Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

including the Islamic Republic of Iran, to restore peace and stability in the region.

The representative of Saudi Arabia stated that the Iranian attacks on Saudi and Kuwait tankers had taken place in Saudi territorial waters and adjacent waterways, far from the area of military operations, and were in retaliation for Iraqi attacks on the Islamic Republic of Iran. He pointed out that the claim by a country at war of a right to attack a third party would have dangerous effects on international relations and peace and security everywhere unless it was condemned and rejected by the international community. Since the Council bore primary responsibility for crystalizing the position of the international community, it must firmly express its determination not to permit any aggression against third parties in the Gulf area.

The representative of Yemen contended that the Iran-Iraq war was being extended beyond the two belligerent States because the Council had failed to assume its responsibilities towards impartially restoring international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the Charter. He stated that the Council was now more than ever duty-bound to work towards halting the war.

The representative of Senegal stated that the situation should be viewed in the wider context of the four-year-old war. He urged the Council to call for unobstructed freedom of navigation in the international waters of the Gulf, to renew its call for the cessation of hostilities and the continuation of mediation efforts, and to reaffirm its appeal to the belligerents to respect the territorial integrity and economic infrastructure of other coastal States and refrain from actions likely to worsen or widen the conflict.

Mr. Chedli Klibi indicated that the LAS Council had adopted a resolution on 19 May 1984, in which, inter alia, it appealed to the Security Council to adopt a clear and firm position on the Iranian aggression. The League hoped that the Council would take appropriate measures to guarantee the safety of international sea lanes, because the disruption of maritime traffic would affect the interests of all nations and could lead to foreign intervention. The Council must assume responsibility for restoring the stability of the Gulf region and must contain the conflict as much as possible pending compliance with its decisions. Since Iraq had already indicated its willingness to comply, efforts should be directed at inducing Iran to heed the Council’s resolutions.

At the 2543rd meeting, the representative of Somalia asserted that the Council must demand that Iraq and its allies cease their attacks on sea traffic, comply with United Nations resolutions and respect the principles of international law. The Council should also vigorously seek to bring both the Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq into a process of peaceful negotiations:

The representative of Turkey stated at the 2545th meeting that the Council should try to help the parties find a solution to the conflict but must not attempt to impose one. It should not adopt a resolution which would be totally unacceptable to either party and which, by its lack of balance, fairness and justice, would lead to further intransigence; rather, it should seek to strengthen the hand of the Secretary-General, who had reaffirmed his willingness on 17 May 1984 to assist in the peaceful resolution of the conflict, and enable both the Islamic
Republic of Iran and Iraq to co-operate with the Secretary-General while taking concrete steps towards the reduction of tension in the Gulf.  


At the 2546th meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.  

The representative of Malta expressed his delegation’s view that the restrictive formulations appearing in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the draft resolution could in no way be interpreted to derogate from universally accepted norms of international behaviour or general principles of international law. Malta’s interpretation of those paragraphs was that they applied equally to all commercial shipping in all regions of the world.  

The President put the draft resolution to the vote. It was adopted by 13 votes in favour to none against, with 2 abstentions, as resolution 552 (1984) and reads as follows:  

The Security Council.  

Having considered the letter dated 21 May 1984 from the representatives of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates complaining against Iranian attacks on commercial ships en route to and from the ports of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia,  

Noting that Member States pledged to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,  

Reaffirming the obligations of Member States with respect to the principles and purposes of the Charter,  

Reaffirming also that all Member States are obliged to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State,  

Taking into consideration the importance of the Gulf region to international peace and security and its vital role to the stability of the world economy,  

Deeply concerned over the recent attacks on commercial ships en route to and from the ports of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia,  

Convinced that these attacks constitute a threat to the safety and stability of the area and have serious implications for international peace and security,  

1. Calls upon all States to respect, in accordance with international law, the right of free navigation;  

2. Reaffirms the right of free navigation in international waters and sea lanes for shipping en route to and from all ports and installations of the littoral States that are not parties to the hostilities;  

3. Calls upon all States to respect the territorial integrity of the States that are not parties to the hostilities and to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any act which may lead to a further escalation and widening of the conflict;  

4. Condemns the recent attacks on commercial ships en route to and from the ports of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia;  

5. Demands that such attacks should cease forthwith and that there should be no interference with ships en route to and from States that are not parties to the hostilities;  

6. Decides, in the event of non-compliance with the present resolution, to meet again to consider effective measures that are commensurate with the gravity of the situation in order to ensure the freedom of navigation in the area;  

7. Requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress of the implementation of the present resolution;  

8. Decides to remain seized of the matter.  

Following the vote, the representative of Zimbabwe stated that the Council should have addressed itself to both parties equally and that his delegation had abstained because the resolution failed to take an even-handed approach to the conflict. They hoped that in its effort to deal with the immediate problem the Council had not made the search for a solution to the wider issue of the Iran-Iraq war more difficult.  

The representative of Nicaragua indicated that his delegation had abstained because it did not believe that the formulation of the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of States contained in the resolution would promote a peaceful settlement of
the conflict. The appeal for respect for the territorial integrity of non-belligerent States should have been extended to include countries at war; as it stood, it left the door open for foreign intervention in countries party to the conflict.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information of Kuwait stated that, having adopted a resolution, the Council must do everything possible to ensure its implementation. Kuwait thanked the Secretary-General and anticipated that he would follow up on the implementation of the resolution, in which he could be sure of their constructive cooperation.
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33. LETTER DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 1984 FROM THE CHARGÉ D’AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 4 September 1984 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Nicaragua requested an urgent meeting of the Council to be convened immediately to examine the situation created by the new escalation of aggression directed against his country.

At its 2557th meeting, on 7 September 1984, the Council included the letter in its agenda and considered it at the same meeting.

The representative of Nicaragua expressed concern about the increasing involvement of mercenaries of the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in the no longer covert war against his country. Nicaragua had been alerting the international community and the Government and people of the United States to the consequences of the increasing involvement. In that regard, the speaker furnished numerous relevant examples including the dispatch of mercenaries, the transport of military equipment, training and direct participation in combat with Contras, the constant holding of military and naval manoeuvres in the waters close to Nicaragua and the building of airports and other military installations in Central America; and permanent reconnaissance, in other words spy flights, over Nicaraguan territory by United States aircraft.

The permanent United States military presence in Central America amounted to 1,400 United States soldiers on seven United States bases. Political solutions seemed increasingly difficult to achieve. High-level spokesmen of the United States Administration, including President Reagan himself, Secretary of State Shultz and Ambassador Kirkpatrick, continued to threaten the Sandinist People’s Revolution and the Government of National Reconstruction. The sole objective of those statements was to isolate Nicaragua internationally and to prepare the political terrain for the invasion. Various United States officials, including the President, had on several occasions made statements in which they did not discard the possibility of direct intervention in Central America, including Nicaragua. The United States constituted a real threat to the security of the Sandinist People’s Republic, which the United States was openly attempting to destroy through a war of aggression.

The representative of the United States rejected the statement by the representative of Nicaragua and stated that the United States was not trying to overthrow the Sandinista Government. He alleged that United States relations with Nicaragua had deteriorated because, instead of keeping their promises about human rights and pluralistic democracy, the Sandinistas had developed increasingly close military ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union, tightened their internal repression, had supported guerrilla insurgency in El Salvador and terrorism in Honduras and Costa Rica and had continued an extensive military build-up that threatened the security of their neighbours.

The representative of Nicaragua in his reply mentioned that his country was concerned and grieved to see the United States, the greatest empire in the world, applying a double standard: that it was going through the motions of seeking a negotiated settlement to the problems of Central America while at the same time committing acts of aggression against Nicaragua. Such duplicity revealed the lack of sincerity on the part of the United States Government.

The representative of the Soviet Union called the American declaration that the United States did not intend to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua fallacious from beginning to end, because in parallel with that and other similar statements the United States had virtually openly continued to finance, arm, train and send mercenaries to Nicaraguan territory. The reason for acts of intervention by the United States against Latin American countries was its consistent policy of not allowing the autonomous, economic, political and social development of Latin America and attempting to impose on Latin American countries the kind of system preferred by the United States.
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34. LETTER DATED 3 OCTOBER 1984 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LAO PEOPLE’S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 3 October 1984, the representative of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the attack on and occupation of three Lao villages by Thailand and the resulting tense situation along the border between the two countries.