

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

**2343<sup>rd</sup>** MEETING: 31 MARCH 1982

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2343) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 19 March 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/14913) .....	1

UN LIBRARY  
SEP 18 1991  
UNISA COLLECTION

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1964-1965  
1964-1965  
1964-1965

## 2343rd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 31 March 1982, at 4 p.m.

*President:* Mrs. Jeane J. KIRKPATRICK  
(United States of America).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2343)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 19 March 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/14913)

*The meeting was called to order at 5.25 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Letter dated 19 March 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/14913)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [2335th, 2337th, 2339th, 2341st and 2342nd meetings], I invite the representative of Nicaragua to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Angola, Argentina, Benin, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Honduras, India, Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table; Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Roca (Argentina), Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Trucco (Chile), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Rosales Rivera (El Salvador), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Ca-*

*rias (Honduras), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Iran), Mr. Srithirath (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Maitama-Sule (Nigeria), Ms. Gonther (Seychelles), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Nguyen Ngoc Dung (Viet Nam), Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia), Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) and Mr. Mashaire (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, the Congo and Costa Rica in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the 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 provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ourabah (Algeria), Mr. Mondjo (Congo) and Mr. Piza Escalante (Costa Rica) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

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

4. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Madam President, I wish to thank you, and, through you, all the members of the Council, for the opportunity to address the Council at this stage in its 36-year history, when it is confronted simultaneously with two issues embracing the two areas regarded as major threats to international peace and security.

5. Let me make it clear at the outset that the delegation of Mauritius is not here to join the debate on the specific items on the agendas of these two series of meetings. From our viewpoint, as a long-standing member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we have, on these and similar issues, made our position abundantly and consistently clear. I am not the designated spokesman in this general debate for this

unique group—unique because it is not a formal alliance where nations are iron-bound by fixed security dogma.

6. Our only alliance is with the United Nations, and our only security pact is the Charter of the United Nations—the only pact in the world whose provisions, from Article 1 to Article 11, are an unbroken refrain of the Preamble commitment to the imperative of peace, “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”.

7. It is also important to emphasize that the Charter is not merely the only such pact in the world—almost in a biblical sense—but is also, for that reason, an overriding pact, just as gold is the overriding commodity in a world of many currencies. Of course, the world has not stood still since the Charter was penned in 1945. The birth or revival of new nations and the universality of United Nations membership have given rise to a number of other pacts—defence pacts, mutual co-operation pacts, common market pacts, cultural pacts, religious pacts, military pacts—in a greater fusion of nations than in any previous 36-year period in contemporary history, each prone jealously to guard the comforts of its own neighbourhood.

8. The founding fathers must have anticipated the dangers as well as the blessings inherent in such fragmentation when they came to what they called “Miscellaneous Provisions”, where they inserted Article 103, which reads:

“In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.”

9. I shall not bear down too hard on the loud pedal in calling attention to this aspect of the debate which has ensued in the Council’s deliberations on the complex agenda before it. For practical reasons, so as not to overburden the Council, the Charter has many doors opening into its mansion—direct negotiations, multilateral negotiations, regional negotiations. Therefore, it could not, as a matter of consistency, use lock and key against those parties to a dispute who prefer to come in through the main entrance and take their case directly to the Council. And so the Council is currently seized of two issues of major importance.

10. As I have stated, it is not my intention to address the agenda issues directly. The interest of my delegation is in what we regard as the third issue—better described as the invisible issue—and that is the issue of the Security Council itself and the growing decline of confidence in the Council. This decline is becoming so general that I need hardly stress it, and if it continues, it may become more dangerous than the items the Council confronts.

11. If we bring that issue up within the context of these two items, it is because my delegation feels that it is within this concrete framework that the Council can put its best foot forward in a practical demonstration that the Council can and will meet the immediate challenge in the manner designated as its responsibility under the Charter, through action that will throw back the cloud of cynicism that is encompassing it like a smog, to its own detriment and to the detriment of the entire United Nations. That is of course easier said than done. Natural smogs lift, but political smogs, as we have painfully learned in the course of 36 years, hang on until the will to action is sufficiently asserted to break through into the light of day.

12. Briefly, I would humbly suggest that this can be done in a preliminary manner by separating the wheat from the chaff—in this case, by separating concepts from principles and by isolating improvised arguments which may be good in themselves but which have no roots in the Charter principles that govern the terms of reference of the Council.

13. The concept of social justice, for instance, for which revolutionaries are fighting, is certainly espoused by the Charter as a moral goal within the framework of the Economic and Social Council. But in the peace-making process it can become an impediment, encountering basic ideological differences in a Council resolution.

14. The same is true of the concept of free elections. Here too we encounter the impasse of deciding what constitutes a democracy—again with ideological differences which, pressed into a resolution, will keep whatever peaceful negotiations are recommended paralysed for 20 or more years, as we have learned to our sorrow.

15. The same is also true of the concept of human rights, which the Charter strongly underlines—but again as a separate category and again under the Economic and Social Council—and which can assume political significance only by universal consensus. If that were not the case, we would encounter the difficulty of nations incorporating the broad range of human rights into their foreign policy with an ambivalence that could only lead to confusion.

16. On the other side of the fence, we find those principles which, unequivocally and uncontestedly, are the basic pillars of the Council: the principle of non-intervention, the principle of self-determination, the principle of national independence, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the right of States to sovereignty and territorial integrity, the right of States to their own social systems and, where differences arise, to solve their problem on the national level, free from outside ideological intervention—and certainly from military intervention—and the right of States to be free from outside threats or intimidation.

17. Those are the pillars of the Council as spelled out in the Charter. Resting on those pillars, the Council can become the proscenium arch through which the United Nations can return to the magnificent edifice of peace envisaged by the founding fathers and by the peoples of the world.

18. To conclude: The Council can restore its prestige by recognition of the Charter of the United Nations as the only peace pact in the world and the United Nations as the last hope of man to escape the sword of Damocles—the nuclear sword of Damocles—now hanging over the entire human race, and it can do so in the context of the twin items on its double agenda, which present a glorious opportunity that may not repeat itself for a long time to come.

19. Finally, Madam President, I should like to associate myself with all the previous speakers who have addressed kind words to you. This has been a very difficult and delicate month for the Council, and I hope that you will guide the Council to a positive conclusion of the issues under consideration.

20. As for your immediate predecessor, our colleague Sir Anthony Parsons, his imminent departure from our midst saddens me. I do not believe that he is about to embark on a vegetative life so soon, regardless of how long he may have been wishing it. The saying "once a Lord always a Lord, but once a Knight is enough" cannot apply to Sir Anthony.

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

22. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): All my colleagues representing non-aligned countries have in their eloquent statements underscored the root causes of the complaint submitted by Nicaragua. It is true that this body, entrusted with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as with the task of determining the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, is empowered to act. Yet it is equally true that the United States can, out of self-righteousness, dilute and perhaps block any meaningful action in relation to the just cause of Nicaragua.

23. The Syrian Arab Republic is participating in this debate not only to express its fraternal solidarity with the Government and people of Nicaragua in a situation described by Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra in this way:

"The waging of covert aggression against our revolution has now intensified the crisis to the point at which the imminence of intervention in Central America has compelled us to request a meeting of the Council" [2335th meeting, para. 21],

but also to lend our support to any sincere effort to defend the independence and sovereignty of a friendly country. Nicaragua is exposed to a grave danger. Mr. Ortega emphasized that danger when he said that his Government's

"predictions regarding the imminence of an intervention are more than justified; and on the basis of the events that have been described, we must assert that although the United States is making public its willingness to enter into negotiations, it has already before that date begun to develop the alternative, aggression" [*ibid.*, para. 67].

24. Mr. Ortega added, unequivocally and in the clearest possible terms, the demand that

"the United States Government officially and explicitly voice its commitment not to attack Nicaragua, nor to initiate or promote any direct, indirect, or covert intervention in Central America" [*ibid.*, para. 86],

and he called on the members of the Security Council

"to reject all acts of force or threats and to repudiate any direct, indirect or covert intervention in Central America" [*ibid.*, para. 87].

25. Despite Mr. Ortega's declared willingness as of the time of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly<sup>1</sup> to spare Central America from the scourge of conflict, the United States has been escalating its campaign of threats against a small country. To this very moment, Nicaragua is the victim of that campaign of intimidation. The witch-hunting tactics of the United States have been exposed, for Mr. Ortega said:

"Nor can there be any doubt that even before, as far back as 1912, the United States was pursuing the erroneous policy that was manifested in Nicaragua by the armed intervention of its Marines" [*ibid.*, para. 18].

26. The threat against Nicaragua cannot in our opinion be portrayed, as is being propagated by some imperialist circles, as an East-West competition for areas of influence. Rather, we believe that it is a pure attempt by the United States to strengthen its grip and its hegemony in an area which it views as its private domain. That leads us to confirm that economic cannibalism is to remain a priority goal of United States imperialism whenever the peoples of the area rebel against tyranny, exploitation and poverty.

27. The representative of Mexico, whose Government is undertaking a constructive role in this crisis, has said:

"Few regions of the world have seen so many recurrent examples of all forms of foreign intervention and interference. Perhaps in no other area has

the encirclement of domination been so persistent and the internal systems of oppression that perpetuate backwardness and dependency so persevering." [2337th meeting, para. 41.]

Nicaragua is not an exception, and the United States is responsible for most of these interventions and this interference.

28. Many ideas and plans for solving the problem have been aired before the Council; yet we doubt that the United States is either willing or able to find a just solution. The United States system cannot keep its hands off the riches and the markets of Latin America which are so sapid, and indisputably the resources of Africa and the Middle East are no less appetizing to economic cannibalism, which constitutes the livelihood of multinational corporations. This pessimism springs from our bitter experience with an avid capitalist system in which the welfare of the majority is subordinated to that of a greedy minority. But we have overcome, as a result of our socialist revolution in 1963. It is by now public knowledge that the instigation to commit aggression against Nicaragua is motivated by a sinister design to prevent the Sandinist revolution from achieving its social and economic goals, as well as to abort any attempt at change in that area of the world, which the United States considers its zone of exploitation. Moreover, the United States regards the capitalist model of development as an ordained, providential design. We utterly reject that view.

29. The excesses of the United States Government are not limited to covert military intervention, attempts at destabilization, acts of sabotage and other threats; they emanate systematically from an anti-revolutionary mind embedded in a reactionary vision of the world and a desire to repress any change. That was best illustrated in this chamber by the representative of the United States when she stated that the \$75 million aid bill to Nicaragua did not influence the Sandinist revolution, thus giving the impression that assistance to a country destroyed by civil war was an essential prerequisite to contain and then to destroy the progressive Sandinist revolution. She candidly said:

"We might have hoped—in fact, we did hope—that support from the United States would alter the Sandinista leadership's hostility to our Government. Alas, it had no such effect. By its words and deeds, the United States Government—the Congress and the executive branch alike—demonstrated not only its respect for the sovereignty of the Nicaraguan political process and the right of Nicaraguans to determine their own Government, but also our concrete, effective desire to give a boost to Nicaragua's new Government, to help it overcome the devastation of civil war."

But the President of the Council added:

"Unfortunately, Sandinista ideology overcame the reality of United States assistance. The fact of United States support for economic reconstruction and national independence proved less powerful in the minds of Nicaragua's leadership than the stereotype: we remained the Yankee enemy of mankind." [2335th meeting, para. 111.]

30. In our understanding, there could not be a contradiction between a revolutionary approach to change and social and economic progress; nor is there a contradiction between social and political change and friendly relations among States. This was eloquently explained by Mr. Ortega Saavedra when he said:

"When our revolution triumphed, notwithstanding the historical inconsistency of United States policy, we felt—and indeed proposed—that it was necessary to normalize relations with the United States within a new framework of respect and co-operation. It was in this spirit that I met in Washington in September 1980 with President Carter, and we must acknowledge that an effective dialogue then became possible. This mutual disposition to readjust and improve relations between Nicaragua and the United States underwent a sharp change when, in January 1981, the new Administration assumed the presidency of the United States." [Ibid., para. 12.]

31. Is progress achieved by a progressive revolution in any way harmful to the people or to the United States itself? The representative of Angola has answered that question as follows:

"I fail to understand how the opening of schools, clinics and hospitals, assistance to agricultural and industrial production and the creation of social institutions to serve the people have turned Nicaragua into a threat to the mighty United States, a threat that is perceived in such dimensions that the 'over-kill' includes the choking off of aid to Nicaragua, the planning of a covert force to invade the country, the mobilization of reactionary international and regional forces to destabilize the Government and threats to blockade the area." [2336th meeting, para. 30.]

32. We should like to draw the attention of the Council to the dangers that the ever-growing and ever-widening aggressive policy of the United States is posing to world peace and security. It is not pure coincidence that these threats are concomitant with similar threats launched, on the one hand, through Israel against the Arabs—the Arabs in general and Lebanon in particular—and, on the other hand, through Pretoria against Angola. These facts demonstrate that there exists a three-pronged design that is being carried out against the three most strategic zones of the world.

33. It is our firm belief that the United States, in its multifarious efforts to keep the *status quo* which prof-

its only its own interests in Central America and elsewhere, is, as stated by Mr. Daniel Ortega, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua,

"out of step with the realities in the region and . . . despite what some had predicted, the threats made against the region in the Government's platform were not mere . . . rhetoric but are increasingly becoming a dreadful fact". [2335th meeting, para. 20.]

34. I shall conclude by saying that aggression against Nicaragua is aggression against the non-aligned countries and the developing nations. As has been said in this chamber, we, the revolutionary peoples, will never allow the continuous onslaught of imperialism; it must end. No one must forget that our solidarity with fraternal Nicaragua is indissoluble, for in reality the enemy is one and the same—United States imperialism, Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

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

36. Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Madam President, it is a particular pleasure for me to begin this statement by congratulating you most sincerely on the way in which you have been discharging the delicate responsibility of presiding over the Council this month. During that term, which comes to an end today, we have observed once again your wisdom, your skill and your sense of fairness—all of which is a great tribute to the prestige and diplomacy of the United States Government.

37. I very sincerely thank the members of the Council which have invited me, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter of the United Nations, to participate in the discussion of the question brought by Nicaragua to the Council.

38. There can be no doubt that the interests of the South American countries, including my own country, are affected, and in a particularly grave way, by the prolonged crisis in Central America. For us on this occasion there are at stake not only fundamental principles of American international law, which we have developed together in fruitful and close co-operation with the countries of the region, but all the aspects of the political, human, cultural and economic relations among the nations of Central and South America. A generalized and violent political crisis with Central America as the stage will have unforeseeable consequences for the rest of the continent.

39. The prelude to the inter-American system can be found in the historic Bolívar Charter, signed at Jamaica in 1815; in the Congress of Panama, in 1826; in the Lima Conference, in 1847 and 1848; in the Montevideo Congress, in 1889; and in the First Pan-

American Conference, which met in Washington in 1889 and where the young American republics established a practical organization of continental solidarity and co-operation.

40. As early as 1923, meeting at Santiago, my own country's capital, all those nations discussed the idea of transforming that type of relationship into a sort of society of American nations. That idea took shape shortly thereafter, at Havana in 1928; and the Pan-American Conferences which began to be held periodically, every five years, became an institution.

41. The Lima Declaration of 1938 and the resolutions that emerged from the Meetings of Consultation of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, held in Panama in 1939, at Havana in 1940 and at Rio de Janeiro in 1942, broadened the concept of continental solidarity and produced the fundamental legal principle of American public law that "any attempt on the part of a non-American State against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, sovereignty or political independence of an American State will be regarded as an act of aggression against the other States signatories of the Declaration".

42. It was on the basis of that principle that the American nations broke relations with the totalitarian Axis during the Second World War and joined their united efforts to those of the Allies.

43. I have provided that brief and incomplete summary of the resolute and solid endeavour developed by the Latin American nations before the existence of the United Nations not only because that endeavour is a valuable antecedent and a justification of our participation in this debate, but also because it contains the direct explanation for the decisions adopted at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace which was convened at Chapultepec (Mexico City) in February 1945 and which led to the historic San Francisco Conference that gave life to the Organization.

44. The Inter-American Conference at Chapultepec preceded by two months the United Nations Conference on International Organization that opened in San Francisco on 25 April of that same year. From Chapultepec there emerged the joint decision of the American nations, adopted by consensus, to propose to the San Francisco Conference, among six other principal points, that of settling disputes and resolving questions of an inter-American nature by giving preference to inter-American methods and systems in harmony with those of the world Organization then being created.

45. The American republics attached particular importance to the experience and well-known effectiveness of their own legal instruments, which, as I have said, pre-dated the creation of the United Nations, and they therefore saw to it that within the new

world Organization the regional organization would be protected and given a certain autonomy in the settlement of disputes, without of course prejudicing the permanent power of the Security Council to exercise its own authority when such disputes could not be resolved through the application of the means provided in the regional agreements.

46. Hence, Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations includes, among the peaceful means to be employed by the parties to a dispute before bringing that dispute to the Council, the resort to regional agencies or agreements.

47. Hence, again, paragraph 2 of Article 52 of the Charter, which provides that Members of the United Nations parties to regional agreements or organizations shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

48. Lastly, it was agreed in San Francisco to include a new article, Article 51, in the Charter, recognizing the right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

49. Thus, if a dispute were to arise between American countries linked by the regional system, that dispute or question was to be raised through the peaceful inter-American means actually in force or through recourse to the regional organization. Of course, if regional systems for the peaceful settlement of disputes failed, the Security Council was to be in a position to intervene immediately to propose formulas for settlement. If an act of aggression against a State member of a regional group occurred at any time, that member State could automatically exercise, without pre-conditions or delay, its right to individual or collective self-defence, as was agreed at Chapultepec and confirmed at San Francisco, until the Council took the proper measures to stop or punish the aggressor.

50. From the foregoing it is clear that the Act of Chapultepec established the solidarity of the American States in the face of aggression and the means for stemming such aggression. The provisions agreed upon at Chapultepec are therefore completely compatible with the Charter of the United Nations, as are both of those documents with the Inter-American Treaty on Mutual Assistance<sup>2</sup> concluded at Rio de Janeiro, which was signed after the Charter of the United Nations.

51. The San Francisco Charter, I repeat, formally recognized the effectiveness of American solidarity and arrived at a harmonious solution, one that we were all seeking and one that has proved extremely

useful over the years and has been in no way objectionable.

52. In fact, up to the present time, not a single one of the many cases that have arisen within the inter-American system has created any question of competence *vis-à-vis* the Security Council; there has, on the contrary, always been appropriate co-ordination between the regional organization and the world Organization. It should also be noted that all the cases brought before the regional system have been successfully resolved, with peace being safeguarded or the dispute settled. This can easily be verified by the Council itself.

53. The best way of co-operating in the maintenance of peace would appear to be precisely the use of an already existing system, one that has been a model of effectiveness in every case in which it has been used.

54. I believe the representative of Togo, along with others, quite rightly pointed out that one cannot ignore the existence of the regional organization, since the States of the region, concerned in the dispute before the Council, are members of the Organization of American States (OAS) and can therefore apply Article 52, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, the matter has been before the regional organization for consideration since the opening of the Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS, which is dealing with the situation of Nicaragua. On 23 June 1979, the 7th plenary meeting of that consultative session adopted the following resolution, which was welcomed with visible enthusiasm and gratification by the present members of the Governing Junta of Nicaragua:

“Whereas:

“The people of Nicaragua are suffering the horrors of a fierce armed conflict that is causing grave hardships and loss of life, and has thrown the country into a serious political, social and economic upheaval,

“The inhumane conduct of the dictatorial régime governing the country, as evidenced by the report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, is the fundamental cause of the dramatic situation faced by the Nicaraguan people, and

“The spirit of solidarity that guides hemisphere relations places an unavoidable obligation on the American countries to exert every effort within their power to put an end to the bloodshed and to avoid the prolongation of this conflict which is disrupting the peace of the hemisphere,

“The Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs



“Declares:

“That the solution of the serious problem is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the people of Nicaragua;

“That in the view of the Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs this solution should be arrived at on the basis of the following:

“1. Immediate and definitive replacement of the Somoza régime;

“2. Installation in Nicaraguan territory of a democratic government, the composition of which should include the principal representative groups which oppose the Somoza régime and which reflects the free will of the people of Nicaragua;

“3. Guarantee of the respect for human rights of all Nicaraguans without exception;

“4. The holding of free elections as soon as possible, that will lead to the establishment of a truly democratic government that guarantees peace, freedom and justice;

“Resolves:

“1. To urge the member States to take steps that are within their reach to facilitate an enduring and peaceful solution of the Nicaraguan problem on the bases set forth above, scrupulously respecting the principle of non-intervention and abstaining from any action that might be in conflict with the above bases or be incompatible with a peaceful and enduring solution to the problem;

“2. To commit their efforts to promote humanitarian assistance to the people of Nicaragua and to contribute to the social and economic recovery of the country;

“3. To keep the Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs open while the present situation continues.” [S/13451.]

55. As I have said, that resolution was adopted on 23 June 1979, at the Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS, which has not yet completed the process of discharging its own responsibilities and competence.

56. I have made those comments because I believe they serve to justify the constant and well-founded interest of the Latin American countries in speaking on an issue that affects them almost directly and that has been brought to the Security Council. The Council's competence to deal with the problem can of course be denied by no one, but that does not prevent us from believing that it would have been fitting, from

the legal standpoint, to take the matter to the regional organization first. In this, as in other similar cases, that was not only fitting but necessary, as it would have avoided many difficulties, moderated the tone of statements heard, cleared the path for understanding, safeguarded the invaluable attainments of the American republics and kept Nicaragua closer to the regional system, which was established by Nicaragua and its brothers.

57. In this connection, we have a sincere concern: Is the machinery for collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes really strengthened when it is used mistakenly?

58. Do we not run the risk of undermining its prestige and that of the United Nations with sterile, lengthy presentations that seem to contradict the need for urgent action described as necessary to face dangers described as imminent?

59. The letter which Commander Daniel Ortega, the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 March, requesting the convening of the Security Council, emphasized “the ever-increasing danger of a large-scale military intervention by the armed forces of the United States” and “the conflagration which becomes imminent today as a result of this decision to intervene in Central America” [see S/14913].

60. The fact that the accusations levelled 13 days ago by the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua have been formally and completely denied by the representative of the United States, and the fact that both speakers have reiterated their intent to begin conversations that might put an end to the disputes and apprehensions, make it possible for us to view the situation with some measure of calm.

61. I fully agree with the representative of Mexico that “we cannot continue to move on two different tracks”, that “confrontation and negotiation are opposed to one another” and that we must “give the two parties a chance to come to an understanding.” [2337th meeting, para. 58.]

62. Unfortunately, it seems clear to me that this meeting of the Council runs the risk of bringing Nicaragua and the United States further away from that chance, because there have been successive statements in which verbal violence and intemperance have clouded a genuine consideration of the question before us. In some cases, political intent has been evident; in others, a lack of adequate knowledge of the region being judged.

63. Several of the ideas outlined here by the representative of Panama, by the representative of Honduras, who repeated the proposal made before the

Council of the OAS by the Foreign Minister of his country, and by the representative of Ireland at this morning's meeting can and should be seen as comprising a formidable and all-important task to which the countries of the region should dedicate themselves.

64. My country wishes to be useful in a joint action involving strict respect for the self-determination of peoples and absolute rejection of the use or threat of use of force and of the diabolical use of internal subversion and terrorism to interfere in matters within the sovereignty of States. We also fully and unreservedly support the use of peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, as provided by the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States.

65. I should like to conclude this statement on an optimistic note.

66. We have expressed our complete rejection of intervention in the internal affairs of States regardless of the form that that intervention might take. Because of that, we have spoken out repeatedly in the international organizations of which we are a member in firm opposition to what seems to us to be interference or unacceptable coercion.

67. Together with the overwhelming majority of the nations of our continent, we draw attention to a joint declaration made a few months ago by the Government of an American nation and that of a European Power [S/14659, annex], because there seemed implicit in it an interventionist aim which opened an extremely dangerous door, as it could encourage and exacerbate the use of violence, calling into question the authority and intentions of the Government of El Salvador to find the solution that country felt most appropriate to its own internal problems.

68. For the same reasons, a few months ago at the eleventh session of the General Assembly of the OAS, held at Santa Lucia from 2 to 11 December 1981, we and 21 other countries of our continent adopted, with only three negative votes—those of Grenada, Mexico and Nicaragua—a resolution concerning El Salvador. In that resolution, the OAS expressed

“the wish that the people of El Salvador attain peace, social justice and democracy within a pluralist system that will enable its citizens to exercise their inalienable rights;”

and

“the hope that all Salvadorians will attain an atmosphere of peace and harmony through a truly democratic electoral process.”

It also repudiates

“violence and terrorism and any act that constitutes a violation of the principle of nonintervention.”

The resolution concludes by pointing out that “in accordance with the principle of nonintervention, it is up to the Salvadorian people alone to settle their internal affairs.”<sup>3</sup>

69. We are extremely pleased that that view has been upheld, and we extend our most cordial congratulations to the Government and the people of El Salvador, which have not been intimidated by violence.

70. I sincerely hope that dialogue, respect and calm consideration of existing problems, and the exercise of prudence and of greater trust in the international machinery and instruments that the American nations have solemnly pledged to respect, will be the shortest and most promising path to putting an end to the tensions the Council has been considering.

71. The PRESIDENT: 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.

72. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): Madam President, I should like at the outset to thank you and the other members of the Council for the opportunity accorded to my delegation to participate in the Council's deliberations on the item before it.

73. My delegation also joins previous speakers in paying you the high tribute you so well deserve following your successful guidance of the Council for this month and, likewise, your predecessor, Sir Anthony Parsons, President of the Council for the month of February.

74. Like every other peace-loving member of the international community, we have followed the developments in Central America with deep concern and, therefore, the debate in this Council on the complaint by Nicaragua with keen interest. We believe that at stake in the admittedly explosive situation in that region are the very principles of the Charter of the United Nations on which the survival of most, if not all, nations depends and the future of peace and security rests. On more than one occasion the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which my country is a devoted member, has reviewed the situation in Central America and expressed its concern over the disturbing developments there. While the security of the States in the area is indeed being undermined, these developments now pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Therefore, the timely submission by Nicaragua to the Council of the dispute between it and the United States and the call by that country for a peaceful settlement of the dispute cannot but be commended as an expression of the spirit which should guide all parties concerned.

75. We therefore wish to take this opportunity to add our voice to those of the Government and the people of Nicaragua in their appeal. We wish also to record

our appreciation to the Government of Mexico for its initiative, which has already won the praise of many members in and outside the Council.

76. It cannot be overemphasized that a lasting solution to the problem with regard not only to Nicaragua but also to the whole area rests entirely on strict observance of the principles of the Charter, particularly respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. In the case of Nicaragua—a non-aligned State—its non-alignment should be respected. To that end, therefore, the parties should refrain from any acts that amount to aggression and interference in the internal affairs of other States and no effort should be spared to seek a solution to any dispute through peaceful means.

77. It is our hope that the Government of the United States will demonstrate its desire for peace and stability in the area, including Nicaragua, by refraining from acts contrary to the foregoing principles and by reciprocating in good faith the offer for a genuine settlement of the disputes in the area. We also hope that the United States will co-operate with the Government of Mexico and other parties proposed in the Mexican plan for a framework that will further guarantee peace and security for all States in the region.

78. It may be appropriate at this juncture to express Tanzania's appreciation to the Government of Nicaragua for making it possible for us to discuss the problems in Central America. More importantly, we welcome the positive contribution made by the head of State of Nicaragua at the beginning of this debate [2335th meeting]. The positive trend that was set in that important statement and the proposals contained therein have won the admiration of most of the speakers who have participated in this debate.

79. The Government of Tanzania pledges its solidarity with the people of Nicaragua during these trying moments. In the same vein, we pledge our solidarity with all the other peoples in Central America and the Caribbean struggling for genuine independence.

80. The Security Council, as the body responsible for preserving peace and security, can do no less than give encouragement and support to the ongoing genuine efforts aimed at bringing long-lasting peace and just solutions to the problems in Central America.

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

82. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Madam President, it has been the practice here that at a certain point guests of the Council are authorized to convey their congratulations to the President. The delegation of Madagascar is pleased that that practice is backed by a certain tradition and is happy to present, along with its thanks to members

of the Council for having invited it to participate in this debate, its sincere wishes on this last day of March for success to you, Madam, in the exercise of your lofty responsibilities.

83. It was not so long ago when those who professed an extreme kind of regionalism, through an interpretation of provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, claimed that the only ones who had a right to speak when a critical situation developed in a certain region were those belonging to that region. People went so far as to say that the solution to a given regional problem must inevitably be brought about by the acquiescence of the parties supposedly concerned in the procedure or in the substance, thus immediately setting aside the United Nations.

84. Now, what situation in the world in which we live today can do without a global solution? What body, in an international society such as the one we have founded, can present a global solution acceptable to all, if not the United Nations? Supporting any contrary thesis would be tantamount to claiming rights which the international community as a whole does not grant and tantamount to denying the international community the competence which has been conferred upon it.

85. To the extent that a situation can still call for a regional solution, it could fall under Chapter VIII of the Charter; there is no contradicting that. But when the fundamental principles that we have referred to are at stake, it seems to us that it would be appropriate to shoulder our responsibilities in a rather different perspective.

86. Throughout this debate all parties have affirmed that it is indispensable to adhere, in the case of Central America and the Caribbean and other strategic regions such as the Middle East, Africa and the Indian Ocean, to the strict application of a certain number of principles which are familiar but shrouded by exclusivist impulses.

87. We have all proclaimed our devotion to the principles of non-interference, non-intervention, the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the duty of States to negotiate in good faith, the self-determination of peoples, and respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States.

88. To what extent have all those principles been applied in Central America and the Caribbean? History has answered that question and will continue to do so in the future. For our part, the sober presentation and compelling analysis made by the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, Commander of the Revolution Daniel Ortega Saavedra, confirmed our opinion on that score and convinced us of the justification for Nicaragua's complaints.

89. Indeed, Nicaragua's demands contain nothing that might be considered unreasonable. Increasingly frequent acts of sabotage have been committed on its territory, and it is calling on the Governments concerned to undertake to put an end to the acts of the counterrevolutionaries who are training, getting arms and receiving funds in foreign countries.

90. The violation of its airspace has been publicly acknowledged; the financing of clandestine activities on its territory has been freely commented upon in the press. The Government of Nicaragua calls upon the official forces and agencies responsible to put a stop to their reprehensible activities, and that seems absolutely normal to us.

91. On the strength of historical precedent and in the light of the differing political options and the tendency represented by the acts I have mentioned, the Government of Nicaragua has become convinced that the threat of intervention is hanging over it. It is calling, as is only natural, for assurances to be given to it and for public statements that leave open the possibility of blockade or military intervention to be formally denied.

92. These demands are accompanied by an offer of negotiation, in the interests of national, regional and even international security. In our view it would be a grievous error not to take up that offer and to continue acts of intimidation and destabilization against the Government of Nicaragua, because such an attitude is not compatible with what is being preached.

93. Nor would anything be solved by attempts to discredit the leaders of Nicaragua by accusing them of being merely a chain in a hypothetical international machination against the stability of the region, particularly because the notion of stability still remains to be defined, as we have not yet been told who is to profit from this in the final analysis.

94. Certainly no one could concede that in an attempt to isolate it or to refuse to hold a dialogue with it charges should be made against the Government of Nicaragua on the grounds that it is taking measures to organize the defence of its country, to strengthen its security and more securely to entrench its revolutionary system, which harbours no illusion about the nature and strength of the resources deployed against it.

95. It is within that context that we consider the initiative of the Mexican President, Mr. José López Portillo, to be of the greatest possible interest.

96. We share the goal of his proposal, which contains a number of measures aimed at promoting détente, stability and development in Central America and the Caribbean. We agree that improvement in relations among the countries concerned should be based on dialogue, which should be systematized.

97. In our view, the President of Mexico's initiative will serve as a test of the good faith of all parties, of the sincerity of what they profess in public and of their determination to work towards the establishment of a system of political relations based on mutual respect and the sovereign equality of States.

98. Nothing should be done to thwart or prevent the success of that initiative. Inasmuch as all parties have come out in favour of the necessary change in the political climate and habits in Central America, the adhesion of all parties to the negotiations contemplated—without any hegemonistic ulterior motives—should constitute an important step towards that change. That is why, in our view, the Council should support this initiative with all its authority and with all its prestige.

99. As a non-aligned country, we are in a position to appreciate the sincerity of the sentiments of the leaders of Nicaragua when they refuse to have their country included in a geopolitical reserve or inside the strategic frontier of any great Power. We understand them when they reject the concepts and pre-conditions that are reflected in a humiliating limitation of their sovereignty and their independence.

100. Like those who have supported Nicaragua and the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean in general, we also wish to speak out on behalf of the Charter and its principles, on behalf of the solidarity of peoples struggling for respect for their options and for the defence of the achievements of their revolution, on behalf of the advent of a new world where peace, freedom and social justice will reign.

101. I reserve the right of my delegation to speak again if new events should be introduced into this debate.

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

103. Mr. SANZ de SANTAMARIA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Madam President, I should like to thank the Council and all its members for allowing me to participate in this debate.

104. My country is pleased that someone as distinguished as you is presiding over the deliberations of the Council. You are in every way qualified to preside over it with dignity and impartiality. Your human and intellectual qualities guarantee this.

105. On this occasion, the Council is considering the complaint of Nicaragua against the Government of the United States. The Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, has referred to an imminent invasion of his country and has warned of the danger that this constitutes for the peace of the region and of the world.

106. I listened with respect and concern to the statement made by Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra. And I have followed the explanations put forward here in an attempt accurately to analyse the problems brought before this Council by the Government of Nicaragua.

107. The representative of the United States, in one paragraph of her statement, said "The United States Government is not about to invade anyone, and we have stated as much . . . on many occasions" [*ibid.*, para. 131]; she added subsequently, "The United States seeks peace in Central America." [*ibid.*, para. 134.]

108. Our Government believes that Mrs. Kirkpatrick's words faithfully reflect the intention of the United States Government and that it will therefore attempt to seek solutions in accordance with the history of American solidarity and with its commitments in the regional system and in the United Nations.

109. The Ambassador of Nicaragua to the Government of Colombia, Mr. Rodolfo Abaunza Salinas, has asked our Government to express in this forum Colombia's position in defence of non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of States. That is why I have requested to speak.

110. One of the basic principles of the international legal order is that of the sovereignty and political independence of States. That premise has an immediate consequence: the duty of all States not to interfere in the internal and external affairs of another State; in other words, complete and global compliance with the principle of non-intervention as an integral and indivisible concept.

111. That principle applies not only to the threat or use of force but also to other types of interference, such as political and economic interference. International law does not protect territorial integrity alone; rather, it also protects other important legal rights, such as the rights of a State to self-determination and political independence. Thus, acts undertaken by one State against the wishes of another or of its government, validly established or elected in accordance with its national constitution, in respect of the way of organizing its government, regulating the rights and duties of its population and meeting the needs of its people, should be considered as acts of intervention, whether or not they are supported by force or threats against territorial integrity.

112. Therefore, intervention exists whenever a State or group of States overtly or covertly attempts to impose its own conditions through acts of interference in the internal affairs of another nation.

113. For all those reasons, Colombia does not intervene in the internal affairs of any country and rejects intervention in the autonomous decisions of any

nation. We do not accept any division of that concept in order to condemn intervention in some cases and support it in others. Of course, any country that suffers direct, indirect or covert intervention by another State or group of States is entitled to defend its sovereignty in the way it sees fit.

114. The history of the country confirms its position on those aspects of international relations. All governments, even those with different political programmes and philosophies, have agreed to respect the principle of non-intervention, regardless of its root cause or aim.

115. Now, while there have been different forms of intervention, while attempts have been made to impose ideologies that differ from those traditional in our countries, Colombian democracy has an outstanding record of political stability, of peaceful alternation of ideologies in our administrations, with periodic elections in which the electoral system has been steadily improved, making it a genuine expression of the will of the national majority in its various trends—as was the case a few days ago, when hundreds of citizens were voted into the Senate, the House of Representatives, the departmental assemblies and councils in all municipalities of the country through the free and majority vote of their compatriots—we can affirm that Colombian democracy calmly but with due strength defends those key principles of international law.

116. Regional bodies, of course, are those most appropriate at this stage to seek and find solutions to the grave problems that have been brought to the Council. That was stressed recently by the representative of Togo [2339th meeting].

117. It seems evident that the inhabitants of this continent are better abreast of the details of the disputes that sometimes divide them and more able to seek peaceful solutions. Thus, the regional system which binds us through solemn commitments can be used when necessary. Nevertheless, Colombia accepts the right of Governments to present their problems in the Council, although we believe that taking that step as a first step weakens the regional system to which the problem before the Council should have been brought to seek and negotiate adequate solutions.

118. That is also the belief of the Government of Honduras, which has presented solutions deserving of study [2336th meeting]. In a different form, but on the same sound basis that we in Latin America understand our own problems better than do those in other continents, the President of Mexico has offered to mediate in order to seek solutions. All this shows that, while the theories have been perfected, the preventive procedures aimed at avoiding interference by countries in the internal affairs of other countries, procedures making it possible for peoples to enjoy self-determination, have deteriorated, if we compare the

results that we see in the region the Council is studying now with the contents of the many documents filling the libraries of the Inter-American System and of the United Nations.

119. We listened with particular attention and interest to the statement of the representative of Panama; aspects of his proposals coincide with the determination of the countries to find peaceful and satisfactory solutions.

120. My delegation agrees with the representative of Panama when, referring to the need to guarantee non-intervention in the internal affairs of each and every country and respect for each country's free choice of its internal system, he stated that:

"That entails, by means of specific and various measures, respecting the territorial borders between the countries and their respective sovereignties and not contributing in any way to the destabilization of the region or the internal system of any of its components or permitting territory to be used for the launching of destabilizing actions against other countries, for arms trafficking or the training or transit of combatants." [2339th meeting, para. 21.]

121. It is interesting to note that at a time when the applied sciences and technology have advanced in the field of nature, laying the ground for considerable transformations for the benefit of mankind, the social sciences—the art of the peaceful coexistence of human beings—have made little progress, and we can see that to impose ideologies, policies, and even trade transactions, the use of force is preferred to the use of the only means that differentiates us from non-human creatures: intelligence, the soul, the ability to understand that peoples can live in peace even though their political and ideological concepts may be profoundly different.

122. Therefore Colombia is concerned at the arms race, the inflated production of weapons in the world and the traffic in those weapons, whether it be legitimate—the result of open negotiations—or clandestine, for the benefit of those who take exception to the procedures of Governments elected in accordance with their respective constitutions and who are attempting to destabilize them by force, subversion and anarchy, and with the intervention of other nations, despite their apparent adherence to the norms of international law.

123. The President of Colombia, Julio César Turbay Ayala, and the President of Ecuador, Osvaldo Hurtado Larrea, at the conclusion of the recent visit by the Ecuadorian head of State to my country, signed a joint declaration in which, referring to the problem of Central America, they pointed out that they agree about the complexity and scope of the political, economic and social crisis of Central America, which demands profound solutions that can create conditions

for the development of stable and prosperous societies. They stated their rejection of foreign interference in the conflicts in this violently disturbed area of the hemisphere and expressed the hope that El Salvador would arrive through democratic means at the solution of its internal problems and at the restoration of peace through respect for the principle of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples.

124. In addressing the President of Ecuador, the President of Colombia highlighted the definition of peace given by Pope Paul VI, when he stated that the new name of peace is social justice. He said:

"There can be no social justice where situations are created such as the ones in our territory today resulting from phenomena that can arise under democratic capitalism, situations that require immediate redress if we do not want the edifice of our democratic hopes to crumble."

125. Peace demands sacrifices, but it is the basic prerequisite for the building of order and social progress. Justice requires that democracy, in order to survive, be understood by those who derive the greatest benefits from it and that it apply to those who are struggling, in difficult conditions, to defend it, maintain it and strengthen it, as an active, participatory, unified democracy.

126. We prefer negotiations, dialogue and the use of imagination to establish coexistence, with pluralistic views and through peaceful procedures, to intervention, subversion or force.

127. The money spent on weapons could transform the development and well-being of our peoples. Their progress, education, health and security are what is important in the life of our continent.

128. If today's generations are incapable of making a positive change in the present, too nationalistic and selfish, concept of the nation-State, so as to work in peace, with pluralism and the differences in our ideologies, if we opt to do harm to our young people and incite them to war, history will be infinitely harsh in its judgement of our time on this planet, a time when science is opening wide a marvelous window on progress for all mankind.

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

130. Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): We consider it a privilege that the delegation of the Congo should have been permitted to take part in this debate, which was requested by Nicaragua, at a time when you, Madam President, have the lofty responsibility of presiding over the Council.

131. That feeling is based on two main considerations.

132. The first stems from the fact that, since the People's Republic of the Congo maintains relations of co-operation with the United States based on the real interests of each partner and on strict mutual respect for the political independence, territorial sovereignty and honour of the other party, my delegation has every justification for its pleasure at seeing you presiding over the work of the Council for the month of March.

133. Secondly, because of the role that it plays in the American hemisphere, your country is particularly involved in the complaint submitted to the Council by Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, head of State of Nicaragua; and it seems to us particularly appropriate that a representative of the United States of your experience should have the opportunity in this very forum of appreciating directly the relationship that should be established between, on the one hand, the need, as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations, to promote international peace and security—a role pre-eminently incumbent upon the United States as a permanent member of the Council—and, on the other, the dangers inherent in any direct or indirect participation in matters which call for delicate handling because of the conflicts of rights that they entail.

134. In the view of the delegation of the Congo, there are at least three grounds—if indeed there is any need for grounds—to justify the complaint made by the Government of Nicaragua to the Council.

135. First, I am sure that everyone will recall the revelations contained not too long ago in the American press about a plan alleged to have been prepared by Washington in order to destabilize the situation in Nicaragua, a plan which would have made use of the henchmen of the former anachronistic Somoza dictatorship who have today taken refuge in a neighbouring country, considered quite rightly by observers of all persuasions as a springboard for the carrying out of acts of aggression against Nicaragua.

136. Secondly, the Sandinist Government has announced overflights of its national territory by United States aircraft for the purpose of photographing military targets in Nicaragua.

137. Thirdly, one has been able to observe recently an intensification of daily increasing incidents along the frontiers of that country—undoubtedly a prelude to larger-scale action that might be undertaken against the institutions which the Nicaraguan people has freely chosen at the cost of a bitter struggle against such a fierce enemy which left it with no alternative.

138. Today the world is distressed to witness the dangerous increase in tension in Central America, where El Salvador, a small, valiant and martyred country, constitutes the focus of obsessive attention. In the face of the maelstrom that Central America has now become, can the Council, whose primary re-

sponsibility is precisely that of maintaining international peace and security wherever peace is threatened, remain indifferent without running the risk of being accused of selective amnesia? No, quite the contrary. Our delegation believes that the Council in its wisdom will raise the level of this debate to that of the lofty responsibilities that are incumbent upon it under the Charter and thus permit the parties to the conflict to return to the path of peaceful negotiation which is so indispensable for a just and lasting settlement.

139. Let us recall that the policy of the worst course often ends up ultimately in removing any possibility of eliminating perils.

140. In this matter which has been under consideration by the Council since Thursday last, it is the conviction of the Congo delegation that, inasmuch as the question of the peace and security of Nicaragua and other Central American and Caribbean countries does not constitute a *sui generis* case, it results from at least two sets of factors.

141. One is the constant danger constituted by the policies of force, solutions of force and the recourse to force by certain great Powers as a means of settling conflicts; the other is the failure to observe the principles and norms of international law as they relate in particular to relations of good-neighbourliness and the options which every people has the right to select, free from outside interference.

142. Recourse to force in relations between States is a practice that, in itself, gives rise to or perpetuates the dangers of war that have been formally condemned by the Charter, which lays down, in its Preamble, as everyone knows, that the peoples of the United Nations are determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

143. The spirit of non-alignment has made that one of its basic principles and rejects any bloc policy that would reduce small and weak States to a tributary status and subject them to the doubtful demands of militarism. For very often it is not at all the interests of the people concerned that are taken into account in the crusades launched in the name of freedom, but only the appetites and ambitions for power of certain States. The disturbing logic of confrontation thus leads to the rendering of aid and assistance to oligarchic régimes which are oppressing their peoples, which are left no other choice by their oppressors than that of resorting to armed struggle to recover freedom and the other fundamental rights of the working masses which have been usurped by these unscrupulous oligarchies.

144. In this context, we should like to express here our profound admiration for the people and Government of Nicaragua for their marked determination to bring about justice and democracy in their country,

finally freed from the clutches of the Somoza clan. The memory of the high price paid by this valiant people for succeeding in overcoming a dictatorship supported from the outside by very powerful quarters remains alive in our minds.

145. There is in our view no established proof of any danger supposedly constituted by Nicaragua in Central America—a danger which the United States wishes to invoke as a pretext to justify its conduct towards that non-aligned country.

146. For us, Nicaragua must freely exercise the attributes of sovereignty without fear of outside intervention of interference in its own affairs, as is laid down in the United Nations General Assembly Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted on 9 December 1981 by the General Assembly as annex to its resolution 36/103, which stipulates:

“No State or group of States has the right to intervene or interfere in any form or for any reason whatsoever in the internal and external affairs of other States.”

The Declaration enumerates a certain number of rights and duties, including sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and the security of all States, the sovereign and inalienable right of a State freely to determine its own political, economic, cultural and social systems. It also calls upon States “. . . to abstain from any defamatory campaign, vilification or hostile propaganda for the purpose of intervening or interfering in the internal affairs of other States”.

147. The second set of factors that we should like to highlight concerns the observance of the principles and norms governing conduct in international relations.

148. Good-neighbourliness, which presupposes peaceful coexistence, embraces the cultural dimension of relations among peoples and thus constitutes an earnest of peace and progress through dialogue and exchange. For weak countries, countries in the grip of underdevelopment, good-neighbourliness is the symbol of unity and consequently of force, and can amount to a very powerful deterrent, just as indeed, thanks to the advantages of complementarity, it can make possible the creation of a network of objective or functional alliances.

149. The turmoil in which Central America is living at the present time is therefore of serious concern to countries like the People's Republic of the Congo, which has made of the principle of good-neighbourliness a keystone of its foreign policy.

150. The policy now pursued by President Denis Sassou-Nguesso towards the Congo's neighbours in Central Africa testifies to our unswerving adherence to that principle.

151. Unfortunately there have not been lacking—and I am sure that there will not be lacking—provocateurs who systematically blame States that have chosen a revolutionary or socialist option for all the misfortunes which may have arisen here and there. Is there any need for me to repeat that all these fabrications will never succeed in bending the will of the Congolese people to live in peace and harmony with their neighbours, whatever may be the differences in our political options? The Congolese revolution is not an exportable commodity. It is up to each people to decide freely on the qualitative transformations of the structures of its society in order to adapt them to the orientation it wishes to give its own history. The people of the Congo have always felt that our country's progress cannot be brought about without progress and development in other neighbouring fraternal countries. That is why we have said that the scrupulous application of the code of good-neighbourliness constitutes one of the most solid pillars of the foreign policy of President Sassou-Nguesso.

152. What is happening today in Central America is indeed what is happening in some parts of Africa, where certain Powers external to the area believe that it is their mission to take decisions and to act in the stead and place of the peoples which they intend thereby more easily to subjugate.

153. For us there can be no doubt that the sovereignty of a State belongs to its people and to its people alone. No problem of legitimacy can be posed from any other standpoint. The people have the right to oppose oppression. This is a fight that has been waged by freedom fighters in southern Africa; it is the same fight that has enabled the people of Nicaragua, who have fought this battle so nobly, to bring about an era of liberty, democracy and dignity.

154. Resistance to fascism in Europe in the 1940s and the French and American revolutions of more than a century ago were precursors of this struggle for liberation, and it would be entirely wrong to try to prevent other peoples from joining this struggle today.

155. We wish to express our sincere hope that, in Central America and in all other parts of the world where peace and security are imperilled because of intolerance and misunderstanding, all those who are responsible for the destinies of peoples will sincerely and honestly agree to mobilize their efforts for the sole purpose of establishing a climate of peace and understanding in order to bring about that true liberty that can only be understood within the framework of the legitimate aspirations of the greatest number in the societies concerned.

156. It is for that reason that we express our conviction that the message brought here by Commander Daniel Ortega, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, can only be a message of peace expressed by a people with out-



stretched hands that is only too well aware of the price of peace and liberty.

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

158. Mr. OURABAH (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Madam President, I should like first of all to congratulate you on behalf of the Algerian delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the month of March. I congratulate also your predecessor, Sir Anthony Parsons, the representative of the United Kingdom, for having directed the work of the Council so well last month.

159. Madam President, you represent a great country and a great people. At the very origin of that nation we find the ideals of independence and freedom. Those are precisely the ideals that other peoples have undertaken to enshrine in their own history, in their daily lives and in their future.

160. Whether they be the victims of colonial domination or of the confiscation of power by an oppressive minority, whether they be reduced to silence or be victims of repressive violence, the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the third world have been faced with the same system of denial and plunder. It is therefore quite natural that they have decided to struggle to regain their freedom and to impose their right to live in dignity.

161. To describe their struggle today in any other terms is to deny the very dynamics of struggles for liberation; it is to disregard the deep significance of the phenomenon of national liberation—that is, the right and freedom to be oneself.

162. The right of peoples freely to determine their own destiny, to defend what they have achieved in their struggle and to strengthen their independence forms the basis on which the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was built and through which the solidarity of its members has been strengthened.

163. The recent turn of events in the Central American region and the dangers inherent in the risk of possible foreign intervention in Nicaragua are a serious violation of that sacred principle of the Non-Aligned Movement.

164. That is why the situation in Central America and in the Caribbean has always been one of the concerns of the Non-Aligned Movement.

165. While expressing their concern at the development of the present crisis in Central America and the Caribbean, the non-aligned countries have, on every occasion, consistently called for the settlement of that crisis by peaceful means through dialogue and negotiation.

166. They have also consistently pointed out that its solution lies in strict respect for the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and those of the Non-Aligned Movement, especially those relating to the non-use of force, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, respect for the right of all peoples freely to determine their own destiny and, lastly, respect for the territorial integrity and independence of States.

167. The convening of the Council bears witness to the seriousness of the situation that currently prevails in Central America and the Caribbean and reflects the legitimate concern of the peoples of that region before the grave threats that exist to regional and international peace and security.

168. The growing danger of foreign intervention and the increasing number of acts likely to exacerbate the tensions existing in that region, which has already suffered too much, are a genuine source of concern for the international community and for the Government and people of Nicaragua in particular. These meetings of the Council, entrusted as it is with the maintenance of international peace and security, respond to the legitimate concern of the Republic of Nicaragua, whose sovereignty and independence are being threatened. They also respond to the international community's desire to see to it that the right of the peoples of that region freely to determine their own destiny is respected.

169. The crises that are creating turmoil in the Central American region are basically the result of many decades of social injustice, of tyranny, of marginalization and of poverty. The struggles those decades have engendered are being carried out on behalf of the right to life, the right to dignity and the right to full participation by peoples in the political and social processes that concern them. It is because they symbolize the attainment of all those rights that such struggles cannot constitute a threat to the security of other States. Quite the contrary, they represent a major contribution to the strengthening of peace and stability in that region. It is in this spirit—and I repeat, in this spirit—that we must view the change victoriously brought about by the people of Nicaragua at the cost of heavy and bloody sacrifices.

170. In welcoming a new era in Nicaragua, the international community welcomed the victory of freedom and social justice over tyranny and oppression. In welcoming the success of the Nicaraguan revolution, the peoples of the region welcomed a victory over exploitation and social injustice.

171. The deterioration of the situation in Central America, together with the threats against Nicaragua, has given rise to legitimate concern. The close surveillance to which that country is subject is sufficient reason for the fear of imminent danger.

172. In the face of the risks entailed by the escalation of violence, it is particularly fortunate that initiatives towards peace have been taken.

173. The fact that Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, has come before our Council with a message of peace is a first sign of such initiatives, and no doubt the most significant.

174. It also augurs well, in our opinion, that President López Portillo has committed all his personal wisdom and the total efforts of Mexican diplomacy to the peaceful settlement of disputes and to the strengthening of opportunities for negotiated solutions.

175. The fact that Nicaragua and Cuba have already expressed support for the Mexican proposals convinces us that the initiative is widely regarded as a wise one.

176. The peaceful, calm, responsible statements that we have been hearing here since the opening of this debate allow us to believe that the principles of the Charter, to which all speakers have reaffirmed their dedication, will prevail.

177. By responding to Nicaragua's request and holding the present debate, the Council has of course grasped the seriousness of a situation that bears the seeds of developments that threaten the peace and security of the Central American region and the Caribbean.

178. It is doubtless because of the faith of the Nicaraguan leaders in the Charter and their dedication to its cardinal principles that, for once, this body has not been called upon to consider a *de facto* breach of the peace, but that instead it has been called upon to

exercise its authority to prevent a crisis and to curcumvent the dangerous progress towards the threat and recourse to the use of force.

179. The Council is thus in a position fully to play its role as the vigilant guardian of the immutable principles of the Charter and to fulfil its primary responsibility, which is the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council is also now able to act in such a way that it will not be called upon to meet again in the future on the same agenda item after an irreparable act has been committed.

180. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Council will complete its present debate with a forceful statement of principles and with a strong appeal that they be duly taken into account.

181. In acting in accordance with the wishes of the peoples of a region so avid for peace and progress, the Council will be meeting the expectations of an international community alarmed at the increase of tension and aware of the indivisible nature of peace.

182. My delegation reserves its right to speak again in this debate, should other elements intervene.

*The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings, 29th meeting.*

<sup>2</sup> *United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 21, No. 324, p. 77.*

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, Eleventh Regular Session, vol. 1, document OEA/Ser.P/XI.0.2, pp. 81-82.*

---

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة  
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها  
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

**如何购取联合国出版物**

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

**HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

**COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

**КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

**COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---