



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 25

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas): report of the Secretary-General (continued)*

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the General Assembly to the report of the Fourth Committee in document A/38/584. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of that report?

It was so decided (decision 38/405).

2. Mr. STRUČKA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): In dealing with the question of the Malvinas Islands we are touching upon one of the clearly anachronistic manifestations of our century. The events around the Malvinas Islands show clearly the efforts consistently made by colonizers to maintain and perpetuate their colonial domination wherever they have an opportunity to plunder the resources of dependent Territories, to use them in the service of the military-strategic plans of imperialism and to achieve political ends. The profits reaped by the United Kingdom from the monopolistic activities of the British company on the Malvinas Islands, the rich oil deposits just off the shores of the islands and, above all, their exceedingly important strategic position are the cause of the United Kingdom's stubborn refusal to carry out the decolonization of the Malvinas Islands. That is precisely why the London Government never responded to the repeated appeals made by the General Assembly since 1965 for decolonization of the Islands. That is precisely why in April last year, with the support of Washington, it sent an armada of 80 ships, including 28 warships with 22,000 soldiers on board, equipped with dozens of modern military planes and helicopters, to the shores of the Islands to restore its colonial domination. More than 700 Argentines and more than 200 British soldiers died in battle. That was the price that had to be paid for the Thatcher Government's adventurism and its decision to use all possible means to ensure the success of the United Kingdom's colonialist and imperialist strategic intentions with regard to the Malvinas Islands.

3. The landings on the Malvinas Islands, carried out by the United Kingdom with the generous help of the United States, confirmed that the methods used by colonialism and imperialism have not changed at all. They ostentatiously use crude military pressure to gain their strategic and exploitative ends and unhesitatingly resort to the use of weapons. This was also illustrated by the United States act of aggression against Grenada, the occupation of its territory and the encroachment on its independence, directly after its people had exercised their right to self-determination. Further testimony to this is provided by the aggressive action of the United States with regard to

Nicaragua, Cuba and the national liberation movements in Central America and by the actions of the imperialists, led by the Reagan Administration, designed to exacerbate the international climate and increase the danger of a world-wide nuclear conflict.

4. Developments in the Malvinas Islands after the forcible re-establishment by the United Kingdom of its colonial domination also testify to the fact that the London Government does not intend to settle the dispute over the Malvinas Islands through the use of diplomacy, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in the spirit of the appeals of the General Assembly and of the non-aligned movement. They also show that the British Government does not intend to comply with the clearly expressed demand of the international community that it complete the process of decolonization and, within the framework of that process, end colonial domination in the Malvinas Islands.

5. London fights these demands by strengthening its military presence in the Islands. It has established a military garrison there with more soldiers than there are civilians in the islands. The United Kingdom has begun building a large strategic air base, where it can land Phantom fighters, bombers and large Vulcan transport aircraft. Numerous communiqués tell us that it has built launching facilities there for multi-purpose medium-range and long-range rockets. It is continuing to build storage facilities for nuclear warheads, electronic equipment and other military technology. Preparations are under way for the deployment of satellite communications equipment, which would carry out intelligence operations. In a word, Fortress Falklands is being built.

6. As a result of this militarization of the Malvinas Islands, which is taking place with the help of the United States and in which, according to numerous communiqués, the South African *apartheid* régime is participating, the South Atlantic could become a new arena of confrontation. A threat to the overall peace is thus being created and the chances for normalizing the situation and decolonizing the Malvinas Islands are growing slimmer.

7. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is fully in favour of a peaceful settlement of the problem of the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, in the spirit of the resolutions of the United Nations and the decisions of the non-aligned movement concerning decolonization of those islands. We condemn the persistent rejection and refusal to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] with regard to the Malvinas Islands. We are alarmed by their militarization, which is being carried out by the United Kingdom with the support of the United States. We consider the transformation of the Islands into a military base as an act standing in the way of decolonization and establishing a source of tension in the South Atlantic region.

8. It is our firm conviction that the only way to a settlement of the Malvinas Islands question is through

*Resumed from the 54th meeting.

peaceful negotiations in the spirit of United Nations resolutions and the consequent decolonization of those Islands.

9. Ms. KUMARI (India): The tragic war in the South Atlantic in April last year, and the atmosphere of aggravated tension that has since characterized the relations between the United Kingdom and Argentina, have caused deep anguish among the international community. My Government, in particular, was pained to see two friendly nations engage in destructive combat. That brief but devastating war produced no solution to a vexed problem. It ended only with a *status quo ante*, compounded by the terrible consequences of the conflict. The one lesson that was driven home to us all was the utter futility of the use of force in the settlement of international disputes.

10. On 6 May 1982 the Government of India appealed to all parties concerned to desist from the use or threat of use of force and to return to the process of negotiations so that a peaceful solution could be worked out. In the Security Council,¹ following the adoption of resolution 502 (1982), we urged that the eruption of a wider conflict be staved off and the search for a negotiated, peaceful settlement be facilitated. We also supported the commendable efforts of the Secretary-General to bring the two parties together and to evolve a framework within which the search for a peaceful settlement could go forward. The Secretary-General deserves further appreciation for his continued untiring efforts in this regard.

11. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in our capital from 7 to 12 March, reiterated the firm support of the non-aligned countries for the

“Republic of Argentina’s right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restituted through negotiations. They urged that these negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom be reopened with the participation of good offices of the Secretary-General and reaffirmed the need for the parties to take due account of the interests of the population of the islands.” [See A/38/132, annex, sect. I, para. 156.]

12. We would have hoped that even while the process of healing of wounds and gradual restoration of normalcy in bilateral dealings continues, the rudely interrupted dialogue between the two countries on this contentious question could also be resumed. We continue to hope that both Governments can find, in the very righteousness of their respective claims and convictions, the necessary will to negotiate so that this issue is resolved peacefully and amicably.

13. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): The Republic of Haiti attaches very great importance to the question of the Malvinas Islands, which, ever since last year, has been the focus of world concern because of its threat to international peace and security.

14. Apart from considerations of regional solidarity and the traditional links of friendship and close relations uniting us with the Argentine Government and people, our position on this question is based on a sincere desire for a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of this problem which has, for 150 years, defied any solution.

15. Indeed, 150 years have elapsed since the United Kingdom, which then ruled the seas, seized the Malvinas archipelago by force, expelled its local population and established a colonial order which has lasted to this day.

16. In this regard, we must emphasize that in spite of the years that have gone by, force has conferred neither

right nor legitimacy. In our view, the British presence on the Malvinas, which cannot be justified either *de facto* or *de jure*, remains illegal and may further jeopardize peace in that region if the occupying Power persists in its determination to ignore the just claims of the Argentine nation.

17. The lesson to be drawn from this war, which last year caused bloodshed in the southern part of our continent, is undoubtedly the need for a prompt, just and peaceful settlement of that conflict. It would be dangerous to believe that the solution to this crisis, or to any such situation, can be deferred indefinitely. The principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)] are the points of reference which can and must serve as a framework for such a settlement.

18. For their part, the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, having recognized the existence of a dispute as to sovereignty between Argentina and the United Kingdom, clearly indicated what road was to be taken. Unfortunately, we have no reason to believe that the appeal of the international community, as expressed by the General Assembly, has been heeded. On the contrary, the British position remains what it has been since 1964—namely, that the principle of self-determination must be applied to the local population and that the process of decolonization must be achieved in accordance with the latter’s wishes.

19. We believe that to be an artificial problem because, after all, the British Government itself considers that the population is indeed British and intends to remain so. In this regard, we respect the choice made by the population. On the other hand, our views differ radically from those of the United Kingdom in its attempt to attribute to this so-called local population which is, in fact, nothing but its agent, the instrument, or, more accurately, the personification of the colonial presence in the Malvinas, the right to have the final say on the future of that Territory. This would be quite contrary to the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

20. It is quite clear that the British position raises serious questions as to the political will, if not simply the will, of the United Kingdom to advance along the path of negotiation. This view is strengthened when one thinks of the militarization process now under way, which would transform the Malvinas into a veritable fortress in no way commensurate with any real or imaginary danger.

21. For us in the American hemisphere, this alarming—in many respects—situation is a clear proof of the desire of the United Kingdom to consolidate and perpetuate its occupation in contempt of Argentine sovereignty.

22. This being the case, Haiti, which has always defended the principle of respect for the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of all States, as the only guarantee of international security, gives its firmest support to the efforts of the Argentine Government to reach a peaceful and negotiated solution to the problem, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant decisions of the General Assembly.

23. Therefore we hope that draft resolution A/38/L.12, submitted before the Assembly by 20 Latin American countries, including Haiti, will have this time the approval

of the United Kingdom, which, by implementing its provisions, will reaffirm its commitment to peace and international co-operation.

24. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Nearly two decades have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted its initial resolution on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [*resolution 2065 (XX)*]. Referring to the Charter of the United Nations and to the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, that resolution urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to proceed without delay to negotiations aimed at finding ways and means of peacefully settling this colonial problem. Unfortunately, we must note that, despite the efforts of the United Nations and despite resolutions 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49, adopted from 1965 to date, the blatant refusal of the United Kingdom to implement United Nations decisions underlies the continuing delay in the negotiations and the adjournment of a final solution to the problem. The aim is to preserve the domination of the United Kingdom over that strategic territory in the South Atlantic. The refusal to conduct constructive and effective negotiations speedily and immediately to eliminate this colonial situation in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), in accordance with the decisions and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and its organs, as well as the refusal of the United Kingdom to heed the numerous appeals and decisions of the non-aligned movement, finally led, in 1982, to the outbreak of a colonial war.

25. The international community witnessed the fanning of a hotbed of tension in the South Atlantic which was fraught with danger for international peace and security. Enjoying the open support of the United States, the United Kingdom, by force of arms, restored the colonial status of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and immediately took measures to strengthen and expand its military presence, which today is indeed a disquieting reality. The United Kingdom is now building a strategic airport on the Islands and is expanding its naval facilities and its military bases, including those designed to berth nuclear submarines, and it has also modernized its reconnaissance facilities. There are more than 4,000 British soldiers on the territory. Naval and submarine units of the United Kingdom are sailing in the waters around the Islands. Like Diego García in the Indian Ocean and Guam in the Pacific Ocean, the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) today have been turned into a military and strategic strong point for controlling the southern parts of the Latin American and African continents, as well as an important section of the world ocean and the space above it.

26. Resolutions 502 (1982) and 505 (1982), adopted by the Security Council last year, and resolution 37/9 adopted by the General Assembly, called upon the two parties to the conflict to make every effort to find peaceful ways and means of settling the dispute. In paragraph 1 of resolution 37/9, the international community requested "the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)".

27. At the Seventh Summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held last March at New Delhi, member States reaffirmed their support for the just cause of Argentina. In the course of their last meeting, held in New York from 4 to 7 October 1983, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of non-aligned countries firmly reiterated their

support for "the Republic of Argentina's right to have sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restituted through negotiations" [*See A/38/495, annex, para. 73*].

28. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria must point out that the General Assembly resolution adopted in 1982 and the efforts that the Secretary-General of the United Nations has made have unfortunately not met with a positive response from the United Kingdom. On the contrary, that country continues to refuse, on various grounds, to participate in any resumed negotiations, and it has indeed raised additional obstacles to such a resumption. It is obvious that the administering State is once again resorting to the well-tryed tactics of the past 18 years aimed at procrastination and manoeuvres designed to perpetuate its domination of the territory. As a long-standing member of the committee on decolonization, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always expressed, and continues to express at this time, its unreserved support for the immediate and final elimination of all vestiges of colonialism, including colonial domination of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), on the basis of United Nations decisions and resolutions and, in particular, on the basis of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That is why my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution [*A/38/L.12*] submitted by the Latin American countries.

29. Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Venezuelan delegation would like to join other delegations which have spoken earlier in expressing the sincere pleasure of the Government and the people of Venezuela at the successful completion of the electoral process which is restoring democracy to the sister Latin American Republic of Argentina. The return to democracy and the massive turnout of the Argentine people in the polling which took place on 30 October last give the entire continent cause for satisfaction and optimism.

30. In its foreign policy Venezuela has always sought to make a decisive contribution to the institutionalization of democratic freedoms in the continent. As has been stated, democracy means opportunities for social participation, progress and the transformation of old structures; it means the continued improvement of political freedoms and of respect for the rights which protect individual freedoms; it means the triumph of genuine, authentic social justice and the enjoyment of equitable participation in the distribution of wealth. Therefore, my country offers the strongest encouragement and support to all nations engaged in the establishment and institutionalization of democratic freedoms.

31. The position of Venezuela regarding the attainment of peace and the struggle against the vestiges of colonialism is well known. The question of the Malvinas Islands is a typical case of colonialism.

32. When it achieved independence in 1816, the Argentine Republic took possession, in accordance with the principle of *uti possidetis juris*, of the Malvinas archipelago, which had been an integral part of the former Spanish vice-regency of Río de la Plata. In our view, the right of Argentina to reclaim this part of its territory is legitimate and just, for the rights which it inherited from the Spanish were taken away by force in 1833. At that time the Argentine Republic protested against the aggression committed against its territory and its people, and it has continuously sought the return of the occupied territories.

33. It is not our intention to give an account of the history of this act of plunder, for the United Nations was

given sufficient information about it last year. What we wish to point out now is that Venezuela—which itself has been the object and victim of territorial plunder by colonial Powers—reaffirms its support for the just claims of Argentina, whose sovereign territory has been diminished, and reiterates that this injustice must be remedied by peaceful means which will guarantee the just, practical and permanent solution of the problem.

34. My delegation is concerned at the fact that the steps taken by Argentina to bring about negotiations have so far had no result owing to the negative attitude and intransigence of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. These steps taken by Argentina were in keeping with the spirit and within the framework of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the subject: resolutions 2065 (XX) of 16 December 1965, 31/49 of 1 December 1976, 3160 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, and 37/9 of 4 November 1982 and the consensuses of 1966, 1967, 1969 and 1971, all of the General Assembly, and Security Council resolutions 502 (1982) of 3 April 1982 and 505 (1982) of 26 May 1982.

35. It was, in fact, in the Security Council on 22 May 1982, during the conflict in the South Atlantic, that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Mr. José Alberto Zambrano Velasco, stated that “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.”²

36. That statement carries even more weight at a time when we are witnessing massive British militarization of the disputed territories, which is a decisive factor in the increase of tension and instability in the Latin American region, especially in the South Atlantic. It is a matter of deep concern to us that a part of our America is being used for the establishment of a large military base. We cannot remain indifferent to that fact, which puts peace and security in jeopardy.

37. In his report on the question of the Malvinas Islands, the Secretary-General states: “it is my belief that a resumption of dialogue, coupled with the adoption of confidence-building measures, can contribute to a normalization of the situation in the South Atlantic”. [See A/38/532, para. 5.]

38. Could it be that the establishment of a British military base in the Malvinas Islands is a confidence-building measure? Can we Latin Americans accept the creation in our region of a new hotbed of East-West tension when the conflict in the South Atlantic is being used as a demonstration of the credibility of the Atlantic Alliance’s powers of deterrence?

39. We must give some thought to such facts and indications.

40. At the request of several Latin American States, including Venezuela, document A/38/496 was distributed in connection with the item before us. It contains resolution 170 (VIII), adopted by consensus by the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [OPANAL], along with statements made with regard to the question of a “report on the introduction of nuclear weapons by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland into the Zone and areas of the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands”.

41. As a State party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco),³ which created the only inhabited area of the world free from nuclear weapons, Venezuela is deeply

concerned by the information that became available as a result of the conflict and that tends to confirm the presence of nuclear weapons in the British fleet which was sent to the area, not to mention the nuclear-powered submarines that participated in those events. Those facts could imply a violation by the United Kingdom, a nuclear-weapon Power, of the denuclearization statute established by the Treaty.

42. To be sure, Venezuela abstained last year in the voting on General Assembly resolution 37/71 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We consider the contents of the aforementioned document of the OPANAL Conference as particularly relevant in view of the fact that the information provided remains a matter of concern to the States in the region, and in view of the further information, furnished by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London in its publication entitled *The Military Balance 1983-1984*, concerning the construction of a strategic military base on the Malvinas Islands that will involve substantial troop units and considerable quantities of naval and air equipment, there is no doubt that the peace and security of our region could be threatened.

43. Although we have just described a rather discouraging situation, our preference for conciliation makes us hope that the parties to the conflict will heed the appeal of the international community to resume negotiations directed to a just, peaceful and definitive solution of the problem. We therefore hail the efforts and concern of the Secretary-General in seeking to initiate dialogue between the parties.

44. Firm in its backing of Argentina’s claim to the Malvinas Islands, Venezuela, in line with its action in the committee on decolonization when resolution A/AC.109/756 was adopted, is co-sponsor, together with 19 other Latin American countries, of draft resolution A/38/L.12 now before the General Assembly.

45. In sum, our sister republic of Argentina comes here today to seek support once again so that its just claim will be met as quickly as possible through a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that has gone on for so many years. That dispute has exhausted the patience of the Argentine people because it has frustrated their sovereign wish and their right to the Malvinas Islands. Consequently the General Assembly should not turn its back on the real facts, but should urge the United Kingdom to begin negotiations immediately to permit a peaceful solution to the existing dispute, since during this new era of return to democracy President-elect Dr. Raúl Alfonsín has said that his Government will resort to every diplomatic means available to achieve as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

46. That decision is the same decision the people of Argentina have always maintained, now more than ever since they have set their course towards democratic pluralism.

47. During this era of serious tension there must be negotiated solutions, and therefore there must be understanding in the world, there must be negotiations and there must be peace. That is what is demanded from the United Kingdom today.

48. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet Union feels that it is important for the current session of the General Assembly to give careful consideration to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), since that

acute colonial conflict in the South Atlantic continues to be one of the serious sources of international tension.

49. For two decades the British Government has resisted the implementation of United Nations decisions on the decolonization of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and the settlement of that problem through negotiations.

50. Last year, as we know, Great Britain gambled on the use of military force to maintain its colonial position in the South Atlantic. The repeated appeals of the Security Council to stop the spread of the conflict were rejected, with the result of heavy loss of life. Efforts to reach a political settlement were blocked. The steps taken by the Secretary-General to reach a solution of the problem through political means, although enjoying broad support in the Security Council, also met with a negative response from Great Britain and yielded no results.

51. Clearly, the Government of Great Britain would not have resorted to armed force to maintain its colonial domination over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) had it not been for the assistance and direct military support of the United States. There can be no doubt that the United States intends to continue using the South Atlantic conflict to achieve its imperialistic goals in the South American region. This past year the policy of the United States and of the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] as a whole has become even clearer with regard to the strengthening of their military positions in the South Atlantic through the militarization of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and through the establishment on those islands of a major air and naval base like the military base on the island of Diego García.

52. According to a press communiqué, barracks are being constructed on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) for 15,000 soldiers. Radar equipment and stations are being set up. Air-defence systems, communications systems and so forth are being established and intelligence information is being gathered via satellites, together with meteorological data. In the Puerto Argentino area, 16 launching pads for multipurpose medium-range and long-range rockets have been built. Forty-eight military aircraft and some 100 helicopters are now stationed in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and special plans are being implemented to build a new strategic air base capable of handling the most modern military aircraft, including B-52 bombers. This action has led to a serious escalation of tension in the South Atlantic.

53. The plans for militarizing the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) are directly linked to the implementation by the United States of its doctrine of forward basing, which calls for deploying groups of American armed forces in every strategically important region of the world.

54. The establishment of a military strategic springboard in the South Atlantic must be considered in the context of the implementation of long-standing plans by the Pentagon to ensure the basing of American forces very close to South America and Africa. The plans for the militarization of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) are especially menacing for the African continent, in the light of the expansion of military political co-operation between the United States and South Africa and the persistent attempt of the United States to involve the racist régime of Pretoria in the efforts to achieve its imperialist intentions.

55. Even now South Africa is being drawn into the construction of military facilities in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). As indicated in a letter sent on 3 November by the representative of Argentina to the Secretary-General, the technical data and the cost of the military base leave no doubt as to the global nature and the long-term prospects of the policy now being carried out in the South

Atlantic by the United Kingdom, a nuclear Power and a member of NATO.

56. The facts show that the leading NATO Powers have adopted a policy of significantly expanding the geographical boundaries of that bloc's operations, ignoring repeated proposals by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty that the spheres of activity of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization should not extend to Asia, Africa or Latin America.

57. The recent American aggression against Grenada has once again clearly confirmed that the imperialist Powers are pursuing their intention to use force of arms in order to achieve their colonialist and neo-colonialist goals.

58. The General Assembly has been called upon decisively to oppose the plans for maintaining the vestiges of the colonial system and restoring the colonial system throughout the world. In this connection the task of ending the colonial status of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is becoming especially important and urgent. For almost 20 years now the United Nations has repeatedly confirmed that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is fully applicable to the Territory of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). These islands were included by the General Assembly in the list of Territories falling under the Declaration. Throughout that period the General Assembly has repeatedly appealed for a peaceful political solution to the problem of the islands by ending unconditionally their colonial status.

59. At its twentieth session, in 1965, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2065 (XX), which unambiguously acknowledged the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), invited Argentina and the United Kingdom to proceed without delay with the negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem and, in this connection, again emphasized the need to implement the historic resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization. Furthermore, in its resolutions 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49, the General Assembly demanded that negotiations with regard to the future of those islands be expedited and noted the efforts made by Argentina in that respect.

60. As was shown at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations are in favour of the speedy, just settlement of the problem of decolonizing the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). On the initiative of the Latin American countries, a wide-ranging discussion of this problem was undertaken, resulting in the adoption of resolution 37/9, which again called upon the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom, with the assistance of the good offices of the Secretary-General, to resume talks with a view to the rapid settlement of the dispute over the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

61. The concern of broad sectors of the international community and of many States of the world over the conflict situation in the South Atlantic has been clearly demonstrated in numerous decisions of various international organizations. At their Seventh summit Conference, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries expressed their firm support for the Republic of Argentina's right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restituted through negotiations [See A/38/132, annex, sect. I, para. 156]. They urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume such

negotiations, with the assistance of the good offices of the Secretary-General, and again confirmed the need for the parties to take duly into account the interests of the inhabitants of the islands.

62. The Soviet Union appreciates the position taken by the participants in the Seventh summit Conference of non-aligned countries and, in particular, their statement of support for the right of the Government of Argentina to regain its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) through negotiations. The appeal for a peaceful settlement of the conflict again rang out at the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in New York from 4 to 7 October 1983. It was reflected also in decisions taken in various forums and in many statements of Latin American countries.

63. The Government of Argentina has repeatedly stated its willingness to resume talks with the United Kingdom in accordance with United Nations decisions. That was reaffirmed in the statement of 14 November by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Mr. Aguirre Lanari [54th meeting]. However, the reaction of the United Kingdom Government to the appeals for a constructive approach to the question of the future of that Territory is to continue to be implacable. The time that has elapsed since the adoption of the last United Nations resolution on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) has quite clearly indicated that the position of the United Kingdom Government has not shown the slightest positive shift.

64. The Soviet Union believes it necessary to emphasize once again that the United Kingdom's refusal to comply with United Nations decisions on talks with Argentina and its policy, adopted with the support of the United States and NATO as a whole, of establishing a major military base on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and militarizing the adjacent islands, are based on its intention to strengthen the colonial status of that Territory and to create a serious threat to international peace and security.

65. The position of the Soviet Union in favour of eliminating all military bases on colonial Territories and rapidly completing the process of decolonization is well known. The Soviet Union considers the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), South Georgia and South Sandwich as part of the problem of decolonization and condemns the United Kingdom's use of military force to maintain the colonial status of these islands.

66. On the basis of its fundamental position in favour of peaceful settlement of disputes, the Soviet Union firmly endorses immediate efforts, including efforts within the framework of the United Nations, to settle the problem which has arisen in the South Atlantic through negotiations carried out on the basis of United Nations decisions.

67. We note with satisfaction that the delegations of many countries at the current session of the General Assembly are in favour of settling the conflict on a just anti-colonial basis.

68. The Soviet delegation feels that the draft resolution submitted for consideration at the current session is correctly directed towards solving the problem of decolonization of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) within the framework of the United Nations, in accordance with the purposes and principles of its Charter, and on the basis of earlier resolutions on the question. The Soviet delegation is therefore prepared to support the draft resolution.

69. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My country, inspired by its traditional devotion

to peace, spared no efforts to help avert the military conflict which cost so many lives in the Malvinas Islands in 1982. At that time Peru saw its own efforts and those of distinguished world figures, which seemed about to succeed, frustrated by unexpected events. We are participating in the current debate with renewed faith and hope, in the belief that the decision that will be adopted at the conclusion of the discussion will make it possible to establish peace, international security and justice in the South Atlantic, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

70. At its thirty-seventh session the General Assembly urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands. The conviction of the international community about the validity of that request was clearly reflected in the massive support for resolution 37/9, which was adopted at that session. That resolution undoubtedly contains the basic and necessary elements for a peaceful solution to the dispute. Unfortunately, during the time that has elapsed since its adoption it has proved impossible, despite the declared desire of the Assembly, to establish a propitious climate for the necessary negotiations.

71. On the contrary, Latin America, and my country in particular—and, I am quite certain, countries throughout the world—have noted with deep concern the work begun with a view to the establishment of a large military base on the Malvinas Islands. The size and nature of those facilities involve an effort that is disproportionate from all angles to the requirements of the islands. On the other hand, no less a matter of concern is the maintenance of an exclusive maritime zone around the Islands, which affects the coasts of continental Argentina. All of this seems to indicate that a new situation is emerging. A colonial Power once again, through its military facilities in the Territories under its administration, constitutes not only an obstacle to the historical process of decolonization, but at the same time a threat which will increase tension in the area. In a violent world such as ours, the construction of military bases, by its very nature, causes hotbeds of tension and potential conflicts.

72. For these reasons, and in view of the role that the United Nations must play in the maintenance of international peace and security, the delegation of Peru once again appeals to the parties concerned, in particular the United Kingdom, to take the necessary steps to establish a climate conducive to effective negotiations.

73. My delegation must express its satisfaction at the fact that the Argentine Government has strictly respected the cessation of hostilities and also has responded positively to the appeal of the Secretary-General to be ready to resume a dialogue on this question.

74. The delegation of Peru sincerely believes that the fact that the process of democratic institutionalization has happily and successfully begun recently in the brother American Republic of Argentina—and I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to congratulate the delegation of Argentina on this fact—and that all sectors of the public there have repeatedly expressed readiness to negotiate gives the United Kingdom the opportunity to find ways and means of establishing this vital contact.

75. My delegation, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, is convinced that today, perhaps more than ever during the discussion on that item, it is necessary to strengthen the Secretary-General's mandate, in order to enable him to help the parties concerned to resume negotiations and

bring about a peaceful settlement of this dispute over sovereignty.

76. Peru and Argentina are bound together historically by links stemming from the actions of the Great Liberator, José de San Martín, who, in one of his proclamations to the people of Peru, said, among other things:

“When the long-lost rights to Peru are restored, I shall have honoured the vow dearest to my heart and concluded the most beautiful undertaking of my life.”

We hope that the United Nations will be able to see the conclusion with justice of this dispute over sovereignty on the American continent and view it as one of the most beautiful undertakings of its existence.

77. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For the current Assembly the question of the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia Islands and the South Sandwich Islands is nothing new. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples considered it for the first time in 1964, and then invited the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to begin negotiations to find a peaceful solution to the problem. Later the General Assembly made a similar statement, in 1965, in its resolution 2065 (XX), calling for direct negotiations. Subsequently, in 1966, 1969 and 1975, decisions were adopted urging both parties to continue those negotiations, which, it must be said, had always encountered British intransigence.

78. General Assembly resolutions 3160 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973 and 31/49 of 1 December 1976, which were intended to lead to decolonization of the Malvinas Islands, while recognizing that Argentina had made efforts to facilitate the process, urged that the negotiations be speeded up.

79. Resolution 37/9, sponsored by 20 Latin American countries last year, fully ratified the decisions adopted in 1965, 1973 and 1976. Moreover, it recognized the existence of a sovereignty dispute over the territory of the islands, a dispute to which there are only two parties—the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom. It requested the Secretary-General to use his good offices and asked him to report on the question to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

80. The prolongation of this anachronistic colonial situation—imposed by an act of force in 1833—met with the continued protest of the Argentine nation, culminating in 1982 in serious acts of war in the South Atlantic, which resulted in the unfortunate loss of valiant young lives from both countries, and commanded the attention of the Security Council.

81. The colonial war in the South Atlantic was a serious lesson for the nations of our continent. It showed the true face of United States imperialism, which allied itself with the aggressors, and the true neo-colonial nature of the so-called Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Once again the peoples of Latin America were able to confirm who had been and still is their historic enemy.

82. The United Kingdom's claim to continue the illegal occupation of the Malvinas Islands has turned the question into a permanent focal point of conflict between on the one hand their occupier, an extra-continental Power, and its allies, and on the other hand Argentina, together with the other Latin American nations.

83. From its early years the non-aligned movement, faithful to its anti-colonialist vocation, supported the just Argentine claim and urged the United Kingdom to negotiate the restoration of that Territory to Argentine sovereignty. Argentina continued to enjoy the solidarity of the

Movement at its meetings and summit conferences at Colombo, Havana and New Delhi.

84. The Argentine Republic, whose vital interests and rights have been ignored by the English colonial presence in the Malvinas Islands, continues to adopt a reasonable and constructive attitude towards a negotiated solution. However, it has rightly alerted world public opinion to the dangers inherent in the British decision to establish a permanent strategic base on the Malvinas Islands, a decision which is a clear provocation to Argentina and is at the same time a cause for serious concern for the other countries of the region. Because of its gravity, the decision was denounced at the plenary ministerial meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in New York from 4 to 7 October 1983.

85. It is no secret how strategically important control of the Malvinas is for the domination of the South Atlantic. That is the reason for the military expansion carried out by the United Kingdom.

86. Likewise, the British Government has announced the construction of a new strategic airport in the Malvinas Islands. Located at Mount Pleasant, about 30 kilometres from Stanley, and with facilities for civil and military aircraft, it is intended to facilitate the movement of military personnel. The Mowlem-Laing-Amey Roadstone Company consortium, which has been awarded the contract for the construction of the new airport, has announced that its base for the transport of workers and materials to the Islands will be established in Cape Town, South Africa, in flagrant violation of the resolutions adopted by our Organization on ending links with the Pretoria régime. This will increase strategic military co-operation between the racist régime of Pretoria and the United Kingdom, across the Atlantic Ocean.

87. The British Government intends to improve its strategic capacity and air mobility in order to engage in military operations outside the geographical scope of NATO. This shows the long-term implications of the current policy of the United Kingdom and of its refusal to discuss the decolonization of the Malvinas Islands.

88. Because so many years have elapsed without any progress in the implementation of the General Assembly resolutions, there is now a permanent hotbed of conflict in the South Atlantic, as was demonstrated by the crisis that occurred last year. This makes it more necessary than ever before for the process of negotiations between the two parties, under the auspices of the United Nations, to be resumed in order to achieve a peaceful, just and final solution to the existing dispute over sovereignty.

89. Unfortunately, despite the willingness and constructive attitude of the Government of the Argentine Republic, and despite the good offices mission undertaken by the Secretary-General, no progress has been made towards the resumption of negotiations.

90. My delegation again appeals for a prompt resumption of the negotiations, and we reaffirm our support for the proposals contained in resolution 37/9, adopted by the General Assembly on 4 November 1982; my delegation had the honour of being a co-sponsor of that resolution, as we are of draft resolution A/38/L.12 now before the Assembly.

91. The maintenance of colonial situations is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace. The just and final solution of the dispute regarding sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and the South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands does not have a merely Argentine and regional dimension; indeed, it has permanent and paramount importance for the entire international community. We are therefore convinced that,

sooner rather than later, justice and reason will prevail. We urge the British Government to give up its intransigent position, which is in contradiction with the progress of history, and through a solution of the Malvinas question to contribute to the total and final decolonization of Latin America.

92. We hope that the draft resolution that has been submitted by 20 Latin American countries will be supported unanimously by the General Assembly.

93. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): It is just over a year since we debated the Falklands question. The draft resolution put forward by Argentina this year is almost a duplicate of last year's. We are thus witnessing the rerun of an old film. When the script becomes too familiar the audience gets bored. Accordingly, I shall not repeat all the well-known and well-founded historical and legal arguments which my delegation put forward in the debate on this question last year and has asserted on various occasions before and after that.

94. I shall merely say that my Government has no doubt that the Falkland Islands, the subject of this debate, are British. The same holds true for the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands, which are not the subject of the present debate. These latter islands were taken into possession by Captain Cook in 1775 and Argentina never thought to advance a claim to them until well into the present century. As to the Falklands, the other side must also have some doubts about their sovereignty claim to them, since there were no inhabitants in the islands when they were discovered by the British and they have been in continuous British occupation for 150 years. That goes beyond the foundation of many States represented here in the General Assembly. It is also worth recalling that the United States, for example, acquired Texas and California quite some years after the beginning of continuous British settlement in the Falklands. It may be worth adding, in the light of what one speaker said this afternoon, that many of the people of the Falklands have been there for six generations or more; the islanders have no other home than the Falklands.

95. Although I have just barely alluded to the historical and legal position, I do not want anyone to think that this means we consider that the question of the Falklands is unimportant. On the contrary, we think it is an extremely important question and one which closely touches our reputation and responsibilities. It also closely touches on basic international principles. It is a question on which the United Kingdom has specific obligations towards the United Nations under Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. I wish to stress that the main importance in this forum of the Falklands question is that it deals with the rights of people—admittedly a small number of people, but people are people and rights are rights. The Charter does not prescribe that the rights it lays down are to be enjoyed only by populations of 5 million or 10 million or 20 million, or any other number.

96. The case that I present to the Assembly today is grounded firmly and squarely on the Charter and on international law. But before coming to that I should like to refer to a purely political event which my Government welcomes and hopes will be a good augury for the future of this problem.

97. I congratulate the people of Argentina on their elections and on the way they were conducted. However, at present we still have to deal with a military régime in Argentina, and in the speech he made yesterday [*ibid.*] the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina was acting on the instructions of that régime. Nevertheless, we have a reasonable prospect that in a few weeks' time there will

be a properly constituted democratic Government in Argentina. That we welcome. We believe that it will strengthen democracy throughout the hemisphere, and indeed throughout the world, for such an important country as Argentina to return to the democratic path.

98. At the same time, we cannot help regretting the rather harsh things said about the Falkland Islands during and after the election campaign. We hope nevertheless that when a properly constituted democratic Government is in power it will look at things a bit differently. Above all we hope that the people of Argentina who have just been able to decide who should govern them will recognize that the people of the Falklands should have the same right and privilege. It is too soon to say how relations will develop between my country and the democratic Government in Argentina which is shortly to be set up. But I can say that for our part we are ready for, indeed eager for, a return to normal relations between our two countries. In his report which is before us, the Secretary-General has wisely said that

“While it is clear that negotiations cannot begin unless both parties agree, it is my belief that a resumption of dialogue, coupled with the adoption of confidence-building measures, can contribute to a normalization of the situation in the South Atlantic and open the way towards a lasting solution of the problem.”
[See A/38/532, para. 5.]

99. Through a resumption of dialogue we hope to achieve the normalization of bilateral relations between Britain and Argentina. For example, we have been working for an early improvement in commercial and economic relations. We would also welcome a resumption of diplomatic relations. We hope that having thus recreated the basic foundations of good relations we can build upon them and establish better understanding in other areas. We are ready, and have made efforts, to bring about such a normalization of relations. When a new Government is formed in Argentina we shall await its response to this offer with interest and, may I say, with hope.

100. Meanwhile, I must stress unequivocally that my Government cannot agree to negotiate on the sovereignty of the Islands. This is not a dispute about empty land. We cannot ignore the people who live on it and whose ancestors lived on it. We cannot negotiate behind their backs or over their heads, nor do I think that the representatives assembled here of many nations, large and small, would ask us to do so.

101. I recognize that I am in front of a psychological difficulty. The word “negotiations” is an attractive one. We ourselves have frequently urged, in one international dispute after another, that the right way to proceed is through negotiations, and we mean it. The word “negotiation” appears in the Charter of the United Nations, for example, in Article 33. But what attention did Argentina pay to Article 33 last year when, despite the fact that both Governments were engaged in a process of negotiation, they launched their surprise attack on the Falklands? As I said, our case is based firmly on the Charter and international law, but my delegation cannot accept that the Charter should be interpreted or quoted selectively.

102. I suppose that every single day during the General Assembly one speaker or another in this chamber has used the hallowed phrase “the inalienable right of self-determination”. It has been used frequently in recent days about the small population of Grenada. In the Falklands the population is smaller though the land is larger than Grenada. The population of Grenada

would fit into a large football stadium, the population of the Falklands into a small football stadium, but is the size of the football stadium to be the determinant of whether or not a people has the right of self-determination? The answer is obvious. As I have already said, rights are rights.

103. There is a simple reason why the draft resolution before us makes no reference to the inalienable right of self-determination. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina told us plainly at the 14th meeting of the thirty-seventh session that it was an essential part of his case that self-determination did not apply to the Falkland Islanders. That was repeated during the general debate at the current session [12th meeting], and the Argentine Foreign Minister repeated it again in his speech yesterday [54th meeting]. At the 16th meeting of the Fourth Committee on 14 November, the Argentine representative went so far as to say that the General Assembly had specifically taken away the Falkland Islanders' right of self-determination. This, he said, was a special and unique exception to an otherwise universal rule. When I pointed out that the essence of an "inalienable" right was that it could not be taken away, the Argentine representative said that it was in fact the United Kingdom which was responsible for taking that inalienable right away from the Falkland Islanders.

104. These are very strange and bizarre propositions. Does anyone seriously hold that the process of decolonization involves a denial of the inalienable principle of self-determination? What the Argentine representative seems to have been referring to was a statement by the United Kingdom representative in the Committee of 24 on 13 November 1964⁴ in which he warned his fellow representatives that the use of incautious phraseology in their draft resolution would not be reconcilable with the right of self-determination which the Falkland Islanders undoubtedly possess. I repeat that warning today. I do so specifically in relation to the draft resolution before us.

105. I am even more strengthened in doing so by the fact that the Argentine delegation has put down in writing the interpretation which it will seek to place upon the votes of delegations who support their draft resolution. Members of the Assembly will see this in section I, page 2, of document A/38/563, where Argentina puts delegations on notice that, if they vote for the present resolution, Argentina will interpret their vote as rejecting the application of the right of self-determination in what they call "this special individual case". The words of the Argentine delegation are even underlined, so there can be no doubt of its intentions. Members of the Assembly have been warned.

106. The whole notion of there being this single and unique exception in the case of the Falkland Islanders to a principle that is recognized as being universal is so strange that the Assembly will want to consider it further.

107. I have already welcomed the fact that Argentina, even if somewhat belatedly, now accepts that the Falkland Islands are properly in the list of Territories covered by Article 73 of the Charter. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina drew the correct conclusion yesterday that this also made resolution 1514 (XV) applicable to the Falkland Islands. I am sure that this is a conclusion with which the Assembly as a whole will also agree. But it seems that the Argentine Foreign Minister wanted to perform a conjuring trick: by invoking resolution 1514 (XV) he wanted to make it disappear. He did this by claiming that paragraph 6 of the resolution was overriding and prevailed over anything else in the resolution. The flaws in his reasoning are obvious. First, the

history of resolution 1514 (XV) shows that paragraph 6 was intended to deal with something quite different; secondly, by invoking the mirage of territorial integrity the Foreign Minister begs the whole question. No doubt it fits in with his way of thinking to presuppose or assume that Argentine sovereignty over the Territory is established and British sovereignty non-existent, but that is hardly an approach calculated to convince my Government or the world at large. Finally, he cannot show any shred of an indication in the wording of resolution 1514 (XV) that the fundamental principles laid down there in its paragraphs 1 to 5 and 7, especially that of the inalienable right to self-determination, were subject to any form of limitation, let alone what is now claimed to be a special and individual exception for one particular case.

108. Self-determination is a principle of the United Nations, and as such has general application. I must also draw the Assembly's attention to Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations, which, though of narrow application, is precisely relevant to the case of the Falklands. It is specifically in accordance with this Article that for some 30-odd years my Government has been reporting to the United Nations on a long list of British colonies. Most of the colonies on the original list have now been removed from it. They have exercised the right of self-determination and they are now either sitting here in this Assembly as sovereign and equal countries, or they have chosen, by their own free will, to join up with neighbouring States. What has been right for the majority of countries on the list is surely right for the others. The Falkland Islanders are as well able to exercise self-determination as other islanders, in the Caribbean or the Pacific or elsewhere.

109. The reference in the draft resolution before us to the interests of the Falkland Islanders is no substitute for the essential principle of self-determination. Argentina is willing to accept references to their interests, while reserving to itself the judgement of where those interests lie. But this is quite inconsistent with the clear words of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 73 says plainly that the interests of the islanders are "paramount" and also obliges the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to promote their well-being to the utmost and to develop their self-government. These are plain words. I deployed this argument last year, but it has had no real answer. Indeed, there is no answer to it. It would obviously be contrary to the Charter for the interests of the islanders to be left to Argentina to decide. It is the islanders themselves who must be allowed to decide what their interests really are and it is accordingly by their wishes, not by any one else's assessments of their interests, that we must be guided.

110. May I refer in parentheses to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which claims that the continuation of colonial situations is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace? This is another distortion of resolution 1514 (XV). Resolution 1514 (XV) says that the continued existence of "colonialism" impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace. The United Kingdom of course was not the author of that resolution, so perhaps it is not for me to say what the authors meant. But they cannot possibly have meant that the maintenance of a form of government that is in accordance with the clear and firmly expressed wishes of the people concerned threatens international peace; nor could they possibly have meant that the progressive development of self-government in the Falklands impedes the social,

cultural and economic development of the Falkland Islanders. Resolution 1514 (XV) is, of course, one of the hallowed texts on the right of self-determination. The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] is another. So are the two International Covenants on Human Rights [*resolution 2200A (XXI)*]. The second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution is therefore nonsense. The Charter of the United Nations, after all, is aimed at securing international peace, and simultaneously provides for bringing colonies peacefully to self-government through self-determination. So there is no inconsistency between the two. What is inconsistent with the United Nations idea of universal peace is any attempt to deny self-government, to suppress self-determination or to hand people over to foreign rule against their will. If any delegations doubt this, I would ask them to think carefully and dispassionately. I would also ask them to read the whole Charter carefully, not least Article 73, to study the whole of resolution 1514 (XV), the whole of the friendly relations declaration and the human rights covenants. That will leave them in no doubt as to the central place in this question of the inalienable right of self-determination.

111. In short, the draft resolution before us quotes very selectively from the Charter. We stand for the full Charter, not a truncated version. For this reason if for no other, the draft resolution is totally unacceptable to my delegation. It is not a question of juggling with the wording here or there to make some of it less objectionable: the very spirit of the draft resolution is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations. So my delegation's strong objection to the draft resolution is not only on account of what it says but, if anything, even more on account of what it omits. In fact it omits the most relevant parts of the Charter.

112. As I said earlier, we look forward to a new democratic government in Argentina. Perhaps it will take a somewhat different, more constructive and more humane view than the present military régime. Let us hope that it will recognize that the Falklanders have the same rights to self-determination as the Argentines.

113. I have to say, however, that I am not optimistic about this point at present. I notice that whenever official statements are issued by Argentine authorities they refer to the sovereignty dispute. They are always very careful to harp on that word "sovereignty". It would be naive if we in Britain were to overlook this point. And it would be worse than naive; it would be irresponsible if we were to ask the islanders to overlook it.

114. We look for a change of heart on the part of the incoming Government of Argentina, a willingness to respect the wishes of the islanders and to acknowledge the applicability of the right of self-determination. If that comes to pass, we would indeed be in a new situation. I hope that Member States will seek to encourage the new Government in that direction.

115. In the mean time, we have to keep up our guard. At the time of the invasion last year, we were sufficiently confident that, with negotiations in train, Argentina would abide by the Charter of the United Nations, including Article 2, paragraph 4, and Article 33, on the peaceful settlement of disputes; we were so confident that we had no more than 42 military personnel in the Falklands. Now we have to maintain about 100 times that number. It is not, in fact, a very large number in the circumstances; indeed, it is less than half the number of the Argentine army that occupied the Falklands.

116. We are building a larger airfield in the Falklands. The Argentines have sought to portray that airfield, and other defensive—I repeat, defensive—dispositions that we are making, as a strategic military base. Such a description is manifestly untrue. The dispositions on the islands are no more than is required to counter the perceived threat from Argentina. The Shackleton report, entitled "Economic Survey of the Falkland Islands", recommended the building of an airfield in 1976 as a developmental measure. My Government has acted on the advice of that report that a new permanent airfield is required to enable the establishment of the regular civil air communications with the Islands which Lord Shackleton identified as an absolute priority. A port facility is being built to service the airfield. Completion of the new airfield will give an essential boost to the island's economy. The long-term purpose of the airfield is therefore civil rather than military. We sincerely trust that the military aspect will never have to become actual.

117. Alongside flights of fancy about the nature and purpose of the new airfield and its place in my country's so-called global strategic plans, we have also heard charges that Britain's defensive dispositions on the Falkland Islands are intended as a link in a strategic alliance with South Africa across the South Atlantic. I hope that these charges will be recognized for the malicious nonsense they are. Basing themselves on rumour and anecdote, Argentine spokesmen have blown the new airfield out of all proportion into a monster which threatens peace and security in the South Atlantic and allegedly draws the region into an East-West conflict. They have chosen to ignore the facts which my Government has publicly volunteered. I was glad to have had an opportunity to draw attention to these public facts in a letter circulated by me on 9 November as a General Assembly document [*A/38/577*] which refers in turn to an earlier letter of 25 August [*A/38/362*].

118. Regrettably, the President-elect of Argentina has also allowed himself to be led down this trail, in a statement he issued at Buenos Aires after the elections. But I am glad to acknowledge that neither he nor the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, who spoke yesterday [*54th meeting*], was guilty of the falsehood contained in two of the other speeches we heard on the first day of this debate, alleging hidden military collaboration with South Africa. I repeat once again what has been said on numerous occasions both here and in London: the choice of Cape Town by the contractors as a transit point for their civilian work force was decided by the contractors without the involvement of either my Government or South Africa. The decision related only to the contractors' civilian work force and not to equipment or construction material. All construction materials will be transported direct from Britain by sea. No military or service personnel will travel via Cape Town. There is no change in my Government's policy of non-collaboration in military matters with South Africa. Allegations to the contrary are smear tactics. I noted that earlier in the meeting the representative of the Soviet Union enjoyed elaborating this Argentine point. He said it was all part of a world-wide imperialist conspiracy based upon a scheme of the United States of America. I wonder whether my colleague from the Soviet Union has private and advance information that the United States delegation is about to change its vote on the draft resolution before us from the way in which it voted last year. Perhaps.

119. In a further flight of fancy the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina accused the United Kingdom of being in breach of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear

Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)³. I should like to make it clear to the Assembly that the United Kingdom gives full support to this Treaty, which we view as a major and valuable piece of arms control legislation. We have scrupulously observed our obligations under Protocols I and II to the Treaty, first, in not deploying nuclear weapons in territories for which we are internationally responsible within the Treaty's zone of application and, secondly, in not deploying such weapons in the territories in which the Treaty is in force. We would like to see the Treaty of Tlatelolco in force in the entire region. To achieve this, all eligible States in the region must become parties to the Treaty, including Argentina and Cuba.

120. Having disposed of these extraneous issues, let me return to my theme. I repeat: the long-term purpose of the airfield is civil rather than military. We have a proverb in Britain: "Once bitten, twice shy". We would rather not have been bitten but now we are going to take care that it does not happen again. Who will blame us for this? It would provide some reassurance if the new Argentine Government would categorically declare a definitive cessation of hostilities. It must demonstrate convincingly that it has renounced the use of force as a means of settling this dispute. That is what the Charter of the United Nations requires. There must be many, many delegations that are wondering why Argentina has still not done so. Several delegations supported last year's resolution [resolution 37/9] in the explicit hope that at least its reference to a *de facto* cessation of hostilities showed that Argentina was beginning to move on this essential point. They will have been disappointed that the year since then has shown only continued intransigence from Argentina's military régime.

121. As I draw to the close of my speech, I do not want it to be thought that I speak briefly because there is little to be said in favour of Britain. On the contrary, little need be said because the Charter of the United Nations says it all.

122. Last year the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina made a lengthy statement of the Argentine legal claims. In my reply I showed that they were spurious. I do not think it is necessary, despite what the Minister said yesterday [54th meeting], to go over all that ground again. Indeed by refraining from doing so I wish to draw attention to the difference between the Argentine and the British positions. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina rests his case partly on the denial of self-determination to the Falklanders and partly on his interpretation of 18th and 19th century history. As I say, those claims are spurious, but the point is that we are no longer living in the days of the great Spanish Empire. We are now in the 20th century and in the second half of that century. We are in the age of the Charter of the United Nations. We are in the age when we care about the peoples involved. We have all of us promised to uphold the Charter. Thus, we have all promised that the interests of the inhabitants shall be paramount and that this shall be expressed through exercise of the right of self-determination.

123. I have tried to take a positive view and to quote especially those passages of the Charter of the United Nations which I trust a new democratic Government in Argentina when it comes into power will respect. But I cannot complete my speech without some reference to those parts of the Charter on which we had to rely when the Falkland Islands were invaded only 18 months ago. That invasion took place in flagrant violation of Article 2, subparagraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter. While we were

trying to settle the dispute by peaceful means, the other side not only threatened but used force in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. We cannot forget that surprise attack, nor that it proceeded in defiance of a mandatory Security Council resolution passed under Chapter VII. We had to rescue the Falkland Islanders from foreign invaders through our own efforts of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter.

124. In recent days we have heard a good deal about invasions. Here was an invasion for which there was no excuse at all. Nobody invited the Argentine army to occupy the Falklands. None of the Falklanders cheered the army of occupation.

125. I ask the Assembly to remember that it is we who are the aggrieved party. I ask delegations further to search their consciences and to refrain from applying double standards. There is nothing particularly difficult about this case. It is a straightforward matter, and the answers are to be found in the Charter of the United Nations to which we all subscribe.

126. I ask for support for the Charter of the United Nations, the whole Charter and not an emasculated selective version. Let no one come to me after this debate and say that they supported the draft resolution before us because it was in accordance with the Charter. Let no one tell me that they favour both this draft resolution and the inalienable right of self-determination. Let no one tell me that the way to resolve this regrettable dispute is by neglecting Article 73 and the other provisions of the Charter. There were many delegations who voted against us last year. I trust they will not let consistency of voting pattern outweigh their support for the Charter itself. Therefore my delegation asks that those who cannot support us should at least not be against the Charter.

127. On the basis of respect for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, let us move forward with a new democratic Government in Argentina to the normalization of relations, which will contribute to a reduction of tension in the South Atlantic. Let us move forward, but let it be with due regard for the wishes of the people and on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

128. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The inclusion in the agenda and the discussion of the item concerning the question of the Malvinas Islands are an expression of a just demand and concern on the part of Argentina and other Latin American countries. In a broader context, this question is a manifestation of the struggle against the vestiges of the colonial system.

129. The delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania considers that a discussion of this problem should not assume the character of an academic debate and get into legal labyrinths aimed at denying Argentina its sovereignty over these islands, because in truth the Malvinas Islands belong to Argentina and not to the United Kingdom, which has occupied them.

130. Argentina and its people have never reconciled themselves to the English occupation of those islands and they have waged a continuous struggle for the achievement of their rightful sovereignty over them.

131. British imperialism, continuing the traditions of the colonialist crusades, did not hesitate to send its warships and troops 12,000 miles away from its crown to preserve its economic, military and strategic interests. Its claim that it undertook this military incursion from one part of the globe to another in defence of the right to self-determination of 1,800 British citizens on those islands is ridiculous and cynical.

132. It is no mere coincidence that a parallel can be drawn between the reasons used by the American imperialists to justify the barbarous act of aggression against Grenada and those used by the British imperialists in the Malvinas, when they state that they are sending their troops and carrying out invasions allegedly to save their citizens.

133. It was a surprise to no one when American imperialism openly and unhesitatingly came out in support of the British act of aggression against the Malvinas, because both are linked by imperialist and colonialist ideology and common strategic objectives and interests. Thus it was no coincidence that when the American marines were launching the attack on Grenada, their troops were strengthened by a British destroyer. This act by the closest military ally of the United States is meant as a recompense for the debt incurred through military aid in the occupation of the Malvinas Islands.

Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

134. The events in the Malvinas Islands tore off the mask of American imperialism, that wishes to pass itself off as a friend and ally of the Latin American countries. Life has demonstrated that the United States always has been and is the fiercest enemy of the freedom and independence of the peoples of that region and of the whole world. Clear evidence of this is the brutal intervention by American imperialism in Central America and other areas.

135. With regard to the events in the Malvinas Islands, the Soviet social imperialists have used all means to depict themselves as supporting Argentine sovereignty over these islands and as friends of the Argentine people and the other peoples of Latin America. However, the real reasons for this "support" were Moscow's ambitions to take advantage of a difficult situation and to prepare the necessary groundwork for its penetration of the region. Reality and the facts reveal the hypocrisy of the Soviet social imperialists, because while advocating Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas, they themselves were trampling underfoot the sovereignty of Afghanistan by occupying it militarily. The position of the two super-Powers in connection with the events in the Malvinas Islands and other events in various parts of the world today attests to the acute rivalry for world domination and hegemony and to the diplomacy of limited crises that is meant to prevent the solution of problems in accordance with the interests of the peoples.

136. The English imperialists, after having landed in the Malvinas by force of arms, have intensively carried out the so-called "Fortress Falklands" policy, which presupposes an increase of their military presence on the islands. They have earmarked large sums for the transport of weapons, the building of airports and strategic roadways and the dispatch of more British settlers. Thus British imperialism, supported by its allies and first and foremost by the United States of America, is seeking to continue its occupation of the Malvinas Islands and to convert them into a base for the United Kingdom and for NATO. But the era of colonialism is over, as incontrovertibly demonstrated by the resolute struggle of peoples to throw off the colonial and neo-colonial yoke and the defeats of the imperialists.

137. The people and Government of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania have clearly stated that Argentina's claim to exercise its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands is just. The sovereign rights of nations and peoples cannot be violated or limited by force of arms or by treaties and agreements harmful to them. We

consider the problem of the Malvinas to be a clear-cut question and we fully support Argentina in its claim to the restoration and exercise of its sovereignty over those islands.

138. Mr. KAM (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Exactly 18 years ago 15 Latin American countries, including Panama, submitted to the twentieth session of the General Assembly a draft resolution entitled "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which was adopted by an overwhelming majority [*resolution 2065 (XX)*].

139. In that resolution, the first adopted by the General Assembly on the question of the Malvinas Islands, the Assembly noted the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and invited both Governments to proceed without delay with the negotiations recommended by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem, bearing in mind the provisions and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the interests of the population of the Malvinas Islands.

140. Subsequently, on 20 December 1966, on 19 December 1967, on 16 December 1969 and on 20 December 1971, the General Assembly arrived at consensuses relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands and called upon the parties to pursue their efforts to reach a final settlement of the dispute as soon as possible. The General Assembly again expressed its views on 14 December 1973, in resolution 3160 (XXVIII), where it stated its grave concern at the fact that eight years had elapsed since the adoption of resolution 2065 (XX) without any substantial progress having been made in the negotiations and, therefore, it declared the need to accelerate the negotiations called for in resolution 2065 (XX).

141. In resolution 31/49, adopted on 1 December 1976, the General Assembly again requested the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to expedite the negotiations concerning the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands. In accordance with its previous decisions, on 4 November last year, the General Assembly adopted a resolution submitted by 20 Latin American countries [*resolution 37/9*] which requested the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

142. We have quite deliberately listed the resolutions and consensuses that have been adopted by the General Assembly concerning the question of the Malvinas Islands in order to emphasize the existence of an entire series of facts which constitute a heritage of views put forward by the entire international community supporting a negotiated settlement of the Malvinas Islands dispute. These cannot be discarded for purely circumstantial reasons, as the Government of the United Kingdom appears to have wished.

143. In accordance with our anti-colonialist mission and our unswerving support for the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes we have this year—as with similar draft resolutions in the past—sponsored, together with 19 other Latin American countries, the draft resolution in document A/38/L.12. In our view, this draft resolution is in keeping with the traditional line of conduct of the Assembly on the question of the Malvinas Islands, because it advocates a speedy negotiated settlement to the

sovereignty dispute relating to the Malvinas Islands and calls upon the Secretary-General to play an important role in this process.

144. My delegation would like to express its very serious concern about the rather discouraging, but factual, report submitted by the Secretary-General concerning his mission of good offices undertaken in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/9. It is unfortunate, to say the least, that because of the British rejection of the resolution, which expresses the majority view of the international community, it has none the less been impossible to implement it. This has contributed to the maintenance of a climate of tension in the South Atlantic that has an adverse impact on peace and security on the American continent. That climate of tension has become more acute because of Great Britain's insistence on maintaining an illegal, exclusive maritime zone and because it has announced that it is going to build a military base in the Malvinas Islands.

145. These two facts, together with Great Britain's refusal to negotiate, make my delegation extremely concerned about British intentions to perpetuate its colonial presence in the Malvinas Islands. In this context, I deem it appropriate to quote a paragraph from the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, in which it is stated:

"The Charter of the United Nations clearly gives priority to dealing with threats to international peace and security and to the commitment of all nations, especially the permanent members of the Security Council,"—and I emphasize here: especially the permanent members of the Security Council—"to cooperate within the framework of the United Nations towards this end. It is the weakening of this commitment that has, perhaps more than any other factor, led to the partial paralysis of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security." [A/38/1, p. 1.]

146. My delegation has noted with satisfaction the many and repeated demonstrations by the Argentine Republic of the fact that it clearly wishes to embark upon the negotiations called for in many General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 37/9, which reaffirms all the earlier resolutions in this connection.

147. My delegation would like to stress as particularly important the statement made on 8 November 1983 by the President elect of Argentina, Mr. Raúl Alfonsín [A/38/578], in which he affirmed that the new Government of Argentina would use all the diplomatic means at its disposal to achieve as soon as possible a peaceful settlement of the dispute on sovereignty between Argentina and the United Kingdom. The democratically elected President indicated that he was convinced that negotiation between the two Governments was the proper way of settling that dispute on a fair and permanent basis. We trust that in the very near future we shall be able to welcome a similar decision on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom.

148. The question of the Malvinas Islands has been the subject of discussion for more than 19 years in the United Nations, so that the international community is fully aware of the fact that the dispute on sovereignty between Argentina and the United Kingdom relating to the Islands is due to the illegal British occupation of the Malvinas Islands in 1833 by an act of force against Argentina and the territorial integrity of the Argentine nation. British persistence in maintaining that occupation of an inalienable part of American territory, whatever the cost, for 150 years has resulted in an anachronistic colonial situation incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations

and the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. In particular, it is an open challenge to the countries of Latin America which have made the cause of the Malvinas Islands their own. But 150 years can in no way validate any kind of colonial occupation; 150 years of occupation give no right to the occupiers; 150 years only prolong the injustice.

149. In the course of the debates on this item speakers have continually referred to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. We must once again welcome the fact that all speakers have defended this cardinal principle of international law, and my country reaffirms its adherence to that principle. However, we consider that some points should be made concerning the applicability of this principle to the decolonization of the Malvinas.

150. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] recognizes the existence of various forms and manifestations of colonialism, all of which must be ended speedily and unconditionally. It is therefore important that the specific characteristics of each colonial case be examined to determine the method of decolonization and whether the population is entitled to exercise the right to self-determination or whether the territory should be restored to its sovereignty. In the case of the Malvinas we are undoubtedly facing the second case, because this is territory which has been illegally occupied, broken off from the territory of a sovereign State, Argentina, and inhabited by people settled there by the occupying Power. It would therefore be wrong for that population to determine the fate of a usurped territory which does not belong to it and with which it really has no legitimate bonds.

151. Furthermore, the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the practice followed in the process of decolonization do not mean that the right of self-determination can be given to illicit settlers of the occupying Power or to settlers who are carrying out the territorial occupation, much less to the employees of companies from the metropolitan country.

152. We therefore consider that the "kelpers" on the Malvinas do not meet the conditions or the appropriate circumstances of persons entitled to the right to self-determination. However, we consider just and appropriate the fact that the interests of the population in the Malvinas should be duly taken into consideration in the negotiating process, in accordance with the provisions of all General Assembly resolutions relating to the question of the Malvinas. We are most gratified to note that Argentina has stood faithfully by that commitment.

153. A different attitude was noted in the case of the occupation of Diego García, when it appeared that the right to self-determination was not applicable because it was said in that case that the native inhabitants did not have any interests or rights to defend.

154. With that self-same devotion to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations with which in 1965 we sponsored resolution 2065 (XX), this year we are sponsoring draft resolution A/38/L.12. We are doing so in the profound conviction that we are not advocating confrontation but rather making room politically for a negotiated solution to the question of the Malvinas Islands. My country's own international experience has provided us with a constructive example of how international difficulties can be negotiated successfully. I am referring to the treaties on the Panama Canal. We are thus encouraged to urge the United Kingdom to prepare forthwith to negotiate in good faith with Argentina, because the path of negotiation is the only one that can ensure just and lasting solutions to international conflicts, particularly

those which affect the dignity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

155. This year, we Latin Americans have commemorated the 200th anniversary of the birth of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar. We have remembered with joy and gratitude his great work as a decolonizer, and we have reaffirmed our devotion to his ideal of an independent, united Latin America, free from any foreign domination. Within that context we have also renewed our determination to carry on the struggle to complete his anti-colonial undertaking. The restoration of the Malvinas Islands to Argentine sovereignty is a major Latin American task in that renewed commitment to our Liberator, Simón Bolívar.

156. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The conflict over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), which has further worsened international tensions, is the result of the United Kingdom's failure to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and its failure to implement a number of General Assembly resolutions directly related to the question of these islands, particularly resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49, which were intended to decolonize the islands and which called for talks between the United Kingdom and Argentina on this matter.

157. The massive military action carried out by the United Kingdom in 1982 for the purpose of maintaining its colonial domination over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the fundamental norms of international law. It created a threat to international peace and security.

158. The conflict in the South Atlantic has demonstrated with renewed force the need to put an end as quickly as possible to the vestiges of colonial domination in all places where unfortunately they are still to be found. This conflict once again clearly showed to the entire world that imperialism, in its insistent efforts at any cost to maintain peoples in colonial slavery, will spare no aggressive actions, and is unhesitatingly prepared to apply armed might, including the newest weapons, to achieve its adventurist goals. This conflict shows why imperialism really needs the arms race, an arms race which it so insistently defends in spite of the massively expressed will of its own peoples and of the peoples of the entire world.

159. "The conflict in the South Atlantic has unmasked the treacherous role of American imperialism." This was written in the Argentine newspaper *Clarín* at the beginning of this year. It was stated in the Panamanian paper *Matutino* that

"The moral support and material assistance given by the United States to Britain is like a stab in the back to all of Latin America. The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance is not even worth the paper it is written on."

In this connection we might recall the Washington-inspired invasions of Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Grenada. We might recall the gunboat diplomacy now being carried out against Nicaragua and we might recall the suppression of the national liberation movements in El Salvador and other countries of Central America.

160. The war in the South Atlantic has unmasked the essence of the military strategic goals of NATO by showing that the imperialist Powers are pursuing far-reaching geopolitical goals with regard to various regions and their adjacent seas, and that they are increasing their armaments in order to achieve those goals.

161. The situation in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) which has arisen in the period following last year's discus-

sion of this problem in the General Assembly and since the adoption of resolution 37/9 continues to show us that the United Kingdom is unwilling to enter into a peaceful settlement to the conflict with Argentina over the status of those Islands. At the same time, it is known that the Government of Argentina, after the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, repeatedly confirmed its readiness immediately to resume talks for settling the existing conflict. The Government of Argentina also agreed to co-operate with the good offices mission of the Secretary-General in such talks.

162. There are now approximately 4,000 British soldiers on the archipelago. Construction of military items, which include air defence systems and radar equipment, is going on at a feverish pace. The waters of the South Atlantic are being plied by a large squadron of British warships led by the newest attack aircraft carrier, the *Illustrious*. According to several news items, a very large air force complex is being built on the Islands. Construction supplies are coming through ports of the Republic of South Africa. There is the growth of a new, sinister military base of a NATO member. That is what the facts tell us in spite of certain "clarifications". Many delegations taking part in the discussion expressed their concern at the provocative arms race started by the imperialist forces in the South Atlantic.

163. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March of this year, stated in its Political Declaration that

"the Conference considered that the massive military and naval presence and the activities of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in the Malvinas Islands region are a cause for grave concern to the countries of the region and adversely affect stability in the area." [A/38/132, annex, sect. I, para. 158.]

and that

"The Heads of State or Government reiterated their firm support for the Republic of Argentina's right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restituted through negotiations. They urged that these negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom be reopened with the participation and good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General and reaffirmed the need for the parties to take due account of the interests of the population of the Islands." [*Ibid.*, para. 156.]

164. At their meeting early in October of this year, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries reaffirmed that position once more. Their appeal must be implemented immediately. A speedy, peaceful and just solution of the problem of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is a very real prospect, and it can be achieved in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49 and 37/9, and also in keeping with the principles and relevant decisions of the Non-Aligned Movement.

165. For those reasons, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is prepared to support draft resolution A/38/L.12.

166. Mr. KUTSCHAN (German Democratic Republic): Highest priority in the foreign policy of the German Democratic Republic is given to doing all in our power to strengthen international security and to establish lasting peace all over the world. At a time when the danger of a nuclear inferno provoked by the confrontational course of the most aggressive circles of imperialism

threatens the very existence of mankind, it is absolutely imperative to unite all forces to counteract that course vigorously and decisively and to bring international relations back to normalcy. The German Democratic Republic therefore supports without reservation all efforts aimed at finding a solution to existing international conflicts through negotiations. It is a fact that every conflict, irrespective of the region involved, bears enormous dangers for world peace.

167. The General Assembly must deal once more with the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). During the past year it has not been possible to make any progress towards finding a settlement of the conflict on the basis of General Assembly resolution 37/9, despite intensive endeavours on the part of both the United Nations and the Latin American States. Now, as before, the negative results of the unsettled problems still cast their shadows over security and stability in that region of our globe. We are witnessing increasing efforts to include the South Atlantic among the global strategic objectives of imperialism, and to make it another arena for the imperialist policy of strength.

168. The non-aligned countries too, at their Seventh Conference, held at New Delhi last March, expressed their deep concern about the stepping up of military activities, which undermines stability in that area. The increased expansion of the Islands into a military base of NATO is indeed a danger to the security of Latin American States, but it is a danger to that of African States as well. Bases of that kind have long been used to hold up progressive development through military means, and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

169. The kind of dangers now emanating from the imperialist policy of strength and threats became only too obvious in the brutal military intervention of the United States in Grenada. Official representatives of the United States Administration have left no doubt about the fact that other peoples that embark upon the road to independent development and that seek good-neighbourly relations with States of their choice might also face the same fate. All this is done on the pretext of protecting so-called vital national interests or of protecting freedom, democracy and human rights. Since there is hardly any region left where the United States does not claim to have "vital interests", the full extent of the danger to world peace becomes manifest. This policy inevitably leads to an aggravation of existing conflicts and brings about new disputes. It increases the danger of the transition of a regional conflict into a global one.

170. Together with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, the German Democratic Republic strongly condemns this policy of military diktat and blackmail, of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and of the threat and use of force in international relations.

171. In the light of the dangerous international situation, we attach particular importance also to the relaxation of tensions in the region of the South Atlantic and support all efforts aimed at finding a just solution to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) through peaceful means.

172. During the current session, on 3 October, the Foreign Minister of my country stated in this regard:

"As for the conflict in the South Atlantic, the German Democratic Republic understands the growing concern of the Latin American States and peoples and advocates a settlement on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of

Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi. [15th meeting, para. 139.]"

173. The German Democratic Republic reaffirms its view that the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), as a part of the question of decolonization, must be resolved in accordance with the requirements of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It holds the view that the threat and use of economic sanctions as well as military force are inadmissible means of resolving international disputes.

174. All activities aimed at an extension of NATO capabilities and range of action to the South Atlantic, thousands of miles away from Western European coastal waters, must therefore cease. Let us recall in this connection that the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty proposed that the radius of action of the two military-political alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Treaty—should not be extended to new regions in Asia, Africa or Latin America.

175. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports the call for a rapid and just solution of the conflict in the South Atlantic through negotiations between the parties concerned, a call that was also made by the Non-Aligned Movement at its Seventh Conference, held at New Delhi. It welcomes the readiness to open negotiations expressed on several occasions by Argentina.

176. Finally, we should like to express the hope that at its thirty-eighth session the General Assembly will adopt a resolution that will contribute to a negotiated solution of the conflict, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations. That would undoubtedly lessen the tensions in the region and would serve to strengthen international security.

177. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In accordance with the relevant resolutions of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the current session is once again considering the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). The Chinese delegation would like to make a few comments on this issue.

178. Last year the war of the Malvinas Islands broke out in the South Atlantic, adding to the turbulence in Latin America and the world as a whole and arousing the concern of the international community. Although there are no longer hostilities in the region and neither party to the conflict has expressed any intention of renewing the hostilities, the negotiations between them have not been resumed and military confrontation still exists. The anxiety aroused by the question of the Malvinas Islands is still with us.

179. The General Assembly has adopted more than one resolution on the question of the Malvinas Islands, pointing out that this is a question of decolonization and urging an accelerated negotiating process between the two parties. Upon the request of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of 20 Latin American countries, contained in their letter of 16 August 1982 to the Secretary-General,⁵ the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly considered the question of the Malvinas Islands and adopted resolution 37/9, which requested "the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)" and requested the Secretary-General "to undertake a renewed mission of good offices . . .".

180. On 20 December 1982 the Assembly of the Organization of American States [OAS] adopted a resolution on the question of the Malvinas Islands supporting General

Assembly resolution 37/9 and demanding that both sides implement the provisions of the resolution. In October of this year the Ministers and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly met in New York from 4 to 7 October and issued a Final Communiqué asking for the good offices of the Secretary-General and his participation in the resumption of the negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom [A/38/495]. All this has fully testified to the strong desire of the international community for a peaceful and rational settlement of the dispute over the Malvinas Islands.

181. The claim of sovereignty by Argentina over the Malvinas Islands has won consistent sympathy and support from the Latin American countries and the non-aligned countries. The conferences of the non-aligned countries and of the OAS have adopted resolutions on many occasions to support the Argentine claim. The Political Declaration adopted at the Seventh summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi last March, and the Final Communiqué adopted at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, held in New York in October of this year, both reaffirmed the Non-Aligned Movement's "firm support for the Republic of Argentina's right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restituted through negotiations . . . and reaffirmed the necessity for all parties to take due account of the interests of the population on the Islands" [See A/38/132, annex, sect. I, para 156].

182. The Chinese Government and the Chinese people always firmly support the third world countries and peoples in their just struggles for safeguarding State sovereignty and territorial integrity. We maintain that the Argentine claim of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands should be respected by the international community. The relevant resolution adopted by the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly [resolution 37/9] should be implemented. We support the Secretary-General in his renewed efforts of good offices. The question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is an issue inherited from history between Argentina and the United Kingdom. We hope that both parties will resume as soon as possible their negotiations on the dispute of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly so as to find a just and reasonable settlement to this problem through peaceful negotiations. This is not only in accord with the interests of the peoples of Argentina and the United Kingdom but is also conducive to the maintenance of peace in the South Atlantic and the world as a whole.

183. Mr. QUIÑONES-AMÉZQUITA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again we are discussing the case of the Malvinas. A year ago in the Assembly we heard the voice of Latin America raised to demand justice for Argentina's cause, which is now America's cause. We have witnessed the inexorable passage of time and we are distressed to note that talks to find a solution to the problem of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands have not yet begun. The patience of the peoples cannot be taxed. To do so leads to conflicts that leave behind them resentments that require years before they are forgotten and sufferings which cannot be foretold.

184. Once again we urge the parties to begin constructive talks to find a peaceful solution.

185. Guatemala, believing that disputes must be settled through peaceful means, is again among the sponsors of a draft resolution. However, we wonder how long one of

the parties, which does not respond to calls for dialogue, intends to remain frozen and unmoved in its position. Is it because of a failure to understand that it is impossible to break, completely or partially, national unity or territorial integrity? For many years my country has maintained that self-determination is bound by territorial integrity and national unity. We cannot violate those principles without spreading anarchy among the peoples and bringing destruction to the countries, by placing them in a secession situation.

186. In the case of the Malvinas, the inhabitants are predominantly of British origin and nationality and, although my country supports the thesis that the interests of the inhabitants must be defended, to protect their interests is not the same as protecting their wishes, particularly when it is a matter of territories occupied and held by force. My country views with profound concern the building of military installations in the Malvinas, including a military airport. This reflects the desire to perpetuate a situation which in terms of international law can be explained only as the use of force. Interests cannot have greater value than rights; there can be partial victories for interests, but rights will win the final victory.

187. We would not wish to end this statement without praising the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts in the task of mediation entrusted to him by the Assembly. We ask him to continue in this endeavour, convinced as we are that the moral weight of truth and justice will be felt and make the colonial country understand the greatness of the Argentine cause.

188. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Honduras is speaking on the question of the Malvinas Islands specifically because it is one that involves the peace and security of the American continent and because we are one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/38/L.12.

189. In our statement on 19 October last, at the 19th meeting of the Sixth Committee, on the report of the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations, I stated that the Charter of the United Nations, its resolutions, the true facts, and international practice all point to the existence of an indivisible unity between the peaceful settlement of disputes, the non-use of force, disarmament and confidence-building measures between States, and that all these must be considered at the same time if the final aim is to safeguard international peace and security.

190. Thus Honduras expresses an unequivocal attitude towards all international conflicts, including as a matter of logic those in which it finds itself involved. Hence we believe it important, with regard to the international dispute on the Malvinas Islands, to focus attention on the interrelationship between the elements to which I have just referred, as the most expeditious method of putting an end to conflicts in the world.

191. In his statement of 10 October last before the Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, Mr. Paz Barnica, said:

"My country also expresses its desire for a just and negotiated solution of the conflict in the South Atlantic and reaffirms its support for the claims of the Argentine Republic to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands. We believe that the essential requirement for the attainment of that objective is good faith in international relations." [26th meeting, para. 38.]

192. The Honduran delegation believes it is of the utmost importance for talks and negotiations to be resumed, despite the loss of life and material damage suffered earlier

by the parties to the dispute, for, as stated by the President of the Republic of Honduras, Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova, speaking on Central American conflicts:

“No pretext, no motive, not even the blood which has been shed and which may be used as a justification for maintaining the climate of violence, can be more powerful than the fervent desire of our peoples to achieve and maintain peace.”

193. For all those reasons, we deem as fundamental the view of the Secretary-General contained in his report of 27 October 1983 on the question before us, as follows:

“While it is clear that negotiations cannot begin unless both parties agree, it is my belief that a resumption of dialogue, coupled with the adoption of confidence-building measures, can contribute to a normalization of the situation in the South Atlantic and open the way towards a lasting solution of the problem. For my part, I stand ready to assist both parties in this process.”
[A/38/532, para. 5.]

194. Honduras hopes that the good intentions expressed by the parties, and the Secretary-General’s good offices, will soon contribute to the strengthening of peace and security, particularly on the American continent.

195. Mr. VIDAL ESPAILLAT (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, I would like to refer to an event which should be a source of legitimate pride not only for all the people of Argentina but also for all those peoples that cherish peace and democracy. I refer to the electoral process conducted by Argentina in the recent elections held there on 30 October 1983. They were conducted in an exemplary manner and the Argentine people voted in massive numbers in a peaceful and orderly manner to elect their civil authorities.

196. In opening the debate on the item before us, “Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)”, the Minister for Foreign Relations of Argentina, Mr. Juan Aguirre Lanari, communicated to the Assembly the statement made by the President elect of Argentina, Mr. Raúl Alfonsín [54th meeting], in support of the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the sovereignty dispute between his country and the United Kingdom. This statement, which accepts the good offices of the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/9, should be welcomed with great satisfaction by the United Nations.

197. The Dominican Republic—as in the case of a similar draft resolution last year—is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/38/L.12, which was introduced yesterday by Mr. Muñoz Ledo, of Mexico [*ibid.*]. The purpose of the draft resolution is to bring about lasting peace in the South Atlantic by means of active negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom, with the assistance of the good offices of the Secretary-General.

198. The draft resolution reiterates the need to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute or conflict relating to the Malvinas Islands, through negotiation. It is a proposal of peace based on the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

199. This territorial dispute has been recognized as such by a number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly since 1965. Therefore, to try to tackle the question of the right to self-determination of the inhabitants of the Malvinas without first bringing about a just and equitable solution to the dispute in question does not seem to be a logical course. While it is true that the solution of the territorial dispute will have to take into account the interests of the population, it must of necessity come before the question of the right of the inhabitants of the

Malvinas to self-determination. The lack of progress in the negotiations, despite the initiatives undertaken by the Secretary-General, not only endangers the maintenance of international peace and security but also fosters an extension of the arms race of the super-Powers into the South Atlantic. Therefore, it is a fundamental duty of the United Nations to call for dialogue, prevent a military confrontation and promote a relaxation of tension in the South Atlantic.

200. The Secretary-General states in his report on the question of the Malvinas Islands [A/38/532] that two things would contribute to a normalization of the situation in the South Atlantic: first, resumption of dialogue, and, secondly, the adoption of confidence-building measures. We therefore wonder whether the presence of military facilities in the area and the plans to increase that militarization—although both parties have expressed their intention to observe the cessation of hostilities—do not, in fact, constitute an obstacle to the promotion of mutual confidence and thereby impede the resumption of dialogue.

201. I will conclude by repeating something that we have often said in the United Nations, as well as in other forums of the international community. A consistent element in the foreign policy of the Dominican Republic is the rejection of all forms of colonialism and all vestiges of colonial situations in any part of the world. This position of principle leads us to support the firm concept that the maintenance of a colonial situation is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace.

202. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I remind members that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes for the first statement and 5 minutes for the second and should be made by representatives from their seats.

203. Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): There is just one point which has emerged during the meeting and to which I would like to reply. The representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, in referring to British military dispositions in the Falkland Islands, talked about “a NATO base”. The representative of the German Democratic Republic also referred to “a NATO military base”. Talk about “a NATO base” is pure fantasy. The Falkland Islands lie many thousands of miles outside the area covered by NATO and the Falkland Islands are not by any stretch of the imagination included in NATO plans and operations; nor would it be possible under NATO for them to be so included.

204. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom referred to the question of the Malvinas Islands in terms which confirmed what was stated quite clearly yesterday by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country [54th meeting], namely, that the British Government continues to ignore the will of the majority of the members of the international community and is violating the essential principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations which commit Member States to seeking peaceful negotiated solutions to their international disputes.

205. I must say specifically yet again that all the relevant decisions adopted by the United Nations since 1964, that is to say in almost 20 years, and the draft resolution submitted this year to the General Assembly [A/38/L.12], quite clearly state that with regard to the Malvinas there is a sovereignty dispute over the territory of the islands

between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom and that the solution of that dispute is the only way of putting an end to the colonial situation in that Territory.

206. What we have heard is a refusal to negotiate.

207. As stated again in resolution 37/9 and in the new draft resolution (A/38/L.12), the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom must resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and with the assistance of the good offices of the Secretary-General.

208. The present Government of the United Kingdom should understand that this is the wish of the Argentine nation, of the incoming constitutional Government, of Latin America and of the overwhelming majority of the international community as represented in the United Nations.

209. My country respects the self-determination of peoples, but it has the support of the countries of the Latin American region and the Non-Aligned Movement, which consists mainly of States that have come to independence recently, in maintaining that the right to self-determination does not apply to the specific case of the Malvinas, because its application there would mean consecrating a fraud—it would be against truth and justice—to benefit a colonial Power that wishes to perpetuate its imperialist presence in Latin America by using that right for its own benefit.

210. I emphatically reaffirm that the growing military presence of the United Kingdom in the South Atlantic, strengthened by the construction of a permanent strategic base in the Malvinas and the collaboration of South Africa, is intolerable. Nothing that the British representative said has detracted from the condemnation by many countries of the militarization of the islands, or disproved the statement by the British Secretary of State for Defence, Michael Heseltine, regarding their future strategic importance.

211. In denouncing here that militaristic policy, which affects the peace and stability of Latin America, Argentina is merely demonstrating to the international community the true intentions of the British Government. It is not the denunciation made by my country that contributes to tension in the area, but the British Government's decisions designed to maintain its illegal occupation of the Malvinas, obstructing the achievement of a just, peaceful, permanent solution to the issue.

212. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom during this meeting quoted resolution 1514 (XV) as the fundamental decision of the General Assembly in the decolonization process. He seems to forget that the British Government abstained from the vote on that resolution on 14 December 1960. He also forgets that his country's delegation at that time stated that the self-determination of peoples was not a right, but only a principle.

213. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom also says that we must respect the right to self-determination of the inhabitants of the Malvinas. On the other hand, he affirms that the Malvinas are a sovereign British territory. It cannot be denied that the United Kingdom delegation is guilty of serious contradictions which have nothing whatsoever to do with the true situation of the Malvinas. The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom forgets that his own country in 1946 put the Malvinas on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. He is ignoring the fact that all decisions of the United Nations on the question clearly recognize the existence of a sovereignty dispute between my country and the United Kingdom, and the fact that all have

rejected the issue of self-determination, because it would be the self-determination of British citizens, thus perpetuating a colonial, illegal, anachronistic situation.

214. The case is the same as that to which we have referred so many times, the case of Diego García, where the original population of the island was expelled by force. They were not asked their thoughts and feelings. The right to self-determination was not invoked in that case. It is possible that the present inhabitants of Diego García will decide the future of that island?

215. In conclusion, I would like to make a few brief observations. It is surprising that the representative of the United Kingdom continues to proclaim the humanitarian sentiments of his Government towards the inhabitants of the Malvinas, whom his country forgot altogether for one and a half centuries, regarding them as second-class citizens and preventing them from living in the United Kingdom itself. It is also surprising to hear him proclaim his defence of peace. The eloquent proof of the sentiments of the United Kingdom is well known to representatives who have witnessed it during two meetings at this session. A few days ago the United Kingdom abstained in the vote on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution that became resolution 38/7, "The situation in Grenada". That paragraph reads:

"Deplores the death of innocent civilians resulting from the armed intervention" [resolution 38/7, para. 2].

The second proof came today, when the United Kingdom abstained in the vote on nothing less than the draft resolution that condemned the policy of *apartheid* as reaffirmed in the new South African Constitution.

216. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In exercising his right of reply, the representative of the United Kingdom said that in my statement I had made a factual error in talking about the construction of a military base in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). I wish to quote from what I said: "There is the growth of a new, sinister military base of a NATO member." To deny the accuracy of that phrase would be to state that the United Kingdom is not a NATO member, or that it intends to leave that Organization in the near future.

217. Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I have a distinct memory that the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic hesitated and slipped in his delivery of his speech at the passage in question. I think he used the words—I wrote them down—"a NATO base", but I shall certainly withdraw what I said if he did not intend to use those words.

218. However, the representative of the German Democratic Republic did not stumble at a similar passage in his speech, and I wrote down his words, which were "a NATO military base".

219. In exercise of his right of reply, the representative of Argentina spoke about United Nations resolutions and the right to self-determination. What he said added nothing to the arguments advanced so far in this debate, which were dealt with carefully and at length in the statement of Sir John Thomson this afternoon.

220. As for the remarks about British military strategy, I can only suppose that the representative of Argentina did not listen with complete concentration to the statement by Sir John Thomson at this meeting. There is an element of surrealist fantasy in such talk. I am sorry that the representative of Argentina continues to attempt to perpetuate it. May I in all sincerity invite him to read Sir John Thomson's statement.

221. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is understandable that it is annoying when

one refers specifically to facts or when one is supported by the truth. All I did was to refer to facts, and I backed them by using the very words of representatives and high-ranking officials of the United Kingdom who have explained in detail the real facts of the militarization of the Malvinas Islands. Indeed, the Secretary of State for Defence of the United Kingdom, Mr. Heseltine, to whom I referred earlier, pointed out the characteristics of this military fortress. I did not invent those words nor are they the product of my imagination. They are simply conclusions that flow from everything that has been said by representatives of the British Government.

222. I do not think it is necessary for me to dwell on the other points that have just been raised, since we have

repeatedly expressed our thoughts on them clearly and with completely convincing arguments and facts.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh year, 2366th meeting.*

² *Ibid.*, 2362nd meeting.

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

⁴ A/AC.109/SR.311.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 135, document A/37/193.