

New York Times / 21 Dec 1989, p. A30; Editorial desk / **Why the Invasion Was Justified**

...

The President also said he acted to safeguard the lives of Americans and to protect the integrity of the Panama Canal treaties. Those are sound reasons, and taken together they support the intervention. Mr. Bush was not obliged to act yesterday, but he was justified in doing so. It was General Noriega who last week declared that a "state of war" existed with the United States. That appeared to put American lives and treaty rights in peril, especially when followed by a series of violent incidents that resulted in the death of one American soldier, the wounding of another and the mistreatment of a third soldier and his wife. The President acted in response to real risks.

...

Any course in Panama would have had costs. In the end, the most important questions are: Did President Bush test less drastic approaches? Yes. Is there a clear legal basis for the presence of Americans in Panama? Yes. Does the President have a responsibility to protect them? Yes.

New York Times / 21 Dec 1989, p. A24; Foreign desk / **Fighting in Panama: Latin America; U.S. Denounced by Nations Touchy About Intervention** / By James Brooke

From Mexico to Argentina, Latin American governments today roundly condemned the use of force by the United States against Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega of Panama.

Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela and Peru criticized the action as interference in the sovereign affairs of a fellow American nation. Nicaragua placed its troops on alert, Peru recalled its Ambassador to the United States and Venezuela said it would not recognize the new Government of Guillermo Endara until United States troops were withdrawn.

Leftist groups in Argentina, Uruguay and Mexico planned public rallies to protest the move. United States diplomatic employees across the continent were instructed to be on the alert for anti-American demonstrations.

...

In Cuba, the Communist Government condemned this "new imperialist aggression against our Latin American peoples." Cuba's Foreign Ministry described the military move as "incredible evidence of the disdain of the United States for international law."

...

In Nicaragua, the leftist Government called the United States invasion "a serious threat to Nicaragua" and placed the armed forces on "a state of general fighting alert."

New York Times / 22 Dec 1989, P. A20; Foreign desk / **Fighting in Panama: Nicaragua; Army Told to Surround U.S. Embassy as Reply to Move in Panama** / Reuters

...

[Nicaraguan Foreign Minister] Mr. d'Escoto called in the United States charge d'affaires, John Leonard, to protest the United States action at the Nicaraguan Embassy, which he called a violation of international law.

...

New York Times / 23 Dec 1989, p. 15; Foreign desk / **Fighting in Panama: United Nations; Council Deadlocked on Panama Rivals** / By Paul Lewis

...

But the Soviet Union, China and the Council's seven nonaligned members from the developing world refuse to confer any legitimacy on Mr. Endara's Government because it was brought to power by the United States strike, which they contend is a violation of the United Nations Charter and international law.

New York Times / 22 Dec 1989, p. A20; Foreign desk / **Fighting in Panama: Beijing; China Calls U.S. Strike in Panama A Violation of International Law** / By Steven Erlanger

Saying it is "shocked," China today condemned the American military strike in Panama as a violation of international law and demanded the immediate withdrawal of American forces.

The statement, issued by the Chinese Foreign Ministry late this morning, came nearly a day after a similar condemnation of the American action by the Soviet Union. . . The Foreign Ministry statement called the American action "a military invasion" and said it "constitutes an infringement against a sovereign state of the third world and violates the norms of international law and the aims and purposes of the United Nations Charter. "We were shocked and condemn this act," the statement said. China, the ministry said, "firmly opposes any country's interference in the internal affairs of another country under any pretext and in any form, particularly by the use of military force."

New York Times / 29 Dec 1989, p. A12; Foreign desk / **After Noriega: United Nations; Two Delegates Vying to Be the Voice of the New Government** / By Paul Lewis

But United Nations officials say they expect Cuba or Nicaragua to challenge Mr. Abadi's right to address the Assembly on the ground that he represents an illegitimate government installed by American force.

...

The United States is certain to oppose such a move. "For us Ambassador Vallarino and Ambassador Adabi are the only legitimate Panamanian representatives in the Assembly," James Wilkinson, who represented the United States at the opening of the debate today, said afterward.

Last week when the United Nations Security Council debated the Panamanian invasion, it split over the legitimacy of the Endara Government. The Soviet Union, China and eight third world members refused to let President Endara's representative address the meeting, saying they did not want to confer legitimacy on a government brought to power by American force.

In the end the Council admitted it was deadlocked over the new government and decided not to invite any Panamanian representative to take part in its debate, which ended with the United States, Britain and France vetoing a resolution that condemned the American invasion. The resolution introduced by Nicaragua and Cuba today says the United Nations "strongly deplores the intervention in Panama by the armed forces of the United States of America which constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence, sovereignty and territoriality of states."

New York Times / 30 Dec 1989, p. 6; Foreign desk / **After Noriega: United Nations; Deal Is Reached at U.N. on Panama Seat as Invasion Is Condemned** / By Paul Lewis

A representative of the Government of President Guillermo Endara of Panama was given only a limited right to speak at the United Nations today as a resolution criticizing the American invasion was approved as expected.

Under a compromise worked out with other Latin American nations, the new Panamanian Government withdrew its request to address the General Assembly in return for an agreement from other nations not to challenge its representative's right to take part in the meeting. Leon Abadi, a 17-year diplomat from Panama's United Nations Mission who supports the new Government, agreed to speak only after the General Assembly had voted on a resolution "strongly deploring" the American invasion as a "flagrant violation of international law." As a result, both sides achieved limited success in the battle over the legitimacy of the Endara Government, diplomats say. The new Panamanian Government obtained qualified representation at the Assembly meeting, while its opponents argue that Mr. Abadi was there only because the Government of Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega had appointed him as its representative.

Smaller Margin Than Expected

The resolution criticizing the invasion was approved but by a smaller margin than many had expected, with 75 mainly third-world and East bloc nations voting in favor, 20 nations voting against and 39 abstaining. Cape Verde did not take part in the vote.

The General Assembly vote puts the international community on record as opposing the American invasion, after the United States, Britain and France used their vetoes in the United Nations Security Council last week to block adoption of a similar resolution.

The United States was joined by many of its allies in opposing the resolution, including Britain, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Japan, Turkey, Israel, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and El Salvador. But Spain, Austria, Finland and Sweden voted in favor, while Greece, Ireland and Honduras joined those abstaining. Explaining Panama's vote against the resolution, Mr. Abadi told the Assembly afterward that President Endara's legitimacy rested on his presumed victory in the May elections, which were annulled by General Noriega. He said the American invasion was the price Panama had accepted to pay for the restoration of democracy.

A Deal Is Reached

In return for Panama's not been allowed to speak during today's debate, Cuba, Nicaragua and other nations opposed to the United States invasion agreed not to challenge Mr. Abadi's right to occupy Panama's seat in the Assembly or to vote against the resolution they had sponsored.

...

Defending the Bush Administration's decision to overthrow the Noriega Government, M. James Wilkinson, the American deputy representative here, said the United States was seeking to advance democracy in a year marked by a spectacular expansion in freedom around the world. But virtually every other speaker today criticized the invasion, seeing it as a violation of the ban against interference in other countries' internal affairs contained in the United Nations Charter. Many described America's assertion to be acting in self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter as absurd for a superpower facing so small and weak a nation as Panama.

New York Times / 30 Dec 1989, p. 6; Foreign desk / **After Noriega: Vatican is Blaming U.S. for Impasse on Noriega's Fate** / By Robert Suro

...

When Mr. Navarro, Mr. Fitzwater's counterpart in the Vatican, was asked about the blockade of the Papal Nunciature in Panama City by American troops and their practice of blasting the building with rock music, he said it was "a very serious matter," unacceptable under international law because it interfered with diplomatic activity.

...

New York Times / 2 Jan 1990, P. A8; Editorial desk / **Reason and Law Reject Our Panama Invasion**

To the Editor:

"Why the Invasion Was Justified" (editorial, Dec. 21) finds legal substance in two of the four reasons President Bush gave for ordering United States troops to change the government of Panama. I doubt that objective observers or history will agree. Nor is there much legal strength in the declaration of war by Panama rationale, not used by the President for good reason, but mentioned by you.

...

Finally, to legal results. The law we violated involves our treaty commitments (the United Nations Charter, the Rio Pact of 1947, the Bogota Charter of 1948, the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977; probably the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, when we closed the canal early in its operation, and possibly others). We have been demeaned by our attempts to ignore those commitments or explain them in interpretations that nobody can believe who has read them and who is aware of the political situation in Panama.

...

ALFRED P. RUBIN
Professor of International Law
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Medford, Mass., Dec. 22, 1989

New York Times / 9 Jan 1990, p. A14; National desk / **The U.S. and Panama: The O.A.S.; U.S. Faulted for Search of Nicaragua Residence in Panama** / AP

The Organization of American States declared in a resolution tonight that the penetration by American troops of the Nicaraguan Ambassador's residence in Panama was a violation of international laws that insure the immunity of diplomatic missions.

The vote was 19 to 0, with six countries joining the United States in abstaining.

The American Representative, Luigi Einaudi, acknowledged that the American soldiers had made a mistake. He asserted that they had entered the building in a search for weapons without knowing it was the Ambassador's residence. Mr. Einaudi said he did not oppose the resolution because the United States fully supports the laws which spell out the inviolability of diplomatic missions.

UN General Assembly / Resolution A/RES/44/240 / 29 December 1989 / **Effects of the military intervention by the United States of America in Panama on the situation in Central America** [vote: 75–20–40]

The General Assembly,

Taking note of the statements made in the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding the invasion of Panama,

Reaffirming the sovereign and inalienable right of Panama to determine freely its social, economic and political system and to develop its international relations without any form of foreign intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat,

Recalling that, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, all Member States 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,

Reaffirming the need to restore conditions which will guarantee the full exercise of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Panamanian people,

Expressing its profound concern at the serious consequences the armed intervention by the United States of America in Panama might have for peace and security in the Central American region,

1. Strongly deplores the intervention in Panama by the armed forces of the United States of America, which constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States;
2. Demands the immediate cessation of the intervention and the withdrawal from Panama of the armed invasion forces of the United States;
3. Demands also full respect for and strict observance of the letter and spirit of the Torrijos-Carter Treaties;
4. Calls upon all States to uphold and respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Panama;
5. Requests the Secretary-General to monitor the developments in Panama and to report to the General Assembly within twenty-four hours after the adoption of the present resolution.

New York Times / 7 Aug 1990, p. A1; Foreign desk / **Security Council Votes 13 to 0 to Block Trade with Baghdad** / By Paul Lewis

The United Nations Security Council today registered its outrage over Iraq's invasion of Kuwait by ordering a far-reaching trade and financial boycott on Iraq and occupied Kuwait. The sanctions, approved just five days after the Council condemned the invasion and demanded that Baghdad immediately withdraw its forces, prohibit all United Nations members from buying oil from either Iraq or occupied Kuwait or having virtually any other commercial or financial dealings with them. [Text of the resolution, page A9.] The embargo won the support of 13 of the Council's 15 members, including all five of the permanent members, which have veto power in the Council - Britain, China, France, the Soviet Union and the United States. Yemen, the only Arab member, and Cuba abstained.

Third Use of Trade Sanctions

This is only the third time in United Nations history that the Council has sought to discipline a country defying its orders by imposing trade sanctions. The earlier actions involved Rhodesia in 1967, after its declaration of independence from Britain, and a ban on arms sales to South Africa.

The vote was welcomed by many participants as a sign that the Security Council was emerging from a long period of cold war paralysis and starting to exercise its responsibility under the Charter for enforcing peace and security around the globe.

Council Action Praised

Britain's representative, Sir Crispin Tickell, said the Council had "faced its responsibilities" and must now "succeed where the League of Nations failed and the Security Council itself had faltered in the past."

The United Nations has only limited means of enforcing compliance with today's sanctions, leaving its members to insure that the measures are respected.

...

U.S. Sees Lesson for Iraq

The United States representative, Thomas R. Pickering, said the sanctions plan would show Iraq that "its disregard for international law will have crippling political and economic costs, including but not limited to arms cutoffs."

"Our concerted resolve," he said, "will demonstrate that the international community does not and will not accept Baghdad's preference for the use of force, coercion and intimidation."

...

Aside from Cuba and Yemen, the resolution was supported by the Council's 10 rotating members, including Canada, Finland and Romania, representing the industrialized northern countries, Ethiopia, Ivory Coast and Zaire from Africa, the single Asian member, Malaysia, and Colombia, which with Cuba forms the Latin American contingent. Britain and Finland said that the embargo was a substitute for military intervention in the dispute and should not be seen as a prelude to it.

...

New York Times / 10 Aug 1990, p. A11; Foreign desk / **Confrontation in the Gulf; U.N. Council Declares Void Iraqi Annexation of Kuwait** / By Paul Lewis

The United Nations Security Council voted unanimously today to declare Iraq's formal annexation of Kuwait null and void in international law. The decision is legally binding on all members of

the organization. But Iraq's United Nations representative defended his Government's action as ending an artificial division of the Arab world created in the last century by what he called the imperialist powers. The representatives of the United States and Kuwait's government-in-exile promptly pointed out that this argument could justify further annexations of Arab countries. The resolution, which was supported by all 15 Council members, said the annexation "has no legal validity and is declared null and void."

It tells all countries and international organizations they must not recognize the annexation or take any actions "that might be interpreted as an indirect recognition of the annexation." And it "demands that Iraq rescind its actions purporting to annex Kuwait."

Unanimous Condemnation

This is the third time the Security Council has condemned Baghdad's takeover of Kuwait since the invasion last week, though it is the first time the Council has unanimously done so. But while Yemen refused to participate in the first vote last Thursday condemning the invasion and Cuba and Yemen abstained in Monday's vote imposing economic sanctions, no member opposed any of these decisions. After the Council had voted and most members made brief speeches denouncing President Saddam Hussein's aggression for the third time in a week, Iraq's Representative, Abdul Amir al-Anbari, told the Council that "those who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones." Iraq's annexation, he said, was an attempt to end the "splintering of the region" caused by the colonial powers that had "transformed the Arab nation into 22 Arab states, redrawing the map of the region." It was part of the reunification of his country, he said. The United States representative, Thomas R. Pickering, and the Kuwaiti representative, Mohammed A. Abulhasan, immediately pointed out that this argument could be used to justify the takeover of other Arab countries.

...

New York Times / 23 Aug 1990, p. A16; National desk / **Confrontation in the Gulf; Transcript of News Session by Bush and 2 Officials on Mideast**

Following is the transcript of the news conference by President Bush, Defense Secretary Dick Cheney and Gen. Colin L. Powell yesterday in Kennebunkport, Me., as recorded by The New York Times:

...

Q. Mr. President, despite demands from the Iraqis that the U.S. and other countries close their embassies in Kuwait and remove all their diplomatic personnel, the State Department announced today that the U.S. would not do that. Why have you decided to take that course of action? And how can you possibly enforce that?

A. Because the occupation of Kuwait is illegal under international law and other countries agree totally that we must not take the position that this illegal regime can shut down legitimate embassies as a result of their aggression, that's why.

...

Q. Mr. President, how constrained do you feel by the Americans trapped in Kuwait as you make your decisions by the plight of the Americans?

A. I think any decision maker in the United States or in any of these countries is concerned about the lives of innocent civilians, innocent people. And so you weigh that very thoroughly against your actions. Having said that, international law in this case, the Chapter 7 sanctions, must be enforced.

...

Q. Are you preparing Americans for the possibility of war and American deaths?

A. I think any time you move American forces and any time you are up against what most of the world now considers to be an outrageous violator of international law, the best thing is to be prepared.

...

Q. Another sense of the enormity of this buildup, the reports have come during the Secretary's visit that the Saudis wanted -preparing to send them the most advanced fighters, the F-15E's. Is that, in fact, the case? And isn't there a political problem with that?

A. I will let Secretary Cheney address it himself to it. But the Saudis have been threatened. A neighboring country has been aggressed against. International law has condemned it. We should do all we can to help the Saudis arm themselves against aggression, and so he can talk 15E's or some other weapon system. I want to do everything I can, and I hope there would be no political problem because the world clearly sees that the Saudis have been strongly threatened, Charles.

...

Q. Mr. President, we asked you last week if you saw any hope of a diplomatic solution. You said, "I don't see it right now." Do these statements from Baghdad that they are willing to put their cards on the table increase the hopes there will be a diplomatic solution?

A. If they're willing to put all their cards on the table, that's good. I didn't hear that, but if they're willing to put them all out there, including complying with international law, that would be good. And in terms of readiness to talk, we've got a very able person there in Baghdad who is prepared to talk, and they came in the other day and said they'd like to talk. Well, here he is available to talk. But please don't tell us that they're going to talk with conditions that are unacceptable under international law, because that is not, that's not the way it would work. The world community has made a strong statement, a very strong statement, and I don't sense any view in the world community that it is going to back away from that statement. And that statement included removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the restoration of the rulers. Yeah, Charles, last one.

Q. Mr. President, somebody's got to ask the tough question. You talked about conservation. Does that include Fidelity?

A. I'm going to keep using my boat. And I hope the rest of America will prudently recreate. I don't think we've reached the point where I want to call on everybody in the recreation industry to shut it down or everybody that's taking a vacation in America to shut it down. It's not a tough question; it's a very fair question. And I would simply say that there's a lot of industry, a lot of people that have been looking forward to vacations in this country, and I would not suggest that the situation at home requires they stay at home now, or that they don't use their recreational facilities. Yeah?