

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

APR 30 1990



SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2362nd MEETING: 22 MAY 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2362)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Question concerning the situation in the region of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas):	
(a) Letter dated 4 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15037);	
(b) Letter dated 20 May 1982 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15099);	
(c) Letter dated 21 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15100)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2362nd MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 22 May 1982, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. LING Qing (China).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2362)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Question concerning the situation in the region of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas):
 - (a) Letter dated 4 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15037);
 - (b) Letter dated 20 May 1982 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15099);
 - (c) Letter dated 21 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15100)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Question concerning the situation in the region of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas):

- (a) Letter dated 4 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15037);
- (b) Letter dated 20 May 1982 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15099);
- (c) Letter dated 21 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15100)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like, at the outset of this meeting, to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, Mr. Jorge E. Illueca, for attending the Council meeting. On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to him.

2. In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2360th meeting, I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Costa Méndez (Argentina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Jacobs (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Street (Australia), Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Azar Gómez (Uruguay) and Mr. Zambrano Velasco (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bolivia, Canada, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Honduras, New Zealand, Nicaragua and Peru, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ortiz Sanz (Bolivia), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Maye Ela (Equatorial Guinea), Mr. Delprée Crespo (Guatemala), Mr. Lobo (Honduras), Mr. Francis (New Zealand), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua) and Mr. Calle y Calle (Peru) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like to inform members that I have just received two letters, dated 22 May, from the representative of Argentina to the United Nations, which will be distributed during the course of this meeting under the symbols S/15102 and S/15103.

5. Mr. de PINIÈS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like first to extend a special greeting to the Foreign Ministers who are honouring us with their presence. Regrettably, this is a true measure of the tragic hour through which mankind is living.

The hour is critical and the circumstances most adverse. Their presence here will highlight these debates. Nevertheless, I would have preferred that they should not have had to come to New York, because this is a time of extreme gravity. May I extend a special welcome to Mr. Illueca, the Foreign Minister of Panama, which is a member of the Council, to Mr. Costa Méndez, the Foreign Minister of Argentina, and to Mr. Zambrano Velasco, the Foreign Minister of Venezuela.

6. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on the skill and diplomatic flair with which you are discharging your functions at a particularly decisive and critical time both for the United Nations and for world peace. I am especially grateful for the promptness with which you have been informing us, the members of the Council, about the grave crisis which is developing in the Malvinas Islands.

7. I should like to thank the Secretary-General for his good offices in the conciliatory mission he has been carrying out with the utmost diligence, sparing neither effort, firmness, skill nor perseverance. My country also wishes to place on record the debt of gratitude we owe the Secretary-General, because we believe that had it not been for his efforts and tireless exertions the situation would have been far more critical and the positions of the two parties to the conflict would have been even further removed from the objective Spain desires: the cessation of hostilities and a negotiated understanding on the substance of the problem. Unfortunately, the Secretary-General himself felt that it was his painful duty to inform the President of the Council that the negotiations he had undertaken with the Council's support offered no prospect of an end to the crisis or preventing intensification of the conflict.

8. The Government of Spain deeply deplores the fact that it was impossible to arrive at an understanding and a contractual arrangement which, in strict application of the doctrine of decolonization, would from the outset have spared us violence by making possible the peaceful restoration of Argentine territorial integrity. This would have prevented a war for which there is no justification and a terrible breach between two peoples belonging to the same Western civilization.

9. In the circumstances, and as is indicated in the Secretary-General's letter to the President of the Council [S/15099], we members of the Council must be fully aware of the responsibility which is incumbent upon us under the Charter of the United Nations. The Security Council is the proper body to act effectively and to prevent an irreparable loss of human lives and the escalation of a conflict the consequences of which are becoming disastrous for world peace. A formal meeting was postponed during the last few days simply because we still hoped that the negotiations then under way between Argentina and the

United Kingdom, through the mediation of the Secretary-General, would yield the desired results. But we can wait no longer. We are faced with the historic responsibility of ending this senseless war and paving the way for negotiations and peace.

10. My delegation's attitude in regard to the Malvinas question was reflected in my statement of 3 April to the Council [2350th meeting]. Nevertheless, as there have been further developments, I shall try to summarize as briefly as possible the most important points of our position.

11. At the beginning of the crisis, my Government expressed its concern over the situation created in the Malvinas and pointed out Spain's consistent position on the substance of the problem, to the effect that decolonization should take place by ensuring Argentine territorial integrity and safeguarding the interests of the population. On the other hand, the Government of Spain stated that it was opposed to the use of force as a means of settling disputes and insisted that the channels for achieving a peaceful solution through the United Nations should be kept open.

12. On 1 May, on being informed of the British military action, the Government of Spain warned of the dangers of unleashing a generalized and massive military action in the archipelago, which would inevitably lead to grievous loss of human life. At that time, my Government pointed out the very grave responsibility of allowing the escalation to continue unchecked and described this in advance as a serious historical mistake. That prediction and omen have unfortunately been confirmed in the intense confrontation in the American hemisphere and the distressing breach between two continents.

13. His Majesty King Juan Carlos I addressed a letter to the Secretary-General dated 5 May, from which I shall quote the following paragraphs:

"I cannot remain unmoved by the confrontation between two peoples, nor can I contemplate, without deep emotion, the loss of human life which this entails.

"I believe that there is a just and honourable solution to every problem through talks and peaceful measures, in a spirit of peace, without reaching irreparable consequences.

"For my part, I offer with the utmost selflessness all my goodwill and assistance in order to contribute in any way which may be deemed appropriate to the attainment of peace and justice."

14. In spite of that appeal and those of several heads of State made during those days, the conflict was aggravated and military confrontation dramatically intensified. In these circumstances, we must with the utmost urgency take a decision reflecting the neces-

sary political balance for it to be viable and envisaging, together with an immediate cessation of hostilities, a separation of the forces and a military withdrawal, and setting in motion a negotiating mechanism, under the auspices of the United Nations, which will ensure respect for the principles of the Charter, including, in particular, the prohibition of the use of force in international relations, and the application of the relevant United Nations resolutions on the Malvinas question. Those resolutions, which Spain supported at the time in the General Assembly, provide the necessary basis for a peaceful settlement of the dispute through negotiations.

15. Cessation of hostilities, negotiation and peace—those should be the priorities of our action. Cessation of hostilities, because too much blood has already been shed in this conflict, a conflict that began with an act of force and that, through warlike escalation and extended military action, has become a tragic historical error and is opening an abyss of misunderstanding between Ibero-America and Europe that Spain, as a member of both the European and the Ibero-American communities, deplors more deeply than any other country.

16. Negotiation to put an end to the colonial situation in the Malvinas should be undertaken without reservations and with the determination to dispel the long absence of the negotiating spirit that cannot be overlooked when making a true evaluation of the conflict.

17. And, at the end of our effort, in which we must not give in to discouragement, peace—an honourable, negotiated peace, a just peace that will result from pacific and concerted action and never from the imposition of military force, which is of necessity painful and precarious. History abounds with examples that prove the stubborn sterility of violence, the uselessness of solutions brought about by war and bearing the seeds of death, destruction and the invasive virus of new discords and violence.

18. With that hope of achieving peace and removing the scourge of war—a peace based on the provisions of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions—my country is prepared to support a draft resolution that, in accordance with the principles I have enunciated, will bring about a peaceful solution.

19. As the Secretary-General indicated yesterday in his statement to the Council, one that we should bear very much in mind:

“It remains my belief that an agreement along the lines developed in the exchanges over the past two weeks, incorporating the approaches suggested in my aide-mémoire of 19 May, could restore peace in the South Atlantic and open the way for an enduring solution of the long-standing dispute between two Member States” [2360th meeting, para. 21].

20. We must energetically take up the Secretary-General's proposal again and build upon it, with the thought that with the appointment of his representative and a team of observers chosen from among the parties to the dispute, a beginning could be made in establishing the bases of a future negotiation.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Uruguay. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. AZAR GOMEZ (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay is grateful for having been given the opportunity to participate in this meeting on a matter of such gravity and of such special concern to my Government, as a peace-loving country and as a Latin American country.

23. At appropriate times and in various international forums, Uruguay has repeatedly stated its position regarding the rights of sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies, a position that we now most energetically reaffirm.

24. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, Mr. Estanislao Valdés Otero, at the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States (OAS), convened in accordance with the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, stated:

“Uruguay and Argentina gained independent life in the first half of the nineteenth century. They come from the same noble Hispanic roots, and together they undertook to engage in a heroic struggle for the recovery and defence of their national sovereignties. In their joint history, they have had to face and vanquish foreign interventions aimed at interfering with their consolidation as independent and sovereign nations.

“Today, however, like our sister republics of America, we are present here, independent and sovereign. That is the lesson of history that some Governments seem unable to understand, thinking as they do that America can be a propitious ground on which to carry out their colonial aspirations.”

25. Mr. Valdés Otero also stated:

“America is present and united. Colonial aspirations run counter to the path of history and the norms of law, and any victory that might be achieved by weapons will only be the source of future suffering by the civilization which we Americans and the British share—not our civilization, but rather that of our children and of future generations.”

26. Argentina's historical claims to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies are

sound and clear. The territories in question were part of the Vice-Regency of Río de la Plata attached to the Naval Station at Montevideo, and thus could hardly be considered to be land subject to an appropriation régime.

27. In 1833, Britain, through an act of force, occupied the Malvinas Islands; an act of force can bestow no rights. Not only did Argentina never consent to that act of despoliation, but from that moment it began to make, through diplomatic channels, its claims for the full restoration of its sovereign rights.

28. As we see it, the present situation must be analysed within the context of and in the light of the fundamental principle of the territorial integrity of States that is clearly reaffirmed in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which enshrines the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and which states:

“Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.”

29. One of the most fruitful tasks of the United Nations has been that of leading to independent life scores of nations that today occupy with supreme dignity their places in our assemblies. We now face a specific instance in that long and noble process of decolonization, and Uruguay is doing no more than applying the general principles set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

30. We firmly support the convening of this meeting and we make a strong appeal to the Council to see that solutions permitting the restoration of peace in the South Atlantic will emerge from it.

31. Seeking solutions through war operations, such as those now taking place, can only satisfy temporary political interests by attempting to legalize a situation of force which must be viewed as contrary to international law, and as jeopardizing—at the cost of young lives—the undertaking of negotiations that will lead us to the much desired peaceful solution of the dispute.

32. Uruguay has with great concern followed, day by day and minute by minute, the situation created by the conflict involving the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies. In particular, we wish to state that we have in the last few days followed very closely the development of the negotiations carried out by the Secretary-General.

33. We should like at this stage to place the greatest emphasis on our profound respect for the objective,

calm and measured way in which the Secretary-General has conducted the negotiations, ensuring, by means of his meticulous negotiating procedure, orderly contacts between the Governments.

34. We regret that that negotiating procedure, which had been tacitly accepted by both parties, was interrupted by the submission on 17 May of a draft interim agreement on the conflict by the representative of the United Kingdom.

35. We believe that the efforts of the Secretary-General made a substantial contribution to clarifying the basic points of difference between the positions of Argentina and the United Kingdom; both Governments, in the light of those differences, should analyse the inevitable necessity of resuming negotiations, for it is clear that the only course which can put an end to bloodshed and to the threat to world peace is peaceful negotiation to bring this dispute to an end.

36. As Latin Americans, we are pleased to see a willingness to negotiate amply demonstrated by the Argentine Government which, despite its uncontested rights of sovereignty over the islands, agreed to begin negotiations within the framework of Article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, that is, without prejudice to the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned.

37. In this very forum, too, Argentina has stated its readiness to comply with the provisions of resolution 502 (1982), a willingness which it could not put into full effect owing to the dispatch southwards, immediately following the adoption of that resolution, of a powerful fleet whose warlike preparations and subsequent warlike actions clearly violate the spirit and letter of resolution 502 (1982), thus leading to a series of hostilities which had not taken place at the time of the adoption of that resolution.

38. We most vigorously condemn these hostilities, which are now taking place openly in the form of a bloody attack launched against the Malvinas Islands.

39. A formula must urgently be drawn up to put an end to the armed attacks. We call on the Council to make every effort to seek for a measure which would call for the following:

1. Immediate cessation of the hostilities. Beyond the central purpose, which is that of saving many innocent young lives, this would also halt a far-reaching military escalation with unforeseeable consequences, an escalation which would make an urgent solution more difficult by further alienating the parties.

2. A formal mandate to be given to the Secretary-General to resume negotiations aiming at a peaceful settlement of the dispute. The tireless efforts made by the Secretary-General to bring about a solution of the problem, and the formulas which he submitted at

various times to the parties to help them to come to an agreement, constitute, in our view, sufficient grounds for the Council, acting in fulfilment of its responsibilities, immediately to entrust to the Secretary-General the task of resuming negotiations.

3. Conservation of and respect for the six points on which essential agreement had been reached. In his statement to the Council yesterday, the Secretary-General informed us that in his opinion essential agreement had been reached on six points [*ibid.*, para. 15], which, in our view, should form the framework for resuming the negotiations.

40. In maintaining the position we have just set out, our aim is not to damage one set of interests or promote another set.

41. Uruguay is acting in defence of the principles it has always upheld. We do this, of course, with the fervour which has always marked our defence of just and noble causes.

42. Our only weapons are the constant protection of law, and freedom, which are indispensable factors for any achievement in the higher sphere of the well-being and coexistence of peoples.

43. At this difficult time, we must remain fully aware that we are controlled by the world. The United Nations must act immediately, without limitations and with a sense of urgency, to find a just, peaceful and lasting solution, based on respect for the rules of international law, and to bring about an immediate cessation of hostilities, which would have a calming effect, ensure a lasting peace and normalize relations between the nations.

44. That is what is expected of us now, for it is the reason for having founded the United Nations, whose very existence is also at stake.

45. In that connection, we must recall that the failure of the League of Nations, and its end, came about precisely because of its ineffectiveness in avoiding the crisis of the 1930s. All that is not so far in the past that we can forget it in the present circumstances.

46. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Colombia, El Salvador and Paraguay, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sanz de Santamaria (Colombia), Mr. Rosales Rivera (El

Salvador) and Mr. González Arias (Paraguay) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

47. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Mr. José Alberto Zambrano Velasco. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

48. Mr. ZAMBRANO VELASCO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. We are sure that your long and distinguished diplomatic career, which we Venezuelans have been particularly able to appreciate, will enable the Council, in this particularly difficult time for the Organization, to exercise its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

49. Venezuela requested a hearing in the Council because of the special interest it takes, as a Latin American nation, in the crisis caused by the warlike conduct of the United Kingdom against the Argentine Republic in an area defined as a security zone by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

50. Latin America is a family of peoples. We cannot stand aloof from anything that occurs there. Any act of aggression against one of its members affects it as a whole and is therefore unacceptable.

51. The organ of consultation of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance clearly expressed the solidarity of our nations with the Argentine Republic at this difficult time in its history.

52. On the occasion of the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States (OAS), convened in Washington on 28 April, in accordance with the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, Venezuela criticized the procedures of the Security Council, which enabled permanent members, with their right of veto, to enjoy a system of concealment and impunity in order to wage war or to protect the warlike adventures of their allies, with the certainty that no sanction or warning from the Council would affect them.

53. The support given to British aggression by the United States has an unpredictable effect on the life of the present regional organization—the OAS—and the hemispheric security system embodied in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. The future of these instruments concerns our own national interests. What has occurred gives cause for profound reflection, in particular with regard to the future. We think, furthermore, that world balance and inter-continental relations are being seriously affected by this tragic conflict.

54. Accordingly, my country asked to take part in this meeting of the Council. The conflict taking place in the South Atlantic is much more than a bilateral confrontation between the United Kingdom and Argentina. Given its nature and consequences, it affects to a greater or lesser degree all the other States in Latin America and relations between Europe and Latin America.

55. Venezuela comes to the Council in the name of peace. We wish to make our critical points of view heard. We wish to reaffirm our solidarity with the Argentine Republic. We are acting in accordance with the positions and stands which we have taken. We hope that the Council will be able to prove its effectiveness by bringing about an immediate end to the war, the essential pre-condition of any subsequent civilized effort—political and diplomatic—to resolve the crisis.

56. Venezuela has very serious comments and objections to express regarding Council resolution 502 (1982). We have described it as biased and pro-colonialist, with solid arguments to support our emphatic charge.

57. Venezuela is here as a result of a cry for peace, a yearning for peace, increasingly acute as the war drags on and worsens.

58. Despite our criticism of resolution 502 (1982), we think that complete compliance with that resolution by both the United Kingdom and Argentina would have made possible a peaceful settlement.

59. In the organ of consultation of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and in the United Nations, Argentina has expressed its willingness to comply fully with that resolution provided the United Kingdom also strictly complies, but the United Kingdom has ignored the resolution, which it had proposed, and has embarked on a tragic warlike adventure which has already cost many innocent lives and which it is necessary to bring to an end immediately.

60. The actions of the United Kingdom since the adoption of resolution 502 (1982) constitute clear violations of that resolution.

61. First, there was the decision to dispatch the fleet, clearly contrary to the demands of the Council, which called unequivocally on both parties to cease hostilities immediately. The British decision constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

62. Secondly, the diplomatic activities carried out by the United Kingdom within the European Community to bring about the imposition of trade sanctions against Argentina constitute an unprecedented act of economic aggression, carried out in blatant violation of all international law.

63. The arrogant conduct of the Government of the United Kingdom has produced a split in the unity of

its European allies, which distrust the purposes and the scope of the armed action undertaken by it.

64. Thirdly, the warlike presence of nuclear submarines in the area defined by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance as a hemispheric zone of security constitutes a use of nuclear energy for non-peaceful purposes, in violation of commitments subscribed to by the United Kingdom itself which have made Latin America the only nuclear-free zone in the world. The United Kingdom has thereby created an extremely serious threat to peace.

65. Fourthly, the declaration of a sea and air exclusion zone around the Malvinas Islands constitutes, under international law, a hostile act against not merely the other party to the conflict but the other members of the international community. Not satisfied with its declaration, Great Britain proceeded to violate its own provisions by sinking the cruiser *General Belgrano* outside the 200-mile area.

66. Fifthly, the United Kingdom has established another 100-mile zone around Ascension Island, which constitutes a serious threat to civil aviation of States outside the conflict.

67. Sixthly, to confirm once and for all the falsehood of the claim of self-defence made by the United Kingdom, that country proceeded to decree a 12-mile blockade off the coast of continental Argentina.

68. The United Kingdom is seeking to justify all its breaches of resolution 502 (1982), which it presented itself, by invoking the right of self-defence as enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. However, that Article only endorses such a right until the Security Council has taken the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security.

69. Accordingly, since the Council had adopted resolution 502 (1982), the United Kingdom could not, without gravely violating the Charter and the resolution of the Council, engage in all the hostile acts to which we have referred.

70. As has been said, one cannot invoke self-defence in this case as that would only apply, following the adoption of a resolution by the Council, if the state of hostilities continued without interruption, which clearly has not happened. On the contrary, the United Kingdom's actions led to a new opening of hostilities.

71. There is no rule of international law that justifies the United Kingdom's armed action which has brought war to the American continent. No provision of the Charter can be used to justify this irrational conduct.

72. From the very moment that the United Kingdom decided to resort to the Security Council for the adoption of the necessary measures for the maintenance of

international peace and security, it entrusted the Council with the exercise of the attributes which the Charter confers upon it for such purposes.

73. The United Kingdom obtained a resolution which has come in for serious criticism. But not satisfied with that, it proceeded, on the one hand, not to fulfil it and, on the other, to allege, in clear violation of Article 51 of the Charter, a supposed exercise of self-defence in order to attack Argentina. The United Kingdom resolved to act as if the Security Council had decided to impose sanctions on Argentina and had commissioned the British fleet to carry them out. The British Government has made a mockery of the world system of collective security.

74. The purpose of this conduct appears merely to be to use the decision of the Council as justification or an excuse for action which is shocking the world today and which has cost hundreds of human lives.

75. While the United Kingdom was carrying out all these activities which we have described, threatening peace and security, the Council did not deem it fit, for the preservation of peace, to adopt other measures apart from those contained in resolution 502 (1982)—neither measures that do not entail the use of armed force, referred to in Article 41 of the Charter, nor measures which do entail the use of force, pursuant to the provisions of Article 42.

76. The United Kingdom is thus trying to get a comprehensive right to use force on the strength of its capacity to paralyse the Council through its right of veto.

77. Therefore, the British action runs counter to the most elementary human rights, to the Charter of the United Nations and to all the practice of the Organization in connection with decolonization. From this point of view, it is unacceptable for an attempt to be made to justify ruthless aggression by alleging adherence to the principle of the rule of law.

78. This principle cannot be used to justify an injustice backed up by the use of force, in accordance with colonial practices. That is why we have insisted that this problem must be fully analysed, taking into account the historical, geographic, political and ethical background, since if that is not done legal principle will be stripped of its fairness and reduced to the law of empire, in the twentieth century, to cover all colonialist abuses.

79. While all these events were taking place, an intense effort to find peace was being carried out by the Secretary-General. In that process, once again Argentina's willingness to be flexible about its position in order to find a peaceful solution to the problem and to save hundreds of innocent lives was very clear. Argentina tailored its conduct to the lines set forth by the International Court of Justice in this connection:

in other words, it acted diligently to find a way to reconcile positions so that negotiations would be meaningful and not become a mere exercise in intransigence.

80. However, once again this effort ran up against the inflexible arrogance of the British Government. What the British Government is seeking is the restoration by force of its colonial title in South America. It is an exercise in imperial doctrines which are self-perpetuating. If we follow this logic, violent occupation dragged out for 150 years cannot hope to be reimposed except by war.

81. The same British attitude to the just and continuing claim of Argentina is not unrelated to the origins of the present conflict. Heedless and impatient, England refused to carry out its international obligation to preserve peace. Thus, we have a story of intransigence and violence by the United Kingdom.

82. As President Luis Herrera Campíns said:

“While it is true that, as the Charter of the United Nations states, one may presume that the aggressor is the person who first resorts to force, such a conclusion is not inevitable but a mere presumption.

“Violence and force adopt subtle methods in order to hold sway. The neglect, disregard, unpleasantness and, on many occasions, even contempt shown for years in the face of the proposals and claims of the weakest addressed to the most powerful are part of these subtle forms of violence.

“Peaceful efforts to solve the problems have come up against the indifference of the international community and the peevishness of the powerful who have normally involved themselves in these disputes. The weak nations see that the strong can use force with impunity. They are helpless witnesses of the prolongation of conflicts sustained by powerful countries. This state of affairs constitutes encouragement of the use of force.”

83. The international community is witnessing with amazement and indignation acts of aggression committed by a Government which has the gall to violate the very norms which it promoted, including those which it arbitrarily established unilaterally. Indeed, the British Government proposed the text for Council resolution 502 (1982) and staked out a war zone around the Malvinas Islands which its own forces with utter treachery then proceeded to violate. The dispatch of the aggressive fleet and the criminal sinking of the cruiser *General Belgrano* outside the exclusion zone, which, totally contrary to law, had been established by the United Kingdom, are clearest proof of the contempt of the present British Government for the law and for their own standards of conduct. British aggression, therefore, is not a struggle for the defence of the rule of law, as they claim, but an attempt to restore the law of empire.

84. The British Government has declared, in the words of the Prime Minister herself, that it is necessary to punish those who seek territorial advantage by force. It is thereby seeking to justify a priori the escalation of military action against Argentina. If the circumstances were not so tragic, such a declaration would be amusing, since, if this principle were to be applied, no citizen of the United Kingdom could go anywhere in the world without exposing himself to the punishment to which the head of the British Government refers. The British Empire extended its colonial domination around the world through the brutal, systematic and calculated use of force, committing innumerable acts against the dignity of peoples. How can we, in Latin America, not react to these acts of aggressive folly by Her Britannic Majesty's Government against the Argentine Republic!
85. The attitude of the United Kingdom seems to be that, assured of impunity for its warlike behaviour and shielded by the privilege of permanent membership of the Council, it is determined to prevent speedy and effective efforts to achieve peace.
86. The Venezuelan Government has condemned the British escalation and it condemns the new aggressions. The loss of innocent young lives, Argentine and British, in the South Atlantic because of the anachronistic political stubbornness of the present Government of the United Kingdom must be halted.
87. We dispatched a mission of solidarity and peace to Europe to inform various democratic countries in the European Community of Venezuela's position and that of Latin America in this conflict. Our envoys have glimpsed a marked shift in European public opinion, which is noting with growing concern the possible consequences of British aggression, which bears all the signs of having been undertaken without advice from any other nation. Europe refuses to continue unconditional support for the English adventure.
88. We are sure that the countries of the third world and the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries are becoming aware of the repercussions of this tragic adventure, which ignores the progress of history and jeopardizes the peaceful efforts to satisfy the most precious and justified aspirations to live in peace and freedom.
89. We must insist that too many have died. Our consciences as indignant and horrified witnesses compel us to call for peace, immediate peace, an immediate cease-fire. This is the least that the Council can demand, and it should have done so sooner.
90. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, I should like to welcome the Ministers for Foreign Affairs who have come here to take part in the work of the Security Council.
91. The Council has been convened in connection with an extremely dangerous situation which has come about in the area of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands. According to available reports, the United Kingdom has begun large-scale military operations which are leading to an exacerbation of the military confrontation in the entire area of the South Atlantic. This has already taken and continues to take hundreds of human lives. Premeditated bloodshed continues; the massive use of force is creating a growing threat to international peace and security; and all this is causing the greatest concern to the international community.
92. The Security Council, to which the Charter of the United Nations has entrusted the major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is duty-bound to consider the prevailing situation and to take the necessary measures to restore peace. In such circumstances, there is every justification for holding meetings of the Council.
93. At the meeting of the Council on 3 April [2350th meeting], we emphasized that the issue of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands is first and foremost part and parcel of the problem of decolonization of territories seized at one time by colonial Powers the world over. The clear position of the United Nations in favour of an unconditional end to the colonial status of these islands has been reflected in the fact that this territory was included by the General Assembly in the list of territories whose colonial régimes should be terminated, in accordance with the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).
94. The issue of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands has been repeatedly dealt with in decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. At the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, the heads of State or Government, in taking up the issue of the Malvinas Islands, "firmly reiterated their support for the Argentine Republic's right to the restitution of that territory and sovereignty over it and requested that the negotiations in this regard be speeded up."
95. This position in support of Argentine sovereignty over the islands was reaffirmed in decisions of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the non-aligned countries, adopted after the present conflict arose. Nevertheless, the British Government has remained deaf to these appeals, disregarded General Assembly decisions, refrained from a peaceful settlement of the dispute with Argentina on sovereignty over the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands and continued with all its energy to hold on to their colonial status. This is the root cause of the armed conflict which has arisen in the South Atlantic.

96. On 3 April the Council adopted resolution 502 (1982). The Soviet Union saw substantial drawbacks in that resolution, which lay mainly in the fact that there were no important anti-colonialist aspects in it, aspects which cannot fail to be borne in mind in a final and just settlement of this conflict. Nevertheless, the resolution was adopted by the Council, inasmuch as many of the members felt that it might help to bring about a settlement of the conflict. The resolution was also accepted by Argentina.

97. As the Secretary-General stated yesterday in the Council [2360th meeting], at the first stage some progress was achieved in bringing the positions of the parties closer together. However, at a subsequent stage the Government of the United Kingdom clearly stiffened its position, resorted to the language of ultimatums and virtually broke off negotiations, openly resorting to the use of armed force in order to restore the colonial status of the islands. These activities cast doubt on the sincerity of the statements made by the British Government to the effect that it was prepared to comply with the provisions of resolution 502 (1982).

98. The question then legitimately arises: did these statements, as well as the very participation of the British Government in talks aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement, not serve simply as a diplomatic cover for military preparations and for an expansion of the scope of military operations?

99. As a result of the current large-scale invasion of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands by the armed forces of Great Britain, the talks on settling the conflict have been torpedoed. Subsequently, the armed conflict has intensified. Responsibility for this is clearly borne by the Government of the United Kingdom, which has embarked upon a military solution of the issue. It is acting in the spirit of bygone colonial times, as if we were living not at the end of the twentieth century but in the times of Queen Victoria.

100. Hence, the energetic efforts of the Secretary-General have unfortunately not been able to improve matters. These efforts enjoyed the broad support of the Council, including that of the Soviet Union.

101. It is quite clear that the Government of the United Kingdom would not have embarked upon seeking a solution of the issue by armed force had there not been agreement and direct support by the United States. It should be noted that military activities were undertaken by the United Kingdom immediately after Washington openly declared its solidarity with the policy chosen in London. Other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) acted in the same spirit. The economic sanctions imposed on 10 April against Argentina by the Western European countries are, among other things, in direct contradiction with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular, Article 41, which

provides that it is precisely the Security Council which may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force, and possibly including complete or partial interruption of economic relations, should be employed to give effect to its decisions.

102. The imposition of economic sanctions against Argentina by the United States and the 10 member States of the European Community demonstrates that the Governments of those countries, in violation of the requirements of the Charter, have undertaken unilateral acts without any authorization from the Council. It is quite natural that that decision taken by Western countries was interpreted by Argentina and other Latin American States as an act of economic aggression.

103. We cannot fail to note the fact that, when the issue of imposing sanctions against South Africa arises, we hear a flow of words to the effect that this is virtually impossible because of so-called existing legal difficulties and that the imposition of sanctions would involve virtually a change in constitutional law, and so on and so forth, whereas when the issue of imposing sanctions against a developing country arises, then it becomes clear that this can be done virtually in one day and with a single stroke of the pen.

104. The NATO countries hastened to demonstrate their solidarity with the United Kingdom. They are clearly pleased by the fact that the United Kingdom is attempting to "punish" a developing country. Indeed, some observers have written that what is involved in this case is not only putting Argentina in its place but also showing other developing and non-aligned countries that the imperialist world still has an arm long enough to stretch across 16,000 kilometers.

105. One trusts that not only the Latin American countries but other developing countries as well will draw the necessary conclusions from this demonstration of imperialist solidarity.

106. The military adventures at present embarked upon by the British Government are nothing other than a recurrence of colonial wars, to which, it had seemed, we were to return no more. However, the present conflict shows that such wars have not yet been expunged from the policy of some Western States.

107. The Soviet Union favours the speedy adoption by the Council—and I emphasize "speedy"—of a cease-fire and a cessation of military operations in order to put the conflict on the road to a peaceful settlement. We believe that the efforts of the Secretary-General at finding ways of overcoming tensions in the South Atlantic by a peaceful solution to the conflict should be continued on the basis of a Security Council mandate.

108. As President Brezhnev stated on 4 May:

"If there arise dangerous complications and conflict situations in the western hemisphere, it

is precisely because there are forces which are attempting to retain or restore positions of domination and to impose a foreign yoke on peoples.

“They do not shrink from threats and pressure, from blackmail or blockades, or from the use of arms; nor do they stop at activities which hark back to the time of colonial plunder.

“Here, as in other parts of the globe, the Soviet Union bases itself on its policy of principle: the elimination of existing and the prevention of future hotbeds of tension, the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of other States and peoples, and the settlement of disputed issues by peaceful means, around the negotiating table.”

109. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

110. Mr. MUNOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank the members of the Council for their invitation to my delegation in response to the Mexican Government's request to take part in this debate on the Malvinas Islands and the grave events that have occurred in the southern tip of Latin America, leading to a breach of the peace and dangerously threatening international security.

111. I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and am gratified that the consideration of this delicate issue is taking place under your wise and impartial leadership. We are certain that this meeting can lead to effective and timely decisions that will put an end to the conflict and promote a just and lasting solution to this long-standing dispute.

112. I should like also to welcome the participation in this debate of the Foreign Ministers of Argentina, Panama and Venezuela, Latin American countries with which Mexico has had a long-standing, close relationship.

113. We also welcome the presence here of the Secretary-General, who has spared no effort or risk in the fulfilment of the essential mission of maintaining the dialogue between the parties and of opening the road to negotiations to restore peace.

114. The tireless dedication and lucidity of the proposals submitted by the Secretary-General in the course of his invaluable efforts have been unanimously recognized by the international community, with explicit thanks from the two countries directly involved in the conflict. For its part, my Government has instructed me to reiterate to you, Mr. Secretary-General, our utmost respect and support.

115. Yesterday we listened to the balanced report in which the Secretary-General [*ibid.*] gave an account

of his efforts and proposals throughout the mediation process, as well as of the progress he had achieved *vis-à-vis* the original positions of the parties in dispute, all within the framework of and in accordance with the objectives of Council resolution 502 (1982).

116. The fact that the representatives of the Governments in dispute did turn to the negotiating table for several weeks and that they did accept the approach set forth in the Secretary-General's aide-mémoire of 2 May constituted grounds for encouragement, which, notwithstanding subsequent events, did commit the parties to pursue their efforts at a negotiated solution.

117. According to the Secretary-General's report to the Council, at the end of last week there was, in his view, essential agreement on a broad range of issues, covering the nature and duration of the arrangement, the procedures for a cease-fire and a mutual withdrawal of forces, termination of exclusion zones and of coercive economic measures, administration of the territory, and the basic outlines of a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

118. Based on these initial results, the negotiations were further encouraged when, on 19 May, the Secretary-General submitted a new aide-mémoire, highlighting those points on which no agreement had yet been reached. The reactions of the parties to that aide-mémoire led to a stalling in the dialogue, but nothing justifies the resumption of hostilities.

119. Whatever the obstacles in the path of the reaching of agreement by States on disputed issues, this new military escalation is unacceptable. It is in blatant violation of Council resolution 502 (1982) and of fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

120. The Mexican Government was distressed to hear the news that British forces had begun military operations in the Malvinas Islands, which resulted in a breaking off of the negotiations that were under way in the United Nations. In those circumstances, it yesterday issued a communiqué which reads, in substance, as follows: first, the Government of Mexico regrets the continued use of force to settle this international dispute; secondly, it considers that there is no legal basis for a Member of the United Nations unilaterally to arrogate to itself the right to implement a Security Council resolution without having received a specific mandate to that end from the Council itself; and thirdly, the Government of Mexico appeals once again to the parties for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for resumption of the search for a negotiated solution within the framework of the United Nations.

121. The President of Mexico, Mr. José López Portillo, has stated time and again his support for the efforts made by the Secretary-General and has expressed his confidence in the capacity of the United

Nations to live up to its responsibilities at such a serious time, when war has reached the shores of Latin America. He has emphasized that the United Nations means all of us, all the peoples of the world, and that we must work together so that the Organization is not left in isolation, devoid of our political support.

122. The hostilities taking place in the South Atlantic must be stopped, as must all kinds of threat or coercion, which only tend to worsen the crisis in inter-regional terms. This conflict should not provoke a resurgence of colonial attitudes and wars of domination, which we thought were things of the past. Let us make sure that this crisis does not become a perverted and anachronistic version of the North-South dialogue.

123. In no case are there grounds for invoking Article 51 of the Charter to justify the use of force, since this would presuppose that the question of sovereignty had been resolved in the eyes of all parties and this, of course, is what caused the dispute in the first place. It is up to the Security Council and the Security Council alone to take the necessary measures to maintain or restore international peace and security.

124. The key difference between the modern international legal order, which stems from the Charter, and those that went before is the existence of a system of collective security in which the sole legitimate use of force rests with the United Nations. Outside this framework, any use of force in relations between States is illegal, and any war is unlawful.

125. This is the position which my Government has taken with regard to all international disputes. As regards this dispute, it became clear on 6 April that Mexico had supported in the United Nations and in regional forums the validity of Argentina's claim over the Malvinas Islands, and that continues to be our position. However, we would point out that States must do their utmost to settle their disputes by peaceful means, and we reject the use of force to settle this or any other conflict.

126. We said at that time that Mexico's position was based on a sincere Latin American spirit, since in our region a large number of territorial conflicts are still going on which, if they were not peacefully resolved, could endanger peace in the continent and friendly relations among the Latin American republics. We stated at that time that the resolutions of the Security Council must be heeded and we appealed to the parties to the dispute to begin negotiations to allow reason and justice to prevail over military might.

127. Today, we reiterate this appeal and we reaffirm our essential solidarity with the fair claims of all peoples and nations and in particular those of Latin America, whose countries, like our own, have suffered from the violation of their rights and from all forms of colonial domination.

128. Everybody must accept, as the General Assembly recognized in resolution 1514 (XV) and in many other specific resolutions, that colonialism is a thing of the past. All those involved in the process of its elimination must avail themselves of the lessons of history and bring to bear all their intelligence and imagination to conclude this process at the least cost to themselves and to international security in order to provide the basis for a new era of co-operation among nations.

129. Only yesterday [*ibid.*], the representatives of Argentina and the United Kingdom stated here their willingness to continue negotiating. The Council should make use of this offer and take into account the result of the enormous efforts made up to now by the Secretary-General in order to supplement and reinforce resolution 502 (1982) and to specify a framework in which negotiations to end the conflict can take place.

130. The Council should immediately take the steps it deems appropriate to avoid a worsening of the crisis and to halt the useless loss of lives which is taking place. It should also encourage the negotiations which were under way and which have been interrupted and keep this matter under consideration until it is finally settled.

131. The Mexican Government addresses a respectful but urgent appeal to the countries to the dispute to end their military confrontation and to return to the path of peace in the conviction that no military victory can serve to generate rights or, in the long term, to improve their respective positions. We would only be running the risk of seeing the conflict assume unforeseeable proportions.

132. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

133. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council during the month of May, I should like to express my gratitude to you and to the members of the Council for allowing me to speak in the important debate that is now taking place on the situation in the Malvinas Islands. I feel sure that your ability and impartiality will enable the Council to arrive at a just solution, one to which all the Members of the United Nations, and the States of Latin America in particular, aspire.

134. Little more than a week ago, President Fidel Castro addressed an urgent message to the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries because of what he described as

“the real possibility that in the coming hours the Government of Great Britain, with the support and

co-operation of the United States, will launch its air and naval forces in new, large-scale acts of aggression against Argentina.

"A colonial war," President Castro stated, "which, because of its nature and evolution the imperialist Powers are attempting to convert into a lesson for all the countries of the third world that, whatever their political or social régime, strive to protect their sovereignty and territorial integrity, is about to enter its most painful and criminal phase."

135. The invasion of the Malvinas Islands by the United Kingdom, with the unconcealed support of the United States, has already begun. This shameful episode seeks to re-enact the despoliation the British Empire carried out in those same islands in 1833, when it expelled the Argentine population and its government and, in a typical act of piracy, took possession of that inalienable part of the territory of the Argentine Republic.

136. Since that long-ago date, the people of Argentina, with the support of the other peoples of our America, have never ceased to claim their rights over the Malvinas Islands. The international community, as proved by the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly within the framework of the historic debate on decolonization, has unequivocally pointed out the colonial nature of that British despoliation.

137. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima in August 1975 was equally categorical. The Lima declaration states:

"The non-aligned countries, without prejudice to ratifying the validity of the principle of self-determination as a general principle for other territories, strongly support in the special and particular case of the Malvinas Islands, the just claim of the Argentine Republic, and urge the United Kingdom actively to continue the negotiations recommended by the United Nations in order to restore the said territory to Argentine sovereignty and thus put an end to that illegal situation which still persists in the southern part of the American continent."²

That firm position of principle taken by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has been ratified time and time again: at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, and in successive ministerial meetings and meetings of the Co-ordinating Bureau held at New Delhi and in New York.

138. Over those years—and with total contempt for the opinion of Member States, for United Nations resolutions and for the explicit will of the Argentine Government to solve the question of the Malvinas Islands through negotiations—the Government of the

United Kingdom has persisted in maintaining its colonial domination over that territory and has repeatedly dragged its feet rather than enter into a serious negotiating process that, in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter and in relevant United Nations resolutions, would restore Argentine sovereignty over the territory of the islands.

139. That British obstinacy and prevarication—a combination of imperialist haughtiness and nineteenth-century arrogance that so singularly characterizes the present Government of the United Kingdom—finally led to the aggression that today so poignantly affects the world and is shattering peace and security in the Americas.

140. That action means a flagrant violation of the most basic principles of international law, of the Charter of the United Nations and of the terms of Security Council resolution 502 (1982), which was sponsored by the United Kingdom itself. It further implies an attempt to return to the obsolete stage of gunboat diplomacy and colonial methods that are unacceptable in our era.

141. At a time when in every part of the world there is an increasing demand that there be no break in the negotiating process with regard to the Malvinas, the British Government, with the shameless support of North American imperialism, is seeking to seize by force that which by law does not belong to it. Cuba repudiates this intolerable aggression and reiterates its solidarity with the Argentine people, who are fighting to defend their sovereignty.

142. As was stated in the 1 May declaration of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba:

"The total hypocrisy of the so-called inter-American system forged by the United States imperialists to serve their own interests is revealed now when, after a direct attack of which a country of Latin America is the victim, the North American Government joins the aggressors and offers them its unrestricted military and political support. The true nature of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance is thus laid bare and, once again, the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean are made aware of who their historical enemy is."

143. This is the hour of Latin American solidarity. The cause of the Malvinas is the cause of the Argentine people and, therefore, the cause of Latin America and of the Caribbean.

144. It is necessary to halt aggression and to impose the rule of law. It is the duty of all peoples of the world to support Argentina in its fight for sovereignty against the colonial war that those who, in recent centuries, tasted the bitterness of defeat in their repeated attempts to trample underfoot the homeland of San Martín are now trying to force upon it.

145. As President Fidel Castro stated in his message to the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries:

“It is in the interest of the defence of each and every one of our countries, and above all of humanitarian solidarity with the people of Argentina and the English soldiers being sent into combat, that we raise our voice in the strongest terms to condemn the continued hostilities and that we renew our appeal that a solution to the conflict be found, a negotiated political solution that will respect the sovereign rights of Argentina.”

146. My Government profoundly regrets that the negotiations undertaken by the Secretary-General with the parties to the conflict were broken off by the United Kingdom. We consider that the peace efforts of the Secretary-General contain the key elements for a peaceful solution.

147. The grave situation, with the unfortunate loss of young, valuable lives, demands an immediate halt to the violence.

148. Cuba, which supports the full implementation of Council resolution 502 (1982) in all its parts—despite its obvious limitations regarding the colonial nature of the problem—considers that it is now the obligation of the Council to take effective measures aimed at putting an end to the hostilities and to issue a formal mandate to the Secretary-General to resume his efforts with the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina, so as to achieve a solution that is honourable and lasting and respects the sovereign rights of the Argentine Republic.

149. Britain's unilateral action, under the pretext of carrying out resolution 502 (1982), in fact violates that resolution's terms; it seriously threatens the peace and security of the region and is a prelude to an escalation of the conflict, with unforeseeable consequences.

150. The economic sanctions imposed—also unilaterally—against Argentina by the members of the European Community constitute a serious precedent. They are not provided for in the Charter and thus lack any vestige of legality.

151. It is now for the Council to speak. The peoples of Latin America trust that, in accordance with its mandate under the Charter, the United Nations will cause reason, justice and the rule of law to prevail.

152. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Bolivia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

153. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I thank you and the

other members of the Council for having invited me to make a statement. I congratulate you, Sir, on the calm and wisdom with which you have carried out the duties of the presidency of the Council in the present difficult circumstances.

154. On a previous occasion in this very chamber [2350th meeting], Bolivia expressed its opinion on the problem of the Malvinas Islands, an opinion which can be summed up in two points: unconditional support for the cause of the restoration of the Argentine Republic's sovereignty over those islands, which are a legitimate part of its territory, and rejection of the use of force as a way of seeking a solution to international disputes. We reiterate both of those points.

155. We regret to have to make further remarks now condemning the ominous course of warlike events which have worsened the situation, damaging the prospects for a peaceful negotiated solution.

156. On 3 April, resolution 502 (1982) was adopted; it called for a cessation of hostilities and a withdrawal of Argentine forces and urged the Governments to seek a diplomatic solution to their differences. Insisting solely on the withdrawal of the Argentine forces, but contravening the primary provision which demanded a cessation of hostilities, and thereby closing the path of negotiations, the Government of the United Kingdom announced that a powerful fleet—which included two aircraft carriers and the most modern and sophisticated weaponry—would immediately set sail to recapture the Malvinas Islands. The attack was carried out through the occupation of South Georgia Island, the bombardment of the main airport of the islands and many other warlike actions. The British navy—which in other circumstances took part honourably, in those same South Atlantic waters, in military engagements which contributed to the salvation of the world from the threat of fascism—sailed this time nearly from one pole to the other to keep a less glorious engagement: to attack with a nuclear submarine and sink an Argentine vessel which was located outside the 200-mile zone of exclusion proclaimed by the London Government itself.

157. The sinking of that vessel, which was not engaged in a military action, caused the loss of hundreds of Argentine lives in the waters of the South Atlantic, not far from American soil, but many thousands of kilometres from the seat of the British Crown. Attacks continued against Puerto Argentino and Puerto Darwin, and against the unarmed ship *Alferez Sobral* and the fishing boat *Narval*. The aggression is now culminating in landings and massive invasion operations.

158. There is cause for concern in those facts because of the disproportionate use of force by a first-rank world Power against a developing republic whose military capacity is limited. There is cause for concern in that an old colonial Power, with the co-oper-

ation of other Powers, could sail from near the Arctic Circle to Tierra del Fuego, evoking the punitive expeditions of the colonial era. There is cause for concern in that the British aggression, perpetrated with the solidarity of Europe—which imposed economic sanctions against the Argentine Republic—is directed against a nation intimately linked with the history, the destiny, the law and the soil of the American continent. There is cause for concern, too, in that the country engaging in this extravagant use of military power to defend a colonial enclave is a permanent member of the Security Council, charged by the Charter of the United Nations with responsibility for maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

159. There can be no doubt that the course of events, their inter-continental characteristics, the potential collapse of major regional agreements and the lack of any progress towards peace and a permanent solution to the problem create, for the members of the Council, and especially for the permanent members, the duty to act right now and effectively, not just to adopt resolutions in favour of or against anyone, but to direct the world community and the parties to the conflict towards that lofty duty: the preservation of world peace.

160. The Secretary-General informed us yesterday [2360th meeting] of his initiatives and efforts to find a negotiated, balanced solution. We who have heard the representative of Argentina and who are mindful of the course of events are sure that any peace effort will be doomed to failure as long as the United Kingdom persists in its equivocal stand.

161. Despite the efforts of the Secretary-General, his professional skill and his impeccable impartiality, the situation has become worse. The prospects for a peaceful settlement seem to be receding. In the last few hours rivers of blood have been shed by both sides. The news of the escalation of the conflict should move the world and mobilize all peoples in a supreme effort for peace. On the one hand there is Argentina, with its right to full sovereignty over the islands, and alongside it the whole Latin American continent, outraged by this extra-continental aggression striking at its beaches. On the other hand stands the United Kingdom, with the European Community, acting like a traditional colonial regional organism against our America, which we hope can still be called the continent of hope.

162. We listened with amazement to certain British sources, in a new attack on America's respectability, referring to the concept of "Argentine machismo". We regret to have to observe that the constant escalation of preparations and warlike actions by Great Britain smack far more of "machismo", since, in order to defend an internal political position, it is striking international attitudes which do no credit to its history.

163. The Argentine Republic is a cultured and civilized country of which all Latin Americans are proud. It is the land of thinkers and statesmen, of artists and experts, of professionals, workmen and farmers. It is the land of Alberdi and Sarmiento, of Ricardo Rojas and Jorge Luis Borges, of Bernardo Houssay and Raúl Prebisch. It is a generous country which since its foundation has opened its arms like a mother to take to its breast Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutchmen, Scandinavians, who had fled from the conflicts and problems of the old world in search of a new land. It welcomed Spaniards and Italians who, stricken by poverty at home, emigrated to America, and the English themselves, who became prosperous farmers and ranchers. Argentina offered them all refuge, a new life, an Argentine name and all the prospects of a future in America. It is against that land that Europe has now decreed its economic sanctions. What a world we are living in!

164. The Bolivian Government appeals, in this lofty setting, for peace; it appeals to the civilized conscience of the European peoples—including those of the United Kingdom—who in the past contributed positively to the formation of the cultural make-up of a young America and who today, because of the unacceptable stubborn determination to maintain a colonial enclave, are on the point of causing a grave and lasting breach in relations between Europe and America.

165. The time has come to end this senseless conflict, in which Great Britain's imperial hankerings threaten to separate permanently a Europe and an America which up to now have lived in peace, co-operation and mutual benefit.

166. Why, after striking its flag in India and in so many former colonies in Africa, is the London Government persisting in seeking sovereignty over some Argentine islands at the far ends of the earth?

167. We listened with amazement also to the fallacious argument that Argentine forces must be withdrawn and that it is not possible to recognize Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas "because aggression cannot be rewarded". We agree: no aggression must be rewarded, but let us recall that the first act of aggression was committed by Great Britain against Argentina in January 1833, and that is the real aggression, the effects of which must now be corrected a century and a half later. It is the Argentine people that at this bitter moment in history is exercising true "self-defence".

168. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, Mr. Jorge Illueca.

169. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should first like to greet you most cordially, Mr. President. We are glad that a states-

man of your stature, who represents one of the major Powers of the world, is guiding these debates, to the satisfaction of all and in a manner consistent with the ideals of the United Nations.

170. I should like also to greet your predecessor, Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, of Zaire, who presided over the deliberations of the Council last month.

171. Panama is particularly pleased at the presence of two Latin American Foreign Ministers, representing two countries with a great Latin American history which we respect, admire and esteem. I am referring to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Mr. Nicanor Costa Méndez, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Mr. José Alberto Zambrano. They represent two nations whose peoples shed their own blood in the days of the struggle for independence in order to liberate other peoples.

172. Behind them is the image of Simón Bolívar and of José de San Martín and the ideal of the unification of Latin America as reflected in the Panama Congress of 1826, an endeavour not yet completed but about to be concluded. I refer to this because we truly do have a colonial question before us, as we stated at the Council's meeting of 3 April [2350th meeting].

173. At that meeting I expressed my own country's concern at the threat represented by the colonial presence of an extra-continental Power in Latin American territory. On 3 April there had been no breach of the peace, there had been no outbreak of hostilities. When the Government of Argentina carried out the occupation of the archipelago which rightfully belongs to it, it did so with great respect for peace and for individual safety which reflected great care for human life, and it caused no personal harm to any British soldier or to any civilian.

174. It was claimed that that action by Argentina violated the legal order, but the opinion of Panama and the opinion of the General Assembly in many resolutions is that the State that was committing a breach of the peace was the State which does not belong to that continent, which did not comply with the United Nations resolutions on decolonization and which was disregarding Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

175. We have proclaimed here an anti-colonial law which has not been codified but which appears in many resolutions and which the colonial and neo-colonialist Powers naturally do not want to see codified. Therefore, peoples that want to maintain their territorial integrity, freedom and independence must lay claim to their anti-colonial rights as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in numerous resolutions.

176. Those resolutions emerged as Latin American initiatives at the time when Latin America constituted the strongest regional group of the United Nations and

have been strengthened with the passage of time by the Asian, African and Arab nations and by some European nations which are in harmony with the interests of the third world. Those anti-colonialist resolutions proclaim in a clear-cut way, without ambiguity, that peoples that are subject to colonial oppression may use all means available to them in order to put an end to that colonial situation.

177. It was for that reason that my country objected to resolution 502 (1982), adopted by the Council on 3 April. On that occasion, we made a very clear statement that the intransigent anti-historical attitude of the United Kingdom was going to cause great problems, tribulations, conflicts and painful situations for the countries represented in the Council, the Western Powers and mankind at large, including the Socialist and Eastern Powers, because this is not a problem that is confined to Latin America and Argentina but rather one which is bringing the world to the brink of a conflagration. It is time to appeal for reflection, prudence and calm so that there will be no more of these punitive expeditions in which two thirds of a British naval fleet—by now I should say it is four fifths of its fleet—is dispatched, to attempt to punish, humiliate and confront Argentina, disregarding the fact that there is a Latin American continent that has historical and cultural links and that an affront or threat to Argentina is an affront and threat to the dignity, image, rights and aspirations of all Latin American peoples.

178. An attempt has been made to conceal and cloud the colonial problem. It is regrettable that countries that call themselves civilized view Latin American peoples merely in terms of their Governments, of particular régimes, regardless of their nature. There are peoples and nations with a history and a social structure that have permanent values, values that cannot be obfuscated, that are not negotiable, are not on the market, cannot be bargained away. Those are the values of our peoples and perhaps that is why the Anglo-Saxons do not understand Latin Americans. Those values of our peoples cannot be subjected or violated, because that would cause blood and tears for mankind. There are many such cases in the history of mankind. It will be seen that Latin America, together with Argentina, is right in this case and that the Security Council, and particularly the countries represented here, must look at the roots of this problem, which are purely and simply colonial.

179. Resolution 502 (1982), in spite of our opposition, contained three elements. One was a cessation of hostilities which at that time did not exist, and that is why we had stated that the resolution was illogical. Those hostilities have now occurred with only one party to blame, one aggressor, with only one Government acting in an irrational and disrespectful way, disrespectful of the United Nations system and the system of contemporary civilization. It is lamentable to see in the newspapers that the leaders of the United

Kingdom are saying that "civilized peoples should be grateful" for its action against Argentina. This is a reflection of colonial thinking—to speak in this day and age of civilized peoples implies that there are uncivilized peoples. Who is civilized and who is not? Is the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom civilized when she tells the Chairman of the BBC in London that British patriotism has to be defended and has to be told that the media exist not to defend patriotism but to provide the facts and that an Argentine widow deserves as much pity as a British widow?

180. We are considering here an infamous loss of life which has no reason, no possible explanation, in a civilized world—to use her own words—a world which has reached this stage of development.

181. That same resolution talked about negotiations. It was not a matter of cessation of hostilities, because unlawful action was taken by the nation that proposed this. We have to go back to General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), which called on Argentina and the United Kingdom to "proceed . . . with the negotiations". To discuss what? The decolonization of the Malvinas. Why with Argentina? Because Argentina's claim was proper in our opinion, and the United Kingdom's was not. And the Assembly stated that account should be taken of the interests of the inhabitants, not the rights of the inhabitants. There is no right to self-determination in this case, and you should not be surprised to hear me say that there is no right to self-determination in this case, because the right to self-determination is for the oppressed, not for the oppressors. The 1,800 inhabitants of those islands are all dependants of a British colonial company with headquarters in London, which has some 700,000 sheep that are grazing in the Malvinas, and it would really be making a mockery of the right to self-determination if we were to say that the future of the islands must be decided by the employees of a colonial company who are of the same nationality as the oppressor nation.

182. This is the situation. Thus, it was not a simple question, in spite of the fact that that resolution was prepared by those who later were going to violate it. But in any event we do have those two elements which must be considered.

183. The United Kingdom has set itself up as the executor of that resolution, but in order to violate it, and what are those violations? On 3 April we stated here that the United Kingdom, with its obduracy in this matter, was going to provoke a crisis in the inter-American system. We stated this before the crisis ever took place, but now the crisis has occurred, and why has it occurred? The United Kingdom has decreed a maritime exclusion zone extending 200 miles from the Malvinas archipelago. That could only be done by the Security Council. We need only read Articles 39, 41 and 42 of the Charter of the United Nations to see that such a thing can only be done by the Security

Council, so this is an affront to the Council. We cannot be indifferent to this. Is there order, or is there not? Does the Charter exist or not? Must it be respected or not?

184. But that is not the only thing. That maritime exclusion zone runs counter to the zone of geographical security enshrined in article 4 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. So it can clearly be seen that this is not a crisis that we are inventing; it is a crisis that was designed by the United Kingdom, which is disregarding the entire inter-American system. I am mentioning this here because the situation must be considered in depth and a solution must be found before more regrettable extremes are reached, because we are all aware of the loss of life, the damage to property and the very profound spiritual injury done to all the Latin American peoples.

185. But the violations of resolution 502 (1982) do not stop there. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister, in an outstanding and most lucid way, described those violations. One of the most disdainful acts has been committed because a major maritime Power, the United Kingdom—which should honour the proper rules, even if they are arbitrary—is taking action which the President of the Republic of Panama, Mr. Aristides Royo, has quite rightly described as a deceitful action. Why deceitful? Because the cruiser *General Belgrano*, which was torpedoed and sunk by one of the nuclear submarines belonging to the United Kingdom, was outside that maritime exclusion zone.

186. If we follow the logic of that civilized people—to use its own words—well then, in a civilized way England decided that, so as not to violate its own zone, the zone should be extended to within 12 miles of Argentine continental territory. Does that exonerate England, or does it mean that England wanted freedom to act, to take justice into its own hands by might, to gain time so that the troops arriving in a luxury liner would manage to reach the Malvinas archipelago and Argentine territory?

187. The zone of war is being extended, and it is being extended without any declaration of war, in the knowledge that Argentina has a territorial sea of 200 miles. We, the developing countries, have greatly suffered from the actions of maritime Powers. Innocent passage is requested of us. At the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea we had great difficulties because of that obsession to keep the seas open. How many of those maritime Powers—above all, the European Powers—have protested or condemned this irrational, unreasonable act on the part of the United Kingdom? I know of only one—the Soviet Union. It must be said that the Soviet Union has stated that it cannot in any way accept the type of decision taken by the United Kingdom. But if there is any other such Power, I think it would be very helpful if it were to state here in the Council that it does not accept that type of decision taken unilaterally.

ally by the United Kingdom, which feels itself very powerful, and we are going to see why.

188. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister, Mr. Zambrano Velasco, has already referred to the nuclear or nuclear-powered submarines which are being used for military purposes; in our view, that is in violation of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).³ Prohibited explosives have also been used, such as certain types of bombs, that really constitute a crime against humanity.

189. We have seen photographs. It has been said that it is not true, but if it is not true, I think it would be good to have repeated here in the Council that that type of device is not being used and will not be used, that nuclear weapons are not being used and will not be used. But we have not seen any great haste to make that kind of pledge.

190. The chain of violations of resolution 502 (1982) by the United Kingdom has created a crisis in the United Nations system of security, a crisis which worsened when other members of the European Community, also in violation of the clear provisions of the Charter that it is for the Security Council alone to decide on taking such action, decided to impose sanctions against Argentina.

191. That crisis has now been reflected in the inter-American security system. We must look at this calmly and give it profound thought. In 1947 the American States signed the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—the Rio Treaty. That treaty stipulates that an attack, particularly one by an extra-continental Power, against a signatory State is to be considered an attack against all the other States parties to the Treaty. Pursuant to the Treaty, during the first week of this month a meeting was held in Washington of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the countries parties to the Rio Treaty. An historic event occurred. The countries gathered there recognized Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas. They decided to make collective representation to the Security Council and to the parties involved. They also requested a cessation of hostilities. Seventeen countries voted in favour of that decision and only four abstained. But the Treaty proved ineffective in this connection, although it envisages sanctions against the aggressor, measures to support the country against which a violation is directed and measures for the collective security of the Rio Treaty countries.

192. Why has it not been possible to apply the Treaty? A strategic problem arises. The question of the Malvinas invites serious reflection because, in addition to its being a colonial question—which is the root of the problem—other considerations are involved which are not ideological but involve strategic interests. The major Powers are interested in the South Atlantic sea routes. The NATO countries, of course,

would be extremely pleased if the United Kingdom, even if by force, were to maintain control over the Malvinas archipelago, given the fact that it is in the South Atlantic and includes South Georgia and the South Sandwich islands, which are near Antarctica. But is it possible to consider whether Argentine sovereignty affects the interests of any other country? Argentina has a legitimate right to sovereignty over those islands and to exercise its full authority there. Of course, in the framework of world relations it is for Argentina to assume its responsibilities, but this is a matter that falls under Argentine sovereignty.

193. It cannot be claimed that we have here a conflict between countries that belong to strategic or military alliances. But, unfortunately, we have found that in this problem of the Malvinas we now have problems of conflict of the NATO and Rio Treaty alliances. The Rio Treaty has proved ineffective and Latin America lacks a system of collective security. A distinguished United States admiral declared, in statements that were published in the press, that the United States was not obliged to help the United Kingdom because the NATO Treaty applied north of the equator and did not include the Malvinas, but that Argentina can invoke the Rio Treaty.

194. We should not like to see this matter handled from a strategic standpoint. We believe that we must go back to its essential roots, that is, its colonial nature. I say that we do not want it handled that way because clearly, in view of the fact that the United Kingdom is concentrating all its naval forces in the South Atlantic to commit this aggression against Argentina, if another NATO country replaces its tanks and planes to render service in NATO, that is just an exchange of colours or positions. In other words, you keep your English-type planes here and we keep English planes with a flag that could be that of the United States, France or any other country, and then, obviously, we would have a State member of the Rio Treaty, with commitments in NATO, affecting another State member of the Rio Treaty in Latin American territory.

195. There is growing resentment in Latin America against the United Kingdom and against all the nations that are lending themselves to the United Kingdom's aggression against Argentina, and this must be put on record. Hence we consider that the root of the problem is colonial, that the United Kingdom is against the legal order of the United Nations, that in attempting to maintain its anachronistic colonial presence it is against the contemporary spirit, against the process of change which must take place in the Malvinas, and in Gibraltar also, where the United Kingdom presence is as anachronistic and undesirable as it is in the Malvinas. Indeed, it is offensive to all of us with an Ibero-American conscience, and this is something that must be considered by the Council and by the other Members of the United Nations, above all, the people of the United Kingdom, who must realize that at the

close of the twentieth century these colonial enclaves have no justification; they are inadmissible, reprehensible and repudiated by the world conscience.

196. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has declared its support for the Argentine claim. Although the Group of 77 is a political group, economic sanctions caused it to be concerned about these issues. Hence its representatives in various capitals have declared their support for Argentina and their opposition to sanctions. We therefore believe that the Council should find a way of reaching some type of decision or agreement that would effectively bring about a cessation of hostilities, a separation of forces and should seek the withdrawal of that colonial presence, thereby opening the way for negotiations.

197. Indeed, as was stated by the Inter-American Juridical Committee, what we have to negotiate is the withdrawal of the United Kingdom. There is nothing else to be negotiated. And it must be negotiated so that, in the most orderly, peaceful way possible, we can restore the legal order of the United Nations, which is completely anti-colonial.

198. The efforts of the Secretary-General are to be commended. Those efforts deserve the support expressed by the Head of State of Panama, as well as the support of all members of the Council. Thus far, however, those efforts have been unsuccessful because of the intransigence of the United Kingdom. The way in which this matter has been handled by the United Kingdom leaves a very bitter taste indeed because, as events have unfolded, I think the very position of the Council has been affected.

199. The intensive negotiations earlier this week here at United Nations Headquarters, both in the offices of the Secretary-General and at his residence, gave us grounds for hope. One of the participants in them was Mr. Enrique Ros, whom we all know and whose human and professional qualities need no additional mention by me. Also present was the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Parsons, who also enjoys our respect because we know he possesses excellent qualities. At the same time, we are aware that he is subject to instructions which at times, it is said, are ironclad, even though we wish they were more human.

200. Now, just when the Secretary-General's efforts seemed headed for success and the Council had been convened, the Council began to find itself in what I believe to be a very difficult position. When the rumour was circulated that the negotiations, as reported throughout the world press, had broken down, the Secretary-General communicated personally with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mrs. Thatcher. According to press reports, Mrs. Thatcher had made positive signs and asked the Secretary-General to continue his efforts. Similarly, the Secretary-General contacted the President of Argentina, General

Galtieri, who also expressed the desire that the Secretary-General continue his efforts.

201. As I understand it, the Council met this past Wednesday in an informal meeting and, as also reported in the press, on the basis of that background information decided to allow the Secretary-General an additional few days in which to pursue his peace-making efforts, efforts which, I repeat, we all commend and fully support. Indeed, we only wish he could be given a mandate to complete those efforts successfully, with, of course, the co-operation of the parties concerned. That was on Wednesday of this week.

202. The Council, as everyone knows, had agreed to give the Secretary-General a few days more to continue his efforts. However, the rebuff to the Council came not from Argentina but from the other side of the Atlantic, because on the following day to Prime Minister of the United Kingdom appeared before the House of Commons to say that negotiations were leading nowhere and had broken down. What caused that? The United Kingdom had made some proposals and issued an ultimatum to Argentina. That also was published. And if the version that I am stating here is inaccurate, may I be corrected. It was indicated that if Argentina failed to accept those proposals as put forward, the United Kingdom, which had been involved in a process of prolonging those talks in order to prevent specific agreement, was going, as indeed it subsequently did, to begin an escalation, an escalation which is taking place right now. That, of course, leaves the Council in the position of being slighted. I believe that, by its intransigence, the United Kingdom is snubbing the Council and all its members. As I stressed in the Council on 3 April [*ibid.*] after the adoption of resolution 502 (1982), a punitive expedition had been mounted, and the resolution should in no way be understood as authorizing the United Kingdom to use force. I said that, because a British expeditionary force was advancing towards the South Atlantic, a force of overwhelming military capability. No one here objected to the interpretation made by Panama that resolution 502 (1982) in no way authorized the use of force by the United Kingdom. Yet it has resorted to force and is now engaged in an escalation of the use of force, to the detriment of the Argentine nation and of the peoples of Latin America.

203. It has been stated in England that civilized peoples should be grateful to England for this oppressive, aggressive, warlike, unlawful action against Argentina. What we must say is that Latin American people are grateful to Argentina; that we are grateful to it for its sacrifices; that the Argentine people have behaved nobly, as they did in the days of emancipation to liberate other peoples, as Venezuela did with other peoples in all the latitudes of America. This is now moving the Latin American conscience towards the reaffirmation of its own cultural, political and economic values.

204. I wish to conclude by stating that the Council must take clear and categorical action for the cessation of hostilities. But, at the same time, I should like to tell the men and women of Argentina, the mothers and sisters who have lost brothers, sons or fathers that all this sacrifice will not be in vain; that this bloodshed, grief and tragedy will lead to a new Latin America, a united, worthy, active Latin America with a greater awareness of the role it must play so that peace and justice may prevail in the world.

205. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

206. Mr. PELLETIER (Canada): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. It is a difficult and challenging assignment which has been thrust upon you.

207. It is with the deepest regret that my delegation has felt obliged to request the permission of the Council members to address them once again on the question of the Falkland Islands. My regret is profound because my speaking today is a consequence of failure, the failure of one party to the dispute to adhere to the provisions of a decision taken by the Council on 3 April. It is also a consequence of the sad lack of success of the courageous and persistent efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General to seek grounds on which to implement Council resolution 502 (1982) and to establish a framework for direct negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom to resolve their differences in this dispute.

208. My delegation has listened to the debate with great attentiveness. There have been several points made which, in my view, tend to depart from the central issues of principle of which the Council is seized. I should like, therefore, to address the key points on which, in the view of my delegation, the Council should focus its attention before any decision is taken on the question at hand.

209. When I participated on 2 April last in the Council debate on the Falkland question [2349th meeting], I communicated the deep sense of shock of the Canadian Government and people that one of the States Members of the United Nations, a country with which Canada has traditionally enjoyed friendly relations, should resort to the use of armed force in order to resolve a dispute, not only in fundamental violation of the Charter of the United Nations but also at a time when bilateral negotiations were being conducted in a civilized spirit with another Member of the United Nations.

210. Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter is quite explicit concerning the requirement for Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means so that

international peace and security and justice are not endangered. To resort to force in order to claim what is disputed or to seize what is considered sovereign, or to impose on a community a régime which it considers foreign has serious consequences for the rule of international law and for the conduct of orderly relations between States. Abrogation of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes can lead only to chaos, the law of the jungle and the dimming of values we hold dear in civilization.

211. As we forecast in April and as events show so clearly, tragedy and suffering are the inevitable results when a nation fails to abide by the principles set out in the Charter and employs force to extend unilaterally its national claims. And we cannot forget that Argentina initiated the hostilities in occupying the islands unilaterally.

212. We had earnestly hoped that Argentina would abide by the provisions of resolution 502 (1982), which the Secretary-General has stated provided the basis for the search for a peaceful resolution of the dispute in question. Paragraph 2 of that resolution demanded an immediate withdrawal of all Argentine forces from the islands. This has not taken place. Canada has thus been compelled to impose certain economic sanctions against that country. We did this with great regret, because Canada greatly values its friendly relations with Argentina. More important, however, we believe that respect for the rule of law throughout the world, as embodied in the Charter, is fundamental in today's society and must take precedence.

213. The tragic consequences of the past several days have been the inevitable result. This terrible reality has now begun to register, and public opinion in all our countries is demanding an end to violence and bloodshed and the needless loss of life and destruction of property. It must now be more clear than ever before that a negotiated solution to the problem is the only civilized course of action. Council resolution 502 (1982), calling for an immediate cessation of hostilities, coupled with an immediate withdrawal from the islands of all Argentine forces, provides the basis for seeking a diplomatic settlement.

214. Canada has not made any judgement on the substance of this question, which is the conflicting claims to the sovereignty of the islands. Canada has always maintained that this a matter to be settled by negotiation between the parties directly concerned, due regard being paid to the wishes of the islanders themselves. How tragic it is that great suffering must be endured, families separated, blood spilled and lives lost because of a dispute whose settlement should and could still be reached by peaceful means.

215. My Government has been greatly heartened by the courageous efforts over the past days of the Secretary-General, who, taking resolution 502 (1982) as the basis of his work, attempted persistently to

narrow further the differences separating the two sides. We applaud his initiative. We admire his skill and that of his staff, and we sorrow at his set-back. We have told him that as a concerned member of the world community as well as of the hemisphere, one that has ties of history and geography with both parties to the dispute, the Government of Canada stands ready to facilitate negotiations or to assist in the implementation of any agreed settlement if the parties agree there is a useful role for Canada to play. The Canadian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has reiterated to the Foreign Ministers of Argentina and the United Kingdom Canada's willingness to cooperate in achieving a lasting, peaceful settlement.

216. The people of Canada have watched the escalation of violence with growing concern, and they will applaud and support any and all efforts that lead to a peaceful settlement. But that must be based on justice and the rule of law. Settlement must be achieved before further lives are lost and before the conflict becomes more widespread. Let no time be wasted or efforts spared in returning to the precepts of resolution 502 (1982).

217. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should like to begin by expressing to you, Mr. President, the appreciation of my Government for your judicious and skilful leadership of the affairs of the Council in this deeply troubled time, as we seek a solution to the tragic conflict under way in the South Atlantic.

218. We desire also to express in this public arena our gratitude to the Secretary-General for his tireless and determined efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the conflict between the United Kingdom and Argentina. The Secretary-General knows, as we should like the world as well to know, that he enjoyed the active support and co-operation of the United States in his search for a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

219. This conflict poses a particularly acute problem for persons and nations that love peace and also for this international body, whose very *raison d'être* is to promote and ensure the peaceful settlement of disputes.

220. The United States stands behind the principle that the use of force to settle disputes should not be allowed anywhere, and especially in this hemisphere where a significant number of territorial disputes remain to be solved diplomatically. For the United States, the Falkland crisis has been and still is a particularly agonizing, tragic event. As the whole world knows, we have a long-standing alliance and, beyond that, the closest relations of friendship with the United Kingdom, the country from which our political institutions, law and language derive. But we have not forgotten for a moment our close geographical, eco-

conomic and political relations with our Latin neighbours. We not only care about this hemisphere, we are part of this hemisphere, and we share many of the aspirations, goals and dreams of all nations of the Americas. Our own culture and society are deeply influenced by a growing Hispanic population. We can never turn our backs on or be insensitive to hemispheric goals and aspirations that we ourselves have promoted and defended.

221. That is why the United States tried so hard to avoid the conflict on the Falklands, why we are hoping so intensely to reduce and isolate it and why we are eager and ready to back any realistic diplomatic initiative that will put a just end to it. And we especially mean to stay in close touch with our Latin neighbours while efforts are made to solve this tragic conflict in order to restore peace with honour so that once again we can concentrate our efforts on the resolution of our problems in the hemisphere. The quicker we put this tragic conflict behind us, the quicker we can begin building our future. And there, as always, Latin America will find how deeply the United States is committed to the cause of peace and prosperity in our hemisphere.

222. As the fighting intensifies and the cost in lives mounts in the South Atlantic, I think we all share a sense of anguish that it has not yet been possible to prevent this tragic conflict.

223. We have all come to appreciate how deep the roots of that conflict are. Britain, in peaceful possession of the Falkland Islands for 150 years, has been passionately devoted to the proposition that the rights of the inhabitants should be respected in any future disposition of the islands. No one can say that that attitude, coming from a country that has granted independence to more than 40 peoples in a generation and a half, is a simple reflex to retain possession.

224. Yet we know too how deep is the Argentine commitment to recover islands they believe were taken from them by illegal force. This is not some sudden passion, but a long-sustained national concern that also stretches back 150 years and is heightened by the sense of frustration at what Argentina feels were nearly 20 years of fruitless negotiation.

225. From the start it has been widely recognized that the conflict engages basic principles without which a peaceful international order cannot stand. Unless the principle is respected that force must not be used to settle disputes, the entire international community will be exposed to chaos and suffering. And unless the right of self-defence is granted, only those countries that use force first will have the protection of law.

226. The Council was profoundly right to reassert those principles in resolution 502 (1982), which forms

the indispensable framework in which a peaceful solution has been sought and will ultimately be found. It is of fundamental importance that both Argentina and Britain have accepted resolution 502 (1982) in its entirety.

227. For the United States, the conflict continues to have a special poignancy. We do not take, and have never taken, any position on the underlying claims. Britain is a country to which we are bound by unique ties of friendship, values and alliance. And Argentina is also an old friend, a country of immigrants and settlers like our own, a country with which we share the enormous human and national potential of the New World experience.

228. That a conflict of such dimensions should take place and that it should occur here in the western hemisphere, whose countries have long shared a particular commitment to each other, to their mutual welfare and to peace, causes us the deepest concern. This conflict, however urgent, cannot be permitted to obscure the common engagement of all American States to the rule of law and to the well-being of this hemisphere.

229. It was natural that the United States should make a particular effort to help Argentina and Britain find a solution. That effort began before 2 April, when we offered to the two sides our good offices to help find a solution to the South Georgia incident.

230. After 2 April, both President Galtieri and Prime Minister Thatcher asked the United States to see whether it could be of assistance. At President Reagan's direction, Secretary of State Haig undertook two rounds of intense discussions in both capitals. Finally, on 27 April, as prospects for more intense hostilities arose, we put forward a proposal. It represented our best estimate of what the two parties could reasonably be expected to accept. It was founded squarely on resolution 502 (1982) by providing for a cessation of hostilities, withdrawal of forces and a political settlement of the dispute.

231. The British Government indicated that it would seriously consider our proposal, although it presented certain real difficulties for it. However, the proposal was not acceptable to Argentina.

232. Immediately afterward, President Belaúnde of Peru, after consultation with Secretary Haig in order to be brought up to date on his initiatives, undertook the initiative to put forward a much simplified peace plan, also drawing on the fundamental elements of resolution 502 (1982).

233. On 5 May, a draft text was forwarded by Peru to Buenos Aires; we forwarded the same text to London. Britain made it clear that it could seriously consider the proposal. Argentina chose not to consider it, asking instead that the Secretary-General use his

good offices as, of course, it was its full privilege to do.

234. The tragic conflict before us also has special poignancy for the United Nations. It is precisely this kind of problem the Organization was created to resolve. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations commits us "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace". It commits us to "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace". It commits us to "achieve international co-operation in solving international problems" and to "be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends".

235. The United Nations record in dealing with this conflict is, we believe, commendable. The Council responded rapidly to the Argentine seizure of the islands. The fact that both parties accepted resolution 502 (1982) proves that it was a constructive response.

236. The Secretary-General's determined and imaginative efforts were, of course, fervently welcomed by all of us. Again the elements of settlement seemed to be present, or nearly present. Again peace eluded us. I believe the institutions of the United Nations have functioned in this crisis in the manner foreseen by its founders and its Charter. We can be proud of it, proud especially of the Secretary-General.

237. We have already heard his account of his search for a formula that could resolve the conflict. I think all of us have been deeply impressed by the skill and sensitivity, by the judgement and fairness, that the Secretary-General brought to this task. That his effort has not so far succeeded does not mean that it has not realized important gains, notably in the establishment of a mutually acceptable concept of negotiations. The United States will whole-heartedly support any initiative that can help Argentina and Britain make peace with honour.

238. But, despite all our efforts, the problem is not solved. Young men die in icy waters, on frozen beaches.

239. The dispute that appeared to many to be simple has proved extraordinarily difficult to resolve. But we must not abandon the effort. Resolution 502 (1982), with its concept of linked and simultaneous cessation of hostilities, withdrawal of forces, and negotiations, must remain the framework of the search for peace. The problem is too important—for the rule of law, for the future of the Americas, for many of us friends of Britain and Argentina—not to make

an all-out effort to settle this tragic conflict, so costly in every way.

240. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Guatemala. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

241. Mr. DELPRÉE CRESPO (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of the Republic of Guatemala wishes to thank the Council for inviting it to participate in the discussion on the situation in the Malvinas Islands and the conflict which has arisen between the United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic.

242. As this is the first time that I have spoken in the Council this month, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. President. Your personal virtues, talent, skill and prudence are guarantees that the Council's deliberations will be conducted in such a way as to ensure their success.

243. Guatemala regrets the deadlock in the negotiations between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom on the Malvinas conflict, because we have always believed, as a matter of principle, in the peaceful settlement of international disputes, which is the very corner-stone of relations among the States that make up the international community. We have always considered it an overriding duty to abide by the norms governing the United Nations.

244. Guatemala appeals to both parties to return to the negotiating table in good faith to find a peaceful solution to the conflict which is having such a decisive effect on peace in this continent, and possibly throughout the world.

245. We also appeal to the parties to support with a constructive attitude the admirable and tireless work of the Secretary-General in the mediation efforts he has undertaken. In them he has demonstrated his faith in the United Nations, its purposes and principles, its procedures and the paramount importance which the maintenance of peace and security should be accorded by the nations which, as we know, have sought to act in this affair that is causing such distress to all the countries of the world.

246. The Government of Guatemala wishes to reaffirm its solidarity with its sister, the Argentine Republic, as it has done before, and with the noble purpose of its Government to safeguard the territorial integrity of the Argentine nation.

247. It is inconceivable that the colonialist system, which is fortunately in its death throes throughout the world, including our continent, should have sprung to life, allowing a colonialist empire to impose its interests upon our America to the detriment of a Latin American country, whose right to sovereignty over

the full extent of its territory has been internationally recognized.

248. We believe that this matter should be dealt with through negotiations so that the vast majority of the States that make up this international community can maintain their faith and belief that international justice lives and prevails, even when what is at stake are the interests of great Powers which seek to impose their will by means of their military might.

249. If this does not come about, Latin America will continue to believe that this action against Argentina is a serious threat also to it and shakes confidence in the rest of the world among those who might suffer similar treatment if an attempt were made to subject them to similar circumstances.

250. The Government of Guatemala, through me, expresses its confidence in this important body and its conviction that, in the face of the situation created by the breaking off of negotiations, it will fulfil its lofty mission effectively and efficiently, by finding or encouraging the parties to find a peaceful and just solution to this conflict that is causing us so much concern.

251. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now. The remaining speakers on today's list will be heard when the Council continues its consideration of the item on the agenda. Some other speakers have also asked to make statements at tomorrow's meeting. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in right of reply.

252. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): This afternoon's debate has contained few surprises to my delegation. Obviously we expected Latin American speakers, for reasons of regional solidarity, to support the position of Argentina. Obviously we expected certain delegations to express their views, however unwelcome to us in substance, with sobriety and moderation. Obviously we expected other delegations to give vent to atrociously offensive, confused and ill-directed rodomontades against my country, even including objectionable personal observations about the leadership of my Government. The Foreign Minister of Panama even went so far as to imply that there might have been some difference between my own judgements and recommendations and the instructions I received from my Government. Nothing—nothing, Mr. President—could be further from the truth. I repeat, nothing, nothing could be further from the truth.

253. We also expected to hear the heavy tread of the dinosaur, stirring the dust of long-extinct political slogans. Again, we have not been disappointed. I am referring, of course, to the bizarre animadversions we have heard about colonialism and imperialism.

No State Member of the United Nations could have done more to promote self-determination and the rights and interests of peoples than the United Kingdom. Between 40 and 50 Members of the Organization can testify to that.

254. There are still a few very small dependent territories of the United Kingdom which have, like the Falklands, decided of their own free, democratic choice not to seek full sovereign independence because of the size of their populations and the limitations of their resources. This is their free choice, not a consequence of such preposterous nonsense as colonial oppression.

255. None of the Latin American speakers today has uttered cries of rage because, for example, there are still islands in the Caribbean which fall into this category. It seems that their objurgations apply only to a territory which happens to be claimed by Argentina. I have listened carefully for any, any serious, mention of the people of the Falkland Islands. I have heard none. The Falklands are not uninhabited rocks. They contain a people, small in number but peaceful, harmless and homogeneous. They have chosen to remain British of their free, democratic choice. That is the right which we are protecting, and which we shall continue to protect.

256. I now turn to the question of self-defence. I think I dealt adequately in my statement yesterday [2360th meeting] with other issues which have been raised today, such as the question of who was responsible for breaking off the latest negotiations, who has shown flexibility and who has been rigid. I will only state again that it was not my Government which brought the last round of negotiations to an unsuccessful conclusion and that my Government has throughout shown the maximum flexibility consonant with the firm maintenance of principles which we will not abandon.

257. First, we are dealing with a simple case of cause and effect. The cause of the present crisis is the invasion of the Falklands by Argentina and Argentina's refusal to obey the mandatory demand of the Security Council to withdraw unconditionally. The effect is the hostilities which are causing such concern to the international community. Remove the cause, Argentine illegal occupation of the Falklands, and the effect, the hostilities, will disappear.

258. I should like to say a few words about Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and I shall address my remarks in response to the statement made to the Council yesterday by Mr. Ros, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Argentine Republic [*ibid.*]. He advanced his arguments in plain language, unadorned by abuse or rhetoric, and I shall therefore address my remarks to him.

259. It has never been the contention of the United Kingdom that we were authorized by resolution 502

(1982) to use force. No such authorization is necessary under the Charter. Article 51 provides that: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of . . . self-defence . . .". The United Kingdom has been exercising this right in the face of Argentina's first use of force to invade the Falkland Islands and subsequent use of force to occupy them and to attempt to subjugate the people of the Falkland Islands.

260. Mr. Ros also argued that there is an obligation to suspend self-defence once the Security Council, under Article 51 of the Charter, "has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security". He went on to say that: "The determination of whether such measures have been effective must be reached objectively and cannot be left to the arbitrary judgement of the . . . United Kingdom" [*ibid.*, para. 55].

261. The United Kingdom accepts that the determination must be an objective one. It must be reached in the light of all the relevant circumstances.

262. What are the facts?

263. By resolution 502 (1982) the Council demanded the immediate withdrawal of all Argentine forces from the Falkland Islands. Argentina did not withdraw any of its forces: it did quite the opposite. Argentina increased considerably the number of its forces in the days following the adoption of the resolution.

264. The resolution determined that there was a breach of the peace as a result of the Argentine invasion. This is made clear by a reading of the preamble. The results of that invasion were Argentine occupation. Accordingly, the breach of the peace still subsisted despite the adoption of the resolution. How, then, can it seriously be maintained that resolution 502 (1982) amounted to a measure "necessary to maintain international peace and security"?

265. In my letter to the President of the Council dated 30 April, I pointed out that the reference in Article 51 of the Charter to measures necessary to maintain international peace could

"only be taken to refer to measures which are actually effective to bring about the stated objective. Clearly, the Security Council's decision in its resolution 502 (1982) has not proved effective. The United Kingdom's inherent right of self-defence is thus unimpaired." [*See S/15016.*]

266. The Council has not, of course, adopted any measures under Articles 39, 41 and 42 of the Charter. The argument of Under-Secretary Ros that the exercise of self-defence is not available because the Council adopted resolution 502 (1982) would lead to absurd results. A State which has committed an act of aggression is told by the Council to stop its aggression and

to withdraw. That State does not heed the demand. The victim, according to Mr. Ros, would then be obliged to fold his arms and allow the aggressor to continue his aggression and to digest its fruits.

267. A moment's thought would lead any fair-minded observer to conclude that the Charter could not have been intended to produce that result and that the Council could not have produced that result by resolution 502 (1982).

268. The Under-Secretary also argued that self-defence could be exercised "only as an immediate reaction to protect essential interests" [2360th meeting, para. 58]. The essential interests of the United Kingdom include the protection of British territory and British nationals. The Falkland Islands are British territory on the basis of history from the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We have occupied and administered the islands in all three centuries and continuously since 1833. The people of the Falkland Islands are British subjects who have chosen to maintain their present way of life and political institutions in free and fair elections.

269. Can there be any doubt in the mind of anyone that the United Kingdom is entitled to protect its territory and its people?

270. A further argument of Mr. Ros was that "the United Kingdom could not allege any imminent and grave danger" [*ibid.*, para. 59]. The Argentine invasion of 2 April not only posed an imminent and grave danger but it was determined by the Council to have caused an actual breach of the peace. It flies in the face of reason that there was no imminent and grave danger. There was an actual and grave danger to the people of the Falkland Islands: that they would continue for ever to be governed by an alien régime which they most decidedly and unanimously did not want.

271. It was also argued that the United Kingdom was not entitled to exercise self-defence because the Falkland Islands are 14,000 km from Great Britain and that the islands are a colonial dependency. My answer is that the Falkland Islands are British territory and that, in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter, we have accepted the obligation to promote, "within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants"—in this case, of the Falkland Islands. This means that the United Kingdom is perfectly entitled to resist the illegal use of force by Argentina, contrary to the fundamental principles of the Charter, peaceful settlement and non-use of force, by exercising the inherent right of self-defence. Distance is irrelevant. Dependant status is irrelevant because Article 73 extends to the people of dependencies the full protection of the Charter regarding the maintenance of international peace and security.

272. Finally, Under-Secretary Ros argued that the United Kingdom had violated resolution 502 (1982) by dispatching the Royal Navy. He argued that this was contrary to paragraph 1 of resolution 502 (1982) which demanded a cessation of hostilities. The resolution has to be read as a whole. Its preamble makes clear that there had been an invasion of the Falklands on 2 April by armed forces of Argentina which had caused a breach of the peace. It was to these hostilities by Argentina that paragraph 1 was directed. The Falkland Islands had been at peace before 2 April and had never threatened Argentina. We maintained only the smallest of garrisons there. Had Argentina complied with paragraph 1 by ceasing its hostilities against the people of the Falkland Islands on 3 April and had Argentina complied with the demand for the immediate withdrawal of all Argentine forces, there would have been no need for the Royal Navy to exercise the United Kingdom's right of self-defence when it arrived off the Falkland Islands. The way would have been open for the continuation of diplomatic negotiations which had been held as recently as 27 February. Instead, Argentina used force to occupy the islands and has used force against the people of the islands day by day since 3 April. This was contrary to resolution 502 (1982). In these circumstances, the United Kingdom retains in full its inherent right of self-defence.

273. Finally, I believe that the Foreign Minister of Panama suggested that we might be introducing nuclear weapons into the area. I only have this to say: it is absolutely inconceivable that Britain would use nuclear weapons in the dispute with Argentina over the Falklands.

274. Mr. ROS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It was not the intention of my delegation to prolong this debate in any kind of personalized way, but the representative of the United Kingdom has opted for this system; obviously we have to act as if we were embarking upon a bilateral dialogue.

275. The fact is that he has made known his points of view, and while he was speaking I was reading resolution 502 (1982), but I could not see in that resolution any authorization for the United Kingdom to send its fleet and to begin hostilities. So no matter how much we debate, in no way does this resolution authorize the United Kingdom to become the world's policeman and to use force in the way it is doing.

276. The representative of the United Kingdom tells us that we are not complying with resolution 502 (1982). I should like to recall that the Government of Argentina immediately manifested its intention to comply with the resolution as a whole, because the resolution cannot be applied one paragraph today or another when it suits the United Kingdom. Obviously it is an integral resolution and it must be wholly complied with.

277. The Argentine Government indicated its acceptance in three communications to the Council. However, it was the United Kingdom which violated the resolution by not ceasing hostilities and by initiating its aggression in spite of that decision which had already been communicated to the Council.

278. Since intransigence was mentioned, I should also like to point out that my country's desire to find a peaceful solution to this conflict has been amply proved by the very great patience with which we have tried to continue to find a negotiated solution to this dispute which was not begun by the Argentine Republic but precisely by this British fleet which, in a full upsurge of British imperialism, came to our coasts, expelled our authorities, imprisoned our inhabitants and expelled them to Montevideo. This was the act of force which gave rise to this problem. It is not a problem of today, it is a problem which goes back a long way. My country never signed a treaty, never accepted any declaration. On the contrary, it constantly protested against this usurpation of its territory, of a piece of our territory on which a colonial régime was imposed, and today it is claimed that we should accept it as if it were a fact which all Argentine generations have constantly rejected.

279. A little logic should be applied to this problem when an attempt is made by a stroke of the pen to ignore a truth shared by all the peoples of Latin America—it is part of our territory and colonial imperialism came to impose a colonial system on it. In passing, I should like to recall that we are talking about a colonial settlement with a handful of people, about 800 families, and this is presented to us as if this were a people, a nation, with all the attributes of a State practically on the brink of independence.

280. This exaggeration of the principles concerned is a way of obscuring the truth, and this is what we want to say.

281. I should also like to recall that the wish of my country has been made clear: within the framework of the negotiations a solution was suggested which permitted an honourable outcome and opened the way towards a final solution of this long-standing controversy. However, we did not find in the exercise the same goodwill on the part of the United Kingdom. On the contrary, we found a constant stretching of legal terminology to cover all the possibilities of a reply which could really provide an intelligent and reasonable solution, a solution which would take care most generously of the concerns of the islanders by means of a statute that would be part of this same agreement and would be presented to the United Nations. What better guarantee than a statute that generously takes care of their interests and enjoys the protection of this international body?

282. However, all these references were ignored, because, we must conclude, the defence of this principle of self-determination is just a pretext to continue

to stay in this territory where the United Kingdom has no business to be at the end of the twentieth century. It is an anachronistic relic of outmoded imperialism.

283. Instead of looking at things in their true light, we keep on looking at peripheral details. Today there is one crisis, tomorrow another, but we never come to the substance, to the crux of the matter. The crux of the matter is that the United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic have to find an intelligent answer to this problem, and if the Secretary-General's good offices could help us to find such a solution, we would be extremely grateful. This very day, the Argentine Foreign Minister has been to see the Secretary-General to ratify our wish to continue negotiating within the framework of his good offices, within the framework of the Charter and within the framework of the resolutions of the United Nations—resolutions which were approved by the General Assembly and which are the voice of this house—calling for a negotiated solution in terms which are indicated.

284. Three resolutions of the General Assembly have been adopted and the three resolutions have borne no fruit, although there was a call to accelerate the negotiations. There was recognition of the efforts of Argentina over the last 10 years to assist the development of these islands, to facilitate communications and demonstrate our goodwill.

285. Why did these negotiations not prosper? Because of a combination of monopolistic interests, plus typically colonial legislation which made it possible to maintain in the islands a kind of artificial cocoon, suspended in time and space, preserving a kind of Victorian policy which suited some, but was rejected by the whole continent, particularly by our nation.

286. I do not want to add much more, because sometimes words only complicate problems more, but I should like to say now that this is not really a reply but an appeal to the intelligence of those of us who are responsible for this matter, and also a request for participation on the part of the Council not only in trying to find a solution to the dispute in which we find ourselves, but also in acting as a kind of interpreter of the will of the General Assembly in the search for an ultimate solution of this dispute. It is our hope that the Council will encourage the Secretary-General and give him a clear-cut mandate to resume negotiations so that we can truly work in an atmosphere of peace in the search for an intelligent and honourable solution.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/34/542, annex, Political Declaration, para. 168.

² A/10217 and Corr.1, annex, Political Declaration, para. 87.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何获取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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