

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2423rd MEETING: 25 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2423) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651) | 1 |

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.

2423rd MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 25 March 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2423)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2420th to 2422nd meetings], I invite the representative of Honduras to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Barbados, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Grenada, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Panama, the Philippines, Spain the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ortez Colindres (Honduras) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Zumbado Jiménez (Costa Rica), Mr. Roa Kourf (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Purushottam (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Maudave (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Arcilla (Philippines), Mr. de Piniés (Spain), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Coronel de Rodríguez (Venezuela) and Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) 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 Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Iran in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's 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, Miss Dever (Belgium), Mr. Salazar Paredes (Bolivia), Mr. Bittencourt (Brazil), Miss Castillo (Dominican Republic), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Sir, representing, as you do, a country with which Guyana enjoys cordial and friendly relations, it gives me special pleasure to welcome your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. You bring to this high office, in addition to your well-known qualities as a diplomat, your methodical, efficient manner, which together give us assurance that under your stewardship the Council will effectively and successfully discharge its responsibilities.

4. I must also take this opportunity to express to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, my delegation's appreciation for the very capable and smooth manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during February.

5. It was exactly one year ago that the Government of Nicaragua requested the convening of the Council [S/14913] to consider the dangerous situation existing in Central America. In the course of the meetings following that request, our attention was drawn to the overt threats of destabilization and harassment being made against Nicaragua and the preparations being made for intervention through the equipping and training of members of the former Somoza National Guard in a territory neighbouring Nicaragua. The Council was warned on that occasion that this situation posed a serious threat to the peace and security of the region, with consequences extending even beyond it.

6. Recent events have served to give even further confirmation of the correctness of the analyses made in 1982. The fears we expressed then are being vindicated by the actions of the same States which were then accused of aggressive and threatening behaviour. As a State of the Latin American and Caribbean region, Guyana has been following with concern the marked deterioration in the situation in parts of Central America, and it is with compelling necessity that we join our voice with those of the delegations which have preceded us in making that concern public.

7. My delegation listened with care as the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua recounted [2420th meeting] recent developments in, and in relation to, his country. We have taken note of the massive infiltration of members of the former Somoza National Guard from across Nicaragua's northern border, some penetrating as far as Matagalpa, in the vicinity of Rio Blanco. My delegation sincerely regrets the loss of Nicaraguan life which has followed these infiltrations and fully shares the assessment of the Nicaraguan Government regarding a possible internationalization of the conflict in the region.

8. I wish to state at the outset that it is my delegation's understanding that the Council is convened, not to sit in judgement against the institutions or the policies which the Government of Nicaragua has decided to put in place or to implement in order to secure the political, social and economic advancement of the people of Nicaragua. To advance a criticism of any such internal arrangements as a reason, or even a justification, for harassing the Nicaraguan Government constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and independence of Nicaragua, an interference in that country's internal affairs and a breach of the Charter of the United Nations. No State has the right to dictate to the people of Nicaragua how they should organize their internal affairs. The political reality of the Latin American and Caribbean region is one of ideological pluralism. Any attempt to impose hegemony or ideological conformity on the States of the region constitutes a violation of our sovereign independence and is bound to lead to relations of tension, distrust and instability.

9. At any rate I must recall, as a parenthesis, that for 45 years the people of Nicaragua endured Somoza's tyranny, with no corresponding concern being raised in the Council for democratic freedoms or for a more even distribution of the country's wealth. Now that for the first time the people of Nicaragua are given an opportunity to organize their affairs for their own benefit and advancement, attempts are being made to frustrate and divert those efforts.

10. What the Council is convened to consider is the complaint by the Government of Nicaragua regarding the dangerous situation created by the intensified attempts at destabilizing the Government of that country and at destroying its successful revolution—attempts organized, financed, supported and loudly proclaimed

from outside and involving the use of the territory of a neighbouring State as a springboard for attacks by mercenaries and dissidents against the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua.

11. It was little more than two months ago that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of member States of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries met in the Nicaraguan capital in extraordinary session, from 10 to 14 January, to address their attention to the situation in Latin America and the Caribbean. The preoccupations expressed by the Ministers were sustained by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which met at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March and in relation to the situation in Central America denounced, in paragraph 136 of the Political Declaration [see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex]:

“the new and increasing threats and acts of intimidation and the growing seriousness and increased number of acts of aggression against Nicaragua, particularly the violation of its airspace and territorial waters, the utilization of the territory of foreign countries in and outside the region as bases for aggression and the training of counter-revolutionary forces, the commission of terrorist actions and sabotage, particularly the attacks of armed groups of ex-Somoza guards through its northern border, which had resulted in considerable loss of life and property, as well as measures of economic pressure at the international level. These were considered part of a deliberate plan to harass and destabilize that country, as has been acknowledged by a foreign Power.”

12. The heads of State or Government also called on the Governments of the United States and Honduras to adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue, in conformity with the principles of international law, and called on all States to avoid any act of policy that might increase tensions in the region.

13. In relations between States, the principles of international law must be inviolate and scrupulously respected. That is our only guarantee of peaceful and stable inter-State relations. The international community long ago outlawed intervention as an instrument of State behaviour. More recently, in 1970, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.¹ That Declaration, taking the Charter as its point of departure, solemnly proclaimed, *inter alia*, the principle that States shall refrain 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. The Declaration on Friendly Relations also set forth the principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

14. In December 1981, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention

and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States.² The Declaration set out in clear language the duties comprehended in the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. Those duties include:

“(a) The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

“(b) The duty of a State to ensure that its territory is not used in any manner which would violate the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity or disrupt the political, economic and social stability of another State; . . .

“(c) The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;

“ . . .

“(e) The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions”.³

This Declaration enjoys the total support of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, because its principles have historically been a corner-stone of our Movement. We felt it was necessary to set them out in clear, declaratory form as further protection for small States, which are invariably the victims of aggression and intervention.

15. It must be emphasized here again that the people of Nicaragua are striving for nothing more than their political, economic and social advancement. Their efforts are not aimed at proving or disproving the superiority of one ideological world view or another. It is dangerous, unrealistic and self-serving to seek to distort and misrepresent the domestic impulses for change in Central America and to seek to explain them in terms of an East-West confrontation.

16. The infiltration of counter-revolutionary forces into Nicaragua, in addition to constituting an attack against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that State, is causing great loss of life and damage to property and is diverting the efforts of the Nicaraguan Government from its most important task of nation-building. What is more, this action leads to a heightening of the tension in the relations between Honduras and

Nicaragua, with the increased danger of an armed conflict which could engulf the entire subregion, with dangerous consequences for the peace and security of the Americas and the Caribbean.

17. The grave nature of the present situation notwithstanding, my delegation nourishes the hope that there is still a chance for reason to prevail and for the voices of moderation to be heard over the shrill clamour of intervention and belligerence. My delegation makes a solemn appeal for an end to all aggressive actions and attitudes towards Nicaragua and the Sandinist revolution. We appeal for full respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua. We appeal for peace to be given a chance in Central America.

18. In this context, Guyana would like to express its appreciation and support for the efforts of States in the region to find peaceful solutions to the crises prevailing in Central America. We make special mention of the proposals of the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela⁴ articulated earlier this year in the Panamanian island of Contadora. Guyana expresses its positive encouragement of this initiative.

19. My delegation also welcomes the reiteration by the Government of Nicaragua of its willingness to enter into a dialogue on Central American problems, its readiness to tackle immediately the problems and differences which have resulted from military actions in its border area with Honduras and its open, constructive attitude to the peaceful settlement of the crises in Central America. My delegation urges all States, in the interest of the well-being of the Nicaraguan people and of peace and stability in Central America, to abandon postures of intervention and destabilization and instead to seek political solutions to whatever differences may exist between them and Nicaragua. I also wish here to reiterate Guyana's unswerving solidarity with the Government and people of Nicaragua in their struggle to defend their independence, their sovereignty and their territorial integrity.

20. Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): It gives me special pleasure, Sir, to join my colleagues who have spoken before me to extend our congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council and to express our appreciation for the exemplary manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of the Council during the past three weeks. We feel confident that the Council will continue to benefit from your wide experience, ability and diplomatic skill in the consideration of the issues before it. May I also take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the excellent manner in which your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

21. The fact is not disputed that the situation in Central America remains deeply disturbed. The growing dislocation of political, social and economic life in that region, resulting from ideological confrontations and foreign interference, is a cause of profound concern and deep

anxiety to all of us who profess our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The worsening situation in the Central American region is of immediate concern to the Security Council, which, under the Charter, has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

22. We have listened with close attention to the statements made by the representatives of the countries directly involved and also to statements by others deeply interested in the situation. The factual situation in the region may look somewhat blurred, but not totally obfuscated, in the light of the passionately held views of the protagonists. There is no doubt that the situation on the Nicaraguan border with Honduras has greatly worsened in recent days and threatens to develop into an armed conflict between these two States, the consequences of which are bound to extend beyond their territories.

23. The process of change in developing countries in recent times is a familiar phenomenon. It is also a familiar development that outside interested parties have sought to distort or thwart this process in the pursuit of goals and objectives which have nothing to do with the interests and aspirations of the peoples directly involved in the process of change. It is as much a travesty to present foreign armed intervention in the affairs of other States as an internal uprising as it is to describe a genuine liberation struggle as a manifestation of foreign interference.

24. It is the sovereign right of all free peoples to decide their own form of government and the political, social and economic structures best suited to their genius free from foreign intervention and to shape their destiny in accordance with their own free will. It is also vital for the peace and security of all States that the process of change within a country not be exploited by any other country for its own purposes, nor should any other country seek to prescribe that process as an unsolicited panacea for the problems of other countries. It is not permissible for any outside Power to attempt to capture the process of change with a view to predetermining its course or changing its direction in its own interest.

25. The people of Nicaragua courageously overthrew the oppressive Somoza régime and are poised to pluck the fruits of their revolutionary struggle. They deserve our help and support to complete the process of change in peace and to consolidate the foundations of a better life for their present and future generations. They have a difficult road to traverse, and it will take time before they achieve total harmony and the fulfilment of their hopes and aspirations. They can do so in peace and with a sense of responsibility if they do not feel threatened by external aggression.

26. During our visit to Nicaragua on the occasion of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983, we had the opportunity to meet the leaders and people of the country and to witness their efforts to rebuild their homeland, so recently ravaged by internal strife and natural calamity.

We wish them well and we feel confident that, left alone, they will be able to achieve their objectives without causing anxiety or concern to any of their neighbours.

27. Pakistan is deeply interested in the demonstration of respect for the principles of the Charter by all concerned in the Central American region, even though we are situated at a distance from that region. Our experience in our own region convinces us that unquestionably the Charter principles are of universal applicability and that no State can escape the consequences of the violation of those principles, no matter how distant the region in which they occur.

28. It is highly satisfying that the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras have both expressed a desire on the part of their Governments to engage in a dialogue in order to seek a negotiated settlement of their differences. In this context, we welcome the initiatives taken by the regional States, which can effectively contribute towards the reduction of tensions and the settlement of the disputes between the neighbouring States. The Council has a great opportunity to encourage such initiatives for peace. It should also take an active interest in promoting a process of peaceful negotiation in fulfilment of its responsibilities under the Charter. As a first step, it might consider sending a fact-finding mission to the region to assess the situation on the ground and to report its findings to the Council. The dispatch of such a fact-finding mission would in itself serve to reduce tension and would be in conformity with the recommendation in the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.⁵

29. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you, no longer merely upon the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month but also in connection with the fact that, for almost a month now, you have successfully and effectively been discharging these functions. Permit me also to thank those delegations that have complimented the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Troyanovsky, on the discharge by him of his functions as President of the Security Council last month.

30. At the request of the Government of Nicaragua, the Council has been urgently convened to consider the question of the expansion of acts of aggression against that State.

31. The Soviet delegation has listened attentively to the cogent statement of the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco. He made a broad and well-developed case confirming the justness of the appeal by the Government of Nicaragua to the Security Council. The numerous facts contained in that statement incontrovertibly demonstrate that direct armed intervention is being waged against the Republic of Nicaragua from the territory of neighbouring Honduras, and that the United States is the prime mover behind

that intervention. Accordingly, there has arisen in that area an extremely serious situation which poses a direct threat to international peace and security.

32. There can be no doubt that the incursion into Nicaragua of gangs of counter-revolutionary mercenaries is the most recent act in an undeclared but none the less dangerous war which the United States has for some years now been waging against the Nicaraguan people and its revolution.

33. The Republic of Nicaragua is appealing to the Council and bringing to it a complaint against actions of the United States by no means for the first time. These actions of the United States have created a threat to Nicaragua's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. Precisely one year ago [2335th to 2337th, 2339th, 2341st to 2343rd and 2347th meetings] this question was the subject of careful consideration by the Council. At that time the United States blocked the adoption by the Council of a draft resolution [S/14941] designed to bring about a peaceful settlement of the problems of Central America, a draft resolution that condemned intervention in the internal affairs of the States of that region and called for a renunciation of the threat or use of force. In retrospect it has become exceedingly clear that the United States veto of that Security Council draft resolution last year was by no means an accident. The United States was thus reserving its right to have recourse to armed force in the struggle against the Nicaraguan revolution.

34. The current invasion of Nicaragua by the Somozist mercenaries, prepared and instigated by the United States, is the direct continuation and consequence of this United States policy. From the political standpoint the United States has unleashed against Nicaragua a low and base slanderous campaign in which the highest ranks of the American Administration are involved. Militarily speaking, on United States territory, particularly in Miami, but also in Texas and in California, bases have been set up for the military training of Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries. Similar camps have been set up in Honduras, where former Somozists are being armed, trained and equipped through the use of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) funds. Today—and here lies the particular danger of this new stage—these mercenaries trained and nurtured by the United States have been released from their chains and thrown against the Nicaraguan people.

35. It is instructive to note that in her statement to the Council [2420th meeting] the United States representative was entirely silent about these facts. She did not deny them. In that statement the representative of the United States even attempted to wax ironical at the allegedly unjustified "obsession" of the Nicaraguans with the danger of invasion by the United States. If we are to believe her assertions, what is happening in Nicaragua is nothing more than a matter of internal complications.

36. However, we should like to draw particular attention to one ominous circumstance. This manoeuvre of

American diplomacy in the United Nations is not new. As recent history has shown, such movement is a prelude to large-scale intervention. By means of precisely such verbal cover Washington prepared an intervention in 1954 against Guatemala and another in 1961 against Cuba. It is worth dwelling on this in further detail.

37. Almost 30 years ago Washington embarked on a slander campaign against the progressive régime in Guatemala. Formerly secret material of the White House and the State Department that has since been published makes irrefutably clear the hypocrisy and cynicism of this diversionary operation. Under cover of it—as emerges clearly from these documents; I stress "documents"—the United States organized and trained interventionist forces for use against Guatemala, primarily on the territory of Honduras. By way of a direct pretext for intervention, as it were, to lend verisimilitude, the CIA even at that time organized bombings of the aerodrome in Honduras. At the same time the CIA introduced into Guatemala itself a number of radio stations which were represented as being "rebel" radio stations. How reminiscent of this is the style of today's American operation against Nicaragua. The same leading figures are involved—counter-revolutionaries armed from abroad, from the United States and Honduras.

38. I should, however, like to add that immediately after the conclusion of the 1954 *coup* in Guatemala the United States Ambassador to that country, Mr. Puerifoy, presented to the new authorities an extremely cynical document. It was a list of names of Guatemalan citizens who were to be shot within 24 hours at the request of the United States Ambassador—I repeat, at the request of the United States Ambassador. Here you have the true position of United States diplomacy in the matter of human rights, a position that is now a matter of historical record. After that one may ask what value we are to attach to the homily delivered the day before yesterday in the Council by the United States representative regarding what was described as the concern of the United States about human rights in Nicaragua.

39. Finally, there is the cynical outcome of the United States operation against Guatemala in 1954, intended to stifle the progressive régime there. The chief of the mercenaries who had been instructed to carry out the *coup* by the CIA, Castillo Armas, stated at the time to the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon: "Tell us what you want us to do, and that is what we will do." Those words were uttered in fact after the mass executions carried out on the basis of the lists delivered by the United States Ambassador.

40. These facts are incontrovertible, and I am basing all that I say on United States documents that reveal the true face of United States policy in Latin America.

41. I would like to mention one further interventionist operation by the United States, one that failed. That is the operation against Cuba in 1961. The United States President, as far back as March of 1960, had ordered the CIA to prepare that intervention; this is a fact that has

now been fully documented. The representatives of the United States in the United Nations were at the time busy slandering Cuba. The United States was already organizing and arranging the financing and training of mercenaries against Cuba on Guatemalan territory, while Washington's diplomats were still holding forth on the "Red threat". Is it not one of the bitter ironies of history that this time preparations for intervention against the progressive régime in Cuba were carried out on Guatemalan territory, where the United States had earlier overthrown another progressive régime? That is the real "domino theory"—counting upon overthrowing progressive régimes one after the other. And United States practice is in accordance with it.

42. Finally, the invasion of Cuba by mercenaries in April 1961 was also begun under cover of the pretext of the alleged beginning of an "internal uprising" inside Cuba. Washington, for example, declared that Cuban airports were being bombed by Cuban pilots who were supposedly "disillusioned with the régime". The then United States representative to the United Nations—and many will have a personal memory of this—displayed to representatives photographs of those aircraft bearing the identification markings of the Cuban armed forces. All of this, as we know today, was the crudest of counterfeits. The aircraft, the pilots, the bombs and even the photographs themselves were all the work of the CIA.

43. After all this, after such a record of service in Latin America by Washington, the United States representative is still trying to discredit the fears of Nicaragua. Now, however, we know. This may very well be another cover operation, and particularly because the United States representative has made no secret here of her hatred of the Sandinists.

44. Thus recent history and actions of the United States in Latin America have shown that it is not a matter of Nicaragua's misguidedly and wrongly fearing intervention on the part of the United States. The fact is that the United States has been suffering to a dangerous degree from a disease called "power mania", a mania of disrespect for the freedom and independence of Latin American countries, an intervention mania. In the final analysis, the so-called "big stick" policy is an invention of the United States linguistically, politically and militarily to be a means of resolving the problem of human rights.

45. If today the United States is openly arming and training former Somozists and sending them onto Nicaraguan territory, the prime motive here is simply to overthrow a progressive national régime in that country and set up a puppet, pro-American régime. It would appear that there are some in Washington who lose sleep at the thought of how obedient a tool the dictator Somoza was in their hands. It is known that Somoza once cynically told the President of Mexico, Luis Echeverría, literally the following: "You should envy me. I have no problems. All I have to do is what Washington wants me to do."

46. The architects of this kind of United States policy, however, should have understood long ago that the days of Somoza, Batista and Trujillo have disappeared into oblivion for ever. Neither the support of anti-popular dictatorial régimes nor intervention on the part of mercenaries will be able to prevent the peoples themselves from determining their own fate, nor will they succeed in breaking the people of Nicaragua.

47. At a meeting held today in Moscow with the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andropov, stated the sincere solidarity of the Soviet Union with the Nicaraguan people and expressed his conviction that Nicaragua will succeed in defending its freedom and independence.

48. The Soviet delegation vigorously condemns the intervention against Nicaragua prepared and carried out by the United States and its mercenaries. It supports the appeal contained in the statement made by the representative of Nicaragua to the Council [*ibid.*] to call on the United States to put an end to acts of provocation against Nicaragua and to halt the undeclared war being waged against that country by the United States Administration.

49. However, what makes the current phase of the interventionist activity of the United States particularly dangerous now is the fact that we are not talking here about an isolated operation against Nicaragua.

50. The aggressive interventionist policy of the United States against Nicaragua is part of its overall policy of stepping up international tension and escalating threats to independent States in various parts of the world. These actions are aimed directly at all non-aligned and other developing countries which are pursuing an independent foreign and domestic policy and do not wish to follow in the wake of Washington.

51. Just a month ago the United States had recourse to flagrant acts of armed provocation and military pressure against Libya. Today it has raised to a new stage intervention against Nicaragua. Tomorrow the target of American blackmail could be any other non-aligned State whose policy is not to Washington's liking.

52. That is why now that Nicaragua is calling upon fraternal non-aligned countries and other States Members of the United Nations for support in this hour of trial for that small country, it is the duty of all countries which love peace and freedom to give Nicaragua that support.

53. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Jordan is primarily concerned at the tension existing inside and around Nicaragua's borders and in the Central American region. Our concern is due to three main factors.

54. First, the last thing needed by Nicaragua and certain Central American countries affected by the present crisis is tension characterized by fear and the danger of armed conflict. The first thing the people of that region need is stability and tranquillity so that they can concentrate all their efforts and means on development and construction. Exhausting their means in a conflict would hardly bring the kind of prosperity that the people of good will of that region so ardently desire.

55. Secondly, it must be realized that security cannot be realized by force. That would be a vain policy. That policy has been and is being tested by one of the parties in conflict in the Middle East, but the results of such conduct are obvious to all: there has been an increase in tension, an excess of violence and a lessening of the chances for peace and security. Furthermore—and this increases our concern—the party in question is becoming involved in the affairs of the region that is under consideration; that party is intensifying its various policies in the region and taking advantage of certain social contradictions and the economic gaps that exist.

56. That type of sabotage in the region confirms what we have said on a number of occasions about our concern. The country in question is pursuing an expansionist policy against Arab countries too and is intervening in the internal affairs of others. This has disturbed the international atmosphere, accentuated tension and caused much turmoil in international affairs. The persistent attempts of that State to control that part of the world and use it as a theatre for its plans require that the international community act with caution in view of the dangers inherent in that policy.

57. The enormous arms transactions and the sending of military experts to that part of the world will certainly not help to consolidate peace and security among the peoples there. We believe that security and war are in a sense inversely proportionate.

58. Thirdly, what accentuates our concern is how frequently there has been recourse to violence and force in international affairs, and insufficient attention has been given to the effects of that negative policy internally and externally. Also, there has been a failure to recognize the results of intervention in the internal affairs of others and the need for good-neighbourliness among States.

59. I have referred to the Middle East in my statement about Central America, not only to point out that those at the source of tension in our region play a role in complicating the problems of our brothers in Central America, but also to recall the consequences of these policies for security and stability not only on the internal affairs of the countries in question but at the regional and international levels as well.

60. The likelihood of the conflict spreading beyond the bilateral or regional framework and becoming internationalized has accentuated our concern; that could very dangerously polarize affairs, resulting in greater hardship

and more suffering for the people in that friendly region. Such a situation would lead to more serious and more widespread problems, and that would mean ignoring the main disputes in order to deal with the emerging problems. Our region also has suffered from such a state of affairs. We see a feverish attempt being made to disguise the true source of tension by creating new problems as a result of war and expansion.

61. Countries must avoid cold war policies, they must promote détente, and they must cease using small States to test and implement their policies. We feel that the major Powers, which bear a special responsibility vis-à-vis security and stability throughout the world, have a better course to follow, instead of pursuing the unacceptable interventionist policy or being indifferent. They must stand by the small countries. They must help them build their democratic and modern institutions and help them develop their productive potential so that they, too, can exercise self-determination without foreign interference. All that would certainly help all the parties to create an atmosphere, regionally and internationally, full of understanding, co-operation and mutual respect.

62. To believe that "He who is not with me is against me" is wrong policy. It ignores the principle of non-alignment, which is followed by more than two thirds of the countries of the world, including Nicaragua, whose people have suffered for more than half a century from one-man dictatorship and who now, more than ever before, need security and peace so that they can devote themselves to security and development. That, if achieved, would be the main guarantee for human rights and would ensure a life of dignity for the citizens of the country.

63. I should like to appeal to all the parties concerned, an appeal that has been repeated by many of those who have spoken before me, to follow a policy of self-control, avoid escalation and settle disputes peacefully by means of a constructive dialogue and quiet diplomacy. We have been encouraged by the declarations of the representatives of all parties concerned in which they expressed their countries' readiness to continue a policy of dialogue and negotiations in an effort to agree on a friendly settlement of the existing dispute. We also hope that efforts made by leaders of States in the area, in particular those of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, will be continued, to bring viewpoints together and to arrive at a common denominator. We believe that if confidence and co-operation prevail, if everyone shows patience and calm, then a spirit of moderation and understanding will prevail and the reasons for tension will disappear.

64. In conclusion I should like to recall what may be known to all, that is, that violence has never succeeded in solving any problem.

65. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to say how pleased my delegation is at seeing the representative of a country so close to ours presiding since the beginning of this month over the

Security Council. Our work has been particularly heavy, and under your enlightened direction, Sir, we have been able to make progress.

66. I should like also to pay a tribute to the representative of the Soviet Union, who presided with such wisdom over our work last month.

67. My delegation has listened with the closest attention to the representatives of Nicaragua, Honduras and the United States. We listened also with particular interest to the representative of Mexico, who made a remarkable speech, as well as to the statements of representatives of Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Spain.

68. We had already met a year ago [2335th meeting] to hear Nicaragua's statement about threats to its security. Today that same country is complaining once again at having to face an armed struggle that imperils its stability. Quite clearly the problems have not been solved and the letter sent to you by Nicaragua, Sir, demonstrates the deterioration of the situation in Central America.

69. Very much concerned by this rising tension, the French Government appeals for moderation. It rejects recourse to force and would like to see the establishment of a climate of understanding, which would make it possible to resolve all the problems of the region by dialogue and negotiation.

70. In this regard we welcome the initiative put forward last year by Mexico and Venezuela to find a solution to the problem of the conflict between Honduras and Nicaragua, and we regret that this initiative was not followed up. We also welcome last January's Contadora declaration,⁴ and we support its principles, in particular its condemnation of interference in Latin American disputes and its refusal to situate these disputes within the framework of the East-West confrontation. This declaration is in any case in no way in contradiction with the Honduran peace plan of March 1982 [S/14919, annex], in which, at the time, we stressed our interest.

71. Dialogue can start only in the absence of external interference. Anxious to see Central America recovering the calm and stability necessary to strengthen democracy and respect for human rights, France rejects any interference, whatever its source. France is convinced that the countries of the region can find, through dialogue and concerted endeavour, ways and means of restoring peace.

72. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Nicaragua wanted to speak to present some information and to bring the situation up to date somewhat as it continues to develop. It is a tense situation in the border region between Nicaragua and Honduras. We hope that we will be constructive.

73. About an hour ago we submitted a letter [S/15656] to you, Sir, in your capacity as President of the Security Council, in which the delegation of Nicaragua presents a

number of official documents from our Government giving information about the situation in the border area. These documents have been annexed to the letter, and we understand they may be available in a few hours to the members of the Council.

74. The annexes are the following. Annex I is a message from the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction dated 21 March 1983, to which I referred last Wednesday in my introductory statement [2420th meeting]. Annex II is a note of protest sent to Mr. Edgardo Paz Barnica, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, by Mrs. Nora Astorga, Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, referring to a certain border incident which I also mentioned in my introductory statement. This has to do with certain attacks from Honduran territory by the Honduran army against a Nicaraguan military observation post. The third annex is an official communiqué from the Ministry of Defence of Nicaragua about another incident. Annex IV is the text of another note of protest sent to Mr. Paz Barnica by Mrs. Astorga, dated 24 March. I should like to read a portion of it aloud to bring members of the Council up to date and to go a little further into the situation as it exists at present in Central America.

"The purpose of this note is to bring the following to your attention:

"At 8:10 a.m. today, 24 March 1983, troops of the Honduran army opened fire from their positions in Honduran territory on the Nicaraguan armed forces' observation post on La Zopilota hill, 2 kilometres south-west of San Pedro de Potrero Grande, department of Chinandega. The attack, in which gunfire from various types of weapons was used, lasted 15 minutes.

"Later that day at noon, another Honduran military unit made an attack with gunfire on a patrol of the Sandinist People's Army at a place called El Oyate, 6 kilometres north-west of the frontier post at El Espino, department of Madriz, wounding one member of the Nicaraguan patrol.

"Moreover, at 9:30 a.m. yesterday, 23 March, troops of the Sandinist People's Army intercepted a unit of Somoza counter-revolutionaries who were attempting to infiltrate into Nicaraguan territory from Honduran territory. As a result of this engagement, three of our soldiers were killed, and 15 FAL automatic rifles, one RPG-7 rocket launcher . . . and several kilograms of C-4 plastic explosives were seized from the counter-revolutionaries."

That is the main information contained in the diplomatic note sent by Mrs. Astorga to Mr. Paz Barnica regarding these border incidents. There are a number of political considerations following upon the above text, but I need not go into them because these matters have already in one way or another been pointed out in this chamber. Annex V is the text of a note of protest sent to Mr. Paz

Barnica by Mrs. Astorga, also dated 24 March. The text of that note reads as follows:

[*The speaker read annex V to document S/15656.*]

75. I wanted to introduce and read out these documents, which will be in the hands of Council members in a few hours, precisely to emphasize the fact that the existing conflict in the border region between Nicaragua and Honduras has taken a dangerous turn, that is, towards the possibility of an internationalization of the conflict, which, as we said last Wednesday, could be part of a more comprehensive plan to attempt to overthrow the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua.

76. In contrast to this official information which I have just transmitted to the Council and which reflects the seriousness of the border situation with Honduras, the attacks that are occurring and the danger of escalation of this conflict, I should like to read out a very small part of an article which most Council members have probably already read, it having been published in today's edition of *The New York Times*. It was written by the well-known American correspondent and specialist in Latin American affairs, Mr. Alan Riding, who is now in Managua. One of the most important parts of this background article by this writer well known in the United States is as follows. Referring to a press conference by the Interior Minister of Nicaragua, Commander Tomás Borge, Mr. Riding wrote:

"Mr. Borge estimated that some 2,000 'counter-revolutionaries' were now inside Nicaragua. But he said most were operating in the northern provinces of Nueva Segovia, Jinotega and Zelaya, which border on Honduras.

" 'Matagalpa is merely diversionary to make us lower our guard in the north', he declared.

"The news conference was held as the situation in the country as a whole appeared calm. Travelers to Matagalpa Province found that roads were open to ordinary traffic and that none of the towns claimed to be controlled by rebels—San Ramón, Muy Muy, Matiguás or San Dionisio—had even been attacked. Army patrols, though, had apparently been stepped up in the area."*

77. I wanted to read out some of this article from an American source well versed in the region precisely to contrast this with other reports and point out that the facts tend to confirm the fears expressed by Nicaragua last Wednesday that the Somozist counter-revolutionary forces infiltrated inside Nicaragua do not in themselves represent a military threat for the stability of revolutionary power, but that they could play a co-operating role as part of broader aggressive action against Nicaragua whose goal would be to strike militarily against Nicaragua in the Pacific region or other regions, with the participation of other forces in the area that are not only

Somozist forces. That is to say that, on the one hand, the falsity of the information and propaganda about the counter-revolutionary forces and their control or activities inside the country has been clearly confirmed; on the other hand, it has been reaffirmed that the counter-revolutionary activity is mostly in the border area, where, as we said, the majority of the counter-revolutionary troops are located and precisely where the incidents with some Honduran military units are taking place. In conclusion, the facts tend to confirm our fears that, because of forces outside the region, the conflict is being converted into an international conflict which will have a destabilizing influence and create even greater problems for the Sandinist revolution.

78. I should also like to present some specific facts concerning the information that has been referred to by delegations that have already spoken in this forum in relation to events and talks that should be taking place in Central America.

79. My delegation wishes to repeat that it considers it vital and urgent to continue to take up bilateral problems between Honduras and Nicaragua, precisely in order to prevent the escalation of a bilateral conflict. Therefore we repeat that we are ready and willing to revitalize the Mexican-Venezuelan proposal, which calls for negotiations and dialogue between Honduras and Nicaragua in the presence of the initiative's two sponsor countries. We repeat Nicaragua's willingness to go further into these bilateral negotiations that we regard as fundamental, and we call on the initiative's sponsor Governments to approach the parties involved in the conflict to sound them out and see if they are prepared for dialogue.

80. The delegation of Nicaragua also wishes to stress that our country is willing to move forward in consideration of the regional problem in Central America. We repeat that we are prepared to listen to initiatives from the sponsor countries of the Contadora initiative⁴—the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela—in order to begin those steps that can lead us to serious and profound consideration of the Central American crisis, its origins, its factors, its worsening, those responsible for it and the steps to be taken to resolve it. We insist therefore that, as we move along bilaterally, we begin to tackle the more complex problems of the regional crisis.

81. But what we do not accept—and what we regard as very dangerous—is that the urgency of bilateral dialogue aimed at resolving urgent problems, such as the threat of an international war, should be denied under the pretext that efforts are being made at the regional level to find solutions for the region. Solutions to the region's problems must be found because that is the only way to spare the people of Nicaragua and the people of Central America further hardship. A regional solution must be sought step by step, as the problem is exceedingly delicate.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

82. Of course we shall talk about an arms buildup; of course we shall talk about advisers; of course we shall talk about significant factors and incidents in the crisis in the region; of course we shall talk about an excessive arms buildup. However, in order to define something as excessive we must define the threat that is facing us, and before qualifying a country's arms buildup as excessive we must qualify the threat hanging over that country, the determining factors, the political will of the Governments inside and outside the region that are involved in this conflict and the readiness of the countries hostile to the country being accused of an excessive arms buildup to respect territorial integrity and sovereignty and publicly to commit themselves not to commit aggression against that country.

83. Therefore Nicaragua repeats that it is prepared to move forward on the regional level in a serious and sustained manner. But in order to prevent internationalization of the war, it urges the taking of steps to deal bilaterally with the problems between Honduras and Nicaragua and halt the campaign of aggression against Nicaragua that is being waged across our borders and against our people.

84. At the same time, the delegation of Nicaragua wishes to stress that it is prepared to consider any other specific suggestion that the Council believes should be considered or explored, in the Council or by any other means. The delegation of Nicaragua has an open mind in this respect; our interest in convening this meeting was to call attention to the seriousness of the situation, and for this reason we are prepared to examine any means of finding a solution.

85. In conclusion, we believe it important to refer to another matter, in connection with the position of the Government of the United States. We should recall that the President of the United States has, to all intents and purposes, repeated the accusations of an arms buildup by Nicaragua in his press conference of two days ago, which we are all familiar with. In order to accuse us of an arms buildup he showed a satellite photograph of Augusto César Sandino International Airport, where there were three Soviet-made MI-8 helicopters for civilian use. One of those helicopters is the one the Pope used to go to León on his recent visit. What are they trying to prove by showing a photograph of Augusto César Sandino International Airport with three helicopters that cannot even fly as far as Miami or any other place in the United States?

86. The general view seems to be that President Reagan, by presenting a series of misinterpreted facts, simply wanted to justify an increase in the military budget he is requesting at home. That is one view that has been widely disseminated. However, for those countries that are being singled out, there could be an explanation other than the mere domestic use of this accusation for reasons concerned with the military budget, and that is that the political conditions are being prepared for acts of aggression against those countries. We cannot be so irresponsibly

as to believe naïvely that arguments are being put forward just to increase the military budget of the United States.

87. As the representative of Grenada said yesterday [2422nd meeting], the history of the United States in Latin America has shown clearly that the aggressive acts of the United States against Latin American countries have been preceded by such political publicity campaigns to prepare American public opinion to accept this kind of military involvement in the region. Thus we should like also to express our concern over these references which not only are baseless and devoid of material content but constitute a threat to our country.

88. In addition, and still in this connection, we wish to point out that we continue to be concerned at the lack of response to our specific charges in respect of the involvement of the Government of the United States in the destabilization efforts against Nicaragua. There has been a silence, and that has been pointed out by a number of representatives in this chamber. Will the silence continue? Will the delegation of the United States continue to remain silent, and in its silence will it reaffirm that a Government which is not democratic, according to the values, canons and interests of the empire, should be overthrown and that it is thus proper to destabilize such a Government and to do what is now practically being publicly accepted?

89. I have three concrete questions that need replies. First, is the delegation of the United States here publicly going to deny that there are links between the CIA and counter-revolutionary bands that have infiltrated Nicaragua? Secondly, is the delegation of the United States going to deny that it is giving money and that there exists an official economic budget for the promotion and support of the counter-revolutionary bands that are taking action against Nicaragua? Thirdly, is the delegation of the United States going to deny officially the existence of training camps for Somozist counter-revolutionaries on United States territory?

90. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): We do not live or act, as Jacob Burckhardt observed, for ourselves alone, but for the past and the future as well. What happens here in the Security Council reflects the expectations and hopes of those who framed this institution and defines as well the hopes and expectations that may be reasonably attached to it for the future. It is at best ironic that the interactions of the past days should have coincided with the Council's ongoing discussion of the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization.⁶

91. We have witnessed in the so-called consideration of the Nicaraguan complaint the kind of cynical debasement of the process of conflict resolution which underlies and largely explains the various specific failures that are outlined in the Secretary-General's report.

92. Nicaragua's new dictators—who share their mentor's preference for wearing military uniforms, carrying

weapons and calling each other by military titles—have come to the Council seeking international support for their policy of internal repression and external aggression. They appeal to the Council to guarantee their right to continue these policies without fear of opposition from other Nicaraguans who, finding all means of peaceful political competition closed to them, seek to open their political system and reclaim their society from the strangulation of totalitarian controls and foreign exploitation. For let us be clear that Nicaragua has closed its political system and that Nicaragua does engage ever more openly in aggression against its neighbours.

93. I spoke earlier about the systematic effort of Nicaragua to consolidate totalitarian control over Nicaraguan society, about the silencing of criticism, the destruction of indigenous societies filled with people who ask only to be left alone, about the use of "divine mobs" to intimidate opposition and about the crude attacks on the Catholic and other churches, extending even to the Pope himself. I did not mention yesterday that this repression is carried out by a new secret police apparatus—the Sandinist State Security—whose thousands of recruits have been trained by Cuban professionals in the suppression of internal dissent. Thus do fraternal "socialist" societies of the totalitarian variant assist one another. Nicaragua's new dictators not only receive help; they also offer fraternal assistance to armed guerrillas seeking to overthrow the Governments of neighbouring States.

94. Indeed, the representatives of Nicaragua no longer even bother to deny that they train and export guerrillas and arms to and through neighbouring countries, though it has not been long since they answered with wide-eyed lies evidence of their many activities aimed at the destruction of the economies and the overthrow of the Governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and other neighbouring States.

95. Between them, Cuba and Nicaragua have managed enough fraternal help to the guerrillas of the region to bring to a halt the economic development that was steadily improving life and prospects in the area, to sow death and destruction in El Salvador and to reap insecurity in Honduras, Costa Rica and elsewhere in the region.

96. Examples abound of the systematic creation and support by Cuba and Nicaragua of war against the other Central American States. In December 1981, after meetings at Havana with Salvadoran guerrilla leaders, Fidel Castro directed that external supplies of arms to El Salvador's units of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) be stepped up to make possible an offensive to disrupt any chance for a peaceful vote in El Salvador's March 1982 elections.

97. In addition to vitally needed ammunition, these supply operations included greater quantities of more sophisticated, heavier weapons. Deliveries in 1982 included M-60 machine-guns, M-79 grenade launchers and M-72 antitank weapons, thus significantly increasing

guerrilla fire-power. Individual units also regularly received tens of thousands of dollars for routine purchases of non-lethal supplies on commercial markets and for payments, including bribes, to enable the clandestine munitions pipeline to function.

98. Following the set-back caused by their overwhelming repudiation in El Salvador's elections, the FMLN leaders repeated what they had done following their 1981 failed final offensive, this time with still more help.

99. After two years of combat, the FMLN headquarters in Nicaragua has evolved into an extremely sophisticated command and control centre. Guerrilla planning and operations in El Salvador are guided from this headquarters by Cuban and Nicaraguan officers. FMLN headquarters co-ordinates logistical support for guerrilla units widely spread throughout El Salvador, including food, medicines, clothing, money and—most important—weapons and ammunition.

100. On 14 March 1982, the FMLN clandestine radio, "Venceremos", then located in El Salvador, broadcast a message to the guerrillas in El Salvador urging them "to maintain their fighting spirit 24 hours a day to carry out the missions ordered by the FMLN general command"—in Nicaragua, that is.

101. Thus, the Nicaraguans provide the arms and weapons to destroy their neighbour's economy, and they direct the effort from their territory. But their activities are not restricted to El Salvador. They also seek to subvert their democratic neighbours Honduras and Costa Rica, while using their territories as intermediate points to channel and disguise outside support for the Salvadoran guerrillas. In Honduras, Nicaraguan agents and Salvadoran extreme leftist groups have maintained links with almost all the Honduran terrorist groups to assist them in subversive planning, training and operations. They have played a role in the increased terrorism in Honduras. Discussions were held in mid-1982 among the Cubans, Sandinists and Salvadoran insurgents about steps to take against the Honduran Government. Captured Salvadoran and Honduran terrorists have admitted that explosives used in bombing attacks in the Honduran capital were obtained in Nicaragua. Other information indicates the Cubans had a hand in planning the seizure of 108 hostages in San Pedro Sula in September 1982.

102. The Morazanist National Liberation Front of Honduras was described in the pro-Government Nicaraguan newspaper *El Nuevo Diario* by "Octavio", one of its founders, as a political-military organization formed as part of the "increasing regionalization of the Central American conflict". As a result of a raid on 27 November 1981 the Honduran police ultimately captured several members of this group. The captured terrorists told Honduran authorities that the Nicaraguan Government had provided them with funds for travel expenses as well as explosives. Captured documents and statements by detained guerrillas further indicated that the group was formed in Nicaragua at the instigation of high-level Sandi-

nista leaders. The group's chief of operations resided in Managua, and members of the group received military training in Nicaragua and Cuba. Other captured documents revealed that guerrillas at one safehouse were responsible for transporting arms and munitions into Honduras from Estelí, Nicaragua.

103. In Costa Rica, where the Government has attempted to stop the continued use of its territory for supplying weapons to the region's Marxist-Leninist guerrillas, Cuba and Nicaragua targeted the Government's efforts. During 1982, for example, the Cubans and Sandinists provided weapons and training for Costa Rican leftist terrorists. Nicaragua has instigated terrorist actions in Costa Rica, leading to increased tensions between the two countries. Although the Sandinistas denied complicity, the 3 July 1982 bombing of the Honduran airports office in San José took place at Nicaragua's direction, according to Germán Pinzón, a Colombia M-19 member who was arrested by Costa Rican authorities on 14 July. Pinzón, who confessed to placing the bomb, said that Nicaraguan diplomats in Costa Rica had recruited and trained him for the bombing operation. With the help of Pinzón the Costa Rican Government caught the Nicaraguan diplomats *in flagrante*. They were declared *persona non grata* and expelled from Costa Rica on 17 July. Since the beginning of 1982 several guerrilla arms caches and safehouses have been uncovered in Costa Rica. Some arms may be for use by radical groups inside Costa Rica, as well as for shipment to guerrilla movements in El Salvador.

104. The evidence of systematic, continuing aggression by Nicaragua against its Central American neighbours is as clear as the evidence of Nicaragua's repression of its own people and the betrayal of the solemn promises made by its military rulers to the Nicaraguan people, the Organization of American States and the world. Of course, massive intervention in the internal affairs of its neighbours is not the only evidence of the junta's contempt for the principles of non-intervention, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, self-determination and the non-use of force.

105. Nicaragua demonstrates contempt for all these principles of the Charter when it supports the Soviet Union's continued brutal occupation of Afghanistan and the Vietnamese invasion and brutal occupation of Cambodia. When its so-called Sandinist governors support the invasion and occupation of those countries and the use of chemical weapons against those peoples, they demonstrate how little they deserve the name Sandinist, how utterly they have betrayed the principles and legacy of Sandino.

106. Pablo Chamorro, editor and publisher of *La Prensa* before his assassination and a writer whose name is from time to time invoked by the leaders of the Nicaraguan revolution, wrote of Sandino—I quoted this passage a year ago [2337th meeting] but it is just as relevant today:

“Sandino should be exalted precisely as a contrast to the communists, who obey signals from Russia and

China. Sandino fought against the United States Marines, but he did not bring Russian Cossacks to Nicaragua as Fidel Castro did in Cuba. There is a great difference in the communist Fidel Castro, who in his false battle for the independence of his country has filled it with Russian rockets, soldiers, planes and even canned goods, and a Sandino, who defended the sovereignty of his ground with home-made bombs but without accepting the patronage of another Power. For this reason, Sandino was great—because he was not handed over to communist treason like Castro, but fought within an Indo-Hispanic limit.

“Naturally the communists who attacked and slandered Sandino when he was in the mountains now try to use him, because they have no moral scruple to restrain them. Sandino was a pure product of our land, very different from the products exported by Russia or China, and as such we must exalt and preserve his memory. The value of his exploits has a Nicaraguan value, not Soviet, and his nationalism is indigenous, not Russian.

“Sandino is a monument to the dignity of our country and we must not permit the communists, with whom he never communed, to besmirch his memory in order to use his prestige and to succeed some day, on the pretext that they are fighting imperialism, in delivering our land over to Russia, as Castro did with Cuba.”

107. We should not deny, however, that Nicaragua's dictators derive as many benefits from its incorporation into the Soviet bloc as her people derive sorrows. In the Council in the last days we have observed the fraternal support Soviet puppet States provide one another in this arena. We have also observed how they mock the Council's values and procedures.

108. When such basic values of international order as respect for territorial integrity, national independence or human rights are invoked by States such as Grenada, Viet Nam and Cuba, which have already made clear their support for the occupation of Afghanistan and Cambodia and their indifference to the gassing of those peoples; when we hear the representative of the Soviet Union speak of intervention, of mercenaries, of invasions, of subservience, we know we are in the presence of an attempt to sow confusion, not understanding—an exercise in intellectual terrorism which mocks the values of the Charter and, above all, the process of reason on which this body must rely. The Council cannot be taken seriously as a forum for the resolution of disputes if it permits itself to be transformed into a weapon in an on-going conflict.

109. We are aware of the theory articulated by Friedrich Engels, among others, that there are no neutral processes, that all notions of truth, law and fairness merely reflect economically based power relations. We know that according to this doctrine truth is what the most powerful say it is, and fairness is whatever the most powerful define it to be. We believe that we are witnessing

here an effort to transform the United Nations into an arena where power, as measured by numbers and volume, defines what is good, what is true, what is fair, what is peace.

110. What is true is what the so-called progressive nations say it is. What is fair is what serves their interests. What is legitimate is what expands their power. Thus it is legitimate for communist Governments to train and arm guerrillas and make war on their non-communist neighbours. It is illegitimate for non-communists to attempt to defend themselves or for others to help them to do so. According to this logic, movements which expand communist power are by definition national liberation movements; everything is permitted to achieve their ends. Nothing is permitted to their targets, not even the right of self-defence.

111. We have seen in the past days discouraging indications that the confusion and intimidation have already had insidious effects.

112. We heard Mexico [2421st meeting] endorse Nicaragua's right to self-determination and freedom from foreign interference. And in the same speech we heard the same representative of Mexico call for an end to all military assistance to El Salvador, which presumably has no right to self-determination or freedom from foreign intervention.

113. We heard the representative of Zimbabwe [2422nd meeting] identify his country and people and their problems with those of the Sandinists and allude darkly to their common experience with powerful, unscrupulous neighbouring nations. We listened to his concern for Nicaragua's independence and territorial integrity and his indifference to the same rights for Nicaragua's neighbours.

114. We heard the representative of Tanzania [*ibid.*] give a distorted account of who is infiltrating terrorists and arms into whose territory and who is seeking peace. We heard him invoke Nicaragua's right to live in peace and choose its own political, social and economic system, without any indication that those rights extended also to its neighbours.

115. We heard the representative of China [*ibid.*] express his admiration for the "Nicaraguan struggle" and call for an end to the intervention of "a super-Power" in the region as though it were only "a super-Power" that posed obstacles to the right of the people of the region to solve their own problems.

116. We listened while the representative of Panama [2421st meeting] discussed the problems of Nicaragua without ever mentioning Nicaragua's massive continuing efforts at destabilization of its neighbours.

117. We heard the Pakistani representative express confidence in the Nicaraguan Government's will to peace and non-intervention, its desire to live at peace with its neighbours. In sum, we have heard in the past days

repeated indications of the corrosive effects of systematic bias, systematic lies, systematic redefinition of key political values and distortion of the key political processes of this body designed to support international peace.

118. In his Nobel lecture, Alexander Solzhenitsyn confronted again the relationship between tyranny and the systematic distortion of reality. Solzhenitsyn commented:

"Whoever has once announced violence as his method must inexorably choose lying as his principle. At birth, violence behaves openly and even proudly. But as soon as it becomes stronger and firmly established, it senses the thinning of the air around it and cannot go on without befogging itself in lies, coating itself with lying's sugary oratory. It does not always or necessarily go straight for the gullet: usually it demands of its victims only allegiance to the lie, only complicity in the lie."

119. Whoever in this arena supports Nicaragua's right to commit repression at home and aggression against its neighbours, whoever is ready to respect Nicaragua's right to self-determination, self-government, non-intervention and peace and takes no account of the rights of its neighbours to the same protections against Nicaragua, has become an accomplice in the betrayal of these values and this process. This betrayal is inconsistent with the search for peace. It must be repudiated before this body will be able to participate in the process of conflict resolution. It is not too late for the nations of Central America to forgo violence, to enter on the pathway of negotiations, internal reconciliation, democracy and development. Let us make certain that what happens in this body facilitates that process.

120. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak on a point of order, and I now call on him.

121. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the light of the nature of the statement of the representative of the United States I would request that I now if possible be given the opportunity to exercise my right of reply. If, however, there is a guarantee that the representative of the United States will not flee the field of battle and will remain until the end of today's meeting, I am willing to speak at that time.

122. The PRESIDENT: The ruling of the President is that the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will speak at the end of today's meeting.

123. I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Peru and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discus-

sion 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. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Pastor de la Torre (Peru) and Mr. Silović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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

125. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India): Permit me first of all to extend to you, Sir, our felicitations on your assumption of the important office of President of the Security Council for the month of March. Allow me also to add that we in the Indian delegation find special satisfaction in seeing in the Chair a distinguished diplomat who has had a personal association with our country very recently as High Commissioner of the United Kingdom to India. We are confident that under your stewardship the Council will be able to address itself in a purposeful manner to the pressing problems of the present day. We wish you well in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities. May I also add a word of appreciation for your predecessor in the presidency of the Council, Mr. Troyanovsky of the USSR, who guided the Council's deliberations during the past month with dignity and his customary competence.

126. A year ago, when the Council was seized of this question, my delegation made [2339th meeting] an earnest appeal for a constructive debate directed not away from, but towards, a dialogue aimed at understanding and reconciliation. We expressed the view that the consideration of the question would have been in vain if it resulted in inflaming passions, deepening mistrust and engendering mutual recrimination.

127. The recent developments in Central America, which the Council is discussing today, have caused all of us deep concern and distress. Once again Nicaragua has come before the Council, pointing out that a serious situation exists in and around its borders as a result of rebel activity. The possibility of a wider conflict in the region looms large on the horizon. The Council has been urged to assume the responsibility entrusted to it under the Charter of the United Nations and to prevent any further intensification of activities likely to result in a breach of peace.

128. The objectives and principles of non-alignment clearly lay down that every State has the right to pursue its own political and social system and to determine the destiny of its own people without any hindrance, interference or intervention. Nicaragua has a rightful expectation that by discharging its functions under the Charter, the Council will help it preserve its independence and territorial integrity. We sincerely believe that, by acting now, the Council will prevent the tensions which have been incipient in the region for some time now from exploding into a horrible war which nobody wants. We

must do everything possible to defuse these tensions. Any attempt to involve extra-regional or global forces can result only in exacerbating an already difficult situation in Central America.

129. The heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in their Seventh Conference, at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, had an opportunity to address themselves to Latin American issues. They noted that the final communiqué issued by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983 once again confirmed the universal applicability of the principles and policies of non-alignment and took note with great concern of the continuing tensions in the region. They went on to assert that the processes of change in Central America could not be attributed to or explained by an East-West ideological confrontation. Denouncing the new and increasing threats and acts of intimidation and the growing seriousness and increased number of acts of aggression against Nicaragua, particularly the violation of its airspace and territorial waters, utilization of the territory of foreign countries in and outside the region as bases for aggression and the training of counter-revolutionary forces, and the commission of terrorist acts and sabotage which had resulted in considerable loss of life and property, they considered these as part of a deliberate plan to harass and destabilize Nicaragua.

130. The heads of State or Government also expressed the view that the cessation of military manoeuvres or demonstrations of force would reduce tension and facilitate the necessary dialogue for the achievement of political and negotiated solutions to the problems of the region. They further reaffirmed the right of any State freely to choose its own political, social and economic system as of paramount importance. Commending the peace initiatives presented by Colombia, France, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela seeking to reduce tensions in Central America, the Conference welcomed the positive response of Nicaragua and called on all States concerned to adopt a similar attitude. The heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries further called on the Governments of the United States of America and Honduras to adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue, in conformity with the principles of international law.

131. I can do no better than to reaffirm the sentiments expressed by the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries and reiterate the fervent call made for constructive dialogue to find a peaceful solution to the present tensions and conflict.

132. It is a matter of grave concern that there has been a dangerous aggravation of the situation in Central America so soon after the call had issued from the New Delhi summit meeting. Nicaragua has come to the Council with a renewed complaint of further acts of intervention directed against its independence and territorial integrity. The seriousness of the situation is such that the Council should not lose time in endless debate but find

ways and means of preventing a deterioration of the situation and a deepening of the conflict, with more loss of innocent lives and property. It is imperative that all armed intervention and action be halted immediately and peace given a chance. Intervention or interference of any kind is inadmissible. Failure to recognize this could lead to incalculable consequences which all of us might have cause to regret.

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

134. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): Allow me to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the other members of the Council for extending an invitation to my delegation to make a statement on the important issue before us.

135. My delegation has requested to be allowed to speak in this debate because of our grave concern over the unfolding developments in Latin America, particularly in Central America, which have ominous consequences for international peace and security.

136. We have strong ties of friendship and co-operation with the countries of the region arising from a common historical past. It is therefore our earnest wish that the sensitive issues facing the region—issues that have engendered an atmosphere of distrust, hostility and confrontation among the States concerned—can be resolved as soon as possible. We believe that the time has come to end mutual recriminations and the hurling of vitriol at one another. While we are completely aware of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues involved, we venture to say with a deep sense of conviction that the time has come for all the parties concerned to sit down and engage in dialogue with a view to forging a mutually acceptable solution to the problems that beset the Central American region. We are convinced that, given the political will of the States concerned, a structure of peace can be achieved. The resolution of the conflict could only redound to the benefit of the man in the street on whose behalf, after all, we all strive to create a world of peace, freedom, social justice and prosperity.

137. In this context, we would like to commend to the parties concerned the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations on the peaceful settlement of disputes. Non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, the inadmissibility of the threat or use of force in the settlement of disputes and its corollary, the necessity to resort to peaceful means in the settlement of disputes among States, come to mind. These, we believe, are the basic elements that could form the basis for meaningful and constructive negotiations among the parties concerned that would lead to the lessening of tensions and, ultimately, to a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region.

138. At the same time it is incumbent upon us to seize every opportunity to build upon the search for this com-

mon goal. In this connection we note in particular the Final Act forged in San José last 4 October 1982.⁷ We find that the conditions set forth in that document provide a good basis for the peaceful resolution of the problems and outstanding issues affecting the area. My delegation believes that no one can dispute the validity of the conditions necessary to achieve peace, as enumerated in the San José document.

139. As members of the international community, it is our solemn duty and obligation to promote international peace and security through the mechanisms provided for under the Charter. It behoves the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, to undertake constructive measures that would assist the countries of Central America to live in peace and in harmony with each other, for the present situation in the area, unless defused, could seriously threaten world peace and security.

140. As it is not my intention to break tradition—a worthy one, at that—allow me before concluding, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Given the wealth of your experience and your sterling diplomatic qualities, we are confident that the Council will achieve constructive results under your chairmanship. Allow me also to felicitate most warmly your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, on the excellent manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council.

141. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

142. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In my statement I have already said that when the representatives of the United States speak about the "Red danger" it is a pretext to divert our attention and to cover up their own interventionist plans. The representative of the United States today inflated the "Red threat" to even greater proportions, extending it over practically the whole world. But I will not be taken in by this attempt to disguise the true intentions of the United States.

143. I should like to say a few words strictly on the agenda before us. On the agenda is one item—an accusation against the United States to the effect that it has been preparing, has already unleashed and has been responsible for interventionism against a small Latin American country, Nicaragua.

144. Nicaragua and many other countries in Latin America have genuine grounds to be apprehensive of intervention by the United States. I have already given two examples today of how the United States organized intervention in 1954 against Guatemala and an unsuccessful attempt at invading Cuba in April 1961, but I should like to give the Council one more list, which must make it evident to everyone why the Latin American countries fear intervention by the United States.

145. I should like to recount a list of cases in which the United States used armed force against other Latin American countries also, cases in which the overwhelming majority of interventions were carried out at a time when the Soviet Union was not even on the map of the world. Here is the list. Against Mexico, the United States used force 14 times; against Cuba, 13 times; against Panama, 11 times; against Nicaragua, 10 times; against the Dominican Republic, nine times; against Colombia, seven times; against Honduras, seven times; against Haiti, five times; against Puerto Rico, three times; against Guatemala, twice. Thus, against just 10 Latin American countries, the United States has used force 81 times. These are the grounds for the fears of the Latin American countries in so far as concerns the current policy of the United States.

146. But let us suppose for a moment that the United States representative really believes what she says about the "Red danger". Let us suppose for a moment that there is a genuine fear of the "Reds" and that it really seems to them, as they say here in the United States, that "there is a Red under every bed". So the question arises, what should these official persons in the United States do? I have some advice for them. Experience here is the best guide. Let these people take a look under their own beds. Let them see that there are not any "Reds" there. What, one may ask, quite understandably, should one do after that? Pay a visit to the doctor.

147. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zimbabwe has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

148. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): The representative of the United States made reference to our comparison of the situation in Nicaragua and Central America with that prevailing in southern Africa and even went further and accused those who support Nicaragua of being accessories after the fact.

149. Much as we want to go further, we should not be diverted from the item on the agenda, which really relates to interference in the affairs of Nicaragua. We would want to emphasize that our support, our championing of this policy of non-interference, our upholding of this principle, is guided by our desire to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, and we shall continue to uphold it. We shall never support interference by whoever it might be, for whatever reason, in whatever country, at whatever time and, allow me to underline, least of all in this honourable chamber.

150. Our duty is to create an atmosphere conducive to peaceful solution of the dispute in Nicaragua and to help resolve that dispute. My delegation has, I think, voted accordingly whenever we have seen that there was interference, no matter who had interfered, and we shall continue to do so.

151. The PRESIDENT: The representative of China has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

152. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Just now the representative of the United States made an accusation with regard to the statement made by China yesterday [2422nd meeting]. The Chinese delegation rejects this accusation by the United States delegation. It is not difficult for people to see that the representative of the United States accuses all delegations that do not agree with the mistaken policy of the United States Government. This is the very repugnant style of a super-Power. The interference by the United States in the affairs of the countries of the Central American region is known to all. It does not matter to what extent the United States representative engages in sophistry. That cannot change the tarnished image of the United States Government as a super-Power.

153. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on her.

154. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I shall comment first of all concerning the Soviet representative's exercise in cliometrics and say that it suffered from what such quantitative historical analyses often do, namely, the effort to add up non-additive—that is, non-comparable—events. Most of the non-comparable events which he attempted to add were drawn from a really quite remote past.

155. Fortunately, however, we are a new nation and his list was relatively short, particularly since we left any kind of interventionist habits in back of us a long time ago.

156. Now, if we were to attempt to do a comparative kind of analysis of Soviet acts of aggression against neighbouring peoples, the job would, I am afraid, require a computer, the quantities being so great. One would, of course, begin with the peoples of the so-called autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics themselves—for example, the Ukraine—and the peoples of Tashkent, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. I am choosing almost at random. There is, of course, more recently and miserably, the people of Afghanistan. The truth is that the Soviet record of armed aggression against the peoples of its own empire is so well known that it does not really bear repetition.

157. May I say that I am terribly pleased to hear the representative of Zimbabwe affirm his dedication to the universality of the principle of non-intervention. That is in fact what the Charter of the United Nations requires of all of us, something which, we hope, all of us are in fact prepared to grant.

158. In so far as the representative of China is concerned, one can hope that they too will affirm that same universality in application of the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other nations.

159. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

160. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would therefore like to note that the representative of the United States did not deny the list of 81 United States interventions against Latin American countries which I read out. She simply said that something was in the past and that now everything was new. So to supplement my own education, I should like, if possible, to receive from the representative of the United States an answer to such questions as these, for example. The United States intervention of 1954 in Guatemala—was that an old intervention or a new one? The intervention of 1961 against Cuba—was that an old one or a new one? The intervention of 1965 in another Latin American republic—was that an old one or a new one?

161. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on her.

162. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): First I should like to point out to my colleague from the Soviet Union that the country in 1965 for whose name he was searching was the Dominican Republic, which today enjoys independence and democracy.

163. As one of my colleagues has pointed out to me quite correctly, there is, of course, one very important difference between those countries in which the United States in an earlier time and in an earlier mode occasionally intervened and those Governments, States and peoples in whose internal affairs the Soviet Union has intervened. That difference, above all, is that, like the Dominican Republic, the States which were the object of United States intervention are today independent States, largely democratic States, which enjoy self-government and self-determination, whereas those States, like Afghanistan or Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia or any other nations of Eastern Europe, which had the misfortune to be intervened in by the Soviet Union have not to this day re-established their autonomy.

164. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

165. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): If I said something that was not quite correct and instead of "Dominican Republic" said something else, then I was properly corrected by the representative of the United States. After all, who but the representative of the United States could know better exactly where the intervention of 1965 by the United States took place? I am therefore grateful to her for this factual correction of my inaccuracy.

166. But now I should like to put a key question to the representative of the United States—key to this meeting of the Security Council today. Can the representative of the United States tell the Council here that the United States has no aggressive designs whatsoever against the Republic of Nicaragua? Can she say that, or not?

167. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on her.

168. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should like to reply unequivocally that the United States Government has no aggressive designs against the Government of Nicaragua, against the Nicaraguan people; that the United States indeed has no intention of invading anyone or of conducting an armed action against anyone, or of occupying any other country. The United States Government, indeed, has no interest in any territorial aggrandizement whatsoever, and as far as the people of Nicaragua are concerned, we desire nothing whatsoever for the people of Nicaragua except precisely the fulfilment of those promises which the Government of Nicaragua—the Sandinist Junta of Nicaragua—made to those people on its accession to power.

169. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

170. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We shall believe in the sincerity of the statement of the representative of the United States with regard to Nicaragua only when that country calls a halt to the preparation, training, arming and equipping of the Somozist bands operating against Nicaragua in its territory.

171. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Honduras has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

172. Mr. ORTEZ COLINDRES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the two Goliaths—Goliaths in terms of power and of intellect. Small countries can learn a lot from them. They evoke all the insight that can be brought to bear in order that those they might regard as international pygmies in this forum may be given the same international standing, even though we do not have—like those who forged that right after the Second World War—the privilege of vetoing draft resolutions in the Council. That really destroys the fundamental balance between a small country and a Power. I refer to points on which there is a real imbalance in the international community, when the veto is employed and the hopes and aspirations of the small countries are dashed. But reality is almost always the most tragic thing: they fight, they laugh and we provide the dead.

173. I should like to speak on behalf of one small country that is affected, solely to clarify our position in this debate.

174. I should not like to tangle with my Nicaraguan colleague in a theological or an ideological struggle or one about alignment, because such is not our intention. On the contrary, we should like sincerely to contribute to providing the Council with all the necessary information to prevent an international conflagration. He has made

some official charges. I have three more here, but I think we have heard enough. One of them concerns the mobilization of Nicaraguan troops: yesterday, more than 100 lorries bearing armed troops arrived at our border. In addition, boats were captured, and Honduran citizens were arrested and taken to Nicaragua. However, we are relating all this with, as the French say, *un sens de la mesure*, for the basic problem is something else; these are incidents.

175. We are fulfilling our obligation to inform the Council. The complaints will be circulated, and I have no wish to return to the ping-pong game where Nicaragua says that our soldiers are firing on them and we say that Nicaraguan soldiers are firing on ours.

176. The fact is that my Government officially announces categorically that it has no wish to commit aggression against or to attack the Nicaraguan army. The Council must realize perfectly well, because it is composed of persons versed in international law, that at a time of tension one shot by a soldier is not international aggression. People in our countries are nervous. The armies are nearby, and the right attitude taken here might prevent a conflagration there, because there people are tense. There is no laughter; there is no assumption of intellectual attitudes, nor any reviewing of the history of invasions. We are ourselves experiencing the additional problems of our poverty and our weakness, serious armed confrontations and profound differences.

177. I am going somewhat to disregard specific complaints, which will be sent to the Council in writing.

178. The fears of the Government of Nicaragua that an international war might be unleashed by Honduras are groundless. We can give them our unqualified assurance that the Honduran army is not going to attack or commit aggression against Nicaragua. We have made a solemn promise. This is a Security Council in which international history will record our words, as well as our attitude as a serious Government which is attempting to forge credibility in the world. Consequently, I have received precise instructions to inform the Council that the army will not move in. Any troop movements on our part will be to defend our sovereignty and our territorial integrity. It is logical that we should take measures.

179. Everyone is talking about internationalization of a conflict. I do not believe that the parties involved in this conflict are standing by with folded arms. Accordingly my country's attitude is one of peace.

180. The representative of Nicaragua says that he wishes to participate sincerely in the search for peace, and he reiterates that it is a matter of the utmost urgency that we engage in bilateral negotiations. There he has a point of agreement. Nicaragua wants negotiations. Honduras also wants negotiations. Where does the difference lie? The difference is that Nicaragua maintains its criterion that those negotiations must be bilateral, because the parties affected are those that, primarily and as a matter

of priority, have had their interests affected. My country believes that our bilateral problems can on the contrary be considered, but that the problem is not one between Nicaragua and Honduras. We have just heard the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

181. Let us ask ourselves a question and let us provide the answer ourselves. Commander Ortega Saavedra visited Moscow today, as was announced by the representative of the Soviet Union—Russia—and that Government offered its cordial support to Nicaragua. We must take into account the fact that he is not walking about in the harsh Moscow winter buying chestnuts, as we are doing in New York, but that, in some form, he is discussing questions of greater importance regarding stability and instability in the region.

182. We are seeking the point, the basic opportunity. As intelligent and experienced persons, help us to see how to structure this dialogue, which Honduras also considers to be vital and urgent. Why can we not accept the notion of beginning solely with the bilateral approach? That would be as if our problem were a crab which, with two of its legs immobilized, could continue to move since we know that six legs still remain, if it had eight legs to begin with.

183. We believe that this is a regional problem and that binding two legs of the crab will not enable us to resolve it, because the crab will continue moving. Weapons continue moving through our territory with the aim of destabilizing the Government of El Salvador. We will continue mobilizing troops to prevent the movement of those weapons, and so on and so forth, so that once again a state of confusion will reign. Consequently, let us take a global and simultaneous approach to the problem and speak of bilateral and regional matters. Why should it be possible to speak of the white and not be possible to speak of the black? Let us speak of the white and the black at the same time. There is not just coffee and milk in history; there is also coffee with milk. I think that more coffee with milk is drunk than is black coffee or pure milk. Accordingly, it seems to me perfectly proper that, under the sponsorship of an international organization, under the auspices of a forum as solemn as this one, it should be possible to find this *sens de la mesure*, this break-even point that would act as a link, the vital spark. Let us not solely continue seeking negative angles that are going to exacerbate the problem.

184. They refer to a very important point. Nicaragua says that it wants to revitalize the proposal made by Mexico and Venezuela. We certainly do not want to weaken that proposal in any way. What do we understand by "revitalize"? Sometimes it is necessary to give to words their true legal meaning and not their grammatical sense. Every proposal has deep implications. In some of these proposals it is suggested that European countries take part in the dialogue. I wonder if it will be necessary for Europe to solve the problems of five countries that once formed a federal republic. Can we as Central Americans be so incompetent that we are unable to converse as

we once did, as five brothers? Are we going to ask that the dialogue be translated into German, Italian or English when we share the same lineage, the same history, the same blood and the same suffering? It seems to me that there is a constructive way of dealing with the problem. Let us not make it worse than it is. We do not want to extrapolate this problem and make of Central America a Viet Nam. We do not want Central America to become a Lebanon, a Middle East, a Poland. We do not want to be a pawn on a chess-board. It is possible that this will not be the case, but we pray and we agree with what the Pope said and we listened seriously to what was booted by the masses there, because we believe in God, not in atheistic systems. But we respect atheists. Before they have to face God, perhaps they will be convinced of His existence. Everyone has his own ideas and the right to believe them in regard to where he comes from and where he is going.

185. The representative of Nicaragua says that we can move step by step in regional negotiations. Wonderful. Where do we begin? When do we begin? They say they view with sympathy the proposal⁴ by four fraternal countries that have credibility for us: Colombia, a democracy; Panama, a friendly country; and Mexico and Venezuela—that is to say, four ideal negotiating partners. However, we should like it if democracy—and we are not going to judge Governments at the present time, but we do believe in democracy as a system—could somehow be established and strengthened in Central America and that Nicaragua might choose the type of government or the plan of government it wishes. That is completely up to the Nicaraguans; the choice is theirs.

186. I have great respect for Cuba. Cuba has said bad things to us on several occasions, but they have given us some good things. This tobacco which is bad for one's health is a Cuban vice. I was sympathetic to Fidel Castro at university. I was happy to see his beard, as I am now happy to see the beard of the Deputy Minister of Nicaragua and that which my friend its ambassador just shaved off. But our sympathies don't concern hair; our ideological interest is in a system, democracy, and we would have put Fidel Castro on a pedestal and be admiring him today if he had given his people freedom of choice. But that is his business. It is the Cubans' problem; it is not up to me to judge. I am a romantic of history.

187. The representative of Nicaragua says that positive steps should be taken as a matter of urgency and that he is open-minded about any consideration or proposal by the Council. Well, we are too. What does the Council want? We have asked the Secretary-General—a serious man, a Latin American who since his election has enjoyed the confidence of the Soviet Union, the United States, France, China, the United Kingdom—and those Latin American men in whom we believe and who are moral forces whom you have chosen and respected, to help us seek a balance so that we can put an end to this ping-pong exchange and so that Nicaragua will not return here tomorrow with three more complaints. My secretaries are tired of typing out copies of these com-

plaints. Believe me, I do not want to continue throwing oil on the fire.

188. We respect the Council's time. My country's Foreign Minister has asked the President that we meet with him on Monday so that we can settle this. I wish the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua would come too, not because we cannot do the job but so that he could see that commitments are serious matters. I am not saying whatever happens to pop into my mind. I smoke cigarettes, not marijuana. I am speaking very seriously.

189. Let me be specific. How could we possibly not want Nicaragua, a brother of ours, to choose its own Government? How could we not respect its right to self-determination? Would it not be a sorry matter for a country like Honduras to lend its territory for an invasion? We have a Government that was elected by more than 82 per cent of our population. Our Political Constitution is the basis of everything. Any traffic in weapons, any movements by armies, have to be considered by a legislative body which is respected, just as the American Senate and the Politburo—or whatever is the legislative body in the Soviet Union—are respected.

190. But, my Nicaraguan brothers, let us not pray and light one candle to God and another to the devil. We want you to be independent, but we also want El Salvador, a country we love, to be independent too, and out of respect for the principle of non-intervention we desire you not to intervene in our territory. We will sign such a bilateral or multilateral commitment, but only on condition that you do not destabilize the region.

191. I should like to end with a saying: "What is good for the goose is good for the gander". Help us to forge a dialogue, since the basic corner-stone of such a dialogue is accepted by both sides. We do not want internationalization of the conflict. We do not want armies clashing on our borders. And if we all agree on the fundamental point, what is missing? Perhaps the humility I must have to seek your experience. Perhaps something positive could come of it. Is there going to be condemnation of the United States or of the Soviet Union? What help would that be? Another piece of paper to veto? That would be of no help at all; only \$300 more for each page in six languages. That is not what we want. I have just come from my country believing in law. I studied public international law because I truly believe that legal norms do exist. But I do not want this conflict that I am today experiencing to be an example of what my professor, the great internationalist Charles Rousseau, taught in his class on the United Nations. He said that the International Court of Justice, the international body that implements the principles of this sacred Organization, always had to take into account three possible results in any conflict. First, whenever there was a conflict between a major country and a small country the big country would win. Secondly, whenever there was a conflict between two small countries, as in the case of Nicaragua and Honduras, the conflict would disappear. Thirdly, whenever there was a conflict between two major Powers,

such as the Soviet Union and the United States, the Court would disappear. Well, I hope that the Council will not disappear on this occasion.

192. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nicaragua wishes to speak in the exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him.

193. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall try to return to the tone of seriousness that should characterize debates in the Council. I should like to refer to one matter that was raised by the representative of the United States in one of her last statements. I do not believe this will be an unnecessary exercise; I think it will help the members of the Council to understand to some extent the dilemma in which Nicaragua finds itself. I think it will help the Council understand the problems and dilemmas of the Latin American countries, the countries south of the Rio Grande.

194. The representative of the United States referred to the founder of the Sandinist movement in our country, and quite rightly she said that Sandino was not a communist. Where there was a mistake, where there has always been a mistake, a mistake that will continue into the future, is that one does not have to be a communist to be anti-imperialist, to defend one's homeland, to defend national rights, to defend national resources and to speak clearly and show unambiguously that one is opposed to those who are committing aggression against the homeland and trying to destroy it.

195. Sandino, then, was not a communist. But he knew what the United States stood for, and he knew that the United States was imperialistic and would continue to be imperialistic. He knew what harm was being done to the peoples of Latin America and would continue to be done to them. And for that reason I should like to read out a few quotations from Sandino, who was not a communist but a patriot, a nationalist, an anti-imperialist and a man who understood the power that the United States has historically exerted over our peoples.

196. Sandino said, "The genuine criminals are in the bowels of the White House in Washington, whence they direct the plundering and destruction of our Hispanic America." On another occasion he wrote in his diary about his fight against the Marines, who had intervened in our country in 1934, "The last of my soldiers may die, the soldiers of Nicaraguan freedom, but before that more than a battalion of yours, the blond invader, will have perished in our rugged mountains." It is unfortunate that the representative of the United States is not present to hear these quotations, for they might have given her food for thought. Sandino also said—and this is important for Latin America—in his message to the Presidents of Latin America on 4 August 1928, at the start of his struggle against American intervention:

"I wonder whether the Governments of Latin America believe that the Yankees will be satisfied with the conquest of Nicaragua. I wonder whether those

Governments have forgotten that of the 21 Latin American republics six have already lost their sovereignty: Panama, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo and Nicaragua are the six unfortunate republics which have lost their independence and become colonies of Yankee imperialism. The Governments of those six peoples are not defending the collective interests of their nationals, because they came to power not through the popular will but through the imposition of imperialism. Those who rise to the presidency supported by the magnates in Wall Street are defending the interests of the North American bankers. All that remains in those six unhappy Hispanic American peoples is the memory that they were once independent and the distant hope of being able to win back their freedom through the strength of a few of their sons who are fighting tirelessly to loose their country from the opprobrium into which those renegades have plunged it."

Sandino, a man who was not a communist but a staunch anti-imperialist, a man capable of defining the role of the United States both then and in the future, also stated, "We must think about our unification and understand that Yankee imperialism is the most brutal enemy threatening us." Elsewhere, he said, "The Yankees need puppets to make presidents for our indohispanic peoples." Perhaps even more emotionally, Sandino wrote on another occasion giving an example of what has come to be known as Sandinist rhetoric, a rhetoric inspired by the hardship caused our people by American aggression. Speaking about the Yankees, he said:

"Come, you drug addicts, come and kill us, in our own land, for at the vanguard of my patriot soldiers I will wait for you, caring little for your numbers. But when that happens, the destruction of your greatness will shake the Capitol in Washington and your blood will stain the famous White House, the den where you plot your infamous crimes."

197. Those were the words of Augusto César Sandino, a patriot who championed the freedom and independence of Nicaragua. He was assassinated in 1934 in a plot involving the then Secretary of State of the United States and Henry L. Stimson, American ambassador to Nicaragua.

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

199. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am truly afraid that the Council's seriousness may have been gravely compromised and its credibility threatened after the unusual statements we have heard this afternoon from one of its permanent members. At the beginning of the debate, the representative of the United States regaled us with a strange dissertation, the smug, didactic tone of which might perhaps have given great pleasure to a group of American college freshmen but which was obviously inappropriate in a gathering of

sovereign and independent States and of adults who long ago left the university classroom.

200. Curious theories were expounded earlier by the representative of the United States on the subject of Nicaragua's complaint to the Council, perhaps because the need to become involved in theory is something she cannot eschew. But it is one thing to go into theory in the ivory tower of academe and something else to examine facts. The facts, as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said—and I am sure that Professor Kirkpatrick remembers—are actually greater than the imagination, because life is simply richer than theory. Nevertheless both in her earlier harangue and in today's peroration, the representative of the United States has stubbornly resisted facing facts, carefully avoiding a reply to the specific charges levelled by the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua.

201. Would the American representative be good enough to tell us once and for all whether or not it is true that there are camps for the training of Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries on United States territory; whether or not it is true that the CIA has received State funds for the development of covert operations against the Government of Nicaragua; whether or not it is true that her Government is involved in attempts to destabilize the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua? We await her replies with keen interest.

202. With regard to other matters I should like to say the following. The Government of the United States arrogates to itself the right to intervene in any part of the world where its interests, as it perceives and defines them, are threatened. Presumably it is for that reason that it finances and arms the genocidal junta in El Salvador, as it is undoubtedly for that same reason that it assists, supports and financially and militarily helps the racists of Pretoria and the Zionists of Israel. On the other hand, they are indignant because Cuba considers that it has the right to assist revolutionaries anywhere in the world. We are speaking of double standards. Could it be because Cuba is a small mulatto country, which from the time of President Adams, through McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, was considered the private property of the Yankee empire?

203. The representative of the United States referred to the so-called interventionist designs of Cuba and Nicaragua but arrogated the right to question the foreign policy of both sovereign States and their right to support anyone, anywhere, in any international dispute or conflict. What is more, like Cato, she thunders curses against other States Members of the United Nations and of the Security Council for daring to support tiny Nicaragua in its complaint. Obviously, arrogance does not seem to be giving her good advice, and it has very little to do with Emerson's spirit of temperance which, I presume, might at some time have found its way into the lectures given by the representative of the United States.

204. Finally, I do not wish to omit something which is simply infuriating to any Latin American—the alleged

tribute which the representative of the United States pretended to pay to Sandino. That Sandino's murderers tried to use his clean name to attack Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutionaries deserves our deepest contempt. But the substance of the message is something else and very different. It is not that they copied his anti-imperialist, let us say anti-Yankee, struggle, which is what we revolutionaries of Latin America have all done, but that it should be done with old revolvers, sticks and stones, in order the better to murder them, as was the case with Sandino.

205. All right, with old revolvers and shotguns we Cubans faced the tyranny of Fulgencio Batista, who was armed by the United States and advised by Yankee military personnel, and we defeated it. But we are not so stupid—because stupidity is not really one of the defects of revolutionaries—as to confront the most powerful of empires with home-made guns and shotguns. Let there be no doubt on the part of the representatives of the United States. Our people is armed, very well armed, and, what is more, better prepared to make sure that imperialism pays very dearly for any attempted aggression against our homeland.

206. In a country where human brotherhood is something that exists only in museums and on paper, we should not be surprised to hear ironic references to the fraternal relations that exist between Cuba and Nicaragua and between my homeland and that of Lenin. We are proud of those relations, and today more than ever we strengthen our fraternal solidarity with the Sandinist Government and the Nicaraguan people and the heroic revolutionaries of El Salvador and Guatemala.

207. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States of America has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

208. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I apologize if I begin this brief statement by sounding academic. It occurred to one of my colleagues to remind me that when he saw something that looked much like a crab, walked like a crab, behaved like a crab, others might call it a turtle but, for his part, he would call it a crab.

209. We did not claim—and we regard it as irrelevant to claim—that the great Sandino was a communist. We say only that those today who use his name have betrayed his fierce independence and have yielded their sovereignty, indeed their national pride, to an outside Power.

210. I wish to reiterate the final words of Mrs. Kirkpatrick in her last statement this afternoon. Our Government harbours no aggressive designs, on any country within the hemisphere or outside the hemisphere. As between my country and the people I represent and the people of Nicaragua, and indeed the people of Cuba,

there are no—there need not be—differences. In so far as the Governments of Nicaragua and indeed of Cuba enhance the freedom and the well-being of their people, in so far as those Governments do not commit aggression against their neighbours, there need not be, and there will not be, any differences, any divisions, between their Governments and mine, between their people and mine.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

NOTES

¹ General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.

² General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex.

³ *Ibid.*, part II.

⁴ See A/38/68, annex.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/37/1)*, p. 3.

⁶ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/37/1)*.

⁷ Final Act of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the countries interested in the promotion of democracy in Central America and the Caribbean. For the text, see Jack W. Hopkins, ed., *Latin America and Caribbean Contemporary Record* (New York and London, Holmes & Meier, 1984), vol. II, 1982-1983, pp. 867-873.