

At its 2558th meeting, on 9 October 1984, the Council included the item in its agenda and invited the representatives of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.² The Council considered the matter at the same meeting.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that on 6 June 1984 several battalions of the Thai Army had attacked Lao territory and occupied three Lao villages. Thailand was taking measures to absorb and assimilate the villages, forcibly isolating them from the surrounding area and abusing the villagers. It justified its claim to the villages on the basis of a map drawn up jointly by the Thai and United States Armies in 1978, despite a footnote on the map stating that the frontier lines it represented were not to be considered official. He claimed that Thai efforts to force a re-examination of the frontier in the area of the three villages were designed to create a precedent for a revision of the entire border, in fulfilment of Thai expansionist aims, despite the fact that there had been no border dispute between the two countries since the frontier had been laid down in 1904-1907.

In negotiations with a Lao delegation, Thailand had initially agreed to withdraw from the villages but had ended by unilaterally breaking off the negotiations. Recently, the Thai Foreign Minister had informed the General Assembly that the Thai Government would withdraw its military presence from the villages, but the Thai statement was untrustworthy as it contained no guarantee and no timetable, no acknowledgement of Lao sovereignty and no commitment to restore the status quo as it existed before 6 June by removing the Thai administration, police force, para-military force etc. He declared that Thailand must withdraw its troops and administrative personnel totally and unconditionally, return villagers who had been forcibly taken to Thailand, compensate villagers for losses of life and property and restore the situation that had prevailed prior to the occupation. The Lao Government appealed to the Council to urge Thailand to respond quickly and positively to the Lao demands and to abide by the Charter in its international relations.⁴

The representative of Thailand pointed out that the villages in question were extremely small, impoverished and remotely situated, and stated that in the view of his Government the issue did not deserve the attention of the Council. He related that the matter had begun when a Thai road-building crew had been harassed by Lao soldiers inside Thai territory, eventually prompting Thailand to send troops to protect the crew and ensure the continuation of the project. He noted that a study of available maps gave Thai authorities reasonable grounds to believe that the villages in dispute were partly or wholly inside Thai territory.

The two sides had entered talks but had been unable to reach general agreement, although they had agreed on the watershed principle. Thailand had then sent a survey team to the area to determine the exact boundary line and had announced its willingness to accept an independent survey to verify Thai findings, but harassment by the Lao side had prevented completion of the survey. Now, in the interest of maintaining good-neighbourly relations with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Thailand had withdrawn its troops from the villages. The Lao People's

Democratic Republic should now have no reason for objecting to a joint technical team establishing the boundary, but if it did Thailand was prepared to ask the Secretary-General to send a fact-finding mission. Meanwhile, both sides should refrain from assaults on the other, including verbal assaults, and should prevent any third-party interference in what was a bilateral issue.

While Thailand naturally wished to renegotiate the border between the two countries, the original boundaries having been established at a time when the Siamese Government had been in no position to resist encroachment by the French colonial administration in Indo-China, successive Thai Governments had given precedence to the larger interest of maintaining good-neighbourliness; Thailand did not want a single inch of Lao territory or a single Lao national and looked forward to a future of peaceful and constructive relations with the Lao People's Democratic Republic.⁴

Exercising his right of reply, the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that his Government would not agree to a survey of the area because it had already submitted definitive proof of Lao sovereignty. Doing so would mean giving up that sovereignty, failing to recognize the France-Siamese treaties and thus the inviolability of the entire border, and so destabilizing not only Laos, but Cambodia as well. He further stated that Thailand had not, so far, removed its troops from the area; instead, it had started bringing in reinforcements, forcibly conscripting young people, violating Lao airspace with reconnaissance planes and indiscriminately firing cannon at neighbouring villages. He requested that the Council remain seized of the issue until the matter had been resolved.⁴

NOTES

¹ S/16765, OR. 39th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984*.

² 2558th mtg. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

³ ORGA, 39th sess., plen. mtgs., 17th mtg., para. 61.

⁴ 2558th mtg.

35. LETTER DATED 9 NOVEMBER 1984 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

By letter¹ dated 9 November 1984 addressed to the President of the Council, the representative of Nicaragua requested that the Council be convened as a matter of urgency for the purpose of considering the very serious situation created by the escalation of acts of aggression, the repeated threats and new acts of provocation fostered by the United States Government.

At its 2562nd meeting, on 9 November 1984, the Council included the item in its agenda and considered it at the same meeting.

The representative of Nicaragua gave an account of numerous military provocations by the United States against his country. He referred to various American official statements and press reports containing serious threats based on unfounded and controversial suppositions. The announcements in

the press and by the Pentagon about American military moves in the region were seen with concern in Nicaragua. Manoeuvres of the navies of Central American countries supported by American advisers and the United States Navy in the Gulf of Fonseca, a state of alert at Fort Bragg in North Carolina, the relocation of the 101 st Parachute Division from a hinterland state to a coastal state, the threatening statements of members of the Reagan Administration, including the President himself, and everyday acts of aggression, led Nicaragua constantly to fear a United States military intervention.

These threats were part of the policy of aggression by the United States against Nicaragua. Statements from the Pentagon and the State Department confirmed that further significant measures of aggression were being prepared by the United States. The Government of Nicaragua denounced these manoeuvres and the manipulation of public opinion. On various occasions Nicaragua had complained in the Council and in the General Assembly about the policy of the United States Government and had done it once again because his country believed that the Council was obliged to take appropriate measures to guarantee the purposes of the Charter.²

The representative of the United States pointed out that members of the Council should call for meetings only after reasonable notice had been given to other members, unless there was an emergency requiring immediate action. No such emergency existed in the present case. Insistence that a meeting take place forthwith constituted a misuse of the Council. The allegations against the United States were totally without foundation. Referring to the procedure employed at the meeting he said that under the provisions of Chapter VI, Article 33, of the Charter, prior to bringing a dispute before the Council an effort should be made to exhaust certain other remedies, including the resort to regional agencies. In the case of the Americas, that was the Organization of American States (OAS).

NOTES

¹ S/16825, OR. 39th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984.

² 2562nd mtg.