

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2425th

MEETING: 28 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2425)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2425th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 March 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2425)

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2420th to 2424th meetings], I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras to take a place at the Security Council table. I invite the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ecuador, Grenada, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Orteiz Colindres (Honduras) took a place at the Council table. Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Miss Dever (Belgium), Mr. Salazar Paredes (Bolivia), Mr. Bueno (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Zumbado Jiménez (Costa Rica), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi

(Democratic Yemen), Mr. Knipping Victoria (Dominican Republic), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Chávez-Mena (El Salvador), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Purushottam (India), Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. La Rocca (Italy), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Maudave (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Narkhuu (Mongolia), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Pastor de la Torre (Peru), Mr. Arcilla (Philippines), Mr. de Piniés (Spain), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Coronel de Rodríguez (Venezuela) Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) and Mr. Silović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Czechoslovakia and Hungary in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Rácz (Hungary) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker this afternoon is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador, Mr. Fidel Chávez-Mena. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. CHÁVEZ-MENA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank the members of the Security Council for allowing me to address the Council during the discussion now under way.

5. Respectful as it has been and is of the principle of non-intervention, my country has not interfered and does not interfere in the internal affairs of other States. If that is our behaviour on the international level, it is equally true at the regional level, on which we have indissoluble ties of geography, history and culture, as was proclaimed by the leaders of an independence that we obtained on the same day, after struggling against

the same colonizer. That is why a great deal of what I am about to say is extremely distressing to us.

6. Everyone is aware that at the present time two ideological trends are vying with each other to establish themselves in Central America. Those two trends are expressed in diametrically opposed behaviour. If they continue, those two attitudes cannot but hinder the elimination or reduction of tension. They are as different as water and oil, or the wolf and the lamb.

7. The recent introduction of political interests alien to Central America, derived from larger-scale confrontations, perpetuates the problems of the countries of our region, making them play the game—apparently unconsciously—of the merchants of war.

8. If we are to be successful in formulating ideas that will lead to harmony based on trust and co-operation, on common origins, on shared geography and destiny, then all people of good will must zealously embark on a search for peace, and others must co-operate with us in our efforts. The presence of both elements is essential, because if there is good will on the one hand and attempts to frustrate our efforts on the other, then in the end there will exist a situation in no way differing from what I have just described: water and oil, the wolf and the lamb.

9. It is a universally acknowledged fact that there is a situation of widespread conflict in Central America. That situation is generating new tensions and fostering other tensions whose origins date far back into the past. This situation makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any political plans to be viable and stable, regardless of their nature.

10. In this connection I reiterate that the existence of different political programmes designed to overcome the conditions caused by social, political and economic underdevelopment produces tension and conflicts when one trend tries to impose itself on the others in the futile belief that they are exclusive approaches.

11. It is clear that the Central American situation is not free from the major disorders of the international monetary system, high rates of unemployment, excessive protectionism and the whole long series of negative symptoms the Central American subregion must face while it is in the very midst of its own social and political crisis.

12. The world has witnessed the fact that El Salvador, a country that belongs to a region in conflict, as Central America now is, has in its international relations acted with the greatest respect for the principles of non-intervention and self-determination. In a word, we have acted with the greatest of prudence.

13. That prudence has not been recompensed, given the accumulation of evidence that the Nicaraguan Government has been one of the primary factors of instability in Central America.

14. El Salvador has never intervened in the internal affairs of the other States of Central America, nor has it ever interfered in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. Consequently we are in a moral position to demand similar conduct on the part of the other countries of Central America.

15. El Salvador has been the victim of—among other belligerent and hostile acts—the continued transfer of weapons, the last link in the chain being our neighbour Republic of Nicaragua, which acts under the aegis of a misunderstood international solidarity and does not practise, and respects even less, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Central American States. As we all know, that principle includes not only one State's individual relations with another but also its relationships with various States and even international organizations themselves.

16. Everyone is aware that the armed groups operating in El Salvador have their central headquarters in Nicaragua. It is there that decisions are made and logistic support is channelled—logistic support without which it would be impossible for them to continue in their struggle and without which they would have joined in the democratic process.

17. Fortunately for the valiant and persevering people of Central America, and the Salvadorans in particular, neither the collusion of countries nor international trends can bend their will of iron, since they only want peace, but peace obtained through democratic channels, not through the fragility of a Government that wishes to impose itself without the support of the people, and surreptitiously.

18. If the principle of non-intervention is the cardinal norm of international law, it is strengthened by the relations of friendship and co-operation among States already developed by the United Nations. We believe it relevant to refer to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty", because we consider that text to be particularly relevant to the present circumstances in Central America. In its operative part it clearly states:

"No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned.

"... no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State.

"...

"The strict observance of these obligations is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another, since the practice of any form of intervention not only violates the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations but also leads to the creation of situations which threaten international peace and security.

"Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State.

"All States shall respect the right of self-determination and independence of peoples and nations, to be freely exercised without any foreign pressure, and with absolute respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

The clarity of those concepts requires no further comment, but we have quoted paragraphs of the resolution *in extenso* because they are very enlightening with regard to the problem of Central America and the situation that is now confronting the countries there.

19. No observer of the international scene can be unaware that the situation in Central America does not bode well for stability, much less for reasonable improvement. Everything seems to indicate that Central America is becoming a region of serious tensions from which wider confrontations could easily arise. For, taking advantage of prevailing instability and unjust economic and social structures, foreign interests are cultivating and directing the action of ideological groups in favour of their own particular military political positions.

20. In this context, it is logical to suppose that the expansionist designs of a Power outside the region should consider Central America and the Caribbean basin as a zone of "vital expansion" and as a bridgehead in America. Its hegemonistic and expansionist objectives are favoured by two ideologically loyal parties, Cuba and the Government of Nicaragua. This makes more acute, in a notable way, the presence on Central American soil of the different forms of struggle in the so-called East-West confrontation; it tends to regionalize or internationalize the conflict and makes its solution depend, unfortunately, on decisions taken by Governments or groups alien to the life of our own countries.

21. At the appropriate time El Salvador will assert the right recognized by the Charter of the United Nations itself with regard to regional competence—in this case, of the inter-American system—which, by political logic, must take preference in conflicts among States in the region. Our country has not deemed it prudent to resort to this measure for the time being in order to maintain some calm in a turbulent region and thus avoid an aggravation of the situation, through diplomacy and in the perhaps vain hope that the leaders of Nicaragua will understand that every country must resolve its own problems through the political system each people voluntarily chooses. Wisdom resides in tolerance for the systems of others—not in the clandestine export of arms, not in logistic support and not in the provision of sanctuaries

for military training. There can be no double standard or scale of values in this respect. The principle of non-interference is a unity, without exceptions or equivocations. If we do not all accept that commitment, not only out of conviction but also because it is suitable, there will be no peace in Central America.

22. We have stated that we do not wish to see Central America become the object of a dispute in a conflict between the super-Powers in their zeal to acquire new zones of influence for their respective hegemonies, nor do we wish to see that process become divisive in an attempt to establish a political model that does not respond to the aspirations and traditions of those peoples, who are eminently Catholic, especially when that model is based on other cultural realities.

23. How can such an extraneous process fail to cause deep social unrest, such as we are observing in Nicaragua? If that occurs inside a country, international tensions heighten when that indistinct model is exported through words and deeds in propaganda and subversion that foment class struggle and magnify the social and economic imbalances that lie at the root of the political problems in Central America but which also exist in other parts of our world.

24. Neither a violent and merciless revolution inspired by nihilism, one that attempts to destroy the national infrastructure and creates unemployment and poverty, nor the maintenance of an unjust *status quo*, can be a true solution in Central America. We therefore firmly reject any attempt to establish through violent means a political system that represents an abandonment of ideological pluralism. This repudiation is consistent with the firm wish of the overwhelming majority of the people of Central America, who abhor the imposition, through force, of alien and dependent models. Precisely owing to that rejection, the path of elections is fundamental to the political solution and opens wide a door for massive and democratic participation by the peoples of Central America. Thus far, in the practice of political science no better method has been invented to reflect the national will. All of this must, of course, be accomplished with the necessary electoral guarantees.

25. We also wish to state that where the freedoms of citizens are concerned, bragging about non-alignment without ideological pluralism internally has no practical meaning and becomes only another tool for totalitarian and anti-democratic propaganda.

26. We must not confuse the full exercise of territorial sovereignty with attitudes that create conflicts by promoting distrust. I am referring to the acquisition of military arsenals that are disproportionate to the needs of national security or regional balance and its true economic capabilities. Is that unbridled arms race not a provocation for neighbours, especially when the exportation of new social schemes to neighbouring States becomes national policy? Is this not an invitation to the arms race? Is it not an element that contributes to regional tension? Is it not a factor that destabilizes the peace of the region in an already turbulent situation?

27. The answer is clearly affirmative. It is high time that in this play-acting—in what is of course, owing to the death and desolation it is creating, a tragedy—that the masks were dropped and that those who today in international forums are posing as victims stood revealed as the victimizers.

28. Our highest aspiration and most fervent desire as a Central American people facing the difficult challenge of mindless gun-fire and the insanity of attacks is for peace in the region. We do not want to see an increase in tension; therefore, we must make every honest and sincere effort possible to achieve political stability, economic development and social peace in Central America.

29. This is not a new position. On the contrary, it is in line with age-old tradition, a long line of conduct that has always been marked by peace. At the meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica, on 15 March 1980, in which the five Republics of Central America participated, we affirmed the highest Central American aspirations for peace, mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, the right to self-determination and, especially, the recognition of the absolute and unfettered observance of the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States as vital requirements for the establishment of peace and security in the region. That was reiterated at the meeting of Central American Foreign Ministers at Tegucigalpa on 15 August 1981.

30. Until peaceful coexistence prevails, until there is respect for the principles of the self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, until petty foreign interests cease to guide the conduct of any country in the region, development, justice and peace will remain unattainable ideals.

31. Thus I do not hesitate in offering all my good will to obtain that peace—a prerequisite if those other values are to be attained.

32. To that end it is essential that all Central American countries adopt consistent policies for the limitation of arms and military troops; that we completely refrain from arms trafficking; and that we do not accept provocation or harassment from outside, because we all have a right to organize ourselves at the social, economic and political levels in the way in which each of our peoples freely decides through its own sovereign will.

33. It is essential, therefore, that each and every one of our Central American Governments, representing each and every one of our peoples, undertake an urgent search for a viable and adequate solution. And the first step is that we sit down face to face, without exclusion and without conditions, to discuss, speak and analyse. In the mean time, let the cannons and guns cease their fire and let the limited resources available to us not be wasted on a useless and shameful arms race.

34. El Salvador reaffirms its democratic and peaceful calling. Without any rancour or desire for revenge as the brothers we are, we publicly invite all the Central Ameri-

can countries, including Nicaragua, to meet to discuss logically, in a civilized manner, the best possible way of putting an end to tensions in our region.

35. Thus, on the basis of the principle of non-interference and the concept and nature of the Central American nation, it is essential that the Central Americans alone, exclusively, resolve the problems of the region. Therefore, no one—absolutely no one—under any pretext should interfere in the regional problems of Central America, which are essentially and basically the responsibility of Central Americans. In this connection, we reject any formulas or proposals, regardless of their intention, from outside the Central American region, since we have the political maturity and awareness of the historic responsibility required in order within a regional dialogue, without any exception, I repeat, to seek the peace and political, social and economic stability of the region.

36. That meeting of Central American countries should be inspired by good faith, by an honest desire to resolve the problems that cause tension and by a renunciation of any aggressive or meddling attitude in the affairs of other States. That gathering of the Governments of Central America, which we have promoted together with the Republics of Honduras and Costa Rica, should, in our view, include the discussion and analysis of the following points: first, limitations on the arms race; secondly, safeguards with a view to eliminating the traffic in weapons from the Central American region; thirdly, the strengthening of trade and economic relations among the countries of the region; and, fourthly, the strengthening of the region's democratic, pluralist and participatory institutions.

37. We hope that the international community will accept and welcome this peace initiative being expressed here with the best of intentions.

38. My appeal is for the establishment of democracy, the complete observance of human rights, social justice, tolerance and fraternal feelings among all the peoples of Central America. And it is for peace—for peace the victories of which are more difficult to achieve and, for that very reason, more desirable than the victories of war.

39. Mr. NATORF (Poland): First of all I should like to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your competence and skill assure us of good leadership in dealing with the Council's business this month. We have already witnessed that. It is also with satisfaction that I take this opportunity to convey to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, our appreciation for the skill, objectivity and personal charm with which he conducted the Council's work last month.

40. The Council continues its consideration of the serious increase of tensions in Central America caused by open interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. That interference is evidently threatening peace and stability in the region and, consequently, in the world at

large. That is why the Council as a whole should not remain indifferent to it.

41. My delegation has listened with particular interest and attention to the statements made before the Council by Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco, the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, including the one this morning [2424th meeting]. He described in detail the situation in and around his country. There is no doubt that the Nicaraguan Government's request for an urgent meeting of the Council was fully justified.

42. Both the content of Mr. Tinoco's statements and the facts widely publicized by the mass media prove that the Government and people of Nicaragua are facing a new aggressive escalation of actions aimed at the destabilization of the life and economy of that country. This sinister escalation is reflected in repeated subversive and terrorist activities, hostile external propaganda, acts of intimidation by the United States Administration and, most recently, the massive infiltration of foreign trained mercenaries from the territory of Honduras. Today *The New York Times* reveals new facts about the real involvement of Honduras in a master plan aimed against Nicaragua. A real army of paramilitary forces has been recruited abroad from ex-Somoza guards and is now being used in sabotage raids against agricultural, industrial and other important targets in Nicaragua. Simple common sense is sufficient to confirm that those activities and the groups conducting them can exist only to the extent that they are financed, trained and supported by external forces interested in overthrowing the legal Government of Nicaragua.

43. The aggressive escalation of hostile acts against Nicaragua is taking place when its Government of National Reconstruction has embarked upon the road of ridding its country of the legacy of economic underdevelopment, poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, social injustice and destruction. It is an irony that former friends and sponsors of Somoza's tyranny are now supporting his ex-followers under banners of lofty slogans of democracy, liberty and human rights. It seems to me that there should be limits to everything, even hypocrisy.

44. A large-scale propaganda campaign against Nicaragua has been escalated and reflected in numerous high-level pronouncements by a number of United States officials. This proves that there is tension in relations between the United States and Nicaragua which affects the security of Central America, and it is not tiny Nicaragua which poses a threat to the security of the United States.

45. I cannot but remark bitterly at this particular moment. Instead of replying to the facts and proof of aggression against Nicaragua, the representative of the United States in both her statements [2420th and 2423rd meetings] indulged in highly propagandistic and rhetorical accusations against Nicaragua's domestic policies. We interpret this as clear-cut interference in the internal affairs of that country, an action which, by the way, is

not unfamiliar to us. There were some references made by her to the alleged proliferation of various "strange rights" in the present world. Indeed, what we very often are witnessing is the United States Administration's efforts to usurp to itself a strange right to be the supreme moral judge of every Government's conduct, of every system and of every country. The facts of the not-so-remote past, very well known to the entire world, do not give the United States moral authority to lecture others on morality. Such pretensions, mixing unilateral, dubious—in our view—moral absolutes and diplomacy, contribute only to aggravating the international climate and worsening of relations.

46. When we listened to the statement of the representative of the United States, we had the feeling that it was intended essentially to prove two things: first, that the Nicaraguan system and Government was an extremely weak one, full of internal illnesses and incapable of assuring the development of the nation—in fact, that the country was almost falling to pieces; and secondly, that Nicaragua posed a grave danger to the security of the whole Central American region and was capable of destabilizing all the Central American nations. Simple logic points to the fact that both assertions are inconsistent with each other; what is more, they are self-contradictory: the first excludes the second, and vice versa. So at least one assertion was wrong. As far as we are concerned, both of them are false.

47. My country, although located far from Central America, cannot remain indifferent to threats to peace and international security, wherever they occur. In the Political Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty of 5 January 1983, Poland joined the call to put a halt to "the policy of constant threats and provocations aimed against Cuba and Nicaragua and to all attempts at external interference in their internal affairs" [see S/15556, annex, sect. IV]. This reflects also our policy of friendship and co-operation with the Government of the peaceful Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua. We welcome the call upon the Government of the United States to "adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue with Nicaragua, and in order to help achieve political and negotiated solutions to the problems of the region" [see S/15628, annex, para. 28], as contained in the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983. This coincides fully with Mr. Tinoco's appeal to the United States on Wednesday [2420th meeting] to cease its aggressive stance against Nicaragua and to reconsider all peace initiatives.

48. My delegation takes note with satisfaction of the fact that the Nicaraguan Government endorses the peace initiative presented by Mexico and Venezuela in which the Presidents of those countries expressed their readiness to promote a dialogue between Nicaragua and Honduras that would facilitate understanding. We took note also that the non-aligned countries appealed to Honduras to reciprocate this gesture.

49. The question before us should be considered with all the attention its gravity calls for. The independence and territorial integrity of Nicaragua should be effectively protected by the Organization. This Central American country, as well as other nations of the region, should be allowed to enjoy fully its sovereign right to determine its system without any external interference, as set out in respective United Nations documents. The Council should not remain indifferent to the Nicaraguan call for help in developing a Central American policy conducive to peaceful, negotiated solutions. The threats and acts of aggression against Nicaragua should be denounced. Careful consideration should be given to Nicaraguan and non-aligned peace initiatives. There are many mechanisms for a peaceful settlement of disputes to be freely chosen by the States concerned. Action by the Council along these lines would contribute to its effective discharge of its primary responsibility as enshrined in the Charter.

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

51. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. President, for having allowed me to take part in this debate. I should like first of all to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of the Algerian delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are convinced that your experience and broad knowledge of international affairs are an earnest of the quality of your contribution to the work of the Council. Our congratulations go also to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, who, with his customary skill, discharged that same responsibility during the month of February.

52. A year ago, almost to the day, the Security Council, at the request of Nicaragua, took up the serious situation affecting the entire region of Central America, and more specifically Nicaragua, whose sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and the very choice of its own political, economic and social system were being threatened. A large number of countries, in particular those in the non-aligned group, expressed their serious concern over the danger of such a situation for Nicaragua itself and for the entire region. Like many other delegations, the Algerian delegation forcefully stressed the desire to see the Council, which was quite rightly seized of the situation to prevent the irreparable from happening, use its authority and assume its responsibilities to preserve international peace and security.

53. That concern and that awareness of the dangers expressed by a broad sector, and given added strength within the Council itself by a significant majority, unfortunately came to naught. Today's debate reflects that failure and in fact points to the worsening of the situation, because the persistence of this same conflict situation means that the peoples concerned continue to be diverted from their overriding legitimate task of reconstruction and development and are pitted against each other to the benefit of interests alien to them.

54. The question before the Council is part of the crisis disrupting many countries in the region of Central America and points to the long struggle of the peoples of the region fully to assume their destiny in dignity, freedom and independence, free of foreign interference.

55. In this difficult path, Nicaragua constitutes an outstanding example of the ability of a people to reverse the tragic course of its history, to regain its usurped freedom, to affirm, in the face of the regal rights of an oligarchy, its rights and to wage a true struggle, which we are all seeking to wage, against poverty and inequality. Far from being a danger to anyone, the Sandinist revolution has been perceived in its true meaning: the ultimate rehabilitation of peoples through the triumph of freedom and justice over oppression and repression.

56. It is this exemplary nature which has won for the Sandinist revolution deep sympathy and broad support throughout the world and which, within the United Nations itself, has been most meaningfully expressed when, scarcely a few months ago, a majority of Member States designated Nicaragua to sit on the Security Council. Over and beyond the natural expression of their solidarity towards Nicaragua, many Member States wished to show their full appreciation of the maturity of the Sandinist revolution and the responsible nature of its leaders.

57. For its part the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, upon the victory of the democratic forces, was happy to welcome Nicaragua to its ranks, aware of the eminent contribution that would make. And it was precisely at Managua that the Non-Aligned Movement convened an extraordinary meeting of its Co-ordinating Bureau in January to take up the problems of Latin America and to express the Movement's solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of that continent. At that meeting, as at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi scarcely two weeks ago, from 7 to 12 March, the non-aligned countries clearly stated their concern at the threats to Nicaragua. The Movement's Co-ordinating Bureau was requested—and I quote from the final communiqué from Managua—to "continue observing the events in this subregion very closely, especially the acts of aggression against Nicaragua, and take appropriate action as called for by the situation" [*see S/15628, annex, para. 41*].

58. Aware of the repercussions of that situation on the future of the peoples of the region and, first and foremost, out of the desire to establish genuine, lasting peace—that is, to the real benefit of these peoples—the Movement welcomed and encouraged the peace initiatives put forward by many countries, notably Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, as regards the problem of concern to us today. Algeria shares the fraternal concern of those countries and supports their initiatives, which, in the clear interests of all the peoples of the region, promote a peaceful search for a solution of the conflict.

59. In this process, which will certainly help stave off the dangers of confrontation, Algeria voices the hope that the Security Council will exert its full authority and thus deter all aggressive and destabilizing attempts of which Nicaragua is a victim. It wishes also to assure that friendly country of its full solidarity in the struggle for the consolidation of its independence, the preservation of its territorial integrity and the defence of its revolution.

60. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With respect to statements in the debate on the possibilities of arriving at specific ways to alleviate existing regional tension and bilateral problems and the reference to the arms buildup of Nicaragua reiterated at this afternoon's meeting, the delegation of my country would like to point out that we have already made it clear that, for the defence measures taken by a nation to be qualified as excessive, the nature and the dimensions of the aggression or the threat it is facing must first be identified and described.

61. The identification and description of the threat confronting the Sandinist revolution must be undertaken in the light of the attitude and actions of the United States Administration towards Nicaragua and in the light of the attitude of the countries of the region—specifically, that of the Governments of Honduras and El Salvador.

62. In this connection I shall give but one example. Just a few weeks ago the Minister of Defence of El Salvador, General Guillermo García, in an open and public statement made in San Salvador, called on all the army heads of Central America—and, more specifically, of Honduras and Guatemala—to form a military alliance to go on the offence against Nicaragua. Subsequently, an attempt was made to deny that statement of the Defence Minister and strong man of El Salvador through an official communiqué issued by the El Salvador Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Nevertheless, the next day that same man, Mr. Guillermo García, said that there had been no mistake and that he had really been calling for an alliance, for the formation of a military triangle—the so-called triangle of the North—between the armies of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala against the Nicaraguan revolution.

63. I wanted to give that example so that there could be some understanding of the complexity of the situation in Central America and how difficult it would be to define the character and the extent of the threat against Nicaragua and, hence, the levels of defence to which the people of Nicaragua is entitled.

64. Moreover, speaking of the problem of negotiation and trying to go in depth into the steps that have been proposed, a representative who spoke before me already said that there was need for trust in order to enter into a negotiating process. It would be difficult to say that there is a high level of trust among the Central American countries, basically among the four countries of northern Central America.

65. In view of this situation, we believe that it is logical and elementary, if there is really a wish for progress in the negotiating process, to count on the presence of

friendly countries that would play the role of witnesses to this declared good will to negotiate. That is why the delegation and Government of Nicaragua have always considered it fundamental to have witnesses in any process of negotiation with the Central American parties and in talks with the United States, precisely because after talks or a meeting when only the two parties in dispute have been present in a given place it is easy for everyone coming out of such conversations to say that he saw or heard something different. It is essential to have the presence there of impartial friends of all the parties and of countries that are economic partners in the region with all the countries involved and that have political, diplomatic and friendly relations with them.

66. Hence this morning [2424th meeting] we proposed that, in order to overcome the escalation of problems between Honduras and Nicaragua—above all the possibility of a conflict in the area between forces of the two countries—the process of bilateral talks be accelerated. We proposed specifically that the Presidents or heads of State—the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra of Nicaragua, and President Roberto Suazo Córdova of Honduras—meet in the presence of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, who are good friends of both countries, so that they can attest to the good will of both countries and their willingness to reach agreements, as they would also be witnesses to the agreements that are reached at each meeting so that at following meetings it might not be said that such agreements were not reached.

67. One could not accuse Venezuela or Mexico of being partial towards Nicaragua or partial against or in favour of Honduras. We believe that this is important, and if there is good will on the part of the Governments of Mexico and Venezuela to participate as witnesses to this process of dialogue with Honduras, then the process will move forward. If any country has any problems regarding participation, then there might be some other country that wants to serve as a witness, but this is a fundamental requirement of any serious process of dialogue and negotiation, above all in a region where there are such high levels of tension and distrust among countries.

68. Furthermore, we wish to point out that Nicaragua is not underestimating regional dialogue. Nicaragua considers that it is important that there also be, parallel to the bilateral dialogue with Honduras, a regional dialogue which tackles the entire complex problem of the Central American region. We believe that in the discussion of the regional problem it is obviously important that, among countries with high levels of tension, differences and distrust, there be third-party countries of the region to bear witness to the level of agreement reached and to the positions stated. This is why we have reiterated that we are prepared to participate in initiatives such as that of Contadora, where countries of the region in proximity to Central America, such as Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Colombia, have begun to work. We reaffirm that as far as the regional discussion is concerned, which is being promoted in this forum, Nicara-

gua is prepared, next week if possible, to respond to any appeal that might be made by the four countries that initiated the Contadora measures.

69. In connection with the United States, we reiterate that this is also a decisive factor in the regional situation and in the threat to Nicaragua. That is why this morning we proposed a direct, immediate dialogue with the United States. It is true that we have not proposed an intermediary or a witness, as far as the United States is concerned, but this is because in the last two and a half years, when we have been proposing to the United States Administration that we should meet, on every occasion there has been a refusal to engage in a dialogue. When we proposed, one year ago, that Mexico should be a witness to such talks between Nicaragua and the United States, the United States purely and simply rejected the idea of Mexico's presence as a witness. Because of this Nicaragua has proposed the very least that could be proposed: that we engage in direct dialogue, without witnesses, in any place that might be acceptable to United States officials. That is what we proposed this morning.

70. We believe that those three lines of dialogue and negotiation are fundamental if we are really to progress towards finding a solution to the Central American crisis.

71. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Venezuela. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

72. Mrs. CORONEL de RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, I should like to express, on behalf of my delegation, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We wish you every success. Through you I should also like to convey to the representative of the Soviet Union our most cordial congratulations on the excellent work he accomplished as President of the Council last month.

73. Venezuela wished to participate in this meeting of the Council requested by the representative of Nicaragua because we consider that today it is increasingly urgent for us to seek formulas of understanding to put an end to the grave problems facing the peoples of Central America. We have listened with interest to the statements by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras. Many countries have expressed their views and their hopes that peace may take root in that region of the Earth where for almost five years now a constant battle has been waged.

74. Mr. Luis Herrera Campíns, the President of my country, in the speech he made in Nicaragua on 19 July 1982, on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Sandinist revolution, which he attended as the only head of State invited to that event, stated that there had been no peace initiative or measure in which Venezuela would not have participated.

75. Venezuela has been accompanied and is accompanied today by many countries that are genuinely interested

in the quest for stable and lasting peace. Suffice it to mention the initiative taken by the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, taken up at the meeting on 8 and 9 January 1983 on Contadora Island by the Foreign Ministers of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela¹ and which the Dominican Republic expressed its wish to join during the recent visit to Caracas by its Foreign Minister Vega Imbert.

76. These efforts are hampered by the participation of other interests that are more concerned with their own hegemonic positions than with the establishment of effective and genuine peace.

77. The Central American countries are not arms producers. Their economies are weakened, not only by the world economic crisis, but also by a long war of considerable proportions and repeated natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods, and because of the terrible scourge of terrorism and sabotage that affects the vital centres of their economies with the purpose of bringing chaos and destruction to them. Within this disastrous economic situation we see an alarming increase in the levels of war materials, military and paramilitary contingents and irregular forces in the region. We therefore have to ask ourselves: Who has been supporting that situation of confrontation for so long? If all statements in favour of peace are sincere and if those who make them are acting according to what they preach, how is it possible that such a situation of confrontation continues day after day?

78. We have to conclude that these statements are part of a verbal exchange, a form of confrontation with the Security Council as its scenario and where mutual accusations replace a new but at the same time ancient form of fighting.

79. Peace in Central America cannot be reached through the Security Council, which already demonstrated its inefficiency during the Malvinas conflict last year. The interests of the super-Powers inhibit the action of the Council and place the Central American problem in terms of East-West confrontation. When this situation arises the Central American peoples cease to be protagonists in their own destiny and become pawns in a chess game where the interests of peace are far removed.

80. We consider it essential for the solution of the conflict that direct talks should take place among the countries of the region, and we are prepared to offer our own assistance and co-operation so that they can begin. We know the difficulties that mutual distrust places in the path of dialogue. This is why we stress Latin American channels, free from outside intervention or that of the super-Powers or middle-sized Powers. Our presence, as witnesses or promoters of dialogue, is intended to encourage a meeting free of propaganda or raised voices. If that meeting is to bear fruit, what we previously referred to as a verbal exchange must be discarded. The mutual accusations that have been put forward in the Council are not a path towards the establishment of a constructive dialogue.

81. In the face of the statements made by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras, Venezuela feels compelled to invite them, together with the other Central American countries, to begin a prudent and frank dialogue that will enable the restoration of trust, the only effective path towards the achievement of peace.

82. We have always affirmed that Latin American problems must be resolved by our own family of peoples, without foreign interference. The internationalization of the conflicts does not in any way help the comprehensive solution of the crisis in Central America. We do not want—indeed, we reject—the hypocritical positions of those from other continents who request for our countries what they forcefully reject for their own countries. Venezuela has never sought any type of “help” from outside the continent which cannot solve the political and military problems of an area vital to it, as is Central America.

83. Consistent in our rejection of war, terrorism and violence and in support of free popular expression and genuine democracy, which is not imposed by weapons but rather is brought about by the genuine desire of the citizens expressed through the vote, we have supported all initiatives aimed at the institutional normalization of the area and at the search for sincere agreements among the States concerned with the goals of reducing weaponry, eradicating terrorism and strengthening the climate of peace.

84. But all of this must be done within a Latin American framework. All of the initiatives, even though they have not been fully successful, have had positive prospects for the reduction of tension. There have been initiatives of a bilateral and multilateral nature. Today, together with other friendly countries, we are promoting the high-level meeting for peace and disarmament in Central America, with the presence of Central American countries, in addition to the presence of five countries acting as witnesses in good faith. One of those witnesses of good faith will be Venezuela. That meeting should take place as soon as possible. Such an initiative is in no way an obstacle to any other procedure that the States concerned may wish to promote within the regional framework. But we insist that this is not the place, by promoting the internationalization of the conflict and increased interference by the major Powers in matters involving our peoples to defend the cause of Latin America. It is in Latin American forums and with Latin Americans as protagonists that we should consider the situation in Central America in its overall complexity.

85. In Central American territory, in the city of Masaya and in Nicaragua itself, the President of Venezuela made a clear appeal to pluralism as the genuine way of achieving peace. The unfortunate violence which is today rending the nations of Central America can be eliminated only through the exercise of genuine democracy. This was stated by His Holiness Pope John Paul II in his historic visit to the area. In recent days, we also have affirmed this and we will continue to say this and act

upon it. We have, with good cause, supported all the processes of free election that have taken place in the area, and we continue to support those that are planned.

86. I wish to conclude by repeating the words spoken by the President of the Republic of Venezuela on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Sandinist revolution, to which I referred at the beginning of my statement:

“For Venezuela, it is a profound aspiration that lasting peace be achieved in Central America, that threats cease, and that people be able to dedicate themselves to education, to work, to the promotion of cordial relations, without having to arm themselves in order to guard against possible surprise attacks.”

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

88. Mr. SALAZAR PAREDES (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This is the first time that the constitutional and democratic Government of Bolivia is speaking before the Security Council. It is therefore an excellent opportunity to record once again our profound democratic convictions and our firm support for the Charter of the United Nations, of which we were among the original signatories.

89. Allow me first of all, Sir, on behalf of the Bolivian Government, to congratulate you on your presidency, which we are convinced will contribute to obtaining results commensurate with the purposes in the Charter.

90. We have followed with close attention the statements made in this forum by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras, both brother countries with which we have ties of close friendship. My Government cannot gloss over a matter as serious as the one which brings us here together in the Council and has given me instructions to express its concerns in this connection. This is not a concern which stems from the circumstances of the present day, but rather the result of our commitment to the norms of international law.

91. As early as 1 December of last year, on the occasion of his visit to the Organization's Headquarters, the President of my country, Mr. Hernán Siles Zuazo, in his speech to the General Assembly, affirmed:

“The grave crisis affecting the brother countries of Central America is a cause of deep concern for my Government. Tension, threats and escalating violence are all factors in the conflict which is developing and becoming more complex in that region. The foundations of peace are being constantly and increasingly weakened and, because of a lack of vision and understanding, the threat of war is arising. What is necessary is respect for the sovereignty of each and every country of the region and of their right freely to dis-

pose of their natural resources and carry out changes in their political, economic and social structures. It is now more important than ever before that the principles of non-interference and self-determination are respected, if a conflagration in Central America, which could so easily extend beyond those frontiers, is to be avoided. The situation calls for initiatives in good faith such as that of Mexico and Venezuela, which have opened prospects for a peaceful political solution. The peoples of that region have already suffered too much under totalitarian régimes to have to suffer now the horrible scourge of war."²

92. Today we would seem to be at the threshold of that terrible scourge to which the President of Bolivia referred. Nicaragua has described what that country considers to be a serious increase in acts of aggression against its sovereignty. Honduras, for its part, has rejected the accusations and has referred to the internal situation prevailing in Nicaragua. Similarly, other countries have echoed that reasoning concerning the internal policy of Nicaragua which, according to them, might be the cause of that dangerous situation in Central America.

93. Bolivia is a democratic and non-aligned country. Therefore we wish clearly to state the need for respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. In the Council we have heard, and not without concern, several lines of reasoning inconsistent with the Council's function, which is to guarantee rapid and effective action for the maintenance of peace in times of danger. The reasoning we have heard, however, runs counter to the principles of the Charter, which does not authorize any Members to intervene in matters that are essentially within the internal jurisdiction of States.

94. In this context our substantive position is in line with the documents adopted in New Delhi this month at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries [*see S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex*], of which we are Vice-Chairman, in the sense that the processes of change taking place in Central America cannot be attributed to an East-West ideological conflict. That simplistic vision makes a secondary issue of the anguish of social justice that exists in Central America and throughout the third world, which in the majority of cases is not ideological in nature, as the vying Powers would claim. The desire to achieve a quality of life more consistent with our aspirations can in no way be taken as an excuse in any way to destabilize any Government, especially if the peace and security of an entire region is jeopardized.

95. In cases such as the one before us a military solution is no solution. Perhaps it would seem to be the easiest way out for those who do not participate directly in the scourge of war but actually cause it. In the long run that type of operation is difficult to resolve when the conflict widens and is prolonged. Therefore my Government has taken a very favourable view of the peace initiative presented by the Governments of Mexico and Venezuela, the proposal of the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, and the recent initiatives presented before this very Council.

96. I have precise instructions from my Government to state our most forceful rejection of any type of intervention from any source and our most energetic condemnation of the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State.

97. We state that most forcefully because we ourselves experienced a huge territorial aggression that deprived us of sovereign and useful access to the Pacific Ocean. Today, after more than 100 years we still suffer the consequences of that aggression against our territory.

98. We are confident that the Council can benefit in some way from the statements we have heard here. In any event my country, Bolivia, wishes cordially to appeal to our brothers from Honduras and Nicaragua to make every effort to find a solution to the situation that has caused us to gather here and is of such concern to us.

99. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Belgium. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

100. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset, Sir, we should like sincerely to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council.

101. My Government was hesitant to speak in this debate because it believes that when a problem is brought before the Security Council it is primarily up to the members of the Council and the parties directly concerned to speak. It is not a good idea to encourage the tendency towards a proliferation of statements by non-members of the Council and to a prolongation of deliberations. However, bearing in mind the need to maintain a balance of opinion in the discussion, we have requested the Council to hear us and we thank it for having acceded to that request.

102. Belgium has been following with disquiet the turn of events in Central America and the escalation of violence that has engulfed the inhabitants and impedes the social and economic development essential to ensure peace and justice in the States of the region.

103. My country is deeply committed to respect for the basic principles of the Charter regarding non-interference, non-aggression, the sovereignty of States and human rights. We welcomed with satisfaction the fall of the Somoza Government and the chance it offered to establish a democratic régime in Nicaragua and to enable populations to enjoy their proper rights. We regret that the hopes aroused have not thus far been fulfilled.

104. Throughout this debate we have heard accusations and counter-accusations, but we have also heard protestations of good will, offers for negotiations and references to proposals made by the countries of the region to seek a solution. The path that should be followed is the seeking not of a military solution but of a political solution that would restore peace and security to all the coun-

tries of the region and guarantee respect for human rights. Thus we support the peace initiatives made, in particular, by the countries of the region, and we oppose any actions that can only poison a situation that is already disquieting enough.

105. We have recalled the basic principles of the Charter. We would urge all parties concerned to respect them by putting an immediate end to violence and by embarking on negotiations through which we believe the regional organization, the Organization of American States, could certainly make a substantial contribution.

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

107. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for having promptly acceded to my delegation's request to participate in this debate.

108. Allow me, Sir, to extend to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency and our appreciation of the efficient and distinguished manner in which you have conducted the business of the Council during the current month.

109. A large number of delegations, in particular those from the Latin American region, have intervened in this debate to state their deep preoccupation with the situation in that area. The Brazilian delegation also wishes to express its grave concern regarding the growing tensions in Central America. In so doing it has in mind the good and fruitful relations Brazil has developed with all the countries in that region which observe the principles of sound international behaviour.

110. My statement is inspired by a long-standing tradition of Brazilian foreign policy which pursues mutual trust and respect among nations, the instruments of which are constructive dialogue and the search for peaceful understanding.

111. The principle of the non-use of force should be strictly observed in today's areas of tension. It is the duty of all States—not only of the more powerful ones—to refrain from acts or attitudes that would contribute to heightening international tensions. It is necessary to circumscribe these tensions to their specific causes and to try to solve them on the basis of the national interests of the countries involved, free from any outside interference.

112. There can be no topical solutions to the problems which have been undermining the stability and development of Central America. In facing those problems we cannot minimize the historic, social, political and economic components of the present crisis in the region. And we cannot isolate the difficulties of Central America from the world economic crisis.

113. In our view a lasting solution to these problems can be achieved only if we rely on the wisdom contained

in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Time and again Brazil has reaffirmed its adherence to the basic principles of the Charter, which call for respect for the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, non-recourse to the threat or use of force and peaceful settlement of disputes. Such principles are equally the backbone of the inter-American system.

114. We still have time—and this should be our main task—to stop and to reverse the escalation of violence in Central America. Only if we do so will it be possible to concentrate efforts to help find solutions to the deep-rooted economic and social problems in the region.

115. I cannot stress it too strongly: the resolution of the present conflict must follow the path of moderation, constructive dialogue and political understanding.

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

117. Mr. KNIPPING VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Please allow me first of all to say how pleased my delegation is, and how pleased I myself am, to see you, Sir, as President of the Security Council at this very delicate juncture. Your presence here is in itself a guarantee that our discussions will be inspired by objectivity, good judgement and, above all, wisdom. We also wish to extend our congratulations to your predecessor, the representative of the Soviet Union, for the brilliant way in which he led the Council debates during his term of office last month.

118. The delegation of the Dominican Republic is appearing before this organ of the United Nations—which has among its functions and powers the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security—deeply concerned at the recent events in the Central American region. The turn that situation is taking adds an element of danger that could lead to the failure of all the enormous efforts being exerted by the peace-loving countries of the Latin American region to create an atmosphere conducive to bringing the parties to the conflict closer together, an atmosphere of peace, of the trust that is absolutely essential to bringing about a negotiated political solution that can eliminate those conflicts and make it possible to study, objectively and in depth, the social causes from which they derive.

119. The prerequisite is that peace be restored. Without peace there can be no political, economic or social development. Peace must be the great consensus of nations and must constitute the common good of mankind. Peace must be the result of international social justice.

120. As representatives of a country which believes in peace and social justice, we cannot be insensitive to the tragic situation our Central American brothers are experiencing. Out of allegiance to Latin American solidarity, we have repeatedly appealed to the parties to the dispute

to reach a ground of understanding and to discuss between themselves possible peaceful solutions to the present crisis. It pains us to see so much bloodshed.

121. In accordance with that principle of Latin American solidarity our Government has offered its territory as the site for a meeting of all the countries of the Central American region, a meeting which would also include the presence and friendly participation of those Latin American countries that have been expressing their legitimate concern at the serious events in that region. In other words, that meeting would exclude no country of the area, since it would be folly for the parties involved in the dispute not to sit down at the negotiating table.

122. The Dominican Republic attaches such importance to a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the dispute that the first act of foreign policy of the Government of national concentration that guides the destiny of my country, the Declaration of Santo Domingo—which was signed by the heads of Government of Venezuela, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Belize and the Dominican Republic on the occasion of Salvador Jorge Blanco's taking the oath as President of my country—states that "the rejection of a violent solution and the acceptance of negotiation and dialogue are indispensable to the political settlement of the crisis, which should be the result of a shared effort and common will, with the ultimate goal of promoting and implementing democracy, economic development and social justice". That same Declaration issues a cordial appeal to the countries concerned with the strengthening of peace to exercise their good offices towards attaining that noble goal.

123. Along those same lines we wish to point out that the Government of the Dominican Republic was the first to speak out in support of the peace initiative taken by the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela. With reference to that initiative, our Minister in his statement at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly said that "the Dominican Government did not confine itself to simple support but expressed its willingness to participate, in whatever useful way it could, without detriment to the principle of non-intervention, in any effort to normalize relations" between Nicaragua and Honduras.³ Furthermore, our Minister stressed:

"For the Dominican Republic it is not Utopian to believe and to say that the Central American and Caribbean region must become a zone of peace, of balance, stability, pluralism and the total rejection of military solutions."⁴

124. We believe that the time has come to begin that fruitful dialogue. We must not allow the situation to reach an extreme that will make it impossible for reason, good judgement and civilized coexistence to prevail.

125. Our country, which enjoys a democratic system recognized by the international community and which maintains excellent relations with all the countries of the Central American region, reiterates its willingness to con-

tribute to the urgent search for a negotiated solution. On that basis and given the delicate and disturbing development of events, we reaffirm our support for an immediate meeting of all the parties involved in the dispute.

126. We believe that this last condition is essential for the meeting to achieve objective and effective results and so that it may not suffer the fate of other meetings which, because they excluded certain parties, could not achieve the desired goals.

127. All the means for the peaceful settlement of international disputes must be used. The use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State must be avoided. There must be respect for the principle of the self-determination of peoples. We should stress the principle of non-interference in matters that fall essentially within the internal jurisdiction of States, the guiding principle for harmonious international relations. Lastly, we wish to reaffirm that for the delegation of the Dominican Republic any political settlement of the Central American conflict must be inspired by and placed within the framework of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

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

129. Mr. SILOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): May I join other speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I am confident that your proven diplomatic skill and personal qualities will contribute to the successful outcome of the deliberations on the item on the Council's agenda. I should also like to express my delegation's appreciation of the successful discharge of this very important duty by your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the USSR, who guided the Council's work with competence last month.

130. The Council is meeting again at the justified request of Nicaragua to consider the latest escalation in the infiltration of anti-revolutionary forces from Honduras into the territory of Nicaragua. We have been alerted to the impending danger by various sources, including the mass media. We particularly appreciate the information and analysis presented by the representative of Nicaragua to the Council at the 2420th meeting, as well as in his later statements. They enable us to understand the gravity of the situation, its causes and possible grave consequences.

131. We believe that what is in question is not a mere dispute between two neighbouring countries or their temporary misunderstanding. It is obvious that causes of tension which have recently increased so dramatically are much deeper. They are to be found in the historical contradictions that affect the whole region of Central America and the Caribbean.

132. One of the main features of the present time is the aspiration of peoples to emancipation, political and

economic liberation, the exercise of the right to decide freely and independently without interference or imposition of foreign will their destiny and their socio-economic system.

133. The longer and greater the social injustice and foreign direct or indirect domination, the more exacerbated the conditions in which changes occur. The revolutionary transformation which has taken place in Nicaragua was an authentic expression of the will of its people to become free of the dictatorship which had brought about injustice, social inequality and poverty and had to a great extent depended on foreign support.

134. Changes resulting from historical necessity and the right to equality, dignity and development of humanity towards a society wherein all segments of the population would constructively participate in establishing a more just system cannot be denied, and even less stubbornly undermined by pressures, threats or infiltration of groups of armed terrorists. It is evident that such groups cannot survive without foreign political and economic support, that is, without direct assistance, since they have no stronghold in the country itself. These groups are obviously being trained and launched from outside. Such pressures and assaults against the sovereignty of any country, as is the case with Nicaragua today, lead to an increase of tension and political polarization in this and in any other region.

135. The international situation is burdened by the policies of blocs which tend to divide the world into spheres of influence and interests, thus leading to further intensification of rivalry under various pretexts and to the prolongation and increase of tension.

136. Arrogation of the right to intervene in arbitrarily proclaimed zones of vital, special or any other interest, according to whatever criteria, nurtures the logic of such behaviour and necessarily leads to its escalation. Such policies carry constant danger of new interference and shift the rivalry to ever new areas. This not only denies the sovereignty of States and the right of peoples to independent choice of decision, but also threatens peace and security in wider regions, not only in Central America but also in other continents.

137. The non-aligned countries, aware of the danger that can result from such a development in Central America, held in January this year an extraordinary ministerial meeting of their Co-ordinating Bureau dedicated exclusively to the problems of that region. The meeting was also an expression of solidarity of non-aligned countries with Nicaragua's determination to confront all threats and to maintain its own independent way. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, recently held at New Delhi, the largest gathering of non-aligned countries so far, also attached great importance to the situation in Central America and in the Caribbean and assessed it as grave and tense. The non-aligned countries condemned in particular the increase in threats and attacks against Nicaragua

and called for the cessation of all hostile acts against that country. They called also upon all countries to refrain from acts and policies that might increase tension in the area, and they reiterated that the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in Central America, as well as in all other regions of the world, should be strictly abided by. They stressed again their opposition to all forms of foreign domination, pressure, threats and imposition of foreign will upon independent countries. They demanded full respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, independence and the right of all peoples freely to decide their own destiny.

138. A number of constructive proposals and initiatives have been submitted concerning the situation in Central America, of which Nicaragua is part and parcel. Among them is the Contadora initiative by Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela from January this year,¹ as well as the earlier ones by Mexico and France and by the Socialist International, as well as a number of others. The value of these proposals lies in the fact that they proceed from an overall perception of the situation and aim at a comprehensive political and peaceful solution based on negotiations, excluding the use of force and taking into account the existing situation, necessities of social development and justified demands for national and political emancipation.

139. Yugoslavia, together with other non-aligned countries, supports such an approach to the solution of the multiple problems in the area. We believe that it is the best way to overcome the existing difficulties, to avoid further aggravation of the situation, to curb foreign interference and to establish peace in this exhausted region ridden with crises. Nicaragua has made and is making efforts to find a peaceful solution. It has many times expressed readiness to negotiate, has put forward proposals in that direction and has reacted positively to those mentioned earlier and to some others. Yugoslavia supports this position of Nicaragua and calls upon all involved and concerned parties to contribute to the search for a negotiated settlement in the interest of peace and security in the region as well as in the world at large. We support the right of the people of Nicaragua and of other Central American countries, as well as of all countries and peoples in the world, to undisturbed development, free from foreign pressure and interference.

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

141. Mr. ORTEZ COLINDRES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is, indeed, not as a customary expression of diplomacy that we should like to extend our Government's thanks for the patience and attention with which these 15 countries of this deliberative body, the supreme body of the United Nations, are conducting these deliberations. The seriousness with which you, Mr. President, have guided this debate will be recorded some day not just in the records, but also in the annals of Central America's quest for peace.

142. The hour is late, so I shall address myself to the crux of the question. The Honduran Minister for Foreign Affairs would have liked to fulfil this responsibility, but as is logical and just, we know that there are rules and norms that must be respected and we have learned how to wait our turn and at the same time to try to be positive.

143. After having heard the interesting statements of a large part of the international community, I could say that we are approaching an analysis of the problem into well-identified parts: internal problems, international problems and dialogue for peace.

144. With regard to the first aspect of the problem, if I were not to provide some information the situation might not be clear, and we would not want this to happen. We shall do our best and not dwell on details, because otherwise the Council would become some sort of peace tribunal or a mini-General Assembly, and it seems to me that when the Council was created that was not the intention.

145. As for the internal questions involved, Nicaragua and some countries friendly to it have asserted that what is happening in that fraternal country is not an internal problem. The statistics on how many persons have died in Central America over the last three years reveal that it is no exaggeration to speak of 100,000 lives lost, and it is our Nicaraguan brothers who have lost the most, I would say some 40,000. As to the Salvadorans, I believe that we do not exaggerate when we say that about 30,000 have died. That makes 70,000. And among the deaths that were not reported there must be another 30,000. That round figure is no exaggeration.

146. When General Somoza's downfall took place and the Sandinist revolution triumphed—I was one of its most ardent admirers, and I publicly defended it in my country at the union and university levels and in those forums in which the will of the people is reflected—there arose in Nicaragua a phenomenon which had repercussions in my own country, namely, a mass migration of 25,000 Nicaraguans seeking refuge after 40,000 persons had been killed in the internal conflict in Nicaragua. Those 25,000 Nicaraguans are still in Honduras, and the Nicaraguan exodus is increasing further with the internal problem in Nicaragua. I have precise figures: every day some 100 persons cross the border, some 600 to 700 persons every week, as the result of Nicaragua's internal problem. Our country has seen this figure swell to 45,000 refugees. Among the 25,000 Nicaraguans are 6,000 Miskitos indigenous to the border area of Nicaragua. Those Miskitos—and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees can attest to this—do not want to return to Nicaragua. They have been asked whether they want to return to the homeland from which they fled, and they answer that they do not.

147. If they answered that they did and the United Nations offered to protect their lives, thus freeing us from any responsibility as to what might happen, then

we would have no objection to providing trucks so they could go back to Nicaragua, to the place whence they came. Why do they not wish to return? Are they on vacation? Have they gone to Honduras to spend Christmas or Holy Week with relatives? It is easy to find the answer: it is because there is no respect for the rights of the ethnic minorities, who rightly fear being exterminated. That is easy to see, because many of the leaders of Miskito groups are in El Salvador trying openly to establish counter-revolutionary movements.

148. I now come to the second internal aspect. I ask in absolute honesty and sincerity: What have we Hondurans to do with the fact that the wife of the man who opposed Somoza for 20 years—Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, who died of a gunshot wound—who was rewarded with the Presidency of the Junta by the revolutionaries; Mr. Arturo Cruz, who, when I was President of the Central American Bank, was my chief of operations for eight years and an honest and brilliant man who had three positions in Nicaragua: member of the Junta, ambassador of the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua in Washington and President of the Central Bank; and Alfonso Robelo, three members of the Revolutionary Junta, denounced the Junta and organized to struggle against the Government today in power in Nicaragua? What internal problems have we been causing the Nicaraguans so that those persons have gone over to the other side in disillusionment?

149. Today [2424th meeting] my Minister mentioned—and I do not wish now to go into petty details—the official notices of Nicaraguan censorship which can be provided to the newspapers; they are official and bear a seal. When the Minister comes to speak of peace, that is completely censored. Press censorship is such that only one newspaper is left, that of Chamorro's widow, and the censors lose all sense of proportion, because of what they have censored, which I shall bring to your attention: the arrival day of my Minister; and the photograph showing ex-President Carter with Brezhnev, who had died a day earlier, giving him a hug. Those are problems they wish to blame on us.

150. The representatives of Nicaragua need have no fear; I shall not tire them; I wish to maintain my sense of respect for them. I have a file which is but an introduction to the acts of aggression committed against us by Nicaragua. I shall read out 10 of them, or fewer, because to go through the entire list would be to show a lack of consideration for the members of the Council. As I said, this is not a court or a peace tribunal, but a most esteemed forum. But I must bring some of these facts before the Council, for were I not to do so—members know that in international law silence grants consent—only one side of the coin would be seen. I shall try to be as brief as possible.

151. In January 1982 a Sandinist patrol pursuing some smugglers crossed into Honduran territory and there came upon a Honduran patrol and exchanged fire for five minutes; violation of our national territory and

harassment of our national army. That occurred in the Palo Verde sector, co-ordinates 0757 on the map of Concepción de María, department of Choluteca. This is just one random example.

152. On 4 March elements of the Sandinist army entered the Guapinol sector and kidnapped citizens Cornelio Rubio and Daniel Gonzáles, taking away their boats. Those two persons were kidnapped: violation of our territorial waters and kidnapping.

153. On 17 March, at 11 o'clock, Sandinist elements attacked elements of the Honduran navy, wounding Corporal Mario Roberto Ramos: violation of our territorial waters; aggression against a Honduran patrol. Co-ordinates 13° 05' 45"; wounded: Mario Roberto Ramos.

154. On 17 March, in the afternoon, two Honduran boats were captured in territorial waters facing the Misquito village of Irlaya. A Nicaraguan coast guardsman shot at the Honduran boat *Debbie K*, taking away its captain and 24 fisherman members of the crew.

155. On 17 March the fishing boat *Baby Jones* was attacked by a Nicaraguan ship and towed to a Nicaraguan port with all its crew: violation of territorial waters. Kidnapped: Longino Cruz, Ligio Ordoñez, Horacio Sandino, René Flores, and others.

156. On 18 March, Sandinist elements penetrated as far as the community of Raya, 30 miles within Honduran waters, capturing 48 fishermen and the *Derveequee*, kidnapping them and taking them towards Nicaraguan waters. Kidnapped: 48 fishermen from the community of Raya, 30 miles within Honduran waters, in the Atlantic.

157. On 21 March, at 1400 hours, a communication was received at the naval base of Puerto Cortés from the naval station of Islas del Cisne to the effect that two patrol boats of the Sandinist forces had entered Honduran waters, capturing four Honduran fishing boats and taking them toward Puerto Cabezas in Nicaragua: violation of territorial waters.

158. I shall not go any further in this regard so as to avoid having it all transcribed and causing further expenditures to the United Nations.

159. Accordingly, I hope that no one will be impressed by Honduran or Nicaraguan attacks, for there are files and dozens of notes which in the last eight months—since I have been ambassador—I have sent officially to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. We are causing internal problems.

160. Shots are being heard today where they were heard last week—in a town which, for those who know Central America, is called Matagalpa. Matagalpa is not on the border with Honduras; it is at least 150 kilometres from the border with Honduras.

161. I shall refrain from mentioning all the attacks carried out today and which are reported from Costa Rica,

on the southern front, which is far from Honduras—that is, some 200 to 300 kilometres from the border. It is inconceivable that these problems should be purely internal problems. It is clear that they have international repercussions.

162. Let us clarify the confusion about the meeting at the highest, presidential, level, between Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova and Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra. I have in my possession notes that have just arrived. They are voluminous and I shall not read them into the record. In these notes, dated 16 September and 11 October 1982, which will be transcribed to authenticate the truth of the statements and words of a responsible Government, President Suazo Córdova agrees to talks, even bilateral ones.

163. What has happened? Where is the change? I have explained to the Council why the President was unable to attend on the date set because of the kidnapping of 100 citizens and because of the enormous rally expressing civic support for him. I was in Honduras at the time, and we talked with his staff and his advisers. One's teachers teach one something. I had some good teachers, in practice, who told me: "Never leave your President exposed; never expose the fundamental part or the stability of a region by preparing a meeting of Presidents badly." When what is at stake is the peace or destiny of a country—or of Central America, as is the case now—a meeting organized hurriedly and in a rush can cause great disillusionment, even if good will is present. Consequently, in these notes, my President tells the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela—witnesses whom I too regard as honourable and whom I accept as honourable, as Nicaragua accepts them, and I accept them now, as we accepted them the last time—that this meeting must be successful and must not be a mere show that will complicate the world's image and create false expectations for our peoples. For Presidents lose prestige when they meet at the highest levels and spend time exchanging solely and exclusively liquors, cocktails, Coca-Colas and photographs; Central America is not for that sort of thing. That is very dangerous. We are a young Government; we have taken 20 years to elect a president and we cannot tarnish him through an international failure, with negotiations lacking seriousness and sound preparation. Therefore in these notes he tells the Presidents: "We wish to accept this bilateral dialogue." Yes, we have no fear of bilateral dialogue. Why should we? If this is nothing more than a bilateral and regional problem, there are two sides to the coin and we want to talk about both of them.

164. For that dialogue to culminate in a responsible agreement to which we subscribe, one which is prudent, logical and sincere, we propose a meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Central American countries. That is how the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the Atlantic Treaty were prepared. The heads of State did not just sign the Treaty of Versailles without their ministers and advisers informing their respective Presidents of the seriousness and gravity of the points and drawing up a formal, serious agenda enabling the

success of such a meeting. The principle is still valid today.

165. My Government does not slight Presidents. That would be irresponsible on our part. I was at the 1973 Guyana meeting when the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela—during the big oil crisis when a barrel of crude oil went up in price from \$2.50 to \$12.50, leaving Mexico and Venezuela with a profit margin of \$10—granted Central America, at the most difficult stage of the crisis, 15-year terms and 8 per cent interest financing to be used for infrastructure replacement and energy consumption in a situation that we were not prepared to bear. It would thus be illogical, impractical, amoral and lacking in gratitude on our part, and we are not like that. Therefore we are not trying to avoid the presence of these two high-level witnesses.

166. The problem, indeed, is greater. This is so true that a few minutes ago the representative of Venezuela—one of the countries suggested for the talks—read its proposal and I listened most attentively. She said that another meeting was held between that date and the present—the Contadora Island meeting. That meeting was not bilateral; it was not just Mexico and Venezuela, but Panama and Colombia also attended. We viewed this with great sympathy, and when those four Presidents, four Ministers and four Governments even took the initiative within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries so that the Latin American countries would not be tied to blocs, encouraging the Latin American countries to forge their own destiny and, with a view to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi, that we unite with the independent world, Nicaragua was opposed. The countries that are trying to censure us here objected to our being included as observers, but thank God we are allowed to speak in this forum. We should have liked to have participated as non-aligned. Yet there were countries that spoke against Honduras defending itself in the non-aligned bloc. Why? Because we are puppets of the United States; they can judge from a distance. We do not reproach those countries that are badly informed, but logically we want the participants in the dialogue to be those who are closely involved.

167. This proposal, made by Venezuela itself a few minutes ago, was made on the instructions of its Government. This is no longer the affair of two countries, as there were four in Contadora and now we are talking about five. But let us play cleanly. It interests us and we welcome it with satisfaction.

168. Out of international prudence and in order to help the Council to achieve consensus we shall not mention the names of those five, who could even be more. Yes, we want these countries that will be observers—these witnesses of high quality that we accept, from now on—to be democratic countries. We want this because it is impossible for us—countries trying to set an example to our peoples—to be observed by dictatorial Governments that do not possess the moral prestige to come and give

us advice. However, as I do not wish to begin—nor does my Government—to sniff out and to judge who in Latin America is democratic and who is not, as this is a very dangerous subject, we accept now that it shall be recorded that we want and encourage this dialogue and that if we do not mention the Latin American countries that should take part in it this is because we do not wish to muddy the waters in passing and we do not want any regional or continental interest to say to us: "Ah! That country is not democratic; it is a dictatorship." Then the dialogue collapses through a judgement that is extremely difficult to handle.

169. But we reiterate that our position is to accept the dialogue. I am happy, Mr. Deputy Minister, that your words are changing a little in substance. You are an intelligent man and a man who has fought in all disputes. You have defended your country with devotion. You were a guerrilla who passed through my territory, I am sure. And if it was not you, because I cannot prove it, I can speak about another hero, Commander Zero. Those men who crossed like you, who forged the victory, were not supported by the Honduran Government; they passed through blind spots on the border. We were not able to control them, did not want to control them. They crossed and overthrew a régime without the complicity of the Government of Honduras. I think that this is a virtue.

170. We as Hondurans must protest this, because when we hear the statements of our allies in peace in the region, such as Panama and Mexico, we note citations as though there exist some articles about what lending of territories or fomenting instability constitutes. I can only hope, since no countries were mentioned, that no one in the region wants to accuse us of actions of that nature.

171. We believe in Mexico and Panama and we do not want to confound our thought. Comments have been made to the effect that, directly or indirectly, Honduras is implicated in officially wanting to destabilize Nicaragua. I repeat: we have faith in Panama; I repeat: we have faith in Mexico; I repeat: we have faith in Colombia; I repeat: we have faith in the Dominican Republic. I have mentioned them by name; there is no taint or bad thought involved.

172. We do not want to say in whom we most believe until a position is taken, so as not to create confusion on what could constitute the bases for a forum of five, where five countries of Central America would be seated, without, of course, exclusion of any Central American country with Latin American observers. I underline the words "Latin American" because possibly my emphasis of this might appear to some as complying with orders from the American Government. But even if some think that we are North American puppets—which we are not—I emphasize that the position of Honduras is that in this dialogue the observers should be Latin Americans, not because we feel there is suspicion attaching to the United States. Just as we have respected the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and have seen the intelligent stance

they have taken, we have seen the talent of Mrs. Kirkpatrick. We know the great responsibilities that they bear; while we are engaged in gun battles, they are discussing invisible missiles. It is logical; that is the nature of the world. But we do respect the Security Council and we are not expressing falsehoods here.

173. Consequently, I should like it to be clear that Honduras views sympathetically, without any exclusion, a meeting of the five ministers. If it is so desired, it can be a meeting of presidents, with no pre-conditions, the five presidents of Central America. And if they want observers from democratic Latin American countries, we accept that, too. The only thing we ask, out of a sense of responsibility to our Ministers for Foreign Affairs, to this forum and to ourselves as public servants, is that the meeting be prepared properly, because there are already 100,000 dead. These are no longer merely rumours. And if these appeals at the highest level come to naught, the world forums remain; when this body—the Security Council—meets, it is because the crisis is being considered so serious as to create a threat to international peace and peace in a region.

174. We believe that instead of coming to a body such as this to ask that we be separated, that each of us be put back in his corner, as unfortunately has happened with the countries of the Middle East and as happened in the case of the thirty-eighth parallel, we should act in a different manner. That is not what we want. We are prepared to have it put on record that we are in favour of all these intentions of the democratic peripheral countries and that we are grateful to them for their desire to aid us in this labour of peace.

175. Let us endeavour to be constructive, because that was my promise. Instead of exchanging accusations and counter-accusations, why do we not clarify key points so that the Council can take note of the points of agreement?

176. I have not been clear, Mr. Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, on one point. And I should appreciate, whenever you deem it appropriate, your telling us if you are prepared to accept a regional dialogue, with no restrictions, of the five Central American countries—with five additional countries or, if you wish to add more, whichever you may mention, because those that have been mentioned deserve our highest consideration—to discuss bilateral and multilateral problems. Because we are not going to escape from this circle simply by saying that this is a bilateral problem and not an internal problem. No. The problem is complex: it is bilateral, regional, internal and international. Consequently, we are going to speak without any restrictions. As of now—let us emphasize this—we are prepared to accept that dialogue. Five and five, as the representative of Venezuela just said, and observers in addition. Honduras' condition: that they be democratic in nature. We do not mention them, but we would like, for the reasons noted and in order to give seriousness and credibility to the meeting on the continent and in the world, that régimes be sought which respect legality, which respect

the laws and the institutions of their countries as a result of free elections. I do not want to make judgements about which Government is democratic and which is not.

177. Secondly, Mr. Deputy Minister, we want to be clear that when we are speaking of "no restrictions"—and we would like to know your feeling on the subject when you deem it appropriate—we shall then discuss general disarmament, international supervision of armaments and of border zones—not just patrolling of borders—supervision and control of ports, airports, sensitive points, dangerous and sensitive areas where there are weapons, where there are strategic points: those things that every country has, no matter how small it is. And we declare and emphasize that, for the record.

178. That is why my Minister came today, because these are very serious commitments. I am an ambassador who respects the laws of my country. My Minister, Mr. Paz Barnica, has already said this, or wanted to say it, this morning, but as a result of procedural problems he was not able to make this statement. However, I am authorized to make it on his behalf and on behalf of the President of the Republic.

179. We are prepared to accept disarmament; we are prepared to accept international supervision and control, provided that the reply of the Deputy Minister is affirmative. Obviously we cannot be so naïve in international practice and theory as to allow our territory alone to be supervised and controlled. That is why we take the multi-national approach.

180. The disarmament we are talking about is substantial disarmament. What do we mean by substantial? All these things must be made perfectly clear. Somebody has to establish the amounts and the limits that indicate when a country has an offensive army and offensive weapons. Technical experts would analyse this. I am not going to decide the matter, but this substantial disarmament should establish the reality or the bases for living in security, in peace, in harmony, respecting the rights of others and the principle of non-intervention, being trusting and sleeping safely.

181. I have enormous admiration for a fraternal country, Costa Rica. It is already in the fifth or sixth democratic round. I have told the Costa Ricans that I admire their democracy. We wish we could all be like the Costa Ricans. Who would want Costa Rica to arm itself? But techniques have changed. Our ambassador in London sent me a letter reminding me of the fall 30 years ago of Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, in 1954, when, at age 20, I was attorney for the strikers. In those days students went out to make something of themselves. We no longer have students; we have graduates, we have Ph.D.s.

182. In the University of Honduras we found—and this has been publicized—torture chambers, masks, printing-presses, subversive material, bombs. And our soldiers did not invade the university, though all Hondurans knew that the seeds of dissent were there, and that there were enormous numbers of kidnappings.

183. On 24 December the daughter of the President of Honduras was kidnapped. Our army fired not a single shot. Never has it fired on any guerrilla movement for a kidnapping. Even with guerrillas we have respected the law. No Honduran citizens have seized our aircraft; they have been Salvadorans, or Nicaraguan citizens—Salvadorans and Nicaraguans who have seized our cabinet and the daughter of our President. I was in Tegucigalpa when the medicine needed by the country spoiled: refrigerators did not work because a technical guerrilla unit had bombed our power plants. Because of a guerrilla movement our entire capital was blacked out for 15 days at a time when we were making enormous efforts to build hydraulic power plants and to find a way out of the poverty in which our people live.

184. I would ask another question—not to open discussion of a problem of give and take, but because these are essential parts of possible negotiations—whether your country, Mr. Deputy Minister, is, as is mine right now, prepared to remove its foreign military technical experts. Let everybody leave: the North Americans, the Cubans, the extra-continentals. Let us play clean. We are ready to agree to this. Therefore in due course I should like to hear the views of your Government on these points so that the peace efforts each of us is making may be on record.

185. Nicaragua has referred to our President, the chief of foreign relations of our country. It said that when that gentleman was elected in popular elections positive expectations regarding Nicaragua and its people and its system were created. I personally happened to receive Commander Ortega Saavedra at the airport when he arrived for the presidential inauguration. It is true that there were expectations. I remember seeing him loaded with weapons when he arrived at the airport. He was afraid that we in Honduras would do something to him. When the aircraft had come to a halt he said he would not disembark unless it was with his people. Our Government said no: if he had no faith that our Government would live up to its word, that was a matter for regret, but the Honduran Government would provide security. He agreed. There was no incident; there was a civic celebration.

186. Mr. Deputy Minister, when Somoza fell we all believed in the great expectations of the Sandinist movement, but I regret to tell you that you have radicalized them. Totalitarianism has seized you. We have no political prisoners.

187. In one of your replies you told me that I had made a numerical error because the problem at the border was a simple one. I had said there were thousands of kilometres; you said it was only 700. It is as though you have used a 50-millimetre photographic lens rather than a zoom. In return I shall use a zoom lens. Let it focus both ways. And these are not digressions; these are figures.

188. My country has thousands of kilometres. Those who study international law, and any person who looks at Central America, even the reporter from *The New*

York Times, to whom we shall refer and to whom we shall reply regarding the photograph that appeared in that newspaper today, must realize the problem of its borders. We had a border which, thank God, was settled legally by arbitration with Guatemala. It is an enormous border, more than 700 kilometres.

189. In Guatemala there is a guerrilla movement. We have in Honduras Guatemalans who have crossed the border, just as Nicaraguans and Salvadorans have. We have borders with El Salvador. They are territorial and fluvial; the Rio Motagua, in the case of Guatemala; the Rio Lenta, in the case of El Salvador. When Commander Ortega Saavedra was here last, he said—and we can look at the record to see if I am mistaken—that there had been a violation of the fluvial border at the Rio Motagua. The Rio Motagua forms the border between Guatemala and Honduras, not between Honduras and Nicaragua.

190. We have one 700-kilometre border, part of which was fixed by the Gámez-Bonilla Treaty and by an arbitration decision handed down by 14 members of the International Court of Justice, 13 in favour of Honduras and 1 in favour of Nicaragua, which clearly and categorically laid down our borders with Nicaragua.

191. But when I mention that dossier, I must add that we also have thousands of kilometres of borders, because we can look at it another way: there is the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean; we are an interoceanic belt, a vital point. Were the Americas a woman, Central America would be her waistline. It is there that the trouble is, in the waist of America, for no chain can be stronger than its weakest link.

192. If only to correct the impression that we are referring solely to border patrols, in addition to the vessels and people who are in Nicaragua that were captured from us as a result of so many incidents, we must add another border, the air border, which is being violated. That astronomical border, which can be projected upward *ad infinitum*, as high as planes can fly, has been violated too. The international news services, as we know, have informed us that the land borders have been violated; we have truckloads of captured weapons, freight cars full of weapons. The guerrilla movement now exists also in El Salvador. I do not understand why we do not *echar la vaca*—a common expression meaning to group together against an adversary. This is not to say that Nicaragua must be an adversary, but it is a problem that they have and that we have and, with God's help, we may reach agreement and these problems may disappear. That border is being violated: press releases mention Salvadoran units in the department of Morazán; official statements of the Government state that aircraft and small planes from Nicaragua are overflying our territory and landing to reinforce the Salvadoran guerrillas. I have no intention of interfering with the Salvadoran guerrillas or with anything else. I am just stating what is going on: that when airspace is violated it is a border violation. And that is why I speak of thousands of miles of border.

193. Why is our Foreign Minister not here to reply? That deserves some explanation. He would wish to have replied, perhaps in a less emotional manner than I. But we respect international commitments. We accept this one, but we also have a regional and continental commitment. Both Nicaragua and Honduras are members of the Organization of American States, and article 23 of its charter clearly states that States members of the OAS should exhaust the resources of that regional forum before turning—and that charter states this specifically—to the Security Council. The Foreign Minister will make his statement tomorrow morning in Washington at 11.30 a.m.

194. So let us land from this flight of the *Columbia* in order to come to something positive at the end. The refugee problem is enormous. I do not know how the refugees cross the border when the news that we receive is that you have mined the border. There is a state of emergency in Mocorón; I do not know how they manage to get across, but they do.

195. So, to sum up: we continue to affirm that the problem has profound domestic implications in the case of Nicaragua. Regarding the one remaining accusation, I did not wish to take the past six minutes to speak about the first page of *The New York Times*. In a forum such as this, we cannot arrive at our opinions on the basis of

what one reporter says that another reporter told him, and so on. However, since the accusation was made in this forum we have telephoned the President of the Republic. And he said: "Tell the Council that we are immediately sending a commission of inquiry, and if we find any camp at all we shall not only destroy it but capture and punish all those in it, whether they be Hondurans, Nicaraguans, foreigners; they will be subject to Honduran law, and the Government guarantees that. We do not support such camps."

196. Can the President's word not be believed? Let us then, I say again, go into what we have agreed to—namely, international supervision of the problem, so that independent parties can have their say and see that their decisions are implemented.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See A/38/68.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. III, 84th meeting, para. 31.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. I, 33rd meeting, para. 53.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 58.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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