



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/PV.1224
10 September 1982

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 1226TH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 19 August 1982, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago)

CONTENTS

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (continued)
Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS) (A/AC.109/712)(continued)

Mr. POPAL (Afghanistan): Very recently the peoples of the world witnessed a tragic event in the South Atlantic caused by the intransigent colonialist policy of the British Government. The British Government, applying various forms of colonialist tactics, has tried to hold on to its illegal control over the Malvinas. Its military blockade, as well as its military operations and manoeuvres with the direct support and collaboration of the United States Government, has jeopardized the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Argentine Republic.

As a result of the colonialist and imperialist policy of aggression in the region, the peace and security of all Latin American countries are in obvious danger.

The Malvinas belong to their motherland, Argentina, not to the British colonial Power. In the final communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the non-aligned countries, held recently in Havana,

"... the ministers reiterated the decisions of previous non-aligned conferences and meetings in which they expressed their support for the Argentine Republic's right to the restitution of the Malvinas Islands and sovereignty over them. They recalled that the struggle against colonialism in all its forms is a basic principle of non-alignment, and reaffirmed their staunch solidarity with Argentina in its efforts to bring an end to the outdated colonial presence in the Malvinas Islands and to prevent its re-establishment."

As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan believes that the Malvinas are an integral part of the Argentine Republic and that the British colonial Power should withdraw its military forces from those islands and recognize the right of Argentine sovereignty over them.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform members that I have received a request from the delegation of Peru to participate in the Committee's consideration of this item. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee accedes to this request.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with decisions taken earlier today, I call on the representative of Argentina.

Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): Since this is my first statement in this Committee, I should like to congratulate all the officers and members of the Committee for the fruitful work that they have done in the field of decolonization, a crucial objective of this Organization.

The Argentine delegation would like to thank the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for making it possible for us to appear before it and state the Argentine Government's position on the question of the Malvinas, one of the most urgent and yet unsolved problems encountered by the United Nations involving countries still subjected to colonial and foreign domination.

On several occasions my delegation has set forth in this Committee and in the General Assembly the historical background of the colonial situation of the Malvinas, and in the South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. We have set forth the foundation of the Argentine Republic's legitimate claims to sovereignty over those Territories. On the other hand, information about recent events in the South Atlantic, as given in British and other periodicals, has once again revealed the United Kingdom's doubtful title to those islands, and the legitimacy of Argentina's claims to them. That information comes from an analysis of British archives - which the British Government has now hastened to hide - and confirms facts that Argentina has maintained all along.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

That explains the attempt by the representative of the United Kingdom, in the note he addressed to the Security Council on 28 April 1982, to ignore the historical aspects and concentrate on the right to self-determination. That note was accompanied by a doubtful chronological list of data.

In contrast to the weakness of the British claims, Argentina's claims are clear. The fact that the United Kingdom occupied the islands by force and expelled Argentine authorities in 1833 in no way vitiates our claim.

(Mr. Muffiz, Argentina)

In sum, our claims stem from the discovery and occupation by Spain, from the recognition by France and England in the course of the eighteenth century of the sovereignty of our predecessor, from the legal continuity of the territorial rights as the successor State to Spain and from the succeeding Argentine occupation.

I cannot fail to point out here that, according to existing evidence from maps, it is undeniable that the Malvinas Islands were discovered by Spanish navigators in the first half of the sixteenth century. That evidence is taken, inter alia, from the Pedro Reinel map of 1522 or 1523, the Weimar Spanish map extant in the 1527 Duke of Weimar Cabinet, the 1529 Diego Ribero map of the world, the 1541 Alonso de Santa Cruz map of the islands of the world and the Sebastian Cabot map of 1544.

The 149 years that have elapsed since Britain's aggression do not give validity to the rights of the United Kingdom, nor do they confer legitimacy on its presence in the archipelago.

It is because the Argentine claims are so well founded that the United Kingdom has never been able to refute them, falling back on the original response of the then head of the Foreign Office, Lord Palmerston. Moreover, the illegitimacy of the British occupation, the result of the usurpation that occurred in 1833, was expressly recognized in the House of Commons on 27 July 1848 by Sir William Malesworth in a statement that remains equally valid today.

That the question of the Malvinas Islands has been dealt with by the United Nations as an intolerable vestige of colonialism demonstrates the need for a speedy solution. Great Britain, in obstinate rebellion against this generally held opinion in the international community, stubbornly maintains this anachronistic situation, obdurately obstructs opportunities for effective negotiations and invokes these so-called pre-existing sovereign claims in order to justify its recent armed attacks perpetrated by its military forces, basing itself on an arbitrary interpretation of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

It is the anticolonial struggle that must be viewed as the exercise of the right to self-defence. Wars against colonialism are international wars of which the colonial Power is guilty, for the continuance of colonialism is a permanent act of aggression.

The occupation of the Malvinas Islands became a colonial situation under the terms of resolution 1514 (XV), since it was recognized as such by the United Kingdom, which included the Malvinas Islands in its own list of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the intention of later using the Special Committee and the General Assembly to legitimize its claims.

Today the British Government has adopted what is called a "policy of strength" in the Malvinas Islands, although many of its citizens have wondered to what extent a purely military solution can be expected to **last** for any length of time. In order to provide a political basis for this action, the British Prime Minister, who stated that she was acting in defence of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands and in defence of democracy, later asserted, making clear her imperialist policy, the strategic importance of the sea lanes around Cape Horn. But we must ask ourselves how this British policy tallies with decisions of the United Nations.

The first concrete manifestation of the concern of the United Nations about this problem occurred in 1965, when resolution 2065 (XX) was adopted with an overwhelming majority. In that resolution the General Assembly noted the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty over the said Islands and invited the two parties to proceed without delay with the negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful solution to that dispute, bearing in mind the provisions and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the interests - I repeat: the interests - of the population of the Islands. That is what is stated in the resolution.

The taking of that position by the sovereign and most representative body of our Organization was the point of departure and the fundamental basis of all its subsequent actions in this matter. This explains its positive attitude whenever circumstances made it advisable. This was the thrust of the consensuses of 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1971 calling upon both parties to continue their negotiations in keeping with resolution 2065 (XX).

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

In 1973 resolution 3160 (XXVIII) once again reaffirmed the existence of a conflict of sovereignty over the Islands between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom. As we have pointed out on previous occasions, the terms used in both resolutions are not accidental; on the contrary, they are the result of a careful weighing of the realities by the General Assembly. Indeed, in the specific case of the Malvinas Islands, there is implicit recognition that the principle establishing the right of States to their territorial integrity is to be applied, and not the right to self-determination, which, as a general rule, governs most cases of decolonization.

Let me emphasize this: the right of self-determination, as a general rule, applies to the majority of cases of decolonization; that is Argentina's understanding of the matter and we support that view. But it is also undeniable that an illegitimate act of force perpetrated by England in 1833, immediately followed by the expulsion of the Argentine population of the Territory, which was replaced by a group of nationals of the occupying Power, forever invalidated Britain's claim to the use of that right to legitimize its presence in those islands. For the right of self-determination, the status of which as a right is today recognized by the international community through the work of the United Nations, and which developed in the face of opposition by the colonial Powers, which did not accept that basic premise, is one thing; the question of who can legitimately claim the exercise of the right of self-determination is quite another thing.

In the course of the General Assembly debates, it became very clear that it is impossible to apply the right of self-determination of peoples, for quite simply, in the case of the Malvinas there is no people which can exercise self-determination.

In this regard it must be recalled that in the course of United Nations activity in the decolonization process common characteristics of peoples - and I underscore the word "peoples" - to which the right of self-determination applies have emerged. Those characteristics have been summarized in the following way:

First, the term "people" designates a social entity which possesses a clear identity and which has its own characteristics.

Secondly, that term implies a relationship with their territory, even if the people in question has been unjustly expelled from it and artificially replaced by another population.

Thirdly, a people cannot be confused with ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities, whose existence and rights are recognized in article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

From those characteristics it emerges quite clearly that a "population" is not a "people". The resolutions on the question of the Malvinas always refer to the "population" of those islands.

Paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) excludes from the concept of self-determination

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country."

That is precisely what the United Kingdom is endeavouring to do in the case of the Malvinas, shielding itself behind the tendentious and fallacious argument of respect for the wishes of its settlers.

The United Nations was created in 1945. The United Kingdom never accepted the right of self-determination in so far as that institution was contrary to the maintenance of its colonial possessions. But now that the decolonization process is nearing completion - not through the will of the United Kingdom, but through the will of the peoples which struggled against colonialism and that of those who stood in solidarity with them - the United Kingdom is trying to use that institution, protecting itself with the colonial links of the employees of the Falkland Islands Company.

Argentina considers and has always considered, the self-determination of peoples to be a part of international law. The United Kingdom on the other hand, in discussing the inclusion of the right of self-determination in the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, stated that the article referring to the right of self-determination was completely unacceptable to the United Kingdom and added that there is no room in the Covenants for provisions which do not concern a fundamental human right.

Moreover, that truly mistaken position of the United Kingdom was made clear when that country abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which constitutes the "Magna Carta" of the true principles of the decolonization process undertaken by the United Nations. It was thus that the then representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Ormsby Gore, in the debate on paragraph 2 of that resolution, which refers to the right of self-determination, expressed his doubts about the inclusion of what he termed a mere principle and one which, even in that limited form, seemed to him inappropriate. We should not be surprised at such an attitude, for this instrument of self-determination hailed the end of the United Kingdom's colonial empire.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

That United Kingdom position was reiterated in many international forums. For example, the British delegation to the Mexico conference which considered the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States stated that:

"In the judgement of Her Majesty's Government, to conclude on the basis of Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter or of sub-paragraph (b) of Article 73 and sub-paragraph (b) of Article 76 that there exists a right of self-determination is an unjustified interpretation of the Charter."

It later stated that:

"If the existence of a right of self-determination is maintained, it could be invoked in circumstances in which it would be in conflict with other concepts embodied in the Charter."

My final quotation from what the British delegation said at that important meeting in Mexico is as follows:

"In the judgement of Her Majesty's Government, while the principle of self-determination is a very important formative principle, it cannot be the subject of a sufficiently precise definition in relation to particular circumstances to constitute a right; it is not recognized as such either in the Charter of the United Nations or in international law as generally practised."

The United Kingdom, on the contrary, has disregarded the right of self-determination on innumerable occasions, going about the dismemberment of its colonies without any consultation, appeal to or consideration of the wishes of their inhabitants.

It is the view of our Government that the right of self-determination of peoples, recognized in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, must be considered in these exceptional cases in the light of the circumstances affecting its exercise.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

Accordingly, we believe that this right would not be properly applied in situations where part of the territory of an independent State has been separated - against the will of its inhabitants - as a result of an act of force by a third State, as is the case with the Malvinas Islands, where no subsequent international agreement exists confirming that de facto situation and when, to the contrary, the State whose interests have been adversely affected has continually protested that situation. These considerations are all the more serious especially when the population has been expelled as a result of this act of force and varying groups of nationals of the occupying Power have replaced it.

On the other hand, the indiscriminate application of the principle of self-determination to such sparsely populated Territories by nationals of the colonial Power would place the fate of such Territories in the hands of the Power that has established itself there by force, in violation of the most fundamental norms of international law and morality. Ultimately, this would mean the absurd case of self-determination for colonizers and would give them the opportunity to legitimize their illegal presence in a Territory that does not belong to them.

The fundamental right to self-determination, as Argentina has emphatically repeated, must not be used to transform illegitimate possession into a case of full sovereignty, under any mantle of protection that the United Nations might afford.

The United Nations has ably interpreted the proper way to apply this right and has recognized, when appropriate, the supremacy of the right of territorial integrity over improperly applied self-determination.

The General Assembly, in a particular case in 1976, opted clearly for the principle which establishes the right of territorial integrity.

I refer to the situation of the Comorian island of Mayotte. The plenary Assembly has since reiterated that position and reaffirmed it once again at its last session in resolution 36/105, which was adopted by 117 votes in favour, including my country's vote, and the text of which needs no comment. Argentina voted in favour of that document and previous similar resolutions because it believes that instruments approved by the General Assembly should be applied to resolve individual cases with clearly differentiated features and not to justify or to resolve theoretical positions.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

Similarly, in 1976, the General Assembly adopted resolution 31/49 on the question of the Malvinas Islands, which reiterated once again that there existed a dispute over sovereignty with regard to a colonial Territory - I repeat, a colonial Territory - and that a satisfactory solution should be found as soon as possible.

That satisfactory solution must be just and lasting and will never be achieved if the colonial Power persists in imposing its claims and in arbitrarily claiming to determine what is lawful and what is not lawful through the support and use of its military might.

It must be understood that any negotiations that might be held in the future under the aegis of the United Nations must lead to the recognition of Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, which has been recognized and recently reaffirmed once again by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at its meetings in New York on 27 April and 5 May 1982, by the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau in Havana, held from 31 May to 5 June 1982 and by the twentieth consultative meeting of Foreign Ministers of Latin American countries, in their adoption of resolutions I and II, of 28 April and 29 May 1982 respectively, which occurred at the same time as the events in the South Atlantic.

In the United Nations and in other multinational forums, the international community had expressed its firm and committed support to Argentina's just claim even prior to Argentina's recovery of the Islands.

So it was that in August 1975, the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries, meeting in Lima, categorically affirmed the position of the particular case of the Malvinas Islands within the decolonization process, calling upon my country and the United Kingdom actively to proceed with negotiations as recommended in United Nations General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII) and also qualified the continuing British presence in the archipelago as illegal.

Furthermore, in the inter-American sphere there has been unequivocal support for the legitimacy of Argentina's claim. There too it is considered that the situation of the Islands is a special case that needs special treatment in the decolonization task that has been undertaken for many years by the United Nations. An outstanding example of this opinion is the

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

Declaration adopted by the Inter-American Legal Committee, made up of some of our continent's most highly qualified legal experts. Formulated in January 1976, it expressly declared, after a serious analysis and with full knowledge of the historical background and our country's legal claims, that the Republic of Argentina has undeniable rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands -- these were the words used by the Inter-American Legal Committee -- and that the fundamental issue to be resolved is how to proceed to recover that Territory.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

In that same year of 1976, the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries meeting in Colombo fully set forth in the political declaration of that Conference concepts later reaffirmed by the Ministers for Foreign Relations of the Movement in Belgrade in 1978; at the Conference of Heads of State or Government in Havana in 1979; at the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Relations in New Delhi in 1981; and at the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Relations and Heads of Delegations of the Movement held in New York in 1981. Is it possible, I venture to ask, that those decisions and declarations on the part of the great majority of the countries of the world lack relevance in the eyes of the Government of Great Britain, which hardly deigns to consider them adopting an attitude of scorn and disdain?

The Republic of Argentina has never been indifferent to the interests of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands, some of whom have been bombed and killed by the "punitive expedition". In that regard I should like to recall that on the basis of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) and of my Government's willingness, in 1971 agreements regarding communications between the Malvinas Islands and the continental Argentine territory were negotiated and adopted, the respective texts of which were deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Since that time the well-being of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands has considerably improved, an improvement that was expressly recognized in General Assembly resolutions 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49.

Our efforts to take due account of the interests of the present inhabitants of those islands led to the adoption of a series of measures benefitting them, ranging from the establishment of a regular air travel service to the granting of fellowships and medical attention in hospital centres in continental Argentina.

Furthermore, I should like to recall that in the letter which the Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General on 29 July 1981 the basic positions of the Argentina Government were set forth with respect to the inhabitants of the Malvinas, and they are as follows:

- "2. The Argentine Government reiterates its promise to respect the interest of the islanders;
- "3. The protection of those interests should take into account the islanders' way of life and traditions;

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

"4. Within the context of acceptable negotiations, Argentina will continue to provide the islanders with the services it is now supplying, which were initiated in 1971 ...

"5. Since these negotiations have been carried out within the framework of United Nations resolutions, the Argentine Republic is prepared to agree that the Organization should provide any guarantees that may be considered desirable in order to provide reliable safeguards for the islanders' interests, should such safeguards be necessary in addition to all those offered by the Argentine legal system and any special statutes that may be negotiated". (A/36/412, p.3)

Once again, on 2 April of this year, the Argentine Executive Branch repeated its position of respect for and protection of the guarantees and essential rights of the islanders and has accordingly proceeded, despite the military operations that have taken place. The recovery of the islands proceeded without the slightest injury to the islanders, not a single one of whom was killed or wounded, despite the casualties, in wounded and dead, sustained by the Argentine troops.

It is a strange juridical situation, indeed, in which those inhabitants, who enjoy Argentine nationality by birth in Argentine territory and by express provision of Argentine law, are considered, on the other hand, by the United Kingdom as second-class citizens, which clearly confirms their state of dependency and subordination.

On 9 August, in London, the Minority Rights Group, a British organization which defends ethnic and cultural minorities, once again recalled that the Government of the United Kingdom between 1965 and 1973 displaced the 2,000 inhabitants of Diego Garcia in order to enable the United States to establish a military base, describing that act as "collective kidnapping". That organization asked what motivated the change in policy of the United Kingdom in the Malvinas Islands. We should like to answer that question. The inhabitants in the Malvinas are not an obstacle; quite the contrary, they are being used by the United Kingdom to justify its territorial presence.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The United Kingdom is attempting to create an individually tailored international law, not only by illegally inventing "zones of exclusion" and broadening "legitimate self-defence" to include aggression, but also by seeking to justify its actions of 1833 by right of conquest of a Territory - a right which has never been recognized or consented to by Argentina. I would stress that it is a widely recognized principle of international law that military occupation of territories does not confer any territorial title or sovereignty upon the occupier.

I believe that there is no doubt as to the broadminded and understanding spirit which the Republic of Argentina has displayed in attending to the interests of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands. It would be merely a further demonstration of the respect which my Government, throughout history and without political or ideological distinction, has shown to men of good will who have lived and live on Argentine soil.

The history of the dispute between my country and the United Kingdom, which I have attempted to summarize in this statement, shows with complete objectivity the willingness that Argentina has always shown in seeking a peaceful negotiated solution.

For 149 years successive Governments in Argentina of all political and ideological hues have, within bilateral and multilateral frameworks, called for the holding of negotiations leading to the restoration of the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands as part of our country's heritage, in accordance with the principle establishing the right to territorial integrity.

All was in vain. The only thing that remained apparent was the constant good will of the Republic of Argentina and, by contrast, the attitude of arrogance and obstruction on the part of the United Kingdom.

Let me recall that early this year, in meetings held on 26 and 27 February in New York, an Argentine proposal was considered which was designed to establish a system of monthly meetings, with a pre-established agenda and venue, presided over by high-ranking officials. That system was to accelerate negotiations leading to the recognition of Argentine sovereignty. The Government of the United Kingdom, in one further demonstration of its traditional policy of ignoring the way of fruitful negotiations in good faith, did not deign to give an answer.

At present in the United Kingdom there is an investigation under way the ultimate purpose of which seems to be to ascertain who in the Government was responsible for the failure to foresee events and take appropriate military steps. In reality, the purpose of that investigation should be very different - to determine why the United Kingdom did not use appropriate diplomatic channels to implement the United Nations resolutions to which we have referred.

On 18 March 1982 the Republic of Argentina was once again faced with the spectre of British aggression emerging from the dispatch of the vessel Endurance and other naval units, with a view to making unlawful use of force against Argentine workers who were engaged in peaceful trade and other legal activities in the San Pedro and South Georgia Islands. Those acts of force, publicly announced in the British press and Parliament, demonstrated once again that the perpetuation of colonial pillage opens the way for imperialist Powers to carry out unjust and irrational actions, with grave consequences for the whole Latin American region. That situation of aggression brought about by the United Kingdom prompted the Republic of Argentina to attempt to recover, without rancour and without material damage but with full right and justice, a part of its national territory.

Since that time and throughout the grave crisis that we have undergone, my country has maintained the position of support and respect for the comprehensive implementation of Security Council resolutions 502 (1982) and 505 (1982) and the good offices undertaken by the Secretary-General, whom we deeply respect and thank for all the work he has done with a view to achieving a proper, lasting and peaceful agreement.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The Government of the United Kingdom, by contract, showed intransigence and arbitrariness, and it was evident that even though it had voted in favour, the United Kingdom did not intend to heed the call addressed to it in Security Council resolution 505 (1982) for a cessation of hostilities in the Malvinas and the establishment of appropriate conditions so that the Secretary-General could continue with his good offices. The aim, already fully demonstrated by the facts, was to restore a reprehensible colonial situation on American soil through armed aggression. There can be no other interpretation of the veto cast by the United Kingdom against the draft resolution submitted in the Security Council by the delegations of Spain and Panama and voted on at its meeting of 4 June last.

That position of the British Government with regard to a draft aimed at achieving a cease-fire and the full implementation of the pertinent resolutions of the Council deserved the express condemnation it received from the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries attending the meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau in Havana, Cuba, from 31 May to 4 June 1982. That vote in the Security Council was a serious warning to the United Kingdom that it was doing injury to international public opinion by pursuing a policy in the Malvinas that was entirely military in content and which disregarded many options that might prove internationally acceptable and politically negotiable.

The recent grave crisis in the region of the Malvinas reached a dramatic peak with the British military forces' occupation of Puerto Argentino, the Malvinas' capital, and of the South Sandwich Islands on 14 and 19 June 1982, respectively: another violation of the territorial integrity of Argentina. As a consequence of those events, the Republic of Argentina informed the Security Council, in a letter of 18 June 1982, in document S/15234, that:

"The total cessation of hostilities will be achieved only when the United Kingdom agrees to lift the naval and air blockade and the economic sanctions referred to above and when it withdraws the military forces occupying the Islands and the naval task force and the nuclear submarines which it has deployed in the area." (S/15234, p. 2)

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

No other words can apply better than those to the untrammelled aggression of the United Kingdom, which could not have been better exemplified than by the hoisting of a pirate flag on the nuclear submarine which sank the Argentine cruiser General Belgrano outside the area considered the war zone by the British Government.

My country, aware of its legitimate rights and in conformity with the Charter of this Organization, wishes once again to point out that real and earnest negotiations carried out within the United Nations framework and in conformity with its relevant resolutions is the way to reach a just and definitive solution of the dispute and thus eliminate an anachronistic and unjust vestige of colonialism which violates my country's territorial integrity and perpetuates a situation that represents an act of force and of permanent aggression.

On 10 August the Foreign Office issued a statement which reads, in part:

"We hope that our European partners will continue the embargo, for the immediate future at least, so long as Argentine intentions are not clear."

Our intention is quite clear: negotiation of the question of sovereignty within a United Nations framework. On the other hand, British intentions are not clear, as can be seen, for instance, from what Vice-Minister Crawley Onslow asked that same day during his visit to Brasilia: "What is it we are to negotiate and with whom?"

It seems clear, then, that the United Kingdom is acting as if there existed a well established international order with "dominant countries", on the one hand, and "dominated countries", on the other, within which it was inconceivable that a dominated country might have a voice of its own or decide its own destiny.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

What the British Government does not understand is that Argentina is defending a principle central to its existence as a nation: the exercise of sovereignty over its own territory.

It is pointless for the United Kingdom to maintain its unwillingness to accept a negotiated, just solution. It is impossible to imagine or to admit that a conflict situation should be prolonged indefinitely, thus obstructing the process of the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism in Latin America.

As pointed out by the Argentine delegation in the 29 April meeting of this Committee, it has been our intention to inform this lofty body of the events that have occurred in the region of the Malvinas Islands as a result of the tragic armed conflict between my country and the United Kingdom, as well as to uphold our full and legitimate rights over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, the need for whose recognition constitutes a national cause rallying the entire Argentine people.

Since the month of April, we have witnessed political events which have made these islands a focal point of international crises, but we have also observed the disinterest of the British Government in bringing about a negotiated solution and how it has attempted to disregard at every turn the ability of this Organization to resolve this conflict, as well as its attempt to transform the islands into a military base with the participation of the United States of America in order subsequently to disguise its imperial image by means of a so-called international agreement for the security of the islands, ignoring the appeals of the international community to administering Powers to dismantle their military bases and not establish new such bases on colonial territories.

We have also noticed a desire to return to the status quo ante of the British administration, accompanied by a studied effort to disguise it in a false exercise of self-determination; there has also been an emphatic rejection of negotiation with Argentina, a country whose legal claims are now enhanced by the blood of its dead sons shed for the ideal of giving effect to the principle of territorial integrity.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

Responding to Mexico's initiative, 20 countries of the region - with that solidarity they have always maintained with Argentina and once again demonstrating their concern at the continuation of the colonial situation - have called upon the Secretary-General, over the signatures of their Ministers for Foreign Affairs, to include the "Question of the Malvinas Islands" on the agenda of the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, in the certainty that that sovereign body will promote a definitive solution of this crisis.

Appreciative of the generosity of spirit which prompted our Latin American brothers, the Argentine Republic also understands the purpose which motivated them and welcomes their gesture with profound and deeply felt gratitude.

I cannot fail to take this opportunity to express my delegation's deep concern with regard to the working paper prepared by the Secretariat in document A/AC.109/712.

It is clear that the account therein of events during the recent crisis between my country and the United Kingdom is neither balanced nor carefully thought out. The text is incorrect and confusing, because in repeated instances in various paragraphs of section B, entitled "Relations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom", assessments are expressed which are based on a partial selection of the facts leading to erroneous interpretations. Similarly, the text of document A/AC.109/712 in many instances makes it impossible clearly to distinguish whether the content of the paragraphs reflects opinions of the Secretariat itself or of the British Government.

Furthermore, my delegation does not understand what criterion was used in selecting the documents referred to in the section under the heading, "Notes", of document A/AC.109/712. Given the extremely serious situation that existed between my country and the United Kingdom, the selection of those documents should have been made rigorously.

The Secretariat affirms having prepared this document on the basis of information transmitted by the British Government in accordance with Article 73 and from other "published reports". We wonder what is the source of those reports, since there is no clarification of this in the Secretariat document.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The Argentine Government was especially interested in keeping the Security Council and the Organization well informed of everything relating to this question. This information was provided through numerous written communications, which have been published as official documents and which provided a full account of the legal and historical bases for our action and of the events taking place in our territory. We view with concern the fact that only two of those communications are cited in the index listing the documentation consulted in the preparation of document A/AC.109/712.

Similarly, in that published document there is no mention of the verbatim records of Security Council meetings which clearly reflect the rights and the positions of Argentina formulated in the course of the negotiations carried out under the good offices of the Secretary-General.

I should like also to refer very briefly to the statements made in the Committee by Messrs. Cheek and Blake, to which my delegation formally objected in a written communication.

I have previously stressed the concern constantly shown by my Government to protect the interests of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands. Messrs. Cheek and Blake were members of the British delegation at the rounds of negotiations on the Malvinas and, as such, they should be in a position to testify to the great care shown by the Argentine delegation in reiterating its Government's willingness to respect the way of life and the interests of the inhabitants of the Islands. The islanders were requested on many occasions to provide a list of the needs and guarantees they felt should be covered under Argentine administration. Throughout the years, we have never received any answer.

Messrs. Cheek and Blake are also aware of the progress made in the well-being of the islanders, thanks to Argentine co-operation. We need not dwell on that in detail here. Suffice it to mention the lines of communication with the continent provided by the Argentine Government to alleviate the enforced isolation and desperate economic straits of the inhabitants of the Malvinas.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The statements we heard at this morning's meeting were, to say the least, surprising. It has never been our wish to attack the way of life of the islands; it has never been our wish to change their language or customs. We were also told that the life of the islanders was subject to decisions by Argentine military commanders. I must point out that at every stage the Malvinas Islanders retained their complete freedom and that the British attempt to characterize the islanders as hostages was a total failure in the light of the ease with which those who wished to leave the islands could do so. Furthermore, in the act of recovering the islands very special care was taken not to damage either the security or the property of the inhabitants. I must say that that attitude is in contrast with the indiscriminate attacks by the United Kingdom which caused casualties among the civilian population.

Perhaps the statements by those gentlemen should not surprise us. They represent the Legislative Council of the islands, an institution organized by the United Kingdom to ensure the maintenance of its occupation, an institution with a colonial structure which has at no time accepted dialogue with Argentina or shown an interest in hearing our facts. It is paradoxical that in a Committee intended to ensure the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples we should have to hear those representing interests seeking to reaffirm colonial links rather than to cause those historical anachronisms to disappear.

I have in front of me the London Daily Telegraph of 10 August 1982. It reports on the trip to New York by Messrs. Blake and Cheek to participate in this debate, and I think it might be useful to mention some of the facts stated in the article.

Mr. Blake is director of the Falkland Islands Company, and came to the islands 11 years ago from New Zealand. Mr. Cheek was in England when Argentina recovered the islands.

One may well wonder what sort of objectivity can be expected from these petitioners. One of them represents the interests of the colonial company, with its headquarters in London, which, as a monopoly, has for many years exploited the economy of the islands. The other was not even in the Malvinas when the events he tried to describe this morning took place.

I cannot complete this statement without saying how much those of us who are struggling for the affirmation of law and of peace with justice deplore the practices of a country, practices which are contrary to civilized co-existence among peoples.

Is it not an attack on the most cherished principles of civilization on the threshold of the twenty-first century to have a distinction drawn between first- and second-class citizens and to adopt an inconceivable hierarchy of human and civic values?

Is the only way of asserting a supposed right to be found through the hegemonistic will of those who possess force against those who possess rights but lack force?

Is it possible in 1982 to show such disregard for human beings as to continue using them as mercenaries assigned to intimidate and kill other human beings?

Is it possible to continue disregarding the resolutions of the international community, as though they did not even exist, and to attempt to decide alone the future of a Territory seized by force from the Argentine people? Can law be defined only by the powerful as their exclusive heritage?

I trust that ultimately justice will triumph. I trust that the British Government will understand that we are in the right and that in this United Nations forum the will of its Members will contribute to guaranteeing once more the rule of law.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform members of the Committee that I have received requests from the delegations of Brazil and Bolivia to participate in the Committee's consideration of this item.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee accedes to those requests.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the decision we took this morning, I now call upon the representative of Ecuador.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador)(interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity granted me to participate in the debate on the question of the Malvinas Islands in the Committee over which you preside so ably and to the credit of the Latin American region.

I have received instructions from my Government to request to participate in this debate not only because this is a problem which affects a Latin American country, but also because the principles involved are of lasting validity for Ecuador's international conduct, principles to which we have unswervingly adhered before, during and after the regrettable episodes which have cast their pall over the South Atlantic. Those principles include the non-use of force in international relations, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the non-recognition of the acquisition of territory by force and the inadmissibility of colonialism in our times.

Similarly, Ecuador has consistently maintained as one of its fundamental principles the right of peoples to self-determination. We have respected it as an inherent characteristic of the process of independence of Latin American countries, thanks to which our region made a decisive contribution to the history of freedom in the world, even before the establishment of the United Nations; this was embodied in the drafting of the Charter of the world Organization as a Latin American contribution to its universality.

This course of principles was manifested in resolution XXXII of the Tenth Inter-American Conference of 1948, which stated that:

"the emancipation of America will not be complete as long as there remain in the continent peoples and regions which are subject to a colonial régime or territories occupied by non-American countries."

Ecuador supported and sponsored the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 - a historic document which gave a universal dimension to the visionary thinking of Bolivar the Liberator, who had foretold a world without the exploitation of some peoples by others in the disgraceful system which began with the shame of slavery, continued with colonialism and is maintained today with neo-colonialism, discrimination and apartheid.

But that Declaration made it very clear in its operative paragraph 6 that:

"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." (resolution 1514 (XV))

The Malvinas are a Territory which in terms of sovereignty belongs to the Republic of Argentina because of the principle of uti possidetis juris of 1810, whereby the territories of Hispanic America were the successors to the Spanish Crown on their independence. In the Malvinas the Argentine governors were deposed by force in 1833.

It is true that in the course of any arrangement or peaceful negotiation on the problem, we must take into account the rights of the inhabitants of these Islands.

Fortunately, in a praiseworthy and vigorous display of unity, 20 Foreign Ministries of Hispanic American countries have brought before the United Nations the request to include the item on the Malvinas Islands in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, with a view to seeking a peaceful solution to the dispute, in an appeal to the parties concerned for negotiation and the restoration of the cordial relations which should follow that peaceful and negotiated solution.

Of course, these rights will have to be considered there, without thereby affecting the principle of territorial unity which, as has been said, must be taken into account at the same time as the principle of self-determination, which has been applied to peoples with ancient and centuries-old roots for their accession to self-government, in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I am grateful for the opportunity to take part in the work of the Special Committee of 24.

Uruguay's participation in the work of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is not a circumstantial act due to temporary factors. As a Founding Member of the United Nations and as a

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

country which acceded to independence in the nineteenth century Uruguay has felt and feels the responsibility actively to co-operate in the decolonization process, one of this century's most important events. At the same time, in accordance with the unswerving principles of its foreign policy, my country has fought to ensure that the solution of the countless problems implied by such a process should be achieved through peaceful procedures and in accordance with international law.

From this point of view it is only natural that the situation of the Malvinas Islands should have merited special attention by Uruguay, since the general factors I have already indicated are here strengthened by specific elements. I shall refer to two of them.

First, the independence of America has many common features, but its general characteristic is the aim of there being no Territory in the continent that is administered or governed from outside the continent. This doctrine, as is well known, was even welcomed in the United States and, furthermore, has had universal repercussions.

Secondly, but no less importantly, the subject of the Malvinas Islands arouses Uruguay's attention and interest since it affects Argentina, a country with which we have fraternal ties.

While these specific subjective factors give rise to our interest, they do not distort our opinions, which are based on objective legal considerations.

Furthermore, my country's relations with the United Kingdom hark back to an era prior to independence and have always been characterized by mutual understanding and respect, including co-operation during some of the darkest hours of world history.

Therefore I feel we can take up the subject without resentment of prejudice.

Uruguay's attention and interest has been demonstrated for a long time. As far back as 20 years ago, in this Committee, my country made a substantive statement on the subject and appealed for negotiations between the parties for a peaceful solution. Since then we have actively participated in all forums dealing with the question and have sponsored the draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject.

This attitude is based on calm consideration of the facts and of the principles and norms applicable to the case.

First, there is beyond doubt a dispute concerning sovereignty over the Islands, between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

Secondly, the General Assembly has expressly pronounced itself on the subject on three occasions, starting with resolution 2065 (XX) of 16 December 1965, inviting the parties to proceed without delay with the negotiations recommended by this Committee with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem. The other resolutions are 1360 (XXVIII) and 31/49.

Thirdly, with regard to the substance of the matter, the Argentine affirmation of sovereignty over the Islands is based on legal principles, which I shall summarize.

(a) The sovereignty of Spain over its Territories in America, including the Malvinas, was replaced by the sovereignty of the independent republics which were set up there and which uninterruptedly succeeded to that sovereignty with the same titles and rights.

(b) Consequently Argentina carried out legal and physical acts of sovereignty consistent with the means available at the time and in compliance with the requirements accepted by the opinio juris of that time.

(c) The British occupation of the Islands does not represent a valid way of acquiring sovereignty over that Territory.

Indeed, occupation - in the technical sense, as a means of acquiring sovereignty - differs from mere settlement or installation. In order to produce the desired legal effect of appropriation of territory, it must fall under res nullius or res derelictae.

In the case of the Islands neither situation obtains. It is obvious that these were not Territories without sovereignty - res nullius - nor were they abandoned Territories - res derelictae. Confirmation of derelictio or abandonment requires a material element of a physical character, such as voluntary abandonment. The background available shows that at no time was there any desire of abandonment by Argentina; quite the contrary.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

(d) The implementation of the principle of inter-temporality as classically formulated by the Swiss mediator, Huber, in the arbitral finding in 1928 on the Palm Islands, confirms the aforementioned criteria, which reflect the legal régime applicable to determine sovereignty, both at the time of occupation and at present.

(e) The occupation of the islands was promptly challenged in accordance with the diplomatic, legal and physical means available at the time of the occupation. The challenge was repeated in due course up until the present time.

(f) One cannot invoke prescription, taking into account the lack of initial title and the systematic opposition of Argentina.

(g) The population settlements since 1833 run counter to the referred-to principles on the occupation of territories, whereby those settlements cannot be considered as giving title to the right of self-determination, a right which has been conceded by the Charter and by resolution 1514 (XV) to colonial countries and peoples. To accept the contrary would furthermore mean establishing a grave precedent for small countries, whose territories could be dismembered by the settling of human groups from other countries.

(h) Along the same lines, the General Assembly resolutions on the Malvinas Islands refer to the Republic of Argentina and to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as parties to the dispute. From the international point of view, there is no recognition that the present population of the islands has the character of a people within the meaning of resolution 1514 (XV) I have mentioned, that is, as having title to the right of self-determination.

(i) In corroboration of this point of view it may be noted that General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII) require the parties to take into account "the interests of the population of the Malvinas Islands". This formula differs in substance from what is stated in operative paragraph 2 of resolution 1514 (XV) regarding exercise of the "right" of self-determination.

(j) In accordance with this requirement, we must take into account and duly respect the unique conditions and character of the present inhabitants: their language, customs, religion, cultural values and characteristics. This delicate aspect, which deserves the most serious consideration, should be examined in the course of the negotiations and be given adequate safeguards.

(Mr. Blanco, Uruguay)

(k) Considering all the foregoing, it is clear that in the case of the Malvinas Islands the principle of territorial integrity must be applied, which in this case does not contradict the right of self-determination, which does not apply here.

Fourthly, the background of facts and law which I have outlined fully justifies in itself the holding of negotiations to find a solution to the dispute over sovereignty, in accordance with international law.

But the tragic events which have occurred in the South Atlantic in the past month have made that necessity a categorical imperative for the international community. I therefore recall with respect and sadness the many dead and wounded and I believe that their sacrifice must have, for the purposes we are here considering, the result of giving greater impetus to the negotiations which will ensure peace.

I wish to associate with these considerations the role of our Organization. My Government believes that it should play a role in the negotiations; in particular we shall, in the appropriate body, support the participation of the Secretary-General, whose action and efforts throughout the conflict deserve our unstinted praise.

Mr. COUTURIER (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I am grateful to the Special Committee on decolonization for giving me this opportunity to address myself to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

Since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken, I should like to express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that under your guidance this Committee on decolonization will continue to discharge the fundamental duties entrusted to it by the United Nations to carry forward the decolonization process and assist in banishing the colonial yoke forever.

Peru was one of the 20 Latin American countries which requested that the question of the Malvinas Islands be included in the agenda for the forthcoming session of the General Assembly as an additional item. This request reflects Latin America's total support for the just claims of Argentina over its captured islands. As a South American country united with Argentina by historical links and our joint efforts to banish colonialism from our continent over the past century and because Argentina's cause is just, we have come to express our solidarity with Argentina in this decolonization Committee.

(Mr. Couturier, Peru)

We must recall that the question of the Malvinas has won repeated support at summit meetings and meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Movement, which not only recognizes the right of Argentina to sovereignty over the Malvinas but condemns all vestiges of colonialism in the world. We are all aware that in the present circumstances a just and lasting peace can be achieved only through negotiations, and therefore this Committee should urge the parties to resume negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General. In order to prevent unnecessary delay in resolving this dispute over sovereignty, we propose that a work programme and a time frame be set up for the negotiations so as not further to delay a solution of this problem, as has happened in the past. Similarly, it is fitting to recall in this forum that the problem of the Malvinas is a question which territorially includes the Malvinas Islands, strictly speaking, as well as the South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands.

When the General Assembly has considered this problem, while it has called it the question of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands it has always included the area of the other islands. Nevertheless, during the recent conflict in the South Atlantic, the United Kingdom tried to limit the geographical range of the dispute to the archipelago of the Malvinas Islands alone. That is why it would be desirable for the Special Committee to consider in toto the question of the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. Accordingly, my delegation proposes that they all be dealt with in this Committee under the said name and be recommended to the General Assembly in like manner. In this respect we believe that there is no opposition on the part of members of this Committee, since the United Kingdom itself, in the joint communiqué signed with Argentina on 26 April 1977, which appears in two official United Nations documents (A/32/110 and A/32/111), states that the negotiations which were to begin in June or July 1977 would concern the "future political relations, including sovereignty, with regard to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands". (A/32/110, p. 2)

(Mr. Couturier, Peru)

These meetings of the Special Committee have heard petitioners from the Malvinas Islands. It is clear to one and all that this is yet another delaying tactic to thwart solutions of the problem in accordance with the law. Furthermore, it distorts the legal and political nature of this colonial case.

The Malvinas item has always been dealt with as a special case within the exclusive competence of the United Kingdom and Argentina. Mention of the population of the islands has been made only in regard to the well-being to which they are entitled; never has the population undertaken a movement to exercise the right to self-determination and independence, because that right - as British subjects on Argentine territory - is something to which they are not entitled.

Argentina has in various forums committed itself to safeguarding and providing for the well-being of the inhabitants. Therefore, the presence of representatives of the colonial Power in the Malvinas as petitioners is contrary to the spirit of General Assembly resolutions, and that should be avoided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Brazil.

Mr. MASSOT (Brazil): I take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of this Committee for your kindness in allowing me to make this brief statement.

Brazil has always followed this Committee's work with deep interest and the way in which it deals with situations of a colonial nature that all of us in the international community seek to have abolished. Our interest in the Committee's work is even stronger when it deals with questions affecting the interests of neighbouring countries or territories from this or the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, a region that we also share, and above all when the item under consideration is the question of the Malvinas Islands.

As we had occasion to state clearly when this matter was under consideration in the Security Council, Brazil has always supported the Argentine Republic in the historical territorial dispute that it has sustained with the United Kingdom for almost 150 years. Our first support for our sister Republic's claims dates back to 1833, when our two countries were freed from colonial rule.

(Mr. Massot, Brazil)

I do not need to recount here the efforts undertaken by my Government in order to bring about a peaceful settlement of the recent conflict in the South Atlantic. The Brazilian Government believes that the continuance of this colonial situation in Latin America and the dispute over sovereignty between the Republic of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are also the concern of the international community. Therefore, my Government has endorsed a letter addressed to the Secretary-General in which 20 countries of our region have requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

I wish to restate our conviction that negotiations must take place aiming at a peaceful solution. The time is ripe for both parties, under United Nations auspices, to look for such a solution in the major interest of peace, the elimination of the last remnants of colonialism, as well as of the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): The Government of Bolivia has unequivocally expressed its support for the Republic of Argentina in all the negotiations and debates which seek to restore Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas, which are unquestionably a part of its territory.

Recent war events in the South Atlantic have dramatically brought into the open the conflict between the legitimate claim of Argentina to part of its territory that has been occupied and the will - with shades of imperial Power - of a European nation which in this latter part of the twentieth century believes it can defend with expeditionary fleets an old colonial position which, from the islands of Oceania to the Caribbean, passing through India, the Middle East and Africa, in times past was part of the British Empire.

Neither Argentine law, nor Latin America's dignity in what is undisputably part of the continent not linked to the British Crown, can accept the sterile attempt to maintain a colonial enclave in the South Atlantic by an improper

(Mr. Ortiz Sanz, Bolivia)

invocation of the merits of self-determination. This highly respected self-determination is applicable to human groups subjected to the colonial yoke but not to Territories which because of foreign armed occupation are segregated from their own nature and legitimate sovereignty. In this case of the Malvinas - an Argentine Territory occupied by Great Britain by force of arms since January 1833 - one cannot invoke the argument that a few hundred island inhabitants have the right to define, in the name of a curious self-determination suggested by London, a non-Argentine status for a Territory which by every right belongs to that Republic. The Malvinas are and will be an integral part of the sovereign territory of the Republic of Argentina, and no foreign group of shepherds or farmers can support the spurious claims that have been made.

We were astonished to hear those who claim to represent that miniscule population - a population which if not Argentine has no other nationality - pronounce themselves in favour of their own subjection to Great Britain and thus leave open the possibility of a puppet independence which would assist the Government of London in claiming Argentine soil. These curious representatives should realize that the land they claim to be speaking for does not belong to the British Crown.

We were astonished also to read working paper A/AC.109/712, which gives some background of some debates in terms worthy of the Foreign Office in London; and there is no doubt that non-aligned Latin America will carefully investigate that tendentious document to its origins. We protest the total lack of balance in its pages.

(Mr. Ortiz Sanz, Bolivia)

The punitive expedition of the United Kingdom against the Argentine presence in the Malvinas was celebrated a short time ago by the Conservative Government of London in a so-called Victory Day. That celebration did nothing other than to record in the previously respectable and often glorious chapters in the history of the United Kingdom a less honourable page, since in the Malvinas the most modern means of war of one of the major world Powers were fully used, with the co-operation of other equally powerful allies, to dislodge from those islands a small fraction of the Argentine forces armed only with the moral weapon of the justice of their cause.

Latin America is preparing to express at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly a continental point of view with respect to the problem. From the days of San Francisco until now, the Latin American States have conducted and supported a lengthy international struggle to secure the benefits of genuine self-determination and freedom for almost 100 nations and to free them from the vestiges of the European colonial yoke. We shall not now allow colonialism in any form to return to our shores.

Mr. SALLU (Sierra Leone): On instructions from my Government, I have asked to speak in order to reiterate its position regarding the situation in the South Atlantic. My Government holds the view that the Falkland Islanders should be given the opportunity to determine their own future in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

In this regard my delegation noted the statements made here this morning by the elected representatives of the Islands. We believe that this Committee with the co-operation of the administering Power and, indeed, with the help of all other freedom- and peace-loving people, particularly of the region - now has the obligation to respect the wishes and aspirations of the people of the Islands. It is our view that they have been ignored for too long in this whole affair.

Secondly, my Government has also instructed me to reiterate that it has never viewed and will never view with favour the use of force as a means of settling disputes between nations. It is indeed an irony of the situation in the South Atlantic that the protagonists should now be calling for talks after

(Mr. Sallu, Sierra Leone)

having caused a war in which many innocent persons have lost their lives, not to mention the incalculable damage caused to property.

In the circumstances, my Government firmly believes that this Committee should now initiate the process of self-determination for the inhabitants of the islands. We see that as the only means of ensuring lasting peace in the area.

My delegation sees no other possible solution, especially if such a solution is imposed from the outside. My delegation wishes to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee that it will make every effort within this body and elsewhere in the United Nations to achieve that objective.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue consideration of this item at its next meeting.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: At our two meetings scheduled for tomorrow, we shall take up the following items: first, the 86th and 87th reports of the Working Group; secondly, Falkland Islands (Malvinas); thirdly, Namibia; fourthly, foreign economic interests; fifthly, military activities and arrangements; sixthly, specialized agencies; seventhly, Western Sahara; eighthly, East Timor; and, ninthly, remaining Territories.

As members are aware, during the course of next week a visiting mission from this Committee will be travelling to Montserrat and, the following week, a group consisting of five members of the Committee will be travelling to Europe for consultations with non-governmental organizations. It is therefore essential that we attempt to complete consideration of the items I have just mentioned during the two meetings scheduled for tomorrow, so that the Rapporteur will have adequate time to submit the Committee's report to the Assembly by the end of this month, as called for in the related decision of the General Assembly.

I therefore appeal to all members to be as punctual as possible at the meetings scheduled for tomorrow and to be ready to speak and to take action on the various proposals now before us.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.