
By letter dated 5 May 1983, the representative of Nicaragua requested an urgent meeting of the Council in view of what he described as the launching of a new stage of the invasion of his country by counter-revolutionary Somozist forces operating out of Honduras and financed, trained and supported by the United States.1

At its 2431st meeting, on 9 May 1983, the Council included the item in its agenda and invited the following, at their request, to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the item: at the same meeting, the representatives of Grenada, Honduras, Mexico and the Syrian Arab Republic; and at the 2432nd meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Guatemala, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali and Seychelles; at the 2433rd meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain and Venezuela; at the 2434th meeting, the representatives of Colombia and Viet Nam; at the 2435th meeting, the representatives of the Congo and Uganda; at the 2436th meeting, the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Greece; and, at the 2437th meeting, the representatives of India and Yugoslavia.2

At the 2434th meeting, the Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Ahmed Gora Ebrahim, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.3

The Council considered the question at its 2431st to 2437th meetings, from 9 to 19 May 1983.

At the 2431st meeting, the representative of Nicaragua stated that he had come before the Council to inform its members of the ever-increasing magnitude of the aggression against Nicaragua, which had begun in late 1982, and of the grave damage, suffering, death and destruction caused by that aggression, which was directed, financed and armed by the United States. He asked that the Council adopt all necessary measures to halt the aggression and reiterated his Government’s willingness to hold an immediate, unconditional dialogue with the United States in order to find genuine solutions to the critical situation caused by the aggression against his country.4

The representative of Honduras said that once again Nicaragua had given the Council distorted and tendentious information with regard to what it called a new stage of the invasion of Nicaragua by forces acting from the territory of Honduras, that Nicaragua had not presented any clear evidence to prove the allegations and that those fighting were Nicaraguans on Nicaraguan territory trying to obtain justice. He stated that Honduras had a long list of violations of its sovereignty and territorial integrity by Nicaragua. Those problems could be resolved once and for all if the Honduran proposal calling for international supervision and monitoring of border and strategic areas were accepted. The Council should recommend that Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, at the foreign ministers level, with other Latin American countries present and collaborating, should begin a dialogue covering regional problems as a whole and resulting in solutions to the serious problems of Central America.5

The representative of the United States stated that it was an extraordinary experience to hear Nicaragua invoke the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs and to accuse the United States of invasion inasmuch as the Sandinistas had been busy fomenting war in the region, destroying the peace and the possibility of progress in El Salvador, Honduras and other neighbouring States and forcing militarization on the region. She referred to a magazine article showing the routes for arms trafficking and the regular flow of arms from Nicaragua through Honduras into El Salvador. Reviewing the charges regarding Nicaragua’s infiltration of neighbouring Honduras and Guatemala, she stated that the United States Government had repeatedly sought to establish constructive relations with Nicaragua and to achieve regional peace through peace proposals based on an end to Nicaraguan support for guerrillas in neighbouring countries. She affirmed that the United States would support any agreement among Central American countries for the withdrawal of all foreign military advisers as well as any verifiable reciprocal agreement among Central American countries on the renunciation of support for insurgent Governments.6

The representative of Nicaragua stated that his Government had asked the Council to consider exclusively the grave problems and the consequences of the aggression to which his country was a victim. He also pointed out that no proof whatever had been produced of routes for a traffic in arms being used by Nicaragua through Honduran territory in order to send arms to El Salvador.7

At the 2432nd meeting, on 13 May 1983, the representative of Mexico stated that, together with Colombia, Panama and Venezuela, Mexico had stepped up contacts aimed at the reduction of tension and the search for practical mechanisms acceptable to all parties which could lay the groundwork for peace. He added that Mexico and the United States had agreed to promote dialogues and negotiations in order to avoid armed conflict and to advance peaceful conditions and economic development. The climate of threats and verbal aggression, however, had intensified and the centres of confrontation had multiplied, therefore, the Council was duty bound to offer a rapid and effective response to the problem brought before it and to contribute resolutely to a negotiated settlement.8

The representative of Zimbabwe stated that unless immediately checked, the build-up of tensions on the Nicaraguan-Honduran and Nicaragua-Costa Rican frontiers would soon lead to open military conflicts in the area. Welcoming the Contadora initiatives by Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Columbia, he said
that the Council must exert maximum efforts
towards negotiated and peaceful solutions to
the problems. He believed that the first positive step in
that direction was for the Council to adopt a
resolution giving the Secretary-General authority to initiate
without delay good-offices efforts, preferably in co-ordination with the Contadora Group. The Council should also warn all concerned, and especially States outside Central America, to refrain from any interference or intervention.1

At the 2433rd meeting, on 16 May 1983, the
representative of Nicaragua described new acts of
aggression against Nicaragua and reviewed the at-
ttempt to establish with Honduras a joint patrol plan
for their joint border. He blamed Honduras for the
failure of that initiative and stressed the need for
direct dialogue with Honduras in the presence of the
representatives of the Contadora Group.2

Rejecting the Nicaraguan accusations, the repre-
sentative of Honduras stated that Honduras had kept
its word not to interfere in Nicaragua nor to mobilize
its troops and that its suggestion to establish a
demilitarized zone on the Atlantic and the Pacific
was still pending. Honduras was ready to arrive, in
collaboration with the Contadora Group, at an
agreement as a result of a regional consensus involv-
ing not only Honduras and Nicaragua but also Costa
Rica, El Salvador and Guatemala.3

At the 2436th meeting, on 18 May 1983, the
representative of the United Kingdom stated that judging from some of the speeches, his delegation felt
that the Council should reaffirm the principles set
out in the Contadora Group bulletin of 12 May and
support the multilateral efforts of the Group with
bilateral talks on the side.4

The representative of China said that meddling by
outside forces, and especially the attempts of the
super-Powers to extend their rivalry to Central
America, had multiplied the complexity of the issue
and constituted an underlying cause of the present
tension in the region. It was imperative to stop all
outside intervention, especially super-Power inter-
vention or intimidation. Reaffirming the expectation
that differences and disputes among various Central
American States would be settled peacefully and
without outside intervention, he said that China
hoped that the Latin-American countries, especially
those of the Contadora Group, would achieve posi-
tive results. China also lent its support to all United
Nations efforts conducive to the easing and elimina-
tion of tension in the region.5

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out
that the statement of Nicaragua showed incontrover-
tibly that a second, more dangerous phase had begun
in the armed intervention against Nicaragua. The
fact that the United States had discussed exclusively
the internal affairs of Nicaragua, cast doubt on the
legitimacy of the Nicaraguan Government and made
pluralism and a mixed economy preconditions for
negotiations with Nicaragua, was a clear example of
direct interference in the internal affairs of a sover-
eign State. The Soviet Union supported the Nicarag-
uan demand that the United States cease its unde-
clarated war against that country and advocated a just
settlement of international disputes at the negotiating
table. He concluded by saying that it was the duty of
the Council to follow closely the development of the
situation and to take all necessary measures to
safeguard the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua.6

Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

The representative of Poland said that the Council
should undertake decisive efforts to bring about a
negotiated, peaceful solution of the problems that
had been created on Nicaragua’s borders. The first
step would be to adopt a resolution reaffirming the
right of Nicaragua to live in peace and security, free
from outside intervention and the threat or use of
force. The Council should warn all concerned to
refrain from open or covert interference in Nicara-
guan internal affairs. New possibilities should be
opened for dialogue and a negotiated solution, with
the assistance of the Contadora Group and the United
Nations.7

At its 2437th meeting, on 19 May 1983, the
Council had before it a draft resolution8 sponsored
jointly by Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Nicaragua, Paki-
stan, Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe.

The representative of Yugoslavia said that the
draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned mem-
ers of the Security Council complemented the
efforts of the Contadora Group; it neither con-
demned nor recriminated, and deserved the support of the Security Council. He urged that at a certain
point in the future it might be necessary to draw
upon the knowledge, authority and wisdom of the Secretary-General.8

The representative of Malta, a co-sponsor of the
draft resolution, announced that the sponsors had agreed to replace “13 May 1983” in the sixth
preambular paragraph by “12 May 1983”, and to
replace the opening words of operative paragraph
4—“Calls upon” by “Urges”. Noting that the draft
resolution was the outcome of a sustained collective
effort, taking into account all the views expressed, he
hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.9

The draft resolution as orally amended was adopt-
ed by 15 votes in favour as resolution 530 (1983).10
The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,
Having heard the statements of the Minister for External
Relations of the Republic of Nicaragua,
Having also heard the statements of the representatives of
various States Members of the United Nations in the course of
the debate,

Deeply concerned, on the one hand, at the situation prevailing on
and inside the northern border of Nicaragua and, on the other
hand, at the consequent danger of a military confrontation
between Honduras and Nicaragua, which could further aggravate
the existing critical situation in Central America,
Recalling all the relevant principles of the Charter of the United
Nations, particularly the obligation of States to settle their disputes
exclusively by peaceful means, not to resort to the threat or use of
force and to respect the self-determination of peoples and the
sovereign independence of all States,
Noting the widespread desire expressed by the States concerned
to achieve solutions to the differences between them,
Commending the appeal of the Contadora Group of countries,
Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, in its 12 May 1983
communiqué, that the deliberations of the Council should
strengthen the principles of self-determination and non-interfer-
ence in the affairs of other States, the obligation not to allow the
territory of a State to be used for committing acts of aggression
against other States, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the
prohibition of the threat or use of force to resolve conflict,

Considering the broad support expressed for the efforts of the
Contadora Group to achieve solutions to the problems that affect
Central American countries and to secure a stable and lasting
peace in the region.
Reaffirms the right of Nicaragua and of all the other countries of the area to live in peace and security, free from outside interference;

Commends the efforts of the Contadora Group and urges the pursuit of those efforts;

Appeals urgently to the interested States to cooperate fully with the Contadora Group, through a frank and constructive dialogue, so as to resolve their differences;

Urges the Contadora Group to spare no effort to find solutions to the problems of the region and to keep the Security Council informed of the results of these efforts;

Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed of the development of the situation and of the implementation of the present resolution.

After the vote, the representative of Nicaragua stated that the very fact that the United States had not opposed the resolution was seen by Nicaragua as a manifestation of its will to put an end to armed aggression against Nicaragua and to respect the right of its people to live in peace and security free from any foreign interference. He said that if it proved otherwise, it would be Nicaragua’s duty once again to come back to the Council.*

The representative of the United States said that Nicaragua had maligned and misrepresented the policies of the United States and of Honduras and that once Nicaragua was willing to fulfill its obligations and promises to its neighbours and its own people, there would be no further problems between the United States and Nicaragua.*
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19. LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1983 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CHAD TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 2 August 1983, the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the grave situation in Chad resulting from open Libyan aggression against that country.

At its 2462nd meeting, on 3 August 1983, the Council included this question in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion: the representatives of Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; and at the 2463rd meeting, the representatives of Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Ivory Coast, Liberia and the Sudan; at the 2465th meeting, the representatives of Benin, Guinea, Kenya, the Niger, Senegal and the United Republic of Cameroon; at the 2467th meeting, the representative of Somalia; and at the 2469th meeting, the representative of the Congo. The Council considered the question at its 2462nd to 2465th, 2467th and 2469th meetings, from 3 August to 31 August 1983.

Opening the discussion at the 2462nd meeting, the representative of Chad accused the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of stepping up its aggression against his country. He charged that since 31 July 1983, when the Chadian National Armed Forces had retaken the town of Faya-Largeau in the north of Chad, the Libyan Air Force had been massively bombing the town, causing many casualties among the civilian population. Chad had come before the Council today to allow it to assume its responsibilities with regard to that situation, which undoubtedly threatened international peace and security.

The speaker recalled the previous discussions in the Council relating to the border dispute between the two countries. He charged that the Libyan government regime continued to be destabilize the government regime in order to set up another régime that would be of its own persuasion. Thus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would be able to perpetuate its occupation of the Aouzou Strip, to annex the entire country and to use it as a base for aggression against neighbouring countries, and finally to carry out its dream of creating the “United States of the Sahel”.

The representative of Chad accused the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. He urged the Council to condemn the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for its bombing of Chadian townships, to order an end to such bombings and to order the withdrawal of Libyan occupation forces from Chad.

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya denied the allegations contained in the letters dated 1 and 2 August 1983 from Chad. He said that the