



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2694  
1 July 1986

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 1 July 1986, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. KASEMSRI

(Thailand)

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

Mr. WOOLCOTT  
Mr. TSVETKOV  
Mr. LI Luye  
Mr. GAYAMA  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. de KEMOULARIA  
Mr. GBEHO  
Mr. RABETAFIKA  
Mr. GRANDERSON  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. SAFRONCHUK  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. MAXEY  
Mr. WALTERS  
Mr. AGUILAR

---

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of July, I should like at the very outset to pay tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Blaise Rabetafika, Permanent Representative of Madagascar to the United Nations, President of the Security Council for the month of June, for the great diplomatic skill, unfailing courtesy and wisdom with which he conducted the Council's business last month. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing our deep appreciation to Ambassador Rabetafika for his service as President of the Council last month.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 27 JUNE 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18187)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of India and Nicaragua in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance 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 conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Verma (India) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda. The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 27 June 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/18187.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/18189, letter dated 27 June 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/18194, letter dated 30 June 1986 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, Mr. Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. D'ESCOTO BROCKMANN (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of my Government I thank you for convening the Security Council to consider the serious and ever-greater threats to international peace and security posed by the United States Government's stepped-up policy of aggression against Nicaragua. I know that you will discharge your presidential duties fairly and efficiently. Your personal talents and your experience augur well for the success of the Council's deliberations this month.

Our gratitude goes also to Ambassador Rabetafika of Madagascar for his exemplary stewardship of the Council last month.

The people and Government of Nicaragua have always been aware that justice, freedom and sovereignty are achieved only through great sacrifice. We knew that after the liberation war we would inevitably be subjected to aggression on the part

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

of those who historically have opposed the efforts of Latin American peoples freely to decide their own destiny - those who imposed on us the Monroe Doctrine, the doctrine of manifest destiny, the "big-stick" policy, gun-boat diplomacy and, more recently, by means of their policy of covert wars, State terrorism.

In the name of freedom and democracy, in the name of the sacred values of Christianity, of civilization, that great and powerful nation is forming mercenary gangs which it trains, finances and directs. In the name of God and democracy, they are murdering our women and our children, as is the case of the two little daughters of Carmen Ortega, whose brutal murder by Reagan's brothers is amply documented in today's edition of The Washington Post. Flouting the most basic norms of civilized life and coexistence, and in violation of international undertakings and international commitments, the United States mines our ports, decrees trade embargoes and tries to destroy countries which, though small, are unwilling to give up the principle of the legal and sovereign equality of all States.

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

On several occasions we have come before this Council to denounce the present United States Administration's policy against Nicaragua. We have done so - and are doing so again today - because we are a peace-loving country; because we believe in the United Nations and in the importance of respecting commitments undertaken through signature of the Charter; and because we have always wished to trust in the seriousness and impartiality of the Council.

We have come yet again to denounce actions of the United States Administration against the sovereignty, independence, self-determination and territorial integrity of Nicaragua, actions against peace efforts in Central America, and which increase the possibility of greater bloodshed in Nicaragua and throughout the region.

On 25 June 1986, the United States House of Representatives appropriated \$100 million - one third of Nicaragua's annual exports - so that the terrorist mercenaries can continue murdering our people. That vote, which amounts to a declaration of war, will have dangerous and unforeseeable consequences; it is one further step towards sending United States troops to Nicaragua.

In 1981 the United States established the contras, composed mainly of former members of the Somozist guard; the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) began to finance, train and direct them covertly. In 1983 and 1984 they attacked and mined our ports, which led the United States Congress to prohibit direct or indirect aid to the contras by any United States Government agency. However, this changed nothing. In 1985 the President's so-called humanitarian assistance to his mercenary forces was approved. In 1986 the House of Representatives approved \$100 million for these forces.

Today United States military personnel are openly training this mercenary army, supplying it with heavy weapons, transport and everything else it needs to carry out its policy of terrorism.

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

The Central Intelligence Agency, which mined our ports, is in charge of these military operations, and has the option of using the funds it receives directly from Congress. Thus, that \$100 million is but the tip of the iceberg.

The journalist Julia Preston, writing from Camoapa, Nicaragua, reported the following in today's Washington Post:

(spoke in English)

"Two children were killed in their beds and six were injured when anti-Sandinista rebels hurled a hand grenade into their home during the crossfire of an attack on a co-operative here last week, witnesses said.

"Carmen Ortega, 44, mother of the victims, recalled that after the shooting died down at dawn on Friday, the guerrillas demanded that she find matches for them amid the wreckage inside her house. They used the matches to burn the house to the ground, the mother said at a wake Saturday in this hill town 105 miles east of Managua.

"Five family members died. In addition to the 12-year-old and five-year-old daughters killed in bed, the woman's husband, Angel Ortega, 65, was killed defending against the attack. A grown daughter was shot to death and another died in the grenade explosion, relatives said. The couple had 16 children.

"This attack on the cattle co-operative known as the Panamerica was the most recent in a series of operations against primarily civilian or economic targets by the counter-revolutionaries, or contras, as the United States-backed rebels are known here".

(continued in Spanish)

That great Power, the United States of America, which claims to be fighting against terrorism, has its own terrorist army, which it pays to murder, destroy and

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

terrorize. Thus we must face the inescapable fact that the policy of State terrorism is being institutionalized and that we can expect an imminent interventionist escalation in Central America on the part of the United States.

As rightly noted by Representative Thomas S. Foley after the House decision,  
(spoke in English)

"This was the cross-the-Rubicon vote".

(continued in Spanish)

It signals the beginning of a new phase, extremely dangerous in the unforeseeable consequences of this open, unceasing commitment to a policy designed to bring Nicaragua down through the overthrow of the only freely and democratically elected Government in the history of our country. If we consider also the counter-revolution's political and military impotence - born essentially of its Socialist and mercenary, that is corrupt and criminal, nature - we would not be wrong to think that the same logic that dominated in this decision will have to prevail also when Mr. Reagan thinks it necessary to send in "his boys", in accordance with the plans that have long been on the Pentagon drawing board.

There are other factors which only confirm the great danger of this new phase in United States policy towards Nicaragua. These relate to the other aspect which has thus far characterized this policy of force: the ongoing boycott by the United States Administration of all diplomatic efforts to find a peaceful, just and honourable solution to the Central American crisis. Just as the United States has refused to resume direct dialogue with Nicaragua, it has consistently used pressure and blackmail with a view to thwarting the work carried out in recent years by the Contadora Group.

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

In September 1984, the Contadora Group presented to the Central American Government the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America. Once Nicaragua had announced its willingness to sign the Act, the United States engaged in intense activity to achieve what it called the "effective blockade of Contadora". They were pleased with the result, as is duly reflected in the secret National Security Council document made public in November 1984 by the United States press.

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

In May this year, when Contadora was once again at a decisive phase in its mediation undertaking and when agreement on the basis of the revised version of the Act of September 1985 was imminent, a United States Department of Defense document was released - a document which not only constituted a total rejection by the United States Administration of any type of agreement in the framework of the Contadora process, but also put forward some calculations and estimates for a large-scale military operation to deny the Nicaraguan people their right to self-determination and to destroy their revolution, at a cost of between \$8.7 million and \$9.1 million annually as well as the required commitment of 100,000 men.

That is the support which the United States has given Contadora - solely rhetorical support. These documents and many others that have been made known to the United States public show how interested the United States is in the signing of a peace agreement in Central America.

Last Thursday the four Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries that make up the Contadora Group arrived in New York to meet with the Secretary-General and to present to him the Contadora Final Act. My Government responded to that new effort in a positive way, expressing its willingness to sign a regional agreement in the spirit of the Panama Message of 7 June 1986. We said clearly in this regard that that Act of 7 June constituted the only instrument which could and should promote the swift and effective conclusion of the negotiating process to achieve peace in Central America. We also expressed our readiness to make available to Contadora the inventory of a list of 14 different types of military weaponry that we had previously submitted for its consideration, as well as the respective itemized bill for these weapons, in accordance with the Contadora explanatory

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

note that is, the note transmitting what Contadora called the "latest version" of the Act.

We feel that, as is stated by the Contadora Governments and those of the Support Group in the Panama Message, that it would be

"erroneous to believe that the crisis could be dealt with merely by means of preparing a draft treaty. Progress must also be made in bringing about the necessary conditions for the signing of the Peace Act." (S/18143, annex, para. 5)

In that regard, we believe that it is urgent to promote dialogue between the United States and Nicaragua and to move forward with the creation of joint commissions for the solution of border problems, and to promote dialogue and the harmonization of non-aggression pacts between the Central American Governments. Furthermore, we agree with the Panama Message that

"If progress is to be made in the Contadora process and the final goal of peace is to be achieved, it is essential that three fundamental commitments should be accepted:

"(a) Use of a country's territory as a base for committing acts of aggression against another country or for providing military or logistical support to irregular forces or subversive groups should not be permitted;

"(b) No country should become a member of military or political alliances that threaten peace and security in the region either directly or indirectly, thus drawing the region into the East-West conflict;

"(c) No Power should give military or logistical support to the irregular forces or subversive groups that are operating, or that may operate, in the countries of the region, or use or threaten to use force as a means of overthrowing any Government in the area." (S/18143, annex, para. 8)

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

The lack of political will on the part of the United States Government to support the Contadora process and its permanent policy of blocking and boycotting these noble efforts become clear once again at this time, when that Government claims that it can ignore the action of that group of countries and tries to make that initiative a tool of domination and interference in the internal affairs of States.

Latin America has said "no" to intervention; Latin America has said "no" to policies of force; Latin America has said "no" to the use of force and "yes" to peace, to harmony and to a political solution of the problems of the subregion.

On 27 June last, the International Court of Justice issued its judgement on the request put before it by my Government in regard to the military and paramilitary activities carried out by the United States against Nicaragua. I do not wish to analyse in depth the meaning and consequences of that overriding and historic pronouncement by the highest international legal organ. I would only draw the Council's attention to two specific aspects of the judgement.

The first relates to the Court's rejection of the justification of collective self-defence maintained by the United States. The Court said clearly that it

(spoke in English)

"rejects the justification of collective self-defence maintained by the United States of America in connection with the military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua the subject of this case".

(continued in Spanish)

The second aspect relates to the decision by the Court that

(spoke in English)

"the United States of America, by training, arming, equipping, financing and supplying the contra forces or otherwise encouraging, supporting and aiding

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua, has acted against the Republic of Nicaragua, in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another State".

(continued in Spanish)

I think that it is appropriate to point out those aspects of the judgement by the highest international legal tribunal, since the representatives of the United States themselves have, before this Council, constantly raised the argument of the use or the right of collective self-defence as a way of justifying United States acts of aggression against Nicaragua. The world has clearly recognized the illegality of this interventionist policy, and today the highest world legal body has confirmed this. The United States has violated and continues to violate the most elementary rules of international law.

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

With this new step in its terrorist policy the United States Government is not only violating international law, it is not only acting directly counter to the Contadora peace initiative and obstructing its success: it is actually opening wide the door to an escalation of hostility that could lead to a generalized conflagration in the region.

The people of Nicaragua and their Government have no military alliances with any super-Power. We can rely on nothing but the guns our people bear and on the grief for our dead. However, that will not silence our voices nor prevent us from shouting: "They shall not pass!" The North American Administration can allocate 100-, 200-, 300,000 million dollars for its mercenary forces, but in the end those forces will be defeated. They can sow death and destruction, they can destroy the country, but along every step of the way they will have to confront patriotic Nicaraguans, who will eventually defeat them.

The Security Council bears the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Because of their serious and unpredictable nature, the facts we have analysed fall directly under that responsibility. Nicaragua, faithful to its desire for peace, has done everything possible, has had recourse to every appropriate and valid international body in its search for peaceful solutions to these grave problems. We take this opportunity to reiterate our irrevocable decision to defend ourselves; we renew our appeal to the Government of the United States to desist from its militarist designs and to resume direct dialogue with Nicaragua to find just solutions to our differences. That is the only way to prevent a catastrophe, and we believe the Security Council has a fundamental role to play in avoiding such an outcome.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua for his kind words addressed to the presidency.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome your presidency of the Security Council, in part because of the deep respect we have for your personal integrity and for your talents as a diplomat, in part as a reflection of the admiration, respect and friendship which our two nations bear toward one another. It is a pleasure as well for the United States to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Rabetafika of Madagascar, who discharged the office of President last month with efficiency and even-handedness.

Before addressing the specific reasons for this present Security Council meeting, I feel it is imperative to point out that this is the eleventh time the Sandinista régime has come to this Council to lay out a by-now standard litany of complaints. Nicaragua seeks yet again to divert the Council's attention from Nicaragua's own behaviour in the region. It is about time we ceased being deceived by Sandinista propaganda; it is about time we recognized that it is Nicaragua's aggression which is the source of the conflict in Central America.

The 27 June opinion of the International Court of Justice is long - some 515 pages in total, including the Court's opinion, the separate and dissenting opinions and a 251-page dissent by Judge Stephen Schwebel. Though Nicaragua asks the Council to reach conclusions based on those opinions, no member of the Security Council can yet have analysed or consider for itself the detailed argument and counter-argument released by the Court. For those who have not yet received it, I may note that our own first reading has identified serious questions about certain conclusions of law stated by the Court.

The Court's conclusions, moreover, are in this case uniquely dependent on the evidence and the facts. The representative of Nicaragua has sought to portray the Court's opinion as establishing, ipso facto, the truthfulness of Nicaragua's assertions in respect to the situation in Central America, its own actions and the policies of my Government. As we have made clear from the beginning, we do not

(Mr. Walters, United States)

believe that the Court is equipped to deal with complex facts and intelligence information which are not available to it.

The members of the Council should by now be familiar with the facts concerning Nicaraguan aggression. The United States has provided abundant overwhelming evidence of Nicaragua's misdeeds. It is none the less evident that the Sandinistas remain consummately skilled in obscuring their odious record of subversion, aggression and armed attack.

Nicaragua has stated in the most solemn terms that:

(spoke in Spanish)

"It has never supplied arms or other material assistance to insurgents in El Salvador or sanctioned the use of its territory for such purpose. It has never permitted Salvadorian insurgents to establish a headquarters or operations base or command-and-control facility in Nicaraguan territory and has never permitted its territory to be used for training Salvadorian insurgents."

(continued in English)

The very beginning has been its continuing support of subversion in Latin America. This support has been active, deliberate, substantial and sustained. The statement I have just read is one of which Nicaragua has made a number, not only at the International Court of Justice, but in innumerable other forums as well. There can be no pretense that this categorical assertion is a slip of the tongue or an ill-considered, ill-informed or unauthorized statement; and yet it was, and is, entirely false.

At a meeting of party activists barely two months after coming to power, the Sandinista leadership committed itself to support the revolutionary struggle beyond its borders. Later that year, as recounted by former commanders of the Salvadorian

(Mr. Walters, United States)

FMLN, the Sandinistas established facilities and sites within Nicaragua for use in training guerrillas from other Central American countries.

The principal target of Sandinista aggression has been El Salvador. Nicaragua has since 1979 provided massive support to the guerrillas seeking to overthrow that country's Government. That support has included training, command-and-control headquarters, advice, weapons, ammunition and other vital supplies. Nicaragua has served as a rear-area sanctuary for the guerrillas and headquarters for their political arm. The interaction of the Sandinista leadership with that of the FMLN and FDR has been constant and intimate. Nicaragua has publicly identified itself with the goals and methods of the Salvadorian guerrillas.

The evidence of this activity is real, varied and massive. Documents captured in El Salvador establish the key Nicaraguan role in unifying, supplying and sustaining the FMLN. That role was crucial in 1980-1981, as shown in the documents published by the United States in February of 1981. Documents captured from FMLN Commander Nidia Diaz in April 1985 made clear that the nature of Nicaragua's support for the rebels had remained substantial. Aerial photography released by the United States shows the Nicaraguan airfield from which many of those supplies were flown.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Guerrilla commanders captured or defecting from 1981 to the present day have, one after the other, described in compelling detail the dependence of the Salvadorian guerrillas on Nicaraguan-supplied weapons and supplies, on safe haven in that country, on communications and command services from Nicaragua, and on training conducted in or facilitated by Nicaragua. The deaths of two top guerrilla leaders in Managua in 1983 - and the attendance of top Sandinista leaders at their funerals - underscored the fact that the FMLN leadership has operated out of Managua with the full collaboration of the Sandinistas.

Weapons captured from or remaining in guerrilla hands have been traced through official United States shipping and production records from Viet Nam through Nicaragua to the rebels. The elaborate smuggling network developed by the Sandinistas is attested to by such irrefutable physical evidence as the large trailer truck crammed with weapons and ammunition captured by the Honduran authorities en route from Nicaragua to El Salvador in 1981. This pattern continues. Several months ago a Lada automobile on the same Nicaragua-Salvador route crashed and was found to contain weapons, ammunition, demolitions, cryptographic equipment and letters to the Salvadorian guerrilla leadership.

Finally, there are the confessions of the Sandinistas themselves. They have on several occasions stated their capacity to halt the aid being given to the FMLN. At the International Court, one of its ruling Comandantes has sworn that his Government "never" had a policy of sending arms to Salvadorian guerrillas - while presenting at the same time an affidavit that it had not done precisely that "in a good long time".

And yet, Nicaragua would have us, and the world, believe that none of this evidence exists. Nicaragua would like us, instead, to pitch all this evidence out of the window and take its flat, unsupported word that "in truth (it) is not engaged, and has not been engaged in, the provision of arms or other supplies" to

(Mr. Walters, United States)

the guerrillas in El Salvador. Nicaragua would have us disregard the tens of thousands of dead, the hundreds of millions of dollars in economic damage, the immense human misery it has imposed on El Salvador, and take its word that it has not attacked El Salvador.

But let us not stop our examination with El Salvador. Others as well have suffered from "revolutionary internationalism". Honduras has been the target of attempted subversion. Twice, in 1983 and 1984, the Sandinistas sought to infiltrate groups into Honduras to initiate a guerrilla war against the Government of that country. A large number of these guerrillas were captured and attested to Nicaragua's role in their training, direction and infiltration across the border. In 1985, members of the Nicaraguan intelligence services were captured inside Honduras and confessed their involvement in conveying arms to subversive groups in Honduras.

As documented in detail by a Costa Rican legislative commission, the Sandinistas - while conducting their campaign against Somoza, and later when they began to provide material support to the Salvadorian rebels - also established and maintained a clandestine arms supply network in Costa Rica. Sandinista-supported terrorists conducted a series of attacks in Costa Rica between 1981 and 1985, and agents of Nicaragua have attempted or conducted a number of assassinations in that country. Farther afield, Nicaraguan support for the M-19 was revealed by tracing the serial numbers of weapons captured after the bloody attack on the Palace of Justice in Bogota in Colombia.

While its preferred method is through secret support for subversion, since if caught it can hope to brazen its way out by lying, Nicaragua has not hesitated to apply direct, conventional military force. It has conducted literally hundreds of cross-border military incursions into Honduras, beginning three days after the 19 July 1979 takeover and culminating in March of this year, when some 1,500

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Sandinista soldiers penetrated 25 kilometres into Honduras and remained there for a period of several days. In familiar form, officials of the Nicaraguan Government - including its Permanent Representative - initially denied that Sandinista troops had crossed the border at all. Ambassador Astorga went before the world's cameras and stated that the so-called invasion was a total falsehood, an invention of the Reagan Administration. Only after undeniable evidence had surfaced did President Ortega acknowledge the incursion and some 150 casualties, proving which country had lied. The Sandinista military has attacked Costa Rica on many occasions, including one occasion last year when it killed two members of the Costa Rican Civil Guard and compelled Costa Rica to take the case to the Organization of American States (OAS).

Nicaragua has been able flagrantly to violate its neighbours' borders because it has amassed the largest and most powerful military force in the history of Central America. Those who considered the Somoza régime to present an image of unmatched military repression should take pause in realizing that the Sandinista armed forces, like their secret police, are some 10 times larger than Somoza's at their height. And yet, Nicaragua has recently begun to assert an intention to expand its forces to 200,000 or even 300,000 trained personnel. Not only are the Sandinista forces numerically the largest, but they have arms, not just the rifles we heard about a little while ago, but arms unmatched any where else in the region, including 340 tanks and armoured vehicles, dozens of combat helicopters and 70 long-range howitzers. These forces are made all the more effective by the presence of thousands of Cuban and other foreign advisers operating from the highest echelons of the ministries to the battalion - and even company level, including Cuban pilots flying combat missions.

This massive military buildup has had the most profound impact on Nicaraguan society. And this impact has not been accidental: the militarization of

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Nicaraguan society has been a key goal from the beginning of Sandinista rule and has, as intended, contributed enormously to the ability of the régime to exercise comprehensive control over the society as a whole. Thus, even long before Nicaragua asserted that there was a threat from contras or any other source, the Sandinistas planned and executed an accelerating and major expansion of the Nicaraguan armed forces. The army, of course, is designated as the "Sandinista Popular Army" and great attention is paid to political indoctrination. These steps parallel those imposed over the past seven years throughout the society as a whole.

This is not the occasion to rehearse the sad and predictable story of Sandinista repression, or to discuss at length - and so easily could that be done - the betrayal of the high hopes of the Nicaraguan people. Sandinista claims to defend human rights have been shown to be as hollow as the claims of the Sandinistas to be living at peace with their neighbours. Nicaragua, a small country, now has more political prisoners than any other country in the hemisphere except Cuba and maintains a system of political tribunals outside the law which ensure that no one escapes "revolutionary justice". In 1982, the Sandinistas imposed a "temporary" State of Emergency: four years later, the Nicaraguan people are still deprived of the rights of free speech, assembly and movement, to name only a few of the "basic human rights" promised in 1979 and stolen by the Sandinista régime. It may be noticed that by closing down La Prensa Nicaragua has now become the single country in mainland Latin America entirely precluding opposition access to the media. Nicaragua today has nothing to do with the Nicaragua its people believed they were fighting for in 1979, nor with the Nicaragua that the Sandinistas promised both to the people of that country and to the inter-American community.

The appeals we have just heard to God, liberty and democracy are denied by the very action of that Government which now claims to speak in addition for all of Latin America.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

The internal situation in Nicaragua, tragic in itself, is relevant to one other crucial element in the Central American picture. The repressive régime of the Sandinistas is directly responsible for the development and growth of the armed democratic resistance in Nicaragua. The Nicaraguan democratic resistance is fighting to restore the original objectives of the Nicaraguan revolution. Its 20,000 participants seek to establish a true democracy in which the people of Nicaragua are free to select their own leaders. They seek full respect for human rights and an economic system providing both for growth and for the equitable distribution of wealth.

The leaders of this resistance are the same men and women who fought against Somoza, and with the Sandinistas, seven years ago. Like thousands of other Nicaraguans who believed in the revolution and once were allies of the Sandinistas, they did not take lightly their decision to join the resistance: they joined because there was no other choice left. The Sandinistas closed the avenues of meaningful political participation within Nicaragua and convinced them that change could come only through armed force.

These, then, are the facts. Nicaragua has deliberately, as a matter of State policy and without provocation, conducted armed attacks on its neighbours. In the case of El Salvador that attack, conducted through proxies, has lasted over five years at immense cost in lives and economic damage. The Sandinistas have sought to develop insurgencies in Honduras, and have both covertly and openly attacked Honduras and Costa Rica. They have sought, through a massive military build-up, to intimidate their neighbours and their own people. They have created a repressive State, the very nature of which is ominously unprecedented in Central America; and, in so doing, they have given rise to a movement involving tens of thousands of men and women fighting to restore Nicaragua to the ideals of the 1979 Revolution.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Is it surprising, in these circumstances, that the United States should have become involved in the response to the multifaceted threat to peace presented by Sandinist Nicaragua?

United States policy towards Nicaragua has four broad objectives: an end to Nicaraguan aggression, whether through support for guerrilla groups in neighbouring countries or through conventional military attack; severance of Nicaraguan military and security ties to Cuba and the Soviet bloc; reduction of Nicaragua's military strength to levels that would restore military equilibrium to the region; and fulfilment of the original promises of democratic pluralism and respect for human and civil rights.

It is our conviction that achievement of those goals would ensure the restoration of peace and a climate conducive to growth, democratic political development, and security in the region. These goals are entirely consistent with those of other countries of the region and with multilateral diplomatic initiatives strongly endorsed by this body. While Nicaragua focuses on United States support - which it considers unjustified - for the democratic resistance, it is important to recall that the United States has pursued these benign and constructive goals through any number of peaceful means. Regrettably, those approaches have proved very largely unsuccessful in achieving changes in the Nicaraguan behaviour that so concerns its neighbours and the United States.

The United States initially provided substantial economic assistance to the Sandinista-dominated régime. We were largely instrumental in the action of the Organization of American States (OAS) delegitimizing the Somoza régime and laying the groundwork for installation of the new junta. Later, when the Sandinista role in the Salvadorian conflict became clear, we sought through a combination of private diplomatic contacts and suspension of assistance to convince Nicaragua to

(Mr. Walters, United States)

halt its subversion. Later still, economic measures and further diplomatic efforts were employed to try to effect changes in Sandinista behaviour. Still, Nicaragua's posture was one of complete and sustained intransigence.

It is perhaps worth underscoring that this "intransigence" is not quite what Nicaragua would like us to see it as - the plucky refusal of a small but proud non-aligned State to be bullied by a brutish and overweening super-Power. Rather, it was an adamant continuation of entirely unprovoked and unwarranted policies of attempting to overthrow the Salvadorian Government, of a rapid military build-up well beyond anything justifiable in internal or regional terms, of an embrace of the Cubans and Soviets, and of internal political repression raising the most profound doubts about the Sandinistas' readiness to observe their commitments of July 1979.

It was long hoped that Nicaragua could be induced to modify one crucial element of its behaviour - its penchant for attacking its neighbours - by demonstrating that it could not hope to achieve its goal of replacing their Governments with one more like its own. My Government provided substantial assistance to the countries suffering from Sandinista attentions.

Nicaragua's neighbours have asked for assistance against Nicaraguan aggression, and the United States has responded. Those countries have repeatedly and publicly made clear that they consider themselves to be the victims of aggression from Nicaragua, and that they desire United States assistance in meeting both subversive attacks and the conventional threat posed by the relatively immense Nicaraguan armed forces.

The United States has provided over \$2 billion in assistance to Central America since 1979; three quarters of that sum has been in the form of economic assistance, and barely one fourth has been military assistance despite the enormous costs entailed in meeting the covert attacks and conventional threats posed by

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Nicaragua. Regrettably, too great a proportion of this assistance must be used, not for the development or human needs of those countries, but to repair the economic damage caused by the policy of the Nicaraguan-sponsored FMLN of deliberately destroying the Salvadorian infrastructure. United States military and economic assistance has contributed to limiting the scale and impact of the active warfare, especially in El Salvador, and to increasing Nicaragua's neighbours' security against the Sandinistas. However, there was every evidence, as there is today, that the Sandinistas could and intended to continue their aggressive policies indefinitely.

Faced with the failure of all peaceful means and the unacceptability of allowing Nicaraguan subversion and aggression to continue unchecked, the United States began to provide limited support for the democratic resistance forces already in the field. Supporting the resistance is the most effective means of exerting pressure on the Sandinistas to modify those policies that present a threat to their neighbours and to regional peace.

The United States hopes that the combination of the failure in Nicaragua's policy of aggression, the increasing costs of maintaining its overblown military establishment, a collapsing economy, deepening popular discontent and an increasingly effective democratic resistance will finally lead the Sandinistas to realize that they have no alternative but to engage in serious negotiations aimed at achieving both regional peace and internal reconciliation.

Let me make clear that the United States policy does not seek the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government; not do we believe that full achievement of our principal policy objectives in Nicaragua could be incompatible with the Government of Nicaragua's own stated positions. Nicaragua has accepted the Contadora Document of Objectives as the basis for negotiation and for a comprehensive and effective peace

(Mr. Walters, United States)

in the region. The United States, too, has made abundantly clear that full and verifiable implementation of the Document of Objectives would meet all our policy goals in Nicaragua and the region. President Reagan essentially confirmed this position as recently as 24 June. Indeed, it is virtually impossible to imagine any other context in which peace could come to the region.

We believe that continued United States support for the resistance is essential to induce the Sandinista régime to enter into meaningful negotiations. We regret that that is so, but we have too often been faced with Sandinista promises which evaporate when the immediate tactical basis for their issuance has disappeared. It is not enough for Nicaragua to assert a readiness to sign an incomplete regional treaty; it must actually achieve and implement one.

The history of Contadora is replete with occasions on which Nicaragua for tactical reasons took an apparently forthcoming position, only to reverse itself at a later moment. Indeed, its 21 June response to the latest draft agreement underscores its cynical attitude towards Contadora. While claiming to respond favourably to the draft, Nicaragua in fact simply recycled old proposals which had been rejected by the other parties to the negotiations. Since the Central American democracies had already noted major deficiencies in the new draft, the Sandinistas' response can be seen only as a cost-free gambit aimed at influencing the vote on assistance for the democratic resistance. Still, we remain hopeful that Nicaragua will come to realize that this course of action is bankrupt and self-destructive, and that there are other, constructive roles that it could be playing instead.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

The United States House of Representatives approval of the request for further assistance for the resistance should give the Sandinistas good reason to negotiate seriously. That vote made it clear that the United States is not going to weary of the fight against their aggression, is not going to let Nicaragua conduct its aggressive and repressive policies unchallenged. Nicaragua, as we have seen, plays fast and loose with the facts. This time, perhaps, it succeeded in deluding even itself about just how well it had deceived the Congress about its true nature and policies.

The United States seeks peace, security, democracy and economic development throughout Central America. We believe that our actions are in compliance with international law and the highest ideals of the United Nations Charter. We are helping friends defend themselves against armed attack from Nicaragua, and thus striking a blow against aggression. Our support for the Nicaraguan resistance is designed only to encourage Nicaragua to participate seriously and in good faith in the regional negotiations now under way. We remain prepared to resume a high-level bilateral dialogue with Nicaragua at the same time as it opens talks with its opposition.

The question now is whether the Sandinistas truly want peace. Are they willing to negotiate seriously with their neighbours and their own people? Are they willing to halt their efforts to overthrow or intimidate their neighbours? Are they willing to fulfil the promises they made in July 1979?

The fact remains that those choices, so crucial for peace in Central America, are for the Nicaraguans, not the United States, to make. We have not launched an unprovoked attack on El Salvador. We have not sustained for five years a war bleeding El Salvador's people and economy white. We have not sought to destabilize or intimidate Nicaragua's unoffending neighbours. We have not inserted the

(Mr. Walters, United States)

East-West dimension by inviting in thousands of Cuban and Soviet-bloc advisers. We have not conducted since 1979 an unprecedented and unnecessary military build-up. We have not established in Nicaragua an increasingly rigid and ideologically-controlled society wholly at variance with the 1979 promises. And, finally, it is not our policies which have caused tens of thousands of Nicaraguans to fight to restore the democratic values in the name of which the 1979 revolution was fought.

The crucial choices, then, are Nicaragua's. We will be watching closely to see what choice Nicaragua makes.

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

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): We are very pleased, Sir, to be among the first to congratulate you on assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of July, and of course we pledge our full co-operation. Having had the opportunity to follow your work in this and other forums of the United Nations, I am certain that you will conduct our proceedings this month with great intelligence and skill.

Before turning to the subject before us, I wish on behalf of all the members of my delegation and on my own behalf to say how much we admired the work of your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Madagascar, Ambassador Blaise Rabetafika. A diplomat with a great deal of experience, and a good friend of long-standing, Ambassador Rabetafika once again demonstrated his wisdom, thoughtfulness and kindness.

The Security Council is meeting at the request of the Government of Nicaragua to consider recent disturbing events affecting relations between Nicaragua and the Government of the United States. That request certainly takes into account the

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

recent decision of the United States House of Representatives to authorize \$100 million of aid for the so-called contras - that is, the irregular armed forces fighting against the Government of Nicaragua.

Because it is a Latin American country, a neighbour of the countries of Central America, enjoying close relations with them, Venezuela has followed with the greatest interest events in that subregion over the past few years, and as a member of the so-called Contadora Group we have made, and continue to make, strenuous efforts to contribute to peace and co-operation in Central America.

As is well known, four other Latin American countries have given their support to that joint initiative by Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela. Those countries - Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay - make up the so-called Support Group. Moreover, the international community has given a great deal of support, as is shown by the statements of many Governments around the world and by resolutions of the Security Council, the United Nations General Assembly and the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

It should be recalled that the Contadora efforts have not been confined to general pronouncements or mere appeals to the countries of Central America to settle their differences by peaceful means. In more than three years of uninterrupted work, with innumerable meetings at various levels in close and continuing dialogue with the Central American countries, the Contadora Group has drawn up a set of documents containing detailed, concrete proposals to bring peace to the area. That phase of its activities culminated in the revised Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America, which was presented to the Central American Foreign Ministers on 6 June this year.

There is no need to quote from or comment at length on that revised Act, which will soon be circulated as an official document of the Security Council and the

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

General Assembly. However, in fulfilment of the mandate my delegation has been given by the other countries of the Contadora Group and the countries of the Support Group, I wish to read out the Panama Message of 7 June 1986 from the Foreign Ministers, which succinctly and clearly lays out the general guidelines for that process and its objectives. It reads as follows:

"The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela, which are members of the Contadora Group and the Support Group, who met at Panama on 6 and 7 June 1986, declare:

"1. That they welcome the historic meeting of the five Central American Presidents at Esquipulas, on 25 May 1986, at which they reaffirmed their support for the Contadora process and their intention to sign the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America. In that connection, they reiterate the statement made by the five Central American Presidents at Esquipulas: 'Peace in Central America can be achieved only through an authentic democratic process that is pluralistic and participatory, which entails the promotion of social justice and respect for human rights, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the rights of every nation to choose freely, and without outside interference of any kind, its own economic, political and social pattern, it being understood that such a choice is the result of the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned.'

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

"2. In recent weeks a set of negotiations has been held with a view to settling outstanding matters relating to the Peace Act. Taking account of the positions stated by the five countries in the negotiations, the Contadora Group prepared a new draft Act reflecting the parties' interests in a balanced manner. This revised version was transmitted, on the agreed date, to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the five Central American countries, who had been invited to Panama.

"3. As in the case of earlier proposals, this proposal was never intended to become an instrument to force the sovereign parties to take any action not in keeping with their legitimate interests. However, we believe that reconciliation of those interests through proposals to promote peace, security and democracy is of the greatest importance not only for Central America but for the entire region.

"4. That the Contadora Group has had, and continues to have, two fundamental goals. The first goal is to co-operate actively in preparing a peace treaty governing relations between the Central American States in a just and balanced manner, and the second goal is to identify the basic requirements for the signing, implementation and observance of the peace treaty by the parties. It is clear that the two goals are complementary: a treaty without conditions for its implementation is an illusion, and without a legal framework such conditions are insufficient to be permanently binding on the parties.

"5. That it would therefore be erroneous to believe that the crisis could be dealt with merely by means of preparing a draft treaty. Progress must also be made in bringing about the necessary conditions for the signing of the Peace Act.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

"6. That in the Caraballeda Message, which was endorsed by the five Central American countries, an endeavour was made to identify the conditions that should be the lasting principles on which to base peace, democracy and security in Central America.

"7. Ten principles and nine forms of action that must be fully realized were set forth in that Message.

"8. If progress is to be made in the Contadora process and the final goal of peace is to be achieved, it is essential that three fundamental commitments should be accepted:

(a) Use of a country's territory as a base for committing acts of aggression against another country or for providing military or logistical support to irregular forces or subversive groups should not be permitted;

(b) No country should become a member of military or political alliances that threaten peace and security in the region either directly or indirectly, thus drawing the region into the East-West conflict;

(c) No Power should give military or logistical support to the irregular forces or subversive groups that are operating, or that may operate, in the countries of the region, or use or threaten to use force as a means of overthrowing any Government in the area.

"9. That peace should be consolidated in the region through the rule of pluralistic democracy, which calls for the exercise of universal suffrage through free, regular elections supervised by independent national bodies and a multi-party system in such a way as to permit the legal and organized representation of all beliefs and political action in society. There must be majority government, thus guaranteeing the freedoms and fundamental rights of all citizens and safeguarding those of political minorities in the context of the constitutional order.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

"10. That this peace endeavour should be accompanied by an effective contribution to the economic and social development of Central America, which Latin America declares itself willing to promote, while inviting the other members of the international community to join it in that endeavour.

"11. That the eight countries members of the Contadora Group and its Support Group reaffirm, for the benefit of all the countries of the region and countries with interests in and links with the region, their willingness to make available their good offices among all the parties involved in these commitments. In that connection, they are willing to consider, together with the parties, ways in which the necessary verification procedures should be carried out, who should be responsible for carrying out those procedures and how fulfilment of the commitments undertaken is to be guaranteed.

"12. That, taking account of all these issues, they believe that the new draft Contadora Act, which is being formally submitted to the Central American countries today, both can and must bring the negotiating process to a rapid and effective conclusion.

The consequent entry into force of the Act as soon as possible and its implementation on the basis of adequate safeguards is the only way of achieving a just and effective peace in Central America, in keeping with the aspirations of the entire international community and all Latin Americans in particular." (S/18143)

That was the Panama Message of 7 June 1986.

To supplement these brief comments on the Contadora Peace process, I would recall that a few days ago, on Thursday 26 June, to be more precise, the Foreign Ministers of the countries of the Contadora Group submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Secretary-General of the

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Organization of American States a document, soon to be distributed as an official document of the Council and of the General Assembly. That document contains a detailed account of the recent actions of the Contadora Group and the Support Group and is intended to keep this Organization and the regional Organization informed of those efforts. At those talks, the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora Group made it clear that the revised Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America marks the conclusion of work on substantive aspects of the problem; at another stage, procedural arrangements will be necessary in order to implement this Act; those arrangements, of course, are subject to approval of the Act itself by the Central American countries. The Ministers also repeated the unshakeable determination of their Governments to lend their good offices to all the parties involved in these commitments, as the Panama Message states.

It is, therefore, obvious that the Contadora Group does not feel that it has finished its business; it is confident that the countries directly concerned, which should obviously have the final say, will respond positively to those efforts, which are aimed solely at helping sister peoples, within a Latin American framework, to find a solution to the difficult problems they are facing at present.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

The Contadora Group is not dead; reports of its premature death, often biased and tendentious, have been proved unfounded by the facts time and time again. But it is true, as pointed out by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Contadora countries at their press conference on Thursday, 26 June, following their meeting with the Secretary-General, that the recent decision by the United States House of Representatives to authorize significant financial and military assistance to the so-called contras does not promote the negotiating process as devised and carried out by the countries of the Contadora Group and the Support Group. As said at that time, the Group has always been opposed to resorting to war in order to seek peace; the essential spirit of Contadora is non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

That conforms to the often reiterated position of those countries. In the Panama Message, which I read out earlier, and in previous public documents, the members of the Contadora Group and the Support Group stressed that it was imperative that no Power whatsoever should give military or logistical support to irregular forces or subversive groups which operate or could operate in the countries of the region, or use or threaten to use force as a means of overthrowing a Government of the region. That is set out clearly in the Caraballeda Message for Peace, Security and Democracy in Latin America, of 12 January 1986, signed by the Foreign Ministers of the countries of the Contadora Group and the Support Group. Central American Foreign Ministers endorsed its principles and purposes in the Guatemala Declaration of 14 January 1986 and in the communiqué they issued at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on 28 February 1986.

The countries of the Contadora Group and the Support Group could take no other position, because, as is well known, Latin America has always been vigorous in its defence of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

which, thanks in large part to its efforts, is in full force today both in inter-American relations and in international relations in general.

Article 18 of the charter of the Organization of American States stresses that principle when it states that

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements."

While the United Nations Charter does not contain a provision framed in those or similar terms, the General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed its validity, as shown by the following Assembly resolutions: resolution 390 (V) of 17 November 1950, entitled "Peace through deeds"; resolution 1236 (XII) of 14 December 1957, entitled "Peaceful and neighbourly relations among States"; resolution 2131 (XX), containing the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty; resolution 2625 (XXV), containing the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and resolution 2734 (XXV), containing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That principle was recently reaffirmed by the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, adopted by the General Assembly through its resolution 37/10 of 15 November 1982.

We must add that the very recent decision of the International Court of Justice in the case of Nicaragua v. the United States of America establishes that the principle of non-intervention forms part of customary international law.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

For all those reasons, the delegation of Venezuela thinks it regrettable that the United States Government has decided to persevere in conduct which is undoubtedly contrary to international law and which, far from promoting the cause of peace in Central America, can only contribute to increased tension in the area, possibly leading a chain reaction of unforeseeable consequences. Clearly, this is the position not only of the Government of Venezuela but of all our country's political parties, which, in one way or another, have censured this action by the Government of the United States.

It is truly surprising that a State which maintains diplomatic relations with the Government of Nicaragua should repeatedly and openly promote and encourage action by irregular forces aimed at overthrowing that Government by force or at imposing certain conduct upon it.

We continue to hope that this course will not be pursued forever, and that the United States Government will come to understand that such action is not only contrary to international law, as has been said, but also prejudicial to its relations with the countries of Latin America, which have always rightly rejected categorically all forms of intervention in the internal affairs of States. History shows, moreover, that United States intervention in various countries of the region generally results in the establishment of autocratic régimes which have been largely responsible for the political, economic and social backwardness of the countries it has then had to support. That was certainly the case of Nicaragua, ruled for more than 40 years by the Somoza dictatorship.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Venezuela for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. VERMA (India): It is my pleasant duty first of all to convey to you, Sir, my delegation's greetings and its congratulations on your assumption of the high office of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. Our two countries have close and cordial relations, and are linked together by ties of culture and tradition that go back into history. We admire your diplomatic acumen and notable personal qualities, which we had several occasions to witness at first hand during our common membership of the Security Council last year. It is therefore a pleasure to see you in the Chair. We assure you of our fullest co-operation and help in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities.

(Mr. Verma, India)

I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Madagascar, who conducted the business of the Council last month with his customary dignity and competence.

The item relating to the situation in Central America has been on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly for the past three years. This is the eleventh time over this period that Nicaragua has felt compelled to have recourse to the Security Council. That is indicative of the gravity of the situation that obtains in Central America as well as of the sense of insecurity that the Nicaraguan Government and people continue to experience, in spite of the valiant efforts of the Contadora Group to find a political solution to the problems of Central America. In this context, we listened with great attention and concern to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua, who explained with clarity the developments that have compelled Nicaragua once again to seek redress by this Council.

Security Council resolution 562 (1985), adopted in May 1985, inter alia, affirmed the inalienable right of Nicaragua and the rest of the States of the area to decide on their own political and economic systems free from outside interference, subversion, direct or indirect coercion, or threats of any kind; reaffirmed the Council's firm support for the Contadora Group; called on States to refrain from carrying out political, economic or military actions of any kind against any State in the region which might impede the peace objectives of the Contadora Group; and called on the Governments of the United States and Nicaragua to resume the dialogue in Manzanillo, Mexico. Regrettably, this resolution has not had the desired positive impact.

The situation in Central America has figured prominently among the important issues engaging the attention of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The Heads

(Mr. Verma, India)

of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in New Delhi in March 1983, took note with great concern of the continuing tension in Central America. They

"denounced the new and increasing threats and acts of intimidation and the growing seriousness and increased number of acts of aggression against Nicaragua [which] were considered part of a deliberate plan to harass and destabilize that country". (S/15675, Political Declaration, para. 136)

More recently, the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries held in New Delhi in April this year noted with deep concern that the present situation in Central America constituted one of the main focal points of tension at the international level, and called for an immediate end to all threats, attacks and hostile acts against the people and Government of Nicaragua.

The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement met in urgent session in New York yesterday and adopted a communiqué on developments relating to the situation in Central America. I should like to read into the record of the Council the text of the communiqué:

"The Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries met in urgent session in New York on 30 June 1986 to consider the latest developments relating to the situation in Central America.

"The Bureau heard a statement by the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations, Her Excellency Ms. Nora Astorga, in this regard, with specific reference to the recent vote in the United States House of Representatives relating to the approval of funds to provide heavy weapons, training and other kinds of assistance to mercenary groups seeking to destabilize and overthrow the legitimate Government of Nicaragua.

(Mr. Verma, India)

"The Bureau recalled that the Ministers of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting in New Delhi in April 1986, had condemned the request as well as the discussion in the United States Congress relating to the approval of funds for the financing of mercenary forces, as an immoral and illegal act in violation of international law. Expressing its grave concern and regret at the recent vote in the United States House of Representatives on this question, the Bureau condemned any such funding as a violation of the sovereignty and political independence of Nicaragua, a non-aligned country, as well as of the principles and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Charter of the United Nations.

"The Bureau expressed its grave concern at the deterioration in the situation in the subregion stemming from the grave new threats against Nicaragua, including in particular the provision of financial assistance to mercenary forces, and noted that such actions increased the danger of direct intervention and military actions against that country and further imperilled regional and international peace and security.

"The Bureau reiterated its call to all States concerned to redouble their efforts to bring the Contadora Group's peace process to fulfilment. In this context, it deplored the fact that the United States continued to prevent a negotiated political solution and to obstruct the peace initiatives.

"The Bureau reiterated its firm solidarity with Nicaragua. It appealed to all members of the Non-Aligned Movement, as well as to the international community, to give solidarity and all such assistance as Nicaragua may require in order to preserve its right to self-determination, national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity."

(Mr. Verma, India)

The Non-Aligned Movement has been following the developments in Central America with serious concern. The Movement has deplored the use of coercive measures against Nicaragua. We respect the right of Nicaragua, as indeed of all States, to mould a new future for itself free from all foreign interference or pressure. It is our conviction that the tensions and disputes in the Central American region can only be resolved peacefully and through negotiations among all concerned. We welcome and support the efforts of the Contadora Group and the recently constituted Lima Support Group.

This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Non-Aligned Movement. At their first meeting in Belgrade, in 1961, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Nations declared:

"The present-day world is characterized by the existence of different social systems. The participating countries do not consider that these differences constitute an insurmountable obstacle for the stabilization of peace, provided attempts at domination and interference in the internal development of other peoples and nations are ruled out."

Those words are universal and abiding truths, not limited by time or space, and represent the very basics both of non-alignment and indeed of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Verma, India)

It is our profound conviction that peace in Central America cannot rest on the foundations of the policies of intervention, interference and intimidation, nor on the threat of use of force, nor on coercive measures of any kind whatsoever. For any peace to be enduring, it must be based on acceptance of the principles of the political and socio-economic pluralism of States, on scrupulous observance of the principles of non-interference and non-intervention, on a positive appreciation of the endemic problems of this troubled part of the world and on a constructive and co-operative approach to their resolution. It is incumbent upon the Security Council to grasp this reality and to give the urgent task of bringing peace to this region a real chance.

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

I call upon the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. D'ESCOTO BROCKMANN (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish):

Actually, I am not going to be availing myself of the right to respond to the words spoken by the representative of the United States. His statement - devoid of seriousness and of respect for those present here - does not merit any reply.

If Mr. Walters really believes in the truth of the wild accusations he put forward he should have persuaded his Government to defend and prove its charges against Nicaragua in the International Court of Justice instead of creating the sad and pitiful spectacle of running away from the Court. The Ambassador should not have tried to do here what his Government lacked the courage to do in the Court.

The members of the International Court of Justice, including Justice Schwebel, decided unanimously that the Court was the proper forum for an in-depth examination and analysis of Nicaragua's complaint against the United States and of the United

(Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann, Nicaragua)

States Government defence. The Court has already handed down its decision, Mr. Walters: it found against the illegal behaviour of the United States. In what is without any doubt the clearest and most categorical condemnation in the Court's history, it has found against the United States systematic violation of the principles that it, as a Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, has committed itself to respect, promote and defend.

We are not abandoning the hope that the United States will find the moral strength necessary to amend its conduct and to join the nations that respect international law and their international commitments to the cause of peace.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 2 July 1986, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

