice on the United States acts of aggression against Nicaragua. The decision of the world legal body should not be treated with contempt; for doing so is tantamount to negating the objectives of the organs we ourselves created under the United Nations Charter. The World Court's decision is based on empirical and irrefutable evidence, and we hope that reason will prevail on those who challenge the competence of the Court on such an important matter as the one now before the Council.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate to the people of Nicaragua its unequivocal support for their struggle against outside interference and intervention. It is our hope that the initiative of the Contadora process will provide the best potential, peaceful solution to the already grave situation in Central America. We strongly appeal to the United States to stand by the letter and spirit of the Contadora process, failure of which would lead to an endless escalation of violence in the region. In this regard, we request the Contadora Group and its Support Group to continue their efforts to find a just and lasting solution to the problem of Central America.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words addressed to the presidency.

The next speaker is the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): When I spoke earlier this month in the Security Council, I had the opportunity of welcoming you, Sir, to the lofty post of President of the Council. I would merely once again note that your great knowledge, your diplomatic

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

experience and your skills highly qualify you to lead the work of this most important United Nations body.

We listened carefully to the convincing statement made by the President of Nicaragua, His Excellency Mr. Daniel Ortega. It clearly set forth Nicaragua's position on the settlement of problems facing Central America - the position of a country that is sincerely and staunchly seeking ways for a peaceful solution to those problems. The statement made by the President of Nicaragua rang with deep concern over the fate of Central American countries and the future of the peoples of that region.

The situation in Central America has once again taken a sharp turn for the worse. Following the adoption of economic sanctions against Nicaragua, participation in the mining of peaceful ports, the giving of assistance to the contra revolutionary bands by means of notorious training manuals, and other activities of pressure and interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs, the United States Congress, under strong pressure from the Administration, took a decision to allocate \$100 million to expand armed interference in Nicaragua's affairs. In this connection, the massive United States armed presence along the borders of that country continues, as do military exercises that are in essence a dress rehearsal for an invasion of Nicaragua.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

However, it is not only a question of the amount of resources that have been allocated by the United States Congress to the contras under various pretexts and covers or of its voting hundreds of millions of dollars for so-called humanitarian assistance. The fact is that, along with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Pentagon and other United States Government agencies, the United States Congress itself has now become involved in the undeclared war against Nicaragua. The decision taken by that body has legitimized United States aggression against the people of a small country defending its sovereign rights.

We have repeatedly pointed out here in the Council that such activities by the United States are in contradiction of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, of the United Nations Charter and of international law as a whole. The statement made here by the President of Nicaragua set forth facts and conclusions that fully support this.

There can be no doubt about the validity of the Judgment of the International Court of Justice rendered at the end of June of this year concerning the United States flagrant violation of its obligations under customary international law - in particular, its interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua, as noted in the Court's Decisions 3 and 6; its use of force against Nicaragua, Decisions 4 and 6; its violation of Nicaraguan sovereignty, Decisions 5 and 6; its interruption of peaceful maritime commerce by laying mines in the internal or territorial waters of Nicaragua, Decision 6, and, lastly, its violation of the existing Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Nicaragua, Decisions 7, 10 and 11.

The Court, in Decision 2, rejected attempts of the United States to justify its unlawful activities by reference to the right to collective self-defence and, in Decision 12, decided that the United States is under a duty immediately to

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

cease and to refrain from all such acts; and, in Decisions 13 and 14, decided that the United States is under an obligation to make reparation to Nicaragua for all injury caused to it.

We should like to emphasize in particular that virtually all the Decisions taken by the Court were adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes - 12 against 3, and 14 against 1 - and, as has already been pointed out, those judges voting against certain decisions did not object in substance to the items under consideration.

That is an eloquent condemnation of the activities of the United States of America, which misses no opportunity to dictate standards of conduct to other countries and peoples and to attempt to impose its own laws upon them. The Hague ruling is another, and this time legal, manifestation of world public opinion's growing condemnation of United States interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua and its policy of exerting pressure upon that country. Now the United States is attempting to disregard the Judgment of the International Court. Once again we are being told that the Court does not have jurisdiction in this case, and the United States baldly states that it does not acknowledge its decisions.

In paragraphs 26 through 31 of its Judgment, the Court convincingly demonstrates that it does indeed have jurisdiction in this matter. Paragraph 26 points out that the Court had the benefit of both parties pleading before it at the earlier stages of the procedure when the question of its jurisdiction was being considered. In its Judgment of 26 November 1984, the Court found that it had jurisdiction to entertain the case. Only after that did the United States refuse to participate in the proceedings and state that it would not recognize the Court's jurisdiction in the matter. However, by participating in the proceedings in the earlier stages, when it was disputing the Court's jurisdiction, the United States

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

was, in fact, recognizing the Court's right and jurisdiction in determining the admissibility of the matter before it. One cannot, however, acknowledge the Court's jurisdiction solely to take a decision on the non-admissibility of a matter being brought before it and then refuse to recognize its jurisdiction in the matter itself.

With regard to the United States non-participation in the Court's further proceedings, the Court quite rightly pointed out, in paragraph 27 of its Judgment, that the non-participation of a party in the proceedings at any stage of the case, as specifically allowed in Article 53 of the Court's Statutes, cannot, in any circumstances, affect the validity of the Court's Judgment.

No matter what manoeuvres or loopholes are resorted to by the United States in its attempt to divert the Council's attention from consideration of the substance of the matter, namely, the Judgment and Decisions of the International Court of Justice, and to turn the discussion to the situation in Central America against the background of East-West confrontation, it cannot refute the fact that United States policy with regard to Nicaragua is aggressive in nature.

In Decision 16, which was unanimously adopted, the Court recalled to both parties their obligation to seek a solution to their disputes by peaceful means in accordance with international law. That, in fact, is the policy that Nicaragua has consistently pursued, as that country's President reaffirmed in his statement here. By its activities, however, the United States has clearly shown that such a policy does not suit it. It wants to overthrow the legitimate Government of Nicaragua at any cost and to subject to its dictates the Nicaraguan people, which is struggling for its inalienable right to determine its own path towards development and to build its own future free from outside interference.

The people of Nicaragua are celebrating the seventh anniversary of the victory of the Sandinista revolution. Over the past 7 years, significant social and

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

economic reforms have been carried out in that country in the interests of all of its people. Whatever attempts may be made here to cast doubt upon those achievements, they remain indisputable. There is a legitimate Government in power in the country as a result of democratic elections, and national discussions are now under way aimed at drawing up a draft constitution.

Of course, Nicaragua is encountering various developmental problems and serious economic difficulties stemming mainly from the undeclared war being waged against it, to which significant and enormous material and human resources are being diverted. The aggression, which has been now going on for several years, has already seriously damaged the Nicaraguan economy. Nicaragua faces not only military but also economic aggression from the United States, which is exerting brutal pressure upon various countries and international financial organizations to halt assistance to that country. However, that has not frightened the freedom-loving people of Nicaragua, who are imbued with the determination to defend their right to freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic sternly condemns the continuing escalation of United States intervention and interference in the affairs of the Central American region and its subversive acts against Nicaragua. We are in total solidarity with the just struggle the Nicaraguan people are waging to win their right to free and independent development, and we agree with the opinion of the International Court of Justice as set forth in its Judgment and Decisions on this matter.

We also support the call of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for an immediate end to all threats, attacks and hostile acts and to all economic measures against the people and Government of Nicaragua, designed as they are to overthrow the legitimately constituted Government of that country and increase the risk of a generalized conflict.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Security Council must support the Judgment of the International Court of Justice and call upon all States - first and foremost the United States of America - to comply with the Court's Decisions and, in so doing, bring about the normalization of the situation in Central America and establish a favourable climate for the solution of all disputes.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for his kind words addressed to the presidency.

The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): This is the second time in just one month that the Security Council is meeting to give due response to the complaint brought to its attention by the people and Government of Nicaragua. This time the convening of the Council is justified not only by the deterioration of the already tense situation in Central America resulting from acts of aggression, subversion and economic coercion perpetrated by the most aggressive circles of United States imperialism against Nicaragua's people and revolution, but also by the fact that the Reagan Administration, by disregarding the Judgment handed down by the International Court of Justice, following its consideration of Nicaragua's complaint concerning United States military and paramilitary activities against that independent and non-aligned country, is damaging the credibility of that international legal institution and jeopardizing the very survival of the norms and principles of international law.

The heroic people of revolutionary Nicaragua, after having fought the Somoza dictatorship, has followed the path of political and economic independence with the staunchest determination. The revolutionary Sandinista Government, in keeping with the aspirations of its people, has begun to construct a genuinely independent, just and prosperous society. At the same time, the people and Government of Nicaragua have had to fight the criminals, bandits and terrorists organized, financed and armed by the criminal Washington Administration, in order to preserve the gains of the Sandinista revolution.

At the international level, the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua, from the very outset, affirmed its support for the development and strengthening of relations of friendship and good-neighbourliness with its neighbours as well, as with other countries the world over. It is in that spirit of peace and co-operation that on many occasions it has put forward constructive proposals and taken concrete measures to overcome obstacles to the normalization of its relations with those countries.

(Mr. Nengrahy, Afghanistan)

The negative response to its tireless efforts prompted it to seek a Judgment from the International Court of Justice on the acts of United States imperialism aimed at undermining the independence and sovereignty of that peaceful and non-aligned country. In spite of all the efforts of the Reagan Administration to deny the jurisdiction of the Court, as well as the admissibility of the complaint, the Court declared that it had the jurisdiction to entertain the case and that the case was admissible.

Following a thorough consideration of the arguments put forward by the parties concerned and the legal aspects of the question, the Court handed down its Judgment in clear and unambiguous terms. The Court, by a majority vote, rejected the justification of collective self-defense invoked by the United States Administration concerning its act of aggression and subversion against Nicaragua.

Furthermore, the Court, in connection with the crimes committed by the Washington Administration against the people and Government of Nicaragua through the use of Somoza terrorists, declared that the United States, by training, arming, equipping, financing and supplying bands of mercenaries, or otherwise encouraging, supporting and aiding military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua, was in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another State.

Moreover, the Court decided that the United States was under an obligation to make reparation to the Republic of Nicaragua for all injury caused to it by the breach of customary international law, as well as the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation signed by the parties in Managua on 21 January 1956.

The clear Judgment of the International Court of Justice on this issue gives the Security Council every reason to condemn in the most forceful terms the acts of aggression committed by the Reagan Administration against the revolutionary Sandinista people and Government and to demand that an immediate end be put to all types of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. We

(Mr. Pengrahy, Afghanistan)

also hope that the Council will demand appropriate compensation for the human and material losses inflicted upon Nicaragua. The Council must see to it that the United States listens to reason and complies with the Judgment of the Court of 27 June 1986 on its military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua.

The people and Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan sincerely share the pain caused the heroic people of Nicaragua by the criminal acts of the most monstrous imperialist circles. We are at one with our brothers and sisters in Nicaragua. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to assure our Nicaraguan friends of our total support for their struggle to defend themselves against the most intransigent imperialist Power. We appreciate the efforts made by the Contadora Group and the Support Group to arrive at an acceptable solution to the problems of Central America.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I should like, first of all, to extend the congratulations of my delegation to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The wide experience and proven diplomatic skills that you bring to your office will be of great assistance to the Council in the performance of its duties. I also take this opportunity to put on record the appreciation of my delegation for the way in which Ambassador Rabetafika of the sister Republic of Madagascar guided the work of the Council during the month of June.

Respect for the rule of law is what separates civilised man from primitive man. It is central to the creation of a just, peaceful, secure and rational international environment. Without it, the relative order we now enjoy evaporates, and a descent into the proverbial jungle is inevitable. The distinguishing features of international law are the absence of an executive authority that can

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

enforce the rule of law, and the relative nascence of the corpus of law governing State conduct in this field. For this reason, the violation of international law on the part of a State is more dangerous and debilitating to the system than the flouting of domestic law by the individual. The international community is therefore fully justified in expressing serious alarm when any State chooses to place itself above the law.

On 27 June last, the highest temporal court with the competence to adjudicate in disputes between sovereign States, the International Court of Justice, the judicial arm of the United Nations, delivered the Judgment the content of which forms the subject matter of our deliberation today. The Judgment followed a complaint filed by Nicaragua on 9 April 1984, charging the United States with conducting military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua in violation of the Charters of the United Nations and the Organisation of American States, as well as general and customary international law.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

In its 142-page opinion, the Court totally rejected the "collective defense" argument advanced by the United States as the justification for its hostile acts against Nicaragua. The Court found the allegation to the effect that Nicaragua supplies arms to Salvadorian rebels to be false. The Court also found that El Salvador had never declared itself the victim of an attack by Nicaragua, had never resorted to force against Nicaragua in its own defence, and had never requested the United States to do so on its behalf.

Having thus thrown out this spurious argument, the Court then ruled on the merits of the case brought before it by Nicaragua. It ruled that by "training, arming, equipping, financing and supplying the contra forces", the United States had violated customary international law and Nicaragua's sovereignty. Furthermore, the United States stands guilty of direct attacks on Nicaragua's oil installations, ports and shipping in 1983 and 1984.

It was also found guilty of authorizing overflights of Nicaraguan territory and mining Nicaragua's harbours and ports in 1984, actions in violation of international law; and of violating international law, in particular a 1956 treaty of friendship between the two countries, by its trade embargo against Nicaragua decreed in May 1985; as well as of violation of the general principles of humanitarian law by its distribution to the contras of the "dirty tricks" manual. It was held responsible for the damage caused by the contras.

The Court also determined that the United States had no right to seek the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government because of its political ideology. On these and other grounds, the Court ruled that by its many hostile acts against Nicaragua, the United States had violated international law; that it is under a duty immediately to cease and to refrain from all such acts; that it is under an obligation to make reparations to the Republic of Nicaragua; and that the form and amount of such reparations, failing agreement between the Parties, will be settled by the Court.

(Mr. Mudge, Zimbabwe)

Those are the findings of the learned men at The Hague. There is no equivocation or hesitation in their Judgment. The United States has violated international law.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time the World Court has ruled on aspects of this issue. As early as 10 May 1984, the International Court of Justice issued "provisional measures" requiring the United States to cease mining Nicaragua's harbours and to refrain from the use or threat of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of Nicaragua. But instead of being restrained by the "provisional measures", the United States defiantly proceeded to supply anti-aircraft missiles to the contra bandits; to stage threatening military manoeuvres on the Nicaragua/Honduras border and to tighten its trade embargo against Nicaragua. And, about a month ago, it voted \$100-million-worth of aid to the contras.

All this happened, as we have already said, after the small struggling nation of Nicaragua, under threat and fire from a super-Power, had sought the protection of the law and had, indeed, obtained temporary legal relief in the provisional measures of 10 May 1984 by the World Court, specifically requiring the United States to refrain from the use or threat of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of Nicaragua.

Does international law then count for nothing? Is might to be equated with right in the conduct of international affairs?

Nicaragua's plight reminds me of the conversations between the people of Athens, a dominant Power in search of empire in 416 B.C., and those of Melos, a small island which, despite its friendly neutrality, the Athenians wanted to gobble up during the Peloponnesian War. According to Thucydides, the Athenians, with disarming frankness, said to the citizens of Melos:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"For ourselves, we shall not trouble you with specious pretences - either of how we have a right to our empire or are now attacking you because of wrong that you have done us - and make a long speech which would not be believed ... since you know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must."

Unfortunately, the age of such honesty and frankness is past. Today's "Athenians" would rather quote the Bible and other sources of moral philosophy in order to put their aggression on a high moral pedestal. Hence Nicaragua's destruction is justified on the strange grounds that it has not remained loyal to its supposed revolutionary goals, when in truth it is being attacked because it has dared to follow a different socio-economic system from the one approved by the dominant Power in the region.

It has been said that the laws obtaining in any society reflect the interests of the dominant members of that society. Nowhere is this more so than in the realm of international law. Contemporary customary international law, general principles of international law and even the so-called conventional international law - the law emanating from the conclusion of treaties - is reflective, in the main, of the interests of the dominant members in the system. The United States is a dominant Power in the system, a key participant in the framing of both the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. It is therefore amazing that a great Power, nay a super-Power, a permanent member of this Council, which should be a status quo Power, should choose, in the pursuit of some narrow short-term gain, to assail the legal underpinnings of an order that has assured its predominance in world affairs and of which it is one of the chief primary beneficiaries.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Those of us from southern Africa never cease to be amazed by the discrepancies in policies towards Nicaragua and South Africa. In the case of South Africa the World Court has ruled that its occupation of Namibia is illegal, and the United Nations General Assembly has declared its policy of apartheid to be a crime against humanity, while both the General Assembly and the Security Council have voted for sanctions against South Africa. Yet the leaders of the United States and United Kingdom have fought, and are fighting, desperate rear guard actions against the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. But in the case of Nicaragua the United States has imposed punitive comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against that country in defiance of, and not in compliance with, international law. Why this contradiction? Are we really to believe the President of the United States when he defends his opposition to sanctions against racist South Africa by quoting the South African writer, Mr. Alan Paton, that:

"I take very seriously the teachings of the Gospels, in particular the parables about giving drink to the thirsty and food to the hungry. I will not help to cause any such suffering to any black person. Nor will we."

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

As a black man from southern Africa, I am touched by this concern for our suffering. But I am somewhat bothered that similar compassion is not shown to my brothers and sisters in Nicaragua. If the suffering of the black man is ground enough not only to protect the universally condemned Pretoria racists from justified sanctions but even to reward their evil policies by increasing the rate of expellees from their country to this country, why is it that international law, morality, Christian charity, the United Nations Charter and so on are not enough to protect the sovereign and legally recognized Government of Nicaragua? Is it because the people of Nicaragua are not black?

The Security Council is called upon not only to show compassion to the suffering people of Nicaragua: it is being asked to uphold the rule of law by endorsing and supporting the ruling of the International Court of Justice. We cannot talk of peace and security in a world where the rule of law is not respected. That is Rambo's world. I might add: Rambo belongs to the steaming heart of the primeval forests; and may he and his tormented mind forever there remain.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zimbabwe for the kind words he addressed to the presidency.

I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): To the unusual experience of being lectured on international law and human rights by Cuba and Viet Nam yesterday, I must add the one today: to be vigorously lectured on these subjects by that Paladin of international law, Libya, and that other Paladin, the Administration of Najibullah.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Libya's meddling in the internal affairs of other nations and support for international terrorism are well known to everyone in this room. Libya's attacks on innocent civilians who happen to be in the path of Libyan terrorism are a scourge of our time. Many African nations have experienced at firsthand the Libyan definition of respect for the sovereignty of independent States. Chad still enjoys the dubious privilege of hosting a large and uninvited Libyan military force on its territory. It is indeed an unusual but not inspiring experience to hear Libya speak for international law and respect of national sovereignty.

A representative here referred to the colossal sum of \$100 million voted by the United States Congress for the support of the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. Does he have any idea of the infinitely greater value of the arms shipped to Nicaragua, openly and brazenly landed at El Bluff and Corinto? Does he know that those arms are killing Nicaraguans, Hondurans, Salvadorians and others?

The record of the United States in fighting aggression is documented by the crosses in our military cemeteries around the world. I would suggest that the representative of Zimbabwe visit one sometime. His attempts to portray my country as some sort of international outlaw are an outrage in the light of our own support for the independence of his country at a crucial time and will not be forgotten by the American people.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I can understand the position of the representative of the United States, which is in the defendant's dock vis-à-vis the international community and the highest legal authority in the world. It has been accused of subversion, acts of genocide and

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

aggression against the small people of Nicaragua. I can understand why the United States representative, instead of invoking legal arguments, resorts to attacks. The record of the United States here in the United Nations is deplorable and has been repeatedly condemned.

The United States, which practises State terrorism, should be the last to speak of human rights, terrorism and humanitarian assistance. The United States has contributed to the expulsion of millions of Palestinians from their homeland. With deadly American weapons Savimbi is committing crimes against the people of Angola. With deadly weapons supplied by the United States the racist régime in southern Africa is committing crimes against the people of Namibia. Also the racist régime in Palestine is killing millions of Palestinians.

The United States should be ashamed to speak of human rights - any human rights. The black person in the United States does not enjoy respect. Look at the black people of New York City: what rights do those human beings have here?

The United States, which has invaded the small peoples of Grenada, Nicaragua and, before them, Viet Nam, has absolutely no right to speak of human rights and terrorism.

I hereby challenge the United States of America to request the Council to establish a committee of investigation to inquire into the allegations of the United States Administration. I am sure that that Government will not accept the challenge, because it recognizes that everything it has said is false and groundless.

Are you, the representative of the United States of America, anxious about the concerns and distress of the people of Chad? What compassion do you show for the people of South Africa when your Government imposes economic sanctions and hunger

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

upon the Libyan people, the Nicaraguan people and the Cuban people? Is it humanitarian to refuse to impose sanctions against the racist régime in southern Africa because, in the view of the United States, the white man there is the only human being?

The representative of Zimbabwe said he hoped the United States President would show as much compassion for the people of Nicaragua as for the people of South Africa. The United States should also show compassion for the life and dignity of the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

The days of Hitler are not forgotten. The United States of America represents neo-nazism. Megalomania does not pay off: everything comes to an end. Just like Hitler's empire and, before that, many other unjust empires, the empire of aggression, too, shall come to an end.

The small people of Libya, like other peoples, has suffered from United States aggression. We know more than others what nazism and fascism are: we lost half of our population in a liberation war against Mussolini.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

We were hoping that the representative of the United States would say that his country recognized international law and the Judgment of the International Court of Justice and would respect Security Council resolutions, instead of trying to change the Council's orientation and using cheap attacks here.

Let us, for the sake of argument, assume that what he said about Libya is true. Others who have addressed the Council - the representatives of India, Zimbabwe and Tanzania and others - anticipated what the representative of the United States would say.

The time has come for the Council to pronounce its judgement and to tell the aggressor that it has committed aggression. What confidence can we small nations have in the United Nations, or in the International Court of Justice, after this demonstration of disrespect by the United States Administration?

The United States of America has assumed the role of world policeman - and it is a policeman who himself violates the law, when any policeman should show respect for international covenants and treaties. The United States should heed the resolutions of the international community.

The United States Administration has itself been a victim of Zionism. Just two days ago we witnessed the Vice-President of the United States visiting the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem - despite all the United Nations resolutions opposed to recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the Zionist entity. Why was the Vice-President of the United States there? Because he is preparing for his campaign for the presidency, and because the United States Administration is in the hands of Tel Aviv and not of Washington. The Israeli Ambassador in Washington orders the Vice-President of the United States not to go to Syria, and there are consultations in that regard. The United States Administration has itself fallen into the grip of the Zionist entity and the racist international régimes.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

I once again challenge the United States representative. This Council should form a committee of inquiry in order to prove the falsehood of the allegations of the United States regarding Libya and also the falsehood of its allegations regarding Nicaragua, which has been confirmed by the International Court of Justice.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zimbabwe wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): The representative of the United States has solemnly invited me to visit some of the graves of his countrymen who gave their lives in defence of freedom and in fighting aggression.

I equally invite the representative of the United States to visit the graves of my own countrymen who gave their lives in fighting aggression and in defence of liberty in the same war, along with his countrymen.

I earnestly appeal to him: neither his Government nor mine should betray the noble blood of those men who died fighting aggression by themselves committing aggression against other States.

My country is grateful to all those who supported us during our liberation struggle, those who supported us from the beginning and those who supported us at the end. We are grateful for that support. We hope that it was given so that we could all enjoy free and unfettered independence and state our opinions on all international issues.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon at 4 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

