

The representative of Zaire said that the situation in Chad was a dramatic attack on the principles of international law and the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the OAU charter, in particular the provisions that related to sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, non-use of force in relations among States, and the peaceful settlement of disputes as stipulated in article 3 of the OAU charter and Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. He said that no country had the right to threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another, and called for the withdrawal of the Libyan forces from Chad. He then quoted the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and stated that, in response to the appeal for assistance by the legitimate Government of Chad, Zaire had sent troops as tangible evidence of its commitments to the preservation of the territorial integrity of each African State in accordance with Article 3 of the OAU Charter.<sup>6</sup>

The representative of France said that France had learned that in the Chadian conflict non-combatants had been the target of attacks resulting in the destruction of Gourma and Monou, areas where civilians had been killed. He said that France had set up a military assistance unit, at the request of the Chadian Government and in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, to act as a deterrent against outside interference in Chadian affairs.<sup>7</sup>

The representative of the United States of America recalled that the Government of Chad had vigorously worked towards the goal of national reconciliation since it had come to power in 1982, but that its domestic progress had been disrupted by external military aggression directed against it, with an invasion in 1983 by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in clear violation, not only of the Charter of the United Nations, but also that of OAU. He recalled further that in that invasion, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had seized nearly half of the territory of Chad and was in continued occupation of Chad's northern provinces, which it

continued to maintain through harsh military rule. He said that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's attacks on Chad had threatened not only its smaller neighbour, but also the peace and stability of other nations in the region. He called upon the international community to demand that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya withdraw its military forces from Chad and cease its aggression against a Member of the United Nations.<sup>8</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya challenged the ground upon which the Security Council was convened, as the problem of Chad was an internal one resulting from the remnants of French colonialism that could best be handled under the auspices of OAU. He said that the regional organization had already entrusted to the President of the People's Republic of the Congo the task of seeking national reconciliation among the contending Chadian parties. He then accused the Government of the United States of America of using the Chadian conflict to divert attention from the American aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and as an excuse to support the Chadian faction led by Hissein Habre, whose regime did not control Chad. He called upon other States, in particular the "colonial Powers" which were intervening in Chadian affairs, to put an end to their intervention in the territory.<sup>9</sup>

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expressed his delegation's support for the position taken by OAU in its attempt to achieve national reconciliation in Chad without any outside interference. He accused the United States of America and France of using the Security Council meeting as a basis for attacking the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, to increase tension on the Libyan border and to use the internal conflict in Chad to effect far-reaching political policies and designs aimed against another African country. He condemned the escalation of imperialist interference in the internal affairs of African countries as illegal acts that threatened destabilization of the international environment.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-19.  
<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 21 and 22.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 23-27.  
<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 28-36.  
<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-43.

### 30. LETTER DATED 9 DECEMBER 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

#### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By a letter<sup>1</sup> dated 8 December 1986 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Nicaragua requested the convening of a meeting of the Security Council to consider the incidents in the Central American region which endangered international peace and security.

At the 2728th meeting, on 10 December 1986, the Council considered the item on its agenda. The representatives of Honduras and Nicaragua were invited, at their request, to participate without vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. Members of the Council had a letter dated 8 December 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations, which contained the text of the note of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras describing the violation of Nicaraguan airspace by firefighter planes flying from Honduras.

<sup>1</sup>S/18514.

The representative of Nicaragua gave an account of the events, charging that three aircraft had attacked positions of the Sandinista People's Army, causing the death of seven people and the wounding of another nine; on the same day, two combat aircraft from the same formation attacked a town, 25 kilometres from the northern border, destroying a home, killing two children and wounding three soldiers. According to Nicaraguan intelligence sources, the aircraft had taken off from United States bases located on Honduran territory and the attacks had been coordinated by American specialists; besides, the rockets and bombs used in the bombings could only have been transported by powerful combat aircraft, which the mercenary forces did not possess. He stated that responsibility for the latest grave event lay with the United States Government, whose objective was to overthrow the legitimately established Government of Nicaragua. The speaker recalled that in recent years his Government had often drawn the Council's attention to such activities as the conducting of joint military manoeuvres by the United States and the Honduran armies; the strengthening of the military structure established by the United States in Honduras; the permanent presence of advisers and specialized bodies of the United States on Honduran soil; the continued financing of counter-revolutionary mercenaries; the constant violation of Nicaraguan territorial waters and airspace. He condemned the United States tactics of bringing the military manoeuvres closer to the counter-revolutionary bases and the border of Nicaragua, as well as of carrying out electronic and air espionage of the Nicaraguan Pacific coast and territory. Moreover, the representative of Nicaragua indicated some actions within the "context of aggression and preparation of the conditions necessary to the direct participation of the United States in the war,"<sup>2</sup> such as financing and direct control of adversary operations, training of commandos, and speculation about an invasion of Honduran territory by troops of the Sandinista People's Army. He stated that his Government had come to the Security Council, in view of preparations for direct military intervention against Nicaragua, to alert the international community to the new escalation of United States aggression as "an attack against the peace, security and lives of peoples of Nicaragua and Honduras".<sup>3</sup> He called for respect for the norms and principles of international law and for the right of the peoples of Central America to life and peace. He informed of his Government's proposal to the Government of Honduras to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send a fact-finding committee to the zone of tension, with the participation of the Contadora Group members, to determine the causes of tension and recommend relevant measures to be adopted to prevent a further worsening of the situation. He described the negative response of the Government of Honduras as being a result of pressure by the United States Government.<sup>4</sup>

The representative of Honduras denied the allegations of the representative of Nicaragua. He stated that the border situations had worsened considerably as a result of the attack by approximately 200 soldiers of the Sandinista People's Army on an observation post within Honduran territory, in the course of which two soldiers had been

captured, three wounded in the battle, and the military equipment from the post belonging to the Honduran army seized by the Sandinista army. At the same time, a number of purely civilian villages had been attacked, and the Government had been so far unable to determine human losses and material damage. The speaker pointed out that his Government, demonstrating a peaceful and conciliatory approach, had made attempts to prevent a worsening of the situation through diplomatic means, warning that Honduran armed forces "would be obliged to carry out their constitutional duty to defend the national territory and sovereignty"<sup>5</sup> and had called for withdrawal of all Sandinista troops from its territory. He said that the Nicaragua proposal to send a United Nations and Contadora Group commission to avoid worsening of the situation had been "absolutely unacceptable", and had left the Honduran Government no alternative but to take appropriate and legitimate action, that is, to order the Honduran air force "to take all necessary measures to remove the invading soldiers" from Honduran territory, using its own resources and those supplied at its request by the Government of the United States. He assured the Council that all the actions had been taken without exceeding the legal limits imposed by the United States Government and under precise orders of the commander of the armed forces of Honduras to operate strictly within national territory. The speaker informed the Council that the Permanent Mission of Honduras would present it with "many identification cards" left behind or taken from members of the Sandinista army on Honduran territory, as well as a document which was an instruction to the Nicaraguan army proving the existence of a premeditated plan of invasion. Totally rejecting his country's responsibility for the incident, the representative of Honduras asserted that the Government of Nicaragua was violating the principles of international law contained in international agreements and in the Charter of the United Nations, in particular, in Article 2. He also quoted in full the response of the Honduras Foreign Minister to the telex of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua claiming that Honduran aircraft had attacked the positions of the Sandinista People's Army on Nicaraguan territory. He affirmed the will of his Government, respectful of its commitments under the Charter, to explore the path to peace with dignity in Central America. He expressed confidence in the Security Council's good judgement and its ability to distinguish lies from the truth.<sup>6</sup>

The President of the Security Council, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the United States, called the reason used by Nicaragua to convene the Council "patently false and a cynical complaint" and an abuse of the Council. He portrayed Nicaragua as an aggressor trying to present itself as a victim. In his account of events, he acknowledged that the United States, at the request of the President of Honduras, had agreed to transport Honduran troops and supplies in nine unarmed United States helicopters to the region, 25 miles away from the conflict. He emphasized that the massive Soviet-backed military build-up in Nicaragua was a serious threat to the countries in the region, which "the Central American democracies had sought to counter not by matching force with force but

<sup>2</sup>S/PV.2728, pp. 9 and 10.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 3 and 13.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-26.

through negotiation of a comprehensive regional agreement", which the United States had supported. He pointed out that the issue before the Council was not one between Nicaragua and the United States; the real problem was the aggression of Nicaragua against its neighbours and the United States was prepared to come to the prompt assistance of the victims.<sup>7</sup>

The representative of Nicaragua questioned the United States insistence on attributing the problems of Central America solely to Nicaragua and observed that the Security Council and the international community were long aware that his country had been more than once subjected to aggression. She referred to a ruling in that regard by the International Court of Justice condemning the United States for its policy of aggression. She affirmed that the only force in Honduran territory that was not Honduran was that of the United States and the counter-revolutionary force created, armed and supplied by the United States Administration. She questioned why the mechanism of a fact-finding commission of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, proposed by her Government to the United States and Honduras, had not been accepted and reiterated that the reason for convening that meeting was to alert the Security Council to the fabrications and pretexts for wider United States involvement in the direct actions against Nicaragua. She recalled that the mechanism should be found for a solution of the situation within the Contadora

framework and in bilateral relations between the United States and Nicaragua. She reiterated the appeal made at a meeting with the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send a fact-finding mission to the border area, despite objections from the Honduran Government, and to send a commission to the bombed area of Nicaragua.<sup>8</sup>

The representative of Honduras, exercising the right of reply, clarified that his country was unable to accept the on-site presence of a United Nations commission as a matter of "national dignity", unless Nicaragua agreed to withdraw the Sandinista troops from its territory. He also stated that the military base in question was under sovereign administration, management and ownership of his country; the United States advisers operated in Honduras within the framework of friendly relations. He confirmed his country's readiness to withdraw the military advisers, in the interest of peace in the region, provided that Nicaragua would also withdraw its troops. He also denied that Honduras had sought to obtain F-15 aircraft and that it had a large number of F-5s. The representative presented photocopies of the military identification papers of Nicaraguan soldiers who were on Honduran territory, and other evidence.<sup>9</sup>

The President said that there were no more speakers on the list and that the next meeting of the Council would be fixed in the course of consultations.

<sup>7</sup>S/PV.2728, pp. 26-28.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 28-32.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 32 and 33.

### 31. STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (IN CONNECTION WITH HOSTAGE-TAKING AND ABDUCTION)<sup>1</sup>

**Decision:** Statement by the President.

On 28 January 1987, following consultations of the Security Council, the President was authorized to issue a statement on behalf of the Members of the Council. The Statement reads as follows:

<sup>1</sup>S/18641.

The members of the Security Council have had occasion in the past to draw attention to various acts of hostage-taking and abduction. In resolution 579 (1985) the Security Council condemned unequivocally all such acts and called for the immediate safe release of all hostages and abducted persons wherever and by whomever they are being held. Conscious of the serious implications of this issue, and, in particular, its humanitarian aspects, the members of the Council again condemn all acts of hostage-taking and abduction and demand the immediate and safe release of all hostages and abducted persons.

### 32. LETTER DATED 10 FEBRUARY 1988 FROM THE PERMANENT OBSERVER OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

#### LETTER DATED 10 FEBRUARY 1988 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF JAPAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

##### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By a note<sup>1</sup> dated 10 February 1988, the President of the Security Council circulated the text of a letter of the same date, together with its enclosure, from the Permanent Ob-

<sup>1</sup>S/19488.

server of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, requesting an urgent meeting of the Council, in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, to consider the situation arising from the incident in which a commercial passenger airliner, Flight 858, of the Republic of Korea, with 115 people on board, had been destroyed by an explosion in mid-air during a regular flight from