



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

**S/PV.2697
3 July 1986**

ENGLISH

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

**Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 3 July 1986, at 10.30 a.m.**

President: Mr. KASEMSRI

(Thailand)

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

**Mr. WOOLCOTT
Mr. TSVETROV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. GAYAMA
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RABETAFIKA
Mr. GRANDERSON
Mr. SAFRONCHUK
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. MAXEY
Mr. OKUN
Mr. AGUILAR**

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

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

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Nicaragua to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, India, Mongolia, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Velazco San José (Cuba), Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Meza (El Salvador), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Verma (India), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Doljintseren (Mongolia), Mr. Moran (Spain), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Guyana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the

(The President)

Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/18184, which contains the text of the report of the Secretary-General submitted in accordance with Security Council resolutions 530 (1983) and 562 (1985).

The first speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I have no doubt that, in spite of the maladjustment of certain permanent members, your diplomatic skills will surely lead the meetings of this Council on the present issue to a satisfactory conclusion. I should also express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor and my dear friend, Ambassador Rabetafika of Madagascar, who administered the affairs of the Council during the month of June with his well-known ability.

Our humble international Organization seems to be destined to suffer from too many conflicting and incompatible traits. It has a Security Council on the one hand with a great deal of zeal and readiness for constructive work, for the defence

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

of the oppressed and for saving the peace and security of the small nations, which really wish to count on the Organization for their peace and security. But the same Security Council is also bound to suffer from the impediment of the veto which has perennially obstructed all the efforts of the Council for the protection of the small victimized Member States of the United Nations. To no one's surprise, there is at least one permanent member which bluntly frustrates the Council when it aims at the termination of the apartheid régime, at the restoration of justice regarding the occupation of Palestine, at the protection of the small but great and revolutionary but victimized people of Nicaragua. A glance at the record of the Security Council over the past four or five years convinces the most stubborn mind that the formidable task of the Organization in so far as the maintenance of international peace and security is concerned has been the Zionist occupation of Palestine, the apartheid régime, and the aggressions and overt and covert conspiracies against the Nicaraguan revolution. What else have we been discussing during the past four or five years?

In all those major international conflicts, the United States has been a major ingredient. I should like to ask all the members of the Council, regardless of political propensities, a very simple question: Can anyone in the Council find any international problem worthy of bringing to this Security Council to which the United States Administration is not a major contributor? And yet, to no one's surprise, the same culprit is also supposed to take a pose as an arbiter in the same Security Council. The result of such a self-defeating scenario is quite clear, and that is the inevitable inability of the Council to perform its constructive constitutional responsibilities.

(Mr. Rajaie-Rhorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Our international Organization also has an International Court of Justice, the acceptance of whose jurisdiction the United States once pioneered. It is the very Court to which the United States appealed when the den of spies in Tehran was occupied. That Court has made a decision regarding United States policies and practices towards Nicaragua. But the veto, to the exercise of which the United States Administration seems to be accustomed, is somehow being extended in an attempt to nullify the decision of the International Court of Justice as well.

In order to maintain the confidence of its client régimes, the United States, shamefully, has to remain very loyal to all the mercenaries and bandits who once served as United States agents against their own peoples. The United States Administration, therefore, feels obliged to act as host to all its overthrown puppets and to assist the residue of the Somoza elements. For United States imperialism, that policy is a sign of consistency and is also an important so-called moral obligation to friends which keeps up the spirits of other United States agents. That is how loyalty and morality are defined in the context of imperial literature.

The President of the United States manoeuvred a great deal in order to obtain a mandate to take \$100 million of the American taxpayers' money to give to the contras. But the whole enterprise may have a motive other than simple animosity to the Nicaraguan revolution, although that is the principal motive. Rumours of corruption are being heard. Interviewed in Miami a few days ago, former officers of the contras, as the Somoza mercenaries are called, said that their allegations of corruption were based mainly on their own experiences in the field. They describe the use of phoney receipts, black market currency deals and other techniques. In the words of Fernando Martinez, who once commanded an 800-member group known as the Jeane Kirkpatrick task force, and who was dismissed last January for complaining about corruption, "I think the entire leadership is corrupt". He

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

described the task force, which was named after the former Chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations, as poorly fed and ill-equipped as it made forays from Honduras into Nicaragua. About the leadership, he said "they have clean boots and dirty hands."

The testimony of that man is not really important, for we all know that mercenaries have dirty hands anyway. Whether or not they have dirty boots does not matter very much. What matters is where all those millions of dollars of United States aid go. The mercenary forces, which enjoy the unreserved loyalty of the President of the United States and his Administration number only 20,000. The assistance they have received thus far per head exceeds the per capita income of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, and yet they are going to receive \$100 million more. If the mercenary forces are still poorly fed and ill-equipped with all that "innocent" investment, then where do all those millions of dollars go? Do they remain only in the dirty hands of the leadership, as one of the commanders of the contras has said they do, or are they spread to other dirty hands beyond the leadership too?

The record of the ex-Shah demonstrates that the mechanism of His Majesty's corruption covered certain elements beyond the Iranian nationals of his Administration. A well known document entitled "The Secret of \$20 Million" contains the names of some important non-Iranian dignitaries and even photocopies of cheques payable to important personalities who had facilitated the task of allocated millions of dollars of financial assistance to His Majesty's "development programmes".

Let us pray that this time the corruption is confined to the leadership of the contras and does not go beyond it. But whether that corruption is only within the leadership of the contras or beyond it, the fact remains that both the International Court of Justice and the Security Council must remain frustrated

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

simply because a permanent member of the Council has the unabashed boldness of blatant lawlessness. An arrogant Power, superciliously unashamed of launching terrorist acts against Libya or working openly for the overthrow of the legitimate popular revolutionary régime of Nicaragua, is the agent of almost all our international calamities. Unless drastic changes are brought about in United States foreign policy, the state of our international affairs may, sadly, remain as it is.

The United States Administration vetoes the draft resolutions of the Security Council, rejects the verdict of the International Court of Justice and avoids the Contadora Group's solutions. Of course, it has some silly explanation for each rejection. But what should small countries with no choice but to be neighbours of the United States do if none of the international or regional solutions appeal to the fastidious taste of the seat of global arrogance?

My delegation believes that the United States must accede to the decisions of the Contadora Group, because all the States members of that Group are neighbours of the United States and are in the best position to define the terms of their relations with the United States. The United States has no right to impose anything upon any of those countries, even though they are in the so-called back-yard of the seat of global arrogance. If the Charter of the United Nations matters to the United States at all, then all States of this region indeed and other regions have the right to form their own Governments free from outside interference, and should be able to exercise that right. If the peaceful settlement of disputes makes any sense to the United States Administration, then the offer of 100 million of the American taxpayers' dollars is in blatant violation of the most fundamental international norms and principles.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

This lawless offer cannot secure any points, even for the United States, because the corrupt contras are not going to repent at the sight of this big lump sum and become defenders of United States ambitions overnight; nor is the heroic Nicaraguan nation going to abandon its popular revolutionary régime to please the spoiled character of the United States. If anything, this offer exacerbates the situation and makes the search for a peaceful and negotiated solution more difficult. Moreover, the United States Administration is once again raising very serious questions about the principles governing the conduct of relations between sovereign States.

For all those and many other malicious policies and practices that it has been pursuing towards Latin America and other regions of the world, the United States Administration deserves the condemnation of the entire international body. In order to enhance national and/or international peace and security, the United States does not really need to develop more sophisticated weapons inside or outside the earth's space. It needs only to develop a peaceful character, an understanding of the fact that it just cannot talk to others at gunpoint.

The issue in the Security Council is not an isolated and simple incident that can be disentangled by good will and the advice of a few members seated at the Council table. It is the result of deep-rooted corruption inherent in the satanic nature of an imperial system which delineates its world view with reference to base, material, selfish interests. Obviously, the contras and those behind them are not going to achieve any success - not only because they are corrupt but also, and more importantly, because they are all wrong and are in contravention of all the recognized human and international values. The United States policy of supplying so much assistance to mercenary elements, which in turn complain about

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

corruption, is a policy of defeat and a mockery of all the slogans about freedom and democracy with which the innocent American public seems to have been kept busy.

Incidentally, at a time when the United States Administration is being interrogated in the Security Council in connection with charges of the violation of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of other nations, the American public is innocently dancing around the Statue of Liberty, not realizing that, instead of this celebration, they should be holding a ceremony of mourning for the demise of freedom and independence; the sinful hands of the United States Administration have so craftily converted mourning into a feast. I wish that the passengers of those 2,000 recreational wagons that have come here to enjoy the traditional hot dogs sold nowadays around the Statue of Liberty could just have a quick peek at the Security Council today to see what their Administration has done to their ideals of democracy and freedom.

It is corruption that impedes the work of the Security Council. It is corruption that impedes the work of the entire Organization. It is corruption that frustrates the International Court of Justice. It is corruption that brings all these sanctions and military operations against the small nation of Nicaragua, which has committed no crime other than struggling for independence. Indeed, it is corruption that is wasting the time and the property of the American people on corrupt issues for corrupt purposes. As the Holy Koran says: "All over the land and the sea, corruption is spread".

The result of the present deliberations and debates in the Security Council will be the same as on previous occasions when the Council has been convened. They will be buried here and remain of no avail. I regret to have to say that.

The case of South Africa has taught us a good lesson. All the resolutions of the Security Council on that subject have been abortive; Chapter VII of the

(Mr. Rajale-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Charter has remained next to non-existent; the efforts of the Security Council had proved to be of no avail in regard to the apartheid régime. What has finally embarrassed the United States Administration has been the present resolute struggle of the oppressed people under the apartheid régime and the demonstrations by the American public. That struggle, in conjunction with those demonstrations, has finally persuaded the United States officials to reconsider their policies of support for the apartheid régime. Although there are no serious practical signs of such a reconsideration, in order to ease the mind of and pacify the American public the United States Administration at least that it is going to be considering such a reconsideration.

The lesson that this case teaches to all of us is that, instead of bargaining about changing commas to semicolons or softer adjectives to stronger ones in our draft resolutions in the Council, we should ensure that our individual and collective voice reaches the public outside this Chamber. We have to make every effort to address ourselves to American public opinion, not only on the particular issue on today's agenda but on every issue and every problem that emanates from the corrupt and corruptive character of United States foreign policy. The American public needs to be repeatedly and loudly reminded of the satanic nature of United States foreign policy. The role of responsible journalism and the responsible media should not be underestimated. We have to ask the media to invite as many members of the Security Council as possible to panel discussions and live debates, and to do so as often as possible. We have to connect this Chamber to the conference room next to it, in order to ensure that our voices will reach the American public effectively. That is the best and safest approach to finding solutions to international problems. Otherwise, all our efforts will be impeded by a simple veto.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Finally, out of the great respect that I, the Muslim people of Iran, my Government and, indeed, the entire Muslim world have for freedom, independence, and the struggle of the oppressed nation, I wish to express my profound denunciation of the decision of the American Congress to allocate \$100 million in aid to the mercenaries and bandits.

I also express the condemnation of my Government and people for the foreign policy of the United States towards Libya and Nicaragua, for the support that the United States has always given the Zionist régime occupying Palestine, and for its support of the apartheid régime in South Africa.

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

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, at the beginning of your term of office, and speaking on behalf of the Council, you made some very kind and generous remarks about the way in which I discharged my duties last month. I sincerely thank you and the other members of the Council, who echoed your comments. I would, nevertheless, add that I take no credit for the qualities which have been imputed to me, since I knew I could count on the co-operation of my colleagues, for which I am extremely grateful.

In turn, Sir, I should like to say how pleased I am, as head of my delegation, to see you presiding over the Council. We are familiar with your tact, your delicacy, and the deep understanding you have of the most complicated problems, as well as with your readiness to put forward well thought out original solutions which always bear the stamp of common sense. I wish you every success and hope that our timetable will afford you some respite.

We are the first to recognize the complexity of the situation which obtains in Central America because of the interests directly or indirectly at stake, the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

involvement of all the countries of Latin America, whether they belong to the region or not, and the need to preserve a balance among the various opinions, options and schools of thought, in a world that is not always to our exact liking. We try to gather and analyse information both at the national level and here at the United Nations. Most of the time, we cannot obtain complete information; for security reasons it often reaches us piecemeal or in abridged form - to such an extent that it provides insufficient grounds for making any assertions at all.

In the course of this debate, we will, therefore, be forced to take as our point of reference, apart from the statements made by the parties concerned and implicated, the principles of international law, the past resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, the successive actions taken by the Contadora Group and their Support Group and, finally, the recent judgement of the International Court of Justice.

I should like to make it clear from the outset that as far as the political problems of Central America are concerned, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, quite naturally recognizes that every State has the right to exercise its sovereignty fully, without any foreign interference or intervention, in a spirit of mutual respect for political, economic and social choices and options. This is the spirit which has always guided the Non-Aligned Movement; our fundamental solidarity with Nicaragua, as with any other country that finds itself in similar circumstances, is rooted in our devotion to those principles. We have come here not to defend Madagascar's position vis-à-vis Nicaragua or any other parties, but rather to ascertain what contribution can be made by the Security Council and the United Nations family on the basis of the facts and means available to us.

It is very difficult to assert that there is a generalized state of civil war in Central America. Nevertheless, the situation is extremely unstable and is a source of concern for us all because of the mistrust which characterizes the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

relations among the parties. Hence the possibility of various types of intervention and interference cannot be ruled out. This is particularly true of Nicaragua, and since we are saying so much about preventive diplomacy these days, I think it behoves us, parallel with the efforts undertaken by the Contadora Group and its Support Group, which were described with such consummate clarity by Ambassador Aguilar of Venezuela, to consider very seriously what the Council should do in order to defuse crises and thus promote the conclusion of an agreement for peace and co-operation in Central America.

In this connection, I shall take as my point of departure paragraph 16 of the judgement handed down on 27 June 1986 by the International Court of Justice, according to which the two parties, that is the United States of America and Nicaragua, are in duty-bound to seek a peaceful solution to their dispute, in accordance with international law. That decision was adopted unanimously and with no riders. It is, furthermore, fully in keeping with the constant position of the United Nations that there is a need to find a just and negotiated political settlement to the problems of Central America.

Having accepted this proposition, the Council cannot fail to denounce direct or indirect intervention or interference in the internal affairs of any country and the resort to force, in violation of obligations under customary international law, and in this case, of Nicaragua's sovereignty.

In the context of the present complaint of Nicaragua against the United States, my delegation - I stress: with the data available to it - cannot understand how anyone can train, arm, equip, finance and supply the so-called contra forces, as well as encourage, support and assist in military and paramilitary activities inside and against that country.

The International Court of Justice rendered its opinion on this matter in paragraph 3 of its judgement, and we subscribe to the communiqué of the non-aligned countries, dated 1 July 1986, which, inter alia:

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

"Express[ed] its grave concern and regret at the recent vote in the ... House of Representatives ... the Bureau condemned any such funding as a violation of the sovereignty and political independence of Nicaragua...". (S/18196, annex)

We recognize that Member States can exercise their natural right of collective or individual self-defence. In this particular case, it is essential, according to Article 51 of the Charter, to have irrefutable proof that there has in fact been armed aggression; it must also be borne in mind that the exercise of that right is valid until the Security Council has taken the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security.

Let us for a moment postulate the validity of collective self-defence. That would warrant intervention, which might result in a counter-intervention, which in turn could also claim to be based on the same principle. This kind of chain reaction and escalation is for us a matter of extreme disquiet and we cannot afford to overlook the negative, even perilous, consequences that it might have for international peace and security.

A State is also in duty bound to protect its national interests. In full sovereignty, it is free to choose the most appropriate means of self-defence. But that freedom, to paraphrase Alexis de Toqueville, must be defined in the context of morality, law, justice, the commonweal and civil responsibility - and, in this particular case, a just responsibility. What was true during the past century is still true today, particularly in view of the obligations incumbent upon every State to serve a just and orderly international society.

Those are our thoughts at the present stage in connection with our consideration of the situation in Nicaragua.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

It is not always a good idea, we have been told, to end with questions. However, in the light of the feelings expressed about the Security Council's role in the field of preventive diplomacy, we must ask ourselves, despite our limited means and the various constraints under which we operate, whether we are really prepared, first, to demand that all States respect the obligations incumbent upon them under the Charter; secondly, to ensure that intervention and interference are not allowed to be automatically justified on the pretext of the defence of national interests, as construed unilaterally; thirdly, to support the principles that constitute the foundation of international society in which pluralism can also be accommodated; and, fourthly, not to rest content with giving a purely formal, almost ritual, support to the Contadora efforts but, rather, to create all the political, legal and other conditions necessary for them to succeed.

We hope that those questions will not go unanswered for ever; otherwise we shall have fallen short of our responsibilities once more.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Madagascar for the kind words he addressed to the presidency.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): It is indeed a great pleasure for my delegation and me to congratulate you, Sir, as President for a second time during our common tenure of office in the Security Council. Your way of guiding our deliberations, firm and gentle at the same time, and your wealth of diplomatic wisdom and experience augur well for the Council's work during your presidency.

(spoke in French)

I should also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Rabetafika of Madagascar, for the skilful way in which he conducted the Council's business during the month of June.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

(continued in English)

The continuation of the serious situation in Central America gives rise to grave concern. Unfortunately, no immediate solution to the complex problems of the region seems to be in sight. On the contrary, recent developments have demonstrated the urgency of intensifying negotiations, without which the tensions and conflicts of the region will no doubt escalate.

The Danish Government continues to believe that there is no realistic and acceptable alternative to the Contadora peace process. The efforts of the Contadora countries are based on a recognition of the facts that it is the responsibility of the countries of the region themselves to solve their differences and that a lasting solution must be achieved by peaceful means, without any military pressure or other forms of coercion.

Thus my country has consistently supported and encouraged the efforts of the Contadora countries and their Support Group. This has been reflected, inter alia, by our participation in the ongoing political and economic co-operation between the member States of the European Community, the Central American States and the Contadora Group aimed at strengthening economic development and social stability in the region.

A lasting solution to the conflicts in Central America must be based on a commitment to democratic systems of government, free elections, freedom of the press, and respect for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Outside interference of any kind in the internal affairs of the Central American countries, the use of force or violation of the sovereignty of any State in the region will not contribute to a just and peaceful solution and must be rejected.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

Respect for those principles have been underlined by the decision of the International Court of Justice announced on 27 June. We have not yet had an opportunity to study in detail the Court's comprehensive documentation. It is well known, however, that Denmark remains committed to the role of the International Court of Justice in settling international disputes and to the strict observance of international law.

It is the sincere hope of my Government that the Contadora countries and the Support Group will continue their efforts in spite of temporary setbacks. We commend them for their tireless efforts and reiterate our appeal to all countries concerned to show restraint, to renew the necessary dialogue, and to seek a solution to the disputes in Central America by peaceful means, in accordance with international law. We ask that all interested parties act in good faith in bringing the Contadora process to a successful conclusion.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Denmark for the kind words he addressed to the presidency.

Mr. BROCHAN) (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, and to express the satisfaction felt by the French delegation on your assumption of the Council's presidency for this month. Your outstanding skill and talent, which I have personally appreciated for a long time, will once again, I am sure, be affirmed in the service of peace and the international community.

I should like also to voice my delegation's gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Rabetafika of Madagascar, who, in exercising his delicate mission, displayed his customary, well-known wisdom, far-sightedness and courtesy.

Once again the Security Council is called upon to discuss a question which seriously affects Central America. That region, while it legitimately wishes to devote itself as a matter of priority to its development and to improving the life of its people, is faced with a series of political conflicts and violent struggles which, for several years, have forestalled any prospects for peace and stability.

France, a permanent member of the Security Council, obviously cannot remain indifferent to what is occurring at present in Central America, even though its interests are not directly affected. Concerned by the deterioration of the situation in the region, my country has constantly proclaimed its commitment to a peaceful settlement of the conflicts occurring there, a settlement based on dialogue and leading to reconciliation. That is also the approach followed by the Contadora Group. It enjoys the broad support of the international community, which continues to promote it despite the obstacles along the way.

It behoves the Central American countries in particular to seek ways and means of arriving at solutions and we are pleased to see that their five Heads of State, at the initiative of the President of Guatemala, recently met in Esquipulas to lay the foundations for a regional rapprochement that would be both political and economic in nature.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

France has already informed the Council of its concern over the arms race in that region. It regrets the new wave of escalation which could, no doubt, have been averted if the necessary overtures had been made. In reaffirming its support for the action undertaken by the Contadora Group, France wishes to underscore the importance which it attaches, on the one hand, to the development of democracy in the countries of the region, which presupposes respect for fundamental freedoms and human rights, and, on the other hand, the quest for a comprehensive and lasting settlement whereby all the States concerned would know that their sovereignty is guaranteed and their security is not in jeopardy.

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

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, it is a sincere pleasure for my delegation to see you presiding over the Security Council and to tell you how much your personal and professional qualities, which we have already been able to gauge in the work of this body, fit you so admirably for the office. We also respect your country, Thailand. Its centuries-old diplomatic traditions in which you were brought up are steeped in the respect for peace - that rare commodity so dear to the group of developing countries, to which we belong.

We should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Permanent Representative of Madagascar, Ambassador Blaise Rabetafika, whose talent and effectiveness need no proof and who has again amply demonstrated those qualities during his term of office as President of the Council last month.

I should like now to set forth the basic position of the Congo in connection with the item before the Council.

Everyone is aware, I believe, that the complaint of Nicaragua against the United States is based on a set of facts with which the Council is very familiar

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

and which it has taken up a number of times in the past; the General Assembly has also debated it under an item entitled "The situation in Central America: Threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives". As recently as last year, the General Assembly adopted a significant resolution, resolution 40/188, which expressed its disapproval of the unilateral embargo measures imposed by the United States against Nicaragua in May and November 1985.

With respect to Security Council resolution 562 (1985) dated 10 May 1985, it is in agreement with General Assembly resolution 39/4, at least in so far as those two main bodies of the United Nations confirm their interest in the Contadora Group and in the diplomatic process which is connected with the efforts of that Group as a preferred way of ushering in a climate of peace, security and co-operation in Central America.

However, since the Republican Administration came into power in Washington and despite the adoption in September 1984 of the Contadora Agreement, the attitude and behaviour of the United States, far from being constructive with regard to the social, economic and cultural problems besetting Central America, which are the root causes of the political conflicts in the area, have only demonstrated a systematic desire for obstruction, if not rampant interventionism.

Indeed, in deliberately committing the very acts it imputes to Nicaragua, the Government of the United States has displayed unprecedented frenzy in its intolerance, provocation and aggression, in constant violation of the rules for co-operation and coexistence established bilaterally between those countries, and, of course, in equal violation of the norms and principles of international law.

The recent decision by the United States House of Representatives to authorize extensive financial and military assistance to the tune of \$100 million to those rebels who have been trained by the United States, is an additional violation of

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

those norms and principles which the People's Republic of the Congo can neither accept nor absolve, without making nonsense of its declared devotion to the sacred concept of the sovereignty of States, a concept which implies the diversity of political, social and economic choices.

As stated in the judgement of the International Court of Justice of 27 June last on this matter, the acts committed or engineered by the United States Government amount, purely and simply, to interference in the internal affairs of an independent and sovereign country. As such, the Government of the Congo condemns those acts out of hand and urges the United States to put an end to them in the interest of international peace and security.

Like the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we express our solidarity with Nicaragua and earnestly desire the success of the peace process initiated by the Contadora Group, to which we should like to pay a sincere tribute.

There can be no doubt that it is the Council's responsibility to deal with all current world conflicts. It is equally true that, pursuant to the provisions of the 1979 Declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes, the achievement of regional agreements is one of the most fruitful ways of preventing and settling those conflicts.

The paradox to which we have unfortunately grown accustomed in the case of Central America is that with last year's augmentation of the Contadora Group, by the Support Group - thus encompassing the majority of the countries of Latin America - the international community had every reason to expect that instrument to pursue its stated goal of promoting peace and security, fundamental to the development and progress of the peoples of Latin America in general, and of Central America in particular.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

We should like to take this occasion to express our thanks to and admiration for those Latin American countries, whose leaders, at different levels, at different times and in various places, have stinted neither time nor effort to find the most equitable and lasting solution possible to the problems besetting their region.

No other subregion in the world which has experienced comparable tension has made as much progress in the diplomatic process as has the subregion of the Contadora Group. No subregional political co-operation involving all the parties to the conflict has yet been achieved, for example, in South Africa - where the racist minority régime rejects any negotiation - or in the Middle East, or in South-East Asia, where no compromise formula has won the support of all the parties concerned.

The paradox to which I refer is that, despite the fact that the States and peoples concerned proved - by their adoption in Panama on 7 June of a new version of the Contadora agreement - that they can succeed, a major external Power, which claims to be directly threatened by just one of the small countries involved, has adopted the policy of ignoring the Contadora process and sticking doggedly to its own interpretation of the facts, to its own goal: the overthrow of the Government of Nicaragua and the imposition of a single development model on that country, which had scarcely emerged from a long struggle against the Somoza dictatorship.

The American Administration's self-induced idea of an aggressive Nicaragua that poses a danger to its neighbours, reminds my delegation of the cynical moral of the fable about the wolf and the lamb, in which the strong always get the better of the weak, even if the strong are in the wrong.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

The attitude of the present American Administration which has always declared itself in favour of a peaceful settlement, as in the case of South Africa, is surprisingly different when it comes to Nicaragua: In South Africa there are apparently no "freedom-fighters". Yet that is the term Washington uses to describe those who long for the "good old days" of Somoza. Their only counterparts in Africa are the controversial Jonas Savimbi and his dubious UNITA elements, who also are very much in favour with the White House.

Nicaragua has known all forms of aggression, not so much on the part of its immediate neighbours, which the United States wants to keep under its protective "umbrella", but rather from its powerful northern neighbour itself, which - by mining Nicaragua's ports, by imposing an economic and commercial embargo against it, by frequently violating its sovereignty and territorial integrity, by rejecting any dialogue with it, in spite of the diplomatic links which exist between the two countries - has thus deliberately placed itself in a state of undeclared war against it.

That powerful neighbour then does everything it can to blame the small country against which it is committing aggression for any attempt to defend itself and to defend its liberty and independence. Nicaragua must today channel a considerable portion of its resources to defending its sovereignty and integrity. Washington claims to accept the principle of self-defence; yet it gets upset when Nicaragua wants to defend itself against the aggression of a more powerful country. Is this not asking Nicaragua to deliver itself tied hand and foot to the mercenaries which are being controlled from outside?

The People's Republic of the Congo is concerned by all the suffering that has been visited upon the people of Central America, particularly on the Nicaraguans, who, to enjoy their right to freedom and independence, have had to engage in a fratricidal Vietnamese-type struggle, pitting Sandinistas against contras.

(Mr. Gayama, Congo)

We are even more concerned by the pent-up grievances and resentment of the proud Latin American people against the United States, whose political selfishness megalomania have made it an international outlaw - with all the risks which that involves for international life in general.

We hope that as a result of this debate, which my delegation wished to be a frank and open one because of the threats to Central America, the use of force and coercion as a preferred means of settling problems, particularly problems which are essentially part and parcel of the internal jurisdiction of States, will soon be banished from inter-American relations and, indeed, international relations. We hope also that all States Members of the United Nations will recommit themselves to the provisions of the Charter and make the International Court of Justice the final arbiter of their disputes.

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

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

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, it is my pleasure to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. You are among the few known by everyone to enjoy a vast knowledge of United Nations affairs. During our friendship in the Security Council, I too have come to know your wisdom, moderation and fairness.

It is also my pleasure to express thanks and appreciation to my friend, Ambassador Blaise Rabetafika, Permanent Representative of Madagascar, for his wise and creative presidency of the Security Council during the last month.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United
Arab Emirates)

Our meeting coincides with the American people's centennial celebration of the Statue of Liberty as the symbol of freedom. As we share the American people's celebration this day we should like to remember the peoples that have been or still are being subjected to colonial oppression. To them, freedom is the supreme value. They are looking forward to the day when they can celebrate that freedom and be able to determine their own destiny. I have in mind the peoples of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine. Tomorrow's celebration should be an occasion to contemplate the basic meaning of freedom.

Freedom should not be the monopoly of a single person; it should not be enjoyed by some people rather than by others: nations, large and small, are equal. Hence, the flags of freedom cannot flutter unless man's enslavement of his fellow man comes to an end. As John Donne said:

(spoke in English)

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent".

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

This makes us think of the tragic situation in Central America, which is the result of attempts to interfere in and control the internal affairs of States, in clear breach of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international conduct. My country's position on the item before the Council rests on the established pillars of our foreign policy, which in turn rest on the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. These are also the main principles and purposes of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Foremost among them is the right of every people to self-determination and to its own choice of a system of government. Compatible with and stemming from that principle is the inadmissibility of interference by any State in the internal affairs of another. It is therefore the right of the people of Nicaragua, as of all peoples, to choose the system of government it desires without direct or indirect outside pressure, advice or interference.

We reaffirm that all the States of Central America possess that right. No State, super-Power or not, has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other States in order to destabilize, modify or replace existing régimes. That is affirmed in Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which states that

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".

Allocating funds to assist, organize and arm such groups as the contras with a view to fomenting trouble in any country constitutes interference in the internal affairs of another State and runs counter to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), which contains the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Political and ideological disputes are a fact of modern life. Disagreement on or disapproval of a given political or economic system must not be used as a pretext for violating the rules of conduct among States, lest the world descend into chaos, with all countries subject to foreign intervention. There is no doubt that third-world countries, being the weakest militarily, would be the first victims.

Article 33 refers to the settlement of disputes by resort to regional agencies or arrangements, since they are better able to understand the circumstances and causes of a given conflict. The Contadora Group, as a regional group of Central America devoted to the settlement of conflicts, has shouldered a special responsibility. It has worked tirelessly and unceasingly to communicate with the parties to the conflict, including the United States. In co-operation with the Support Group, it has succeeded in formulating the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America. It has also succeeded in formulating the Panama Message of 7 June 1986, which reiterates 10 principles and nine forms of action that must be fully realized if peace, democracy and security are to be secured in Central America. We appreciate the efforts of the Contadora Group and the Support Group and call upon all the States concerned to accept their approach and refrain from obstructing its realization.

Article 33 of the Charter also calls for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and sets forth the means and machinery to that end. Thus, unilateral action outside the framework of such means and machinery - most importantly the Security Council - constitutes a breach of the Charter.

We note Nicaragua's responsiveness and its desire to negotiate, and wish the United States to reconsider its position in keeping with the principles of the Charter and the norms of international law so that a final settlement of the

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

critical situation in Central America can be reached in mutual respect for independence and national sovereignty.

The ongoing volatile situation in Central America threatens not only the peace and security of the region but international peace and security as well. Thus, it is the primary responsibility of this Council to halt and settle such conflicts permanently and comprehensively.

I reaffirm my delegation's rejection of the threat to the independence and national sovereignty of States on the pretext of an East-West conflict. We reject the imposition of any conditions for the independence, sovereignty and political options of States. Major Powers in particular must respect these principles so that small nations may build their independent systems free from oppression and pressure.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to the presidency.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place this afternoon at 3 o'clock. I appeal to members kindly to exercise punctuality to the best of their ability.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.