

UN LIBRARY

UNITED NATIONS

MAY 16 1990

UN/ISA COLLECTION



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2363rd MEETING: 23 MAY 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2363) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| Question concerning the situation in the region of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas): | |
| (a) Letter dated 4 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15037); | |
| (b) Letter dated 20 May 1982 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15099); | |
| (c) Letter dated 21 May 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15100) | 1 |

NOTE

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

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

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

2363rd MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 23 May 1982, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. LING Qing (China).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2363)

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

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

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings [2360th and 2362nd meetings], I invite the representative of Argentina to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of

Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Costa Méndez (Argentina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Jacobs (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Street (Australia), Mr. Ortiz Sanz (Bolivia), Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Rosales Rivera (El Salvador), Mr. Maye Ela (Equatorial Guinea), Mr. Delprée Crespo (Guatemala), Mr. Lobo (Honduras), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Francis (New Zealand), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua), Mr. González Arias (Paraguay), Mr. Calle y Calle (Peru), Mr. Azar Gómez (Uruguay) and Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Belgium and Indonesia requesting to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite them to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Dever (Belgium) and Mr. Kamil (Indonesia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have already expressed my views, on 2 April [2349th meeting], on the subject of the initial responsibility for the hostilities, which belongs, clearly to the one who was first to use force in violation of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations. My Government gave its whole-hearted support to resolution 502 (1982), voted upon the following day by the Council, whereby Argentine armed forces must withdraw from the islands, called in French Les Malouines. In the absence of such a withdrawal, the breach of the peace noted in that resolution could lead only to military confrontation.

4. After the initial serious military incidents, the French Government expressed its desire to see everything possible done to bring about a cessation of hostilities and the separation of the forces confronting each other. On 5 May, therefore, the French Government, without taking a stand on the substance of the problem, that is, the dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom, repeated its conviction that it was imperative for resolution 502 (1982) to be strictly applied. On that occasion we expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would succeed rapidly in indicating ways which would make it possible to resume peace negotiations after the cessation of hostilities.

5. My Government has been unstinting in its support for the efforts undertaken to this end by the Secretary-General. We deeply regret that these efforts have not so far proved successful. We wish to express our most serious concern at the exacerbation of a conflict which has already caused considerable loss of human life. We are also aware of the emotion which this situation has aroused in Latin America, a region where France maintains historic and close ties of friendship and co-operation. We know that this emotion deepens with the prolongation of the conflict.

6. France therefore believes that every possible effort should be made, as a matter of urgency, to bring about a cessation of hostilities. We are aware that the efforts already undertaken by the Secretary-General have made it possible to discern certain positive features mentioned in the report he presented to us [2360th meeting]. However that may be, we must preserve what has been achieved.

7. My Government feels that the Secretary-General has thus shown that he is particularly well placed to carry out this work successfully. It considers that the Council should recognize this and give the Secretary-General the whole-hearted support that he needs.

8. Mr. WYZNER (Poland): Allow me at the very outset, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your assumption and discharge of the functions of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. We are confident that you will guide our work during what is certainly a very difficult and busy month with your well-known wisdom, impartiality and diplomatic skill.

9. I wish also to express our sincere gratitude to Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda for the admirable way in which he led us through the month of April, which was equally beset with difficulties.

10. The Council has had to resume its consideration of the situation in the South Atlantic in dramatically changed circumstances. During the weeks that followed our last meeting on this subject, we have

been watching with increasing concern the developments in the area and, in particular, the sharp aggravation of tension resulting from the escalation of military activities by the United Kingdom, an aggravation which, in our view, if left unchecked is likely to endanger international peace and security.

11. Likewise, we are deeply concerned at the tragic loss of life and mounting non-fatal casualties on both sides caused by a colonial war so obviously anachronistic at the end of the twentieth century.

12. The Council will recall that on 3 April [2350th meeting], when we spoke in explanation of our vote on resolution 502 (1982), we began by pointing out that we had joined the President and other members of the Council in calling on the two Governments concerned to exercise the utmost restraint and, in particular, to refrain from the use or threat of force in the region and to continue the search for a diplomatic solution.

13. We also pointed out the decolonization aspect of the dispute concerning the Falkland Islands/Islas Malvinas. We stated, *inter alia*, that we had taken into account the fact that:

“as long ago as 16 December 1965, the General Assembly, in resolution 2065 (XX), recognized that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in resolution 1514 (XV),

“ ‘was prompted by the cherished aim of bringing to an end everywhere colonialism in all its forms, one of which governs the case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)’ ” [*ibid.*, para. 264].

14. We also recalled that since that time the matter has been considered by 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 and that this fact had been reflected in the report of the Special Committee to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.¹ We added as a conclusion that we deplored the fact that this aspect of the problem was totally missing from resolution 502 (1982).

15. Those observations of ours have lost none of their validity today. We continue to believe that neither the use of force nor gunboat diplomacy is the right way to solve international disputes. Nor, for that matter, is the legally unfounded and morally suspect policy of sanctions applied outside the system prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations, particularly when, ironically, it is being pursued by some of those countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) which on so many occasions in the past have been vehemently opposed to the application by the Security Council of sanctions against, for instance, South Africa, arguing that sanctions

were unwise, counter-productive, not a proper instrument of foreign policy and so on. No wonder that so many speakers who have preceded me in this debate have referred to the application of sanctions against Argentina as an act of economic aggression and an attempt to apply a policy of diktat towards that developing Latin American country.

16. My country has consistently favoured the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whatever their nature and geopolitical setting. That is why we do not give up hope for the peaceful settlement of the dispute between the two parties concerned through the process of diplomatic negotiations. The same approach has been very ably expressed by many, both within and outside the Council. Allow me to quote at this juncture only one, but a pertinent, sentence from the telegram dated 4 May addressed by the President of Colombia to the Secretary-General, which seems to summarize so aptly the feelings prevailing in this chamber: "peace can be achieved more easily through dialogue than by resorting to the bloodshed of war" [see S/15045].

17. We wish to reiterate here our full support and admiration for the Secretary-General, as well as gratitude for his selfless efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict. We regret very much that those efforts have up to now failed to achieve their objective, certainly through no fault of his. As we know today, the urgent pleas for the exercise of maximum restraint by both sides which have echoed throughout the world in recent days have failed to convince the Government of the United Kingdom that it should not resort to force, that the solution of the problem should be arrived at in a peaceful manner. We cannot but strongly deplore this failure and the unilateral escalation of hostilities on a large scale, culminating in the recent massive military operations, but we still believe it is not too late for a peaceful approach to prevail. The Council must act urgently and forcefully in this regard. First of all, in our view, it should order an immediate cessation of all hostilities. The utmost need to prevent any further loss of young lives, to which the Secretary-General referred earlier, requires no argumentation and brooks no delay. Further steps to follow on could include the gradual withdrawal of the military forces of both sides from the area and the lifting of sanctions. It should also become possible to resume shortly concrete and meaningful negotiations, held under the auspices of the United Nations and properly mandated by the Council, with a view to reaching a lasting political settlement in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the elements of which have already emerged through the previous efforts of the Secretary-General. My delegation stands ready to assist in endeavours leading in that direction.

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

19. Mr. LOBO (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express my most grateful thanks, Mr. President, for the opportunity given to the Honduran delegation to participate in this important meeting of the Council. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of your important post and to say that we are confident that you will be most successful in your work, because of your political tact and your widely recognized ability.

20. With regard to the hostilities now taking place in the Malvinas Islands between Argentina and the United Kingdom, I should like to state that the Government and people of Honduras have feelings of friendship and profound respect for both countries.

21. Our Government wishes to express its solidarity with the claim of the Government and people of Argentina to the Malvinas Islands. What we deplore are the acts of aggression which are causing loss of human life. Faced with the existing situation, one of war, we urge the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom finally to find common ground which would constitute the essential basis for a peaceful and just solution in accordance with the principles and norms laid down by the Charter of the United Nations and by international public law.

22. The firm and unswerving aim of the constitutional Government headed by Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova is to internationalize peace, and that goal is mentioned in the statement of our foreign policy made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Edgardo Paz Barnica, in the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States (OAS), in which he proposed a concrete plan for bringing peace to Central America.

23. We believe that this much-desired aim is equally relevant to the hostilities going on in the southern zone. In accordance with that conviction, we hope that Argentina and the United Kingdom will begin a constructive dialogue to bring peace to this region.

24. Finally, I should like to state that the people and Government of Honduras are sincerely anxious to promote and support any action or initiative which would lead to the restoration of international peace and security.

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

26. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I am sure that with your experience as a diplomat and with your political skill you will conduct the deliberations of the Council wisely and successfully.

27. I also wish to congratulate Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, a representative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, who with his well-known political qualities successfully conducted the affairs of the Council in April.

28. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General, on behalf of my Government, for the efforts that he made to bring peace and tranquillity to the Malvinas area.

29. We believe that his dedication, wisdom, equanimity and political skill have been fully demonstrated. We are sure that the results of his action would have been totally successful had it not been for the intransigence of an extra-continental Power which wished to keep Latin America in a colonial status, and had it not been for the fact that the negotiations were taking place at a stage where success was very difficult. At an earlier stage efforts had failed, and then another Power, this time from our continent, tried to intervene and act in an allegedly neutral and impartial manner.

30. Mr. President, we should like to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving us an opportunity to intervene in this matter, which is of great importance to Latin America in general and Nicaragua in particular.

31. It is difficult for my Government to understand how at an advanced stage of the twentieth century we should have to meet to discuss such a problem as that before us, which not only endangers international peace and security but constitutes an absurd colonial situation.

32. The situation in one of our Latin American countries, the sister Argentine Republic, is truly alarming. At the present time, the military forces of a colonial Power from outside our continent are using force to establish alleged sovereignty over an archipelago which they illegally occupied in the past as a result of acts of force, thereby depriving Argentina of territory which, from the legal and geographical point of view, belongs to it. Argentina's claim is just, for it succeeds Spain's rights, according to the Latin American doctrine of *uti possidetis juris*, and because the Malvinas Islands are on its continental shelf. International law and American law fully support the right of the Argentine Republic to the Malvinas Islands.

33. In this context we cannot ignore the attitude assumed by another Power, one from our continent. Abandoning its alleged position as a mediator, it has openly allied itself against a Latin American nation, making it quite clear that its interests are quite different from those of our peoples. In that connection, I should like to read out an official communiqué issued by our Government on 5 May in regard to this conflict:

"Nicaragua expresses its vigorous repudiation of the colonialist military aggression of which the sister Argentine Republic is a victim today at the hands of Great Britain. In addition to being an absolute violation of Security Council resolution 502 (1982) and a violation of the recent resolution of the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States of 28 April [see S/15008, annex], it is an attempt by that extra-continental Power to bring back to a Latin American region its past policy of territorial usurpation by force. The unjustified British attack is a direct attack on the sovereignty of the Latin American peoples.

"Nicaragua, as a country that has cordial relations with Great Britain, urges that nation immediately to cease hostilities and to abide by the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States.

"At the present time the attitude assumed by the Government of the United States cannot be ignored. By its open support for the extra-continental Power which is the aggressor against an American country, it has revealed its lack of neutrality in this conflict."

34. My Government, in saying this, is abiding by anti-imperialist principles and the principles of non-alignment of our revolution, and we do not hesitate in denouncing colonialism and neo-colonialism, which regrettably continue to exist today in the world and, in this particular case, in our continent. In addition, we believe that the maintenance of anachronistic colonial enclaves, such as those represented by the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies, disturbs international peace and conflicts with the fundamental principles of contemporary international law.

35. It is important to make quite clear to the Council and to the international community the position of the United States on this problem. We would only refer to the words of the representative of the sister Argentine Republic, Mr. Eduardo Roca, when he spoke to the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries:

"But there is also another fact which, because of its singular importance, its seriousness and its treacherousness, deserves to be highlighted as a precedent. I am referring to the attitude of the United States Government, which gained for the United Kingdom the time needed for the punitive fleet to reach its destination. It then went back on its own promises of impartiality, lied with regard to our proposal, deceived its own public opinion and is now providing economic and military support to the colonialist aggressor.

"The facts make it perfectly clear that the United Kingdom did not wish to shoot without first having

the consent, support and direct complicity of the North American Government, and for that reason both are equally responsible. That is the interpretation of the peoples of Latin America."

36. That, then, is the interpretation of the peoples of Latin America, and there can be no doubt about it. They believe that the Pan-Americanism brandished by the United States applies in only one direction: it is invoked when favourable to its interests, but is considered invalid when it is a question of giving real support to our countries, which do not bring to the United States the same advantages that it receives from its European ally, a "first-class" ally of a kind that the United States seems not to have found on our continent. We must make it clear that this colonialist aggression, which reminds us unequivocally of the brutality of the piratical adventures of the past, but with the added refinement of British war *matériel*, is an aggression against all the Latin American peoples, running counter to the decision of the modern world to eliminate colonialism, neo-colonialism, hegemonism and imperialism, scourges that can be maintained only through the use of force, as *apartheid*, racism and zionism are maintained.

37. The Latin American community is experiencing a whole gamut of feelings. Suddenly it is both spectator and victim of the stand taken by the United States. Today it is clearer than ever before that the crisis it has inflicted on the inter-American system is probably irreversible. Today it is clearer than ever before that it regards the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance as an instrument to be used only for its own benefit and defence and the protection of its own interests. We do not understand how it can reconcile that attitude with the Monroe Doctrine. Are we now to say that America is for the Americans—and for the British? Nothing the United States Government can do will surprise us now.

38. The right of the sister Argentine Republic to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and its dependencies is unquestionable. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which my Government is honoured to be a member and which we consider to be a natural forum for the expression of the views of the countries of the third world, where common answers to common problems can be found, has given a clear response. At various ministerial meetings of the Movement, we have unequivocally supported Argentina's just claims of sovereignty, and we have urged the United Kingdom to engage in active negotiations with a view to returning that territory to Argentine sovereignty.

39. For our part, since 1979, when Nicaragua took the path of freedom and political independence and joined the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we have actively supported the just claims of the sister Argentine Republic to a part of its territory which was taken from it by force in 1833. It should perhaps be

mentioned here that the fact that the occupation has until recently been maintained by force does not give the British any legal right to the sovereignty they claim. We are fully convinced that the doctrine of acquisitive prescription cannot be supported, even though the territory has been occupied for such a long time, because Argentina has never ceased to lay claim to it and to defend its rights.

40. The Government of Nicaragua understands how distressing these situations are because it is not only the sister Argentine Republic that is suffering. As the representative of Ecuador said [2360th meeting], the mere occupation of territories that legitimately belong to our countries does not become valid with the passage of time, no matter how much time passes, since it is a simple usurpation of territory.

41. On the basis of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which has been invoked by Argentina to preserve the unity and territorial integrity of the country, the United Nations has maintained a constant interest in this matter and has urged the parties to engage in peaceful negotiations, and subsequently expressed its concern, as for example in Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49. Those resolutions, *inter alia*, call on the parties to engage in peaceful negotiations, and they express concern at the lack of substantial progress in negotiations. At the same time, they urge the parties to undertake negotiations without delay.

42. More recently, the Council adopted resolution 502 (1982), which was introduced and sponsored by the United Kingdom and which, *inter alia*, appeals to the parties not to engage in actions that will increase hostilities and to begin negotiations immediately. It also calls for the withdrawal of all Argentine forces.

43. My Government found it surprising that that same country, a permanent member of the Security Council and, therefore, a country with the power of the veto, in clear disregard of the authority of the Council and the resolution that it had itself presented, was at the same time setting its war machinery, including its nuclear submarines, in motion. The United Kingdom thus disregarded the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco Treaty)² in order initially to recover the South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and to retake by force the territory it had initially usurped in the same way in 1833, thus maintaining a colonialist enclave in the Americas for which there is no logical reason, nor any legal, still less moral, justification.

44. We are quite convinced that this warlike attitude, which is unprecedented in the history of Latin America, has made it impossible for the sister nation of Argentina to abide by the resolution. It expressed its willingness to abide by that resolution in a letter

from the representative of Argentina to the President of the Council on 12 April [S/14968], in which he expressed his country's intention to abide by each and every one of its paragraphs. More recently, a couple of days ago, we heard the Argentine Vice-Minister, Mr. Enrique Ros, reiterate that willingness as follows:

"But, in spite of the serious shortcomings of resolution 502 (1982) and the serious reservations it deserved because it did not note the fact that this is an anachronistic colonial case, Argentina unequivocally stated its readiness to comply with its provisions, so long as the British Government adopted a corresponding attitude." [2360th meeting, para. 35.]

45. Today, more than ever before, the cessation of all hostilities is necessary, and we would appeal to the Government of the United Kingdom to cease its aggressive attitude and to show a willingness to negotiate seriously and to arrive through dialogue at a just and lasting solution to this problem.

46. We would also issue an appeal to the member countries of the European Community to put an end to their unjust economic sanctions against a Latin American country that is a victim of aggression, for those sanctions certainly do not contribute to the cause of peace and a negotiated settlement of the conflict. On the contrary, they strengthen the warlike attitude that the most conservative sectors in England have encouraged. We would most sincerely congratulate the Governments of Ireland, Italy and Denmark on the positions they took when the sanctions were extended for one week. Recognizing their contribution to the betterment of mankind and the maintenance of international peace and security, we would urge the other member countries to dissociate themselves from the untenable position of the United Kingdom and rather to urge that country to participate in the search for a solution that is desired by the inter-American community.

47. Nicaragua believes that it is the obligation of the Council immediately to take the action necessary to bring about an immediate cessation of hostilities and the undertaking of the negotiations that the situation demands. The present situation, with the loss of life and the material losses and, what is worse, their continuation and worsening because of Great Britain's obstinacy, make it necessary for the Council to take prompt and specific action in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Today, more than ever before, we must make it perfectly clear, especially for those of us who are searching for peace and fighting for it, that it is in the Council, in this political forum of the United Nations, that we must find the answer to our anxieties and concerns and seek solutions to our problems.

48. In conclusion, I should like to remind the Council of the unconditional solidarity of the people and

Government of Nicaragua with the sister nation of Argentina. We confirm the full meaning of the words of the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua at the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS: "Brother Argentinitians, it is now your turn". That message is one of active solidarity. We reiterate here the solidarity of our people and Government. Our people, devoted to the defence of our revolutionary gains, share the feelings of Latin America, and we are prepared, as required, to defend the right of the Argentine people to its sovereignty.

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

50. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): May I thank you, Mr. President, and your colleagues for allowing me to speak before the Council on behalf of the New Zealand Government. May I say, too, how glad we are that you are guiding the Council's deliberations. We know that you and the great country that you represent have the patience, experience and wisdom needed at this critical time.

51. Seven weeks ago, before the Council [2349th meeting], my delegation expressed New Zealand's grave concern over the situation that had arisen as a result of Argentina's invasion of the Falkland Islands. The concern of the Council was expressed in resolution 502 (1982), adopted on 3 April. That resolution provided the basis on which settlement of the dispute could be pursued by peaceful means.

52. Since 3 April, however, the Argentine Government has ignored the essential elements of that resolution and has defied the Council. It has interpreted the resolution in a manner contrary to both its spirit and its letter. It has sought to shift responsibility for the fighting to the United Kingdom and, in a curious inversion of fact and logic, to deny that the United Kingdom was justified in exercising its legitimate rights to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Instead of withdrawing its forces, it reinforced them. It set unacceptable pre-conditions for its implementation of resolution 502 (1982), pre-conditions which frustrated the most determined efforts of the United States and of Peru to pave the way to a peaceful solution.

53. Not long ago it looked as if an agreement was within reach that would satisfy the requirements of resolution 502 (1982) and pave the way to an acceptable settlement. But the Secretary-General's efforts foundered on the rock of Argentine obduracy and rigidity, and it is that which has, in the mean time, brought his patient and dedicated search for a peaceful settlement of the conflict to a close. New Zealand has the greatest admiration and respect for the impartial and determined way in which the Secretary-General has exercised the responsibilities which the Organization has bestowed on him.

54. Though the matter is in dispute, there is, in the view of the New Zealand Government, no doubt as to where sovereignty over the Falkland Islands lies. Nor is there any doubt as to the wishes of the people of the Falklands. When all the facts are assessed, one thing is plain: the two aggrieved parties in this crisis are Britain and the people of the Falkland Islands, whose lives have been so violently disrupted.
55. Argentina's invasion of the Falkland Islands was entirely unprovoked. It was a violation of international law and of those norms that govern relations between States. It was undertaken in complete disregard of two cardinal principles of the United Nations which must be upheld: the principle that force shall not be used to settle territorial disputes and the principle that all people have the right to self-determination, in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter. It is inescapable that Argentina's defiance of a mandatory resolution of the Security Council demonstrates disdain for the principles for which the United Nations stands.
56. With the breakdown in negotiations, the matter has properly returned to the Council. The clear duty of the Council now is to call for Argentina to end its aggression against the Falklands and to demonstrate its readiness to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the dispute without prejudging the outcome. We would certainly see an important continuing role for the Secretary-General in the negotiating process.
57. The actions taken in recent weeks by the British Government, and those now being taken, are a direct consequence of Argentina's unlawful and unprovoked aggression against the Falkland Islands. They are a demonstration of British determination to resist aggression and to uphold the right of the islanders to decide their future. The United Nations stands for the principle of self-determination. The right to decide their own destiny belongs to the Falkland islanders no less than to any other people. It is a right of which they have been forcibly deprived; it is a right which must be returned to them.
58. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Equatorial Guinea. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.
59. Mr. MAYE ELA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to join all those who have congratulated you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Your outstanding diplomatic qualities and your experience in international matters guarantee the success of our deliberations.
60. We wish also to congratulate the representative of Zaire, Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, on his work as outgoing President. He conducted the affairs of the Council with dignity and ability.
61. I should also like to thank you, Mr. President, for permitting me to speak before this high body.
62. The delegation of Equatorial Guinea believes that the actions taken over the past few days in connection with the thorny problem of the Malvinas Islands have created a situation that threatens international peace and security and have moved us closer to an escalation of the war, which could lead to a conflagration with unpredictable effects. The consequences of that would be lamentable and sad for both the United Kingdom and Argentina and for all humanity.
63. At the present time, when there is a desire to put an end forever to all colonial vestiges, the delegation of Equatorial Guinea believes that the question of the Malvinas Islands is a purely colonial matter, clearly demonstrating hegemonistic desires to impose the will and the desire of one State on another, or, to put it differently, to restore the colonial yoke.
64. The delegation of Equatorial Guinea supports Argentina's sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands as a piece of land that belongs to it. It is well known by everyone that a good part of decolonization has been realized thanks to the doctrine of a great American statesman, whose philosophy is known by the famous historical term "the Monroe Doctrine".
65. In the name of the Government of the Supreme Military Council of Equatorial Guinea, led by Colonel Obiang Nguema Mbasogo, and in my own name, I should like to state that the people of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea are in full solidarity with the people of Argentina, our brothers, to whom we are bound by historical ties of culture, language and religion within the Hispanic community of nations, during this difficult time in their history as they try to find a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Malvinas.
66. The delegation of Equatorial Guinea likewise believes that the good offices of the Secretary-General in the negotiations just conducted must be continued, and here we would call on the Council and the international community to support his efforts. My delegation believes that this supreme body must take all possible measures and give the Secretary-General a new mandate to continue negotiations with all the parties by means of a dialogue aimed at bringing about a peaceful settlement and an immediate cease-fire in the hostilities taking place in the South Atlantic.
67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of Paraguay. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.
68. Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express my gratitude for this opportunity to address the Council on the serious matter which has brought us together.

First of all, I should like to welcome the Foreign Ministers from Latin America who are present here: Mr. Nicanor Costa Méndez, of Argentina, Mr. Jorge Illueca, of Panama, and Mr. José Alberto Zambrano Velasco, of Venezuela, who was present yesterday [2362nd meeting].

69. My delegation learned with great concern of the most recent news reporting a worsening of the conflict over the Malvinas Islands, a conflict between two Western nations with which we have cordial relations.

70. The painful experience of my own country, which in slightly more than 100 years of independent life has twice suffered the horrors of war, with a ferocity perhaps unequalled in the American continent, makes it clear that our concern is genuine and justified.

71. With regard to this conflict, and in the course of commenting on the relations between Paraguay and Argentina, the Foreign Minister of my country, Mr. Alberto Nogués, stated the following before the OAS:

"It is not necessary for me now, in this exceptional forum, to give you an inventory of the feelings which are well known to Argentina, nor to mention the hopes shared by Paraguay and Argentina which make for sincere and mutual co-operation. The most eloquent testimony to this today is the Yacyretá undertaking, a monumental project whereby we offer to succeeding generations a standing testimony to authentic integration."

72. We listened with the greatest interest to the words which the Secretary-General used to report to the Council on his efforts to promote a negotiated and peaceful settlement to the conflict [2360th meeting]. It is to be regretted that the desired result was not attained and that recourse has once again been had to force. Nevertheless, the efforts undertaken and the statements made by the Secretary-General still stand. We believe in his ability, as well as in the maturity of the two parties to the conflict. Perhaps it is a question of evaluating the situation, of calming passions, of relinquishing extreme attitudes and of seeking a genuine solution which would satisfy the rights invoked by both parties.

73. Paraguay has from the very beginning of the conflict stated that it supports a negotiated solution and has been watching with interest and with hope all the efforts to bring the parties together undertaken by both the United States Secretary of State and the Secretary-General, as well as the initiatives of certain Latin American countries.

74. My country's position on the substance of the matter is well known and has already been set forth in the Council in a statement made last month [2350th meeting], and I do not think it necessary to repeat it.

75. Our primary concern right now, however, is the escalation of hostilities occurring in the Malvinas. Before this stage of confrontation was reached, the Foreign Minister of my country said in the OAS:

"What is of primary importance is to put out the fire which has broken out in the destiny of America and calmly to find a formula to preserve peace and security on our continent, in the conviction that by so doing we would be rendering an inestimable historic service not only to America but also to the very future of mankind."

He also said:

"No other country in America more than my own has an interest in averting the serious crisis which has arisen in the South Atlantic, which, as time goes by, becomes ever more threatening and dangerous."

76. Therefore, the Council should first find a formula for bringing about a cessation of hostilities and then engage in a search for machinery to bring about a peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict.

77. My delegation is convinced that there does exist an appropriate framework, both in the Security Council resolution and in certain relevant resolutions of the General Assembly on the subject of decolonization adopted in 1965, 1973 and 1976, which recommended negotiations between the parties and which were co-sponsored by my country.

78. Efforts to find a peaceful solution, which were given a notable boost in 1965 by the United Nations, should continue. We believe that the irreparable loss of life and enormous material damage suffered by both parties are painful proof precisely of how beneficial a negotiated solution to the conflict would have been, if there had been any concrete result from the last 17 years of contacts between Argentina and Great Britain.

79. New acts of bloodshed, which are still going on and the full magnitude and gravity of which we do not know, prompt us to confirm our conviction that any effort made to bring about a cessation of hostilities would be beneficial. The Council has the unavoidable and urgent responsibility of adopting the measures necessary to bring about such a result. We therefore support the idea initially put forward that the Secretary-General be given a formal mandate to continue his efforts to bring about a negotiated solution and that there be an immediate cessation of hostilities.

80. Any delay on the part of the Council in fulfilling the obligations laid down by the Charter of the United Nations could lead to an even worse escalation of the situation, which could threaten the peace of our whole region and have, in both the long and the short term, political and economic repercussions which would be difficult to predict.

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

82. Mr. SANZ de SANTAMARIA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to extend very cordial and fraternal greetings to Mr. Costa Méndez, the Foreign Minister of Argentina, and express my best wishes to my distinguished friend, Mr. Illueca, the Foreign Minister of Panama. I should also like to express, through the representative of Venezuela, Mr. Martini Urdaneta, my best wishes to the Foreign Minister of Venezuela, Mr. Zambrano Velasco, who yesterday honoured us with his presence.

83. As I have had the pleasure of telling you, Mr. President, I have had occasion to admire your human qualities and your statesmanship. For that reason, in these very difficult circumstances in which the Council finds itself, it is indeed fortunate that we have someone with so much experience presiding over these meetings. I thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council for this opportunity to participate in this debate.

84. I am confident that the Council will take the necessary action speedily to bring about a cease-fire and compliance with resolution 502 (1982), in its entirety, by the United Kingdom and Argentina so as to put an end to this absurd loss of valuable young lives and resources that those nations need to develop and improve the well-being of their societies.

85. For the United Nations the preservation of peace is not only its principal purpose but its daily challenge. Efforts are made daily to solve problems besetting the community of nations and to resolve conflicts which have not been settled by other means. When conflicts occur, as in the case of the South Atlantic, the responsibility of the Council for preventing an aggravation of the conflict that already exists is immense.

86. This is a very difficult time for the United Nations. To demonstrate inability to impose an international order of law, to fail to stop the use of force to settle a conflict, to fail to prevent war between these two nations, would make the Organization appear to be powerless to preserve international peace and security. The Organization would emerge greatly weakened if it were unable to achieve its purposes.

87. My country is well aware of the seriousness of the crisis in the South Atlantic and of its great repercussions for peace and security in the hemisphere and in the entire world. We are convinced that a peace settlement is possible by means of a solution that is satisfactory to both sides. A great deal of progress was made through the efforts of the Secretary-General. Regrettably, his mission was not entirely successful.

88. Acts of violence have, unfortunately, intensified, and hostilities have continued, although the Council had demanded that they cease, and this has led to the irreparable loss of many innocent lives. The danger of an escalation of the conflict should not be underestimated, especially if one bears in mind the relationship between the tensions among the major Powers, on the one hand, and regional conflicts that occur in various parts of the world, on the other.

89. One of the greatest potential threats to international peace at the present time is the possibility that some regional conflict might unexpectedly directly involve the complex and fragile relations between the nuclear Powers, forcing them to move incautiously and uncontrollably to a dangerous point.

90. This concern is, in turn, linked to the problem of intervention or non-intervention in certain events in the world and to the difficult and highly controversial situation resulting from military pacts, requests for military assistance and the massive supply of weapons and technical assistance to opposing sides in regional conflicts.

91. Two countries which have traditionally been friends are in conflict over what both of them consider to be their territorial rights. Each is seeking to defend what it considers to be its exclusive interests. In the pursuit of its goals, each calls on the alliances and solidarity pacts which make it possible to defend itself and to penalize offences.

92. The cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal of military forces and the carrying out of diplomatic negotiations are fundamental to a peaceful settlement. If the parties concerned accept that, then a very important step will have been taken towards the necessary solution.

93. All the peoples of the Americas and of the West have inextricable links to certain common legal, political and moral principles. Ever since the beginning of its independent life, Colombia has been determined to bow to the rule of law. Our status as a "State of law" makes it an obligation on the part of my country to bow to solutions of law and not solutions based on force. This fundamental position is also that of the Argentine people, which, in such difficult times, have the support of the people and Government of Colombia in their claims to sovereignty during the relevant negotiations. Argentina and all the Members of the United Nations know that here and in other forums we have unhesitatingly opposed colonialism. This is a pillar of our international policy.

94. For any man or woman of the past 10 or 15 generations in Colombia, a reference to slavery is really a reference to history, which prompts us to think of our forefathers who ended that slavery in our country in 1851. I imagine that the young people in other Latin

American countries have similar thoughts. This was a time in the history of mankind when people, trafficking in human lives, were really not very far from the Stone Age, and it was thought that modern civilization, education and culture should have completely eliminated such inhuman procedures of the past.

95. Other kinds of injustices—the bondage of poverty, unemployment, ignorance, malnutrition, ill health—concern the present generation, and the ambition for development is really only a desire to eliminate, by intelligent means, these new forms of human bondage.

96. For the present generation on our continent, the concept of colonialism, which long formed part of the relationships between the powerful countries and the small and weak countries, is also as anachronistic and as alien to the thinking of Latin American youth as the traffic in human beings. No one can accept it or tolerate it. All nations in our hemisphere share this anti-colonialist position.

97. Nevertheless, it is only fair to recognize that the policy of decolonization of the United Kingdom has allowed both great and small countries to become independent by means of negotiations, dialogue and political agreements.

98. Because of those historical experiences, our delegation believes that the continuation of diplomatic and political negotiations may lead to a settlement of this dispute. If the United Kingdom has so often shown flexibility in the past in granting freedom to its former colonies, it is reasonable to expect that, in this particular case also, it can do so in the light of the policy of decolonization accepted by the United Nations.

99. The President of Colombia, Julio César Turbay Ayala, on 14 April in a reply to a communication from President Galtieri of Argentina, stated, *inter alia*, the following:

“Colombia attaches great importance to the situation in which Argentina and the United Kingdom at present find themselves. Our reaction to that situation was, together with Costa Rica and Ecuador, to submit to the Permanent Council of the OAS a draft resolution whereby the inter-American system offers mediation to prevent the tragic consequences of an armed confrontation and the disturbing effects of a military and economic blockade.”

He further stated:

“Colombia defends the cause of Argentina in its claim against the United Kingdom and has no hesitation in declaring this support in the United Nations.”

100. Yesterday, once again, President Turbay expressed himself in similar terms in support of a proposal of the President of Peru, in a message to the President of Argentina, to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

101. The delegation of Colombia wishes to repeat the appeal it has already made, jointly with Costa Rica and Ecuador, for a peaceful, practical and effective solution.

102. In the present conflagration in the South Atlantic, the circumstances are so serious and the loss of innocent young lives so tragic that we must act swiftly. Our delegation would like to refer to two specific points: first, a proposal to the Council that it impose an immediate cease-fire; and, secondly, a reaffirmation of confidence in the work that the Secretary-General has been doing and a request that he continue, with an official mandate from the Council, his efforts to bring about a suitable settlement of the present serious situation. His devotion to the cause of peace, his prudence and his ability to offer valuable advice are the best means of halting the armed conflict and bringing both Governments back to dialogue and negotiations.

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

104. Mr. ROSALES RIVERA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, the prudence, skill and diplomatic experience which have characterized your actions within the United Nations are sure guarantees of the success with which you will conduct the proceedings of the Council during your presidency.

105. My delegation would like to extend its best wishes to Foreign Minister Costa Méndez, of Argentina, and to Foreign Minister Illueca, of Panama, who are present in this chamber.

106. My first words are to thank the Council for permitting me to address it at such a difficult time, in which two friendly countries, one extra-continental and the other belonging to Latin America, find themselves in open conflict within the framework of the American continent over the Malvinas Islands.

107. We should like to state that El Salvador's position has been and still is that the Malvinas Islands belong within the territorial jurisdiction of the Argentine Republic and that, consequently, Argentina should exercise sovereignty over them. This position has been reiterated by El Salvador both in the regional body, OAS, and in this world Organization, the United Nations.

108. Thus for us it is a problem that comes under the heading of decolonization, and we therefore con-

sider that the colonial redoubt in the American hemisphere should cease to exist.

109. From this standpoint, the *de facto* occupation carried out by the Argentine Republic on 2 April is in accordance with its *de jure* title. We cannot accept the idea that an occupation resulting from a usurpation carried out in 1833 by the United Kingdom in the Malvinas Islands should give rise to any lawful claim to them. Indeed, the claim of the Argentine Republic to the Malvinas Islands is an intrinsic right inherent in Argentina's act of gaining independence from the metropolitan country. Therefore, Argentina has inherent rights and it is not legally possible for any Power to deny those sovereign rights, which are essentially imprescriptible.

110. Chronologically, we are in the presence of two *de facto* events: the first taking place in the last century when Great Britain forcibly occupied the Malvinas Islands, and the second on 2 April of this year.

111. It is in the light of these circumstances that we must consider if it is relevant to invoke the concepts of aggression and of self-defence—the latter being exercised rationally and with a sense of proportion—to justify punitive expeditions when we come to analyse the Articles of the Charter of the United Nations.

112. There is a true connection between these facts, and, on the basis of the terminology of penal law, we can appropriately say that there is a causal relation between these two events.

113. The development of military actions in connection with the Malvinas Islands has been escalating the conflict. The Council has been convened precisely at a time when bloodshed and hostile actions are taking place with great intensity, according to press reports coming from both London and Buenos Aires.

114. Our statement here, which is motivated by concern over these serious events in the South Atlantic that have been reported, is an opportunity to appeal to the parties to return to the negotiating table. Within this context, the Council unquestionably has the responsibility to promote a cessation of hostilities and a resumption of dialogue.

115. For my country, the finding of a solution acceptable to both sides, a solution which would respect the rights and interests of both, would, of course, be the ideal result, and in this regard El Salvador gives its utmost support to the efforts of the Secretary-General in the search for such a solution. We believe that if more time had been available, time which the Government of Argentina appeared ready to give, the Secretary-General could have been successful in his mediation efforts. In this regard, we believe that it would be right for the Council at this meeting to give a formal mandate to the Secretary-General to resume

his work, which began so promisingly, and to continue to offer his good offices. El Salvador is convinced that thanks to the skilful work of the Secretary-General, it should be possible to find common ground between the positions of the parties.

116. My country believes that it is indispensable that we put into operation, within the competence of the United Nations, the machinery laid down by the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is necessary, too, for Council resolution 502 (1982) to be complied with in full. In this regard, neither of the parties involved in the conflict can legitimately claim that it is the only executant of that resolution and that the other is not, because the development of events is equally applicable to both.

117. We should like to draw attention to the resolution adopted in Washington on 28 April by the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS, convened in accordance with the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, in which an appeal is made for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to call a truce that would make it possible to resume work towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict, taking into account the sovereign rights of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands, as well as the interests of the people living there.

118. The text of that resolution can be found in document S/15008, and I do not want to discuss it in detail. However, it is worth looking at what was said at that meeting about the economic sanctions against Argentina undertaken by the European Community. We believe that those sanctions have the character of economic aggression against the Argentine people and are therefore to be rejected. We condemn equally vigorously the acts and statements of those other countries which have joined in this scheme against the Argentine Republic.

119. In conclusion, I wish to state that, in the interests of international peace and harmony, El Salvador hopes that the approaches that have been made to the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations with a view to finding a just, peaceful, honourable and lasting solution to this conflict in the South Atlantic will bear fruit.

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

121. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I would like to express my satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the proceedings of the Council at such an important time.

122. May I thank you for having acceded to my delegation's request to speak in this debate on behalf of the Government of Belgium.

123. I should first of all like to pay a warm tribute to the Secretary-General for the work he has done with such tenacity, perseverance and conviction over the last few weeks in an attempt to bring about a peaceful and just solution to the conflict with which we are concerned. It is regrettable that his tireless efforts were not successful. We should like to hope that by making it possible more clearly to identify the problems at issue and to outline possible solutions, those efforts may serve as a basis for a new attempt on his part, for which we all hope.

124. We have asked to participate in the debate because Belgium is particularly sensitive to violations of international law and of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. My country, very logically, is particularly devoted to the provisions relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-use of force.

125. These principles were violated by Argentina when it invaded the Falkland Islands in spite of the appeal issued by the Council on 1 April that force not be used [2345th meeting, para. 74].

126. Too often, in the statements we have heard so far, it has seemed to me that sight has been lost of the fact that it was that action on the part of Argentina which was at the origin of the tragic situation that the Council is now facing.

127. Following the appeal of the Council, resolution 502 (1982) was adopted on 3 April, without objection in the Council. It called for the withdrawal of troops, but it continues to be ignored by Argentina.

128. It would seem that for some the reaction to the Argentine action was disproportionate to what was at stake.

129. But what is at stake is not negligible. It is nothing more or less than the need to make it absolutely and unambiguously clear that the use of force is inadmissible and cannot be a means of settling conflicts. If the use of force were to be rewarded, this would encourage any State with territorial ambitions to follow suit.

130. Peace in the world would become even more precarious and many countries, no matter what group they belonged to, would feel threatened. The reaction of many small countries in the world to the Argentine invasion demonstrates, furthermore, that this danger has been understood.

131. In many statements we have heard attacks on the economic sanctions decided upon by the countries of the European Community. An entirely new idea, it

seems, was even invoked, whereby this decision was said to be a violation of Article 41 of the Charter, which it was claimed would give the Security Council a monopoly on deciding on sanctions.

132. In joining in these sanctions, Belgium intended, like its partners, to give specific form to the grave view it takes of violations of the Charter, which have been condemned by a resolution of the Council, on the one hand, and above all to support the diplomatic efforts under way to find a negotiated solution, on the other hand.

133. I do not wish here to go into an analysis of the different aspects of the problem, or to take a stand on the question of sovereignty, which should be settled by negotiations, the outcome of which cannot be prejudged.

134. We would have hoped that the situation would not reach its present scale. In spite of the tragic development of events, we hope that reason will prevail and that Argentina will agree to abide by the terms of resolution 502 (1982), which it has so far ignored.

135. We earnestly hope also that efforts to find a peaceful settlement can be resumed very rapidly, on the basis of the principles of that resolution and in the light of the elements which have emerged from previous negotiations. We should not forget the commitment entered into by all States Members when they signed the Charter to do everything possible to bring about a peaceful settlement of disputes. The Charter itself makes available to us procedures which promote that end. Furthermore, territorial claims should not be allowed to override the interests of peoples in choosing democratically their own destinies.

136. We express the heartfelt hope that these efforts will be successful and that it will be possible to conclude a just and honourable peace, in keeping with law.

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

138. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): At the outset, Sir, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to express to you my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Your vast experience and the outstanding qualities that you have exhibited assure us all in the Council of your ability to guide the deliberations of the Council in dealing with this most difficult and challenging task.

139. I should like also to take this opportunity to express my high appreciation to Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda for his skilful and dedicated performance as President of the Council last month.

140. I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this debate upon the specific instructions of my Government. My delegation, representing a country in another part of the world, geographically, continents away from the arena of war and the parties to this dispute, namely, South-East Asia, joins previous speakers in expressing our utmost concern over developments in the South Atlantic and in conveying to the Council our urgent appeal for prompt action to silence the guns of destruction now being employed on land, in the air and at sea in and around the Malvinas Islands.

141. The Council is meeting in an atmosphere of crisis and at a moment when the ongoing war between Argentina and the United Kingdom is not only causing destruction and death but also poisoning relations between countries and regions. That this is a moment of veritable crisis is thus very evident.

142. My delegation pays the highest tribute to the Secretary-General, who endeavoured indefatigably over the past weeks to seek to establish a cease-fire and a framework for a negotiated settlement, with the active participation of the two parties directly involved. There is no doubt that he made good progress, thanks to the desire all round to achieve a peaceful solution and to implement resolution 502 (1982), as stated by both countries to the Council. The Secretary-General presented a draft text, during his efforts, which, combined with further suggestions and elaborations on the basis of his consultations with both parties, could, as he said, restore peace and herald the beginning of an enduring solution to the conflict. However, even the extent of agreement to these proposals, which was, in the Secretary-General's words, "substantial and important" [2360th meeting, para. 19], was not enough to lead the way from a warlike situation towards the negotiating table, for as the Secretary-General stated, "the necessary accommodations had not been made" [ibid., para. 21]. Today a full-scale war, in all its fury, is raging in and around the Malvinas Islands. Furthermore, it is a war between two countries which, until a few weeks ago, had cordial and very friendly relations.

143. Although situated in South-East Asia, which is so far away from the scene of conflict, the Government of Indonesia is no less gravely concerned with the developments arising out of the Malvinas dispute. On 10 April last, my Government, through its Foreign Ministry, underlined this concern in a press statement. It expressed the sincere hope that the two parties to the dispute, with both of which Indonesia maintains the best of relations, could settle their differences peacefully and not take any action which could exacerbate the already difficult situation and cause a widening of the conflict.

144. Listening to the Secretary-General on 21 May [2360th meeting], when he reported to this body his

various proposals to contain the conflict and prevent it from erupting into open war, my delegation was reminded of a somewhat similar situation involving my country over the West Irian dispute. In that conflict, when the initial phases of a full-scale military engagement had already begun, it was proposals quite similar to those presented by the Secretary-General, which he reported to the Council, which changed the war into a cease-fire and an eventual settlement of the West Irian dispute. This came about thanks to the goodwill expressed all round, the initiative of the then Secretary-General, U Thant, and the full participation of the United Nations in the implementation of a framework of agreement.

145. The present situation may not be exactly the same and such a procedure might perhaps meet with objection in the present crisis, but I feel, speaking for my delegation, that it might be timely to recall, for whatever it is worth, that episode of two decades ago. That settlement epitomizes the spirit of accommodation displayed by both parties to the dispute and their close co-operation with the United Nations as the Organization entrusted with the responsibility to maintain international peace and security.

146. Today, with the war situation worsening in and around the Malvinas, the first urgent and prompt thing the Council should do is to call for an end to this war and for a cessation of hostilities. No one knows whether this war might not be the beginning of a wider conflagration involving not only the present two combatants. War, as all members know, has its own unpredictable dynamics. The representative of Ireland said in that connection last Friday that war "may start through calculation. But once started, it soon escapes all calculation." [ibid., para. 159.]

147. Furthermore, the Secretary-General, who so admirably accomplished so much in the days before full-scale warfare began, should be fully authorized to continue his efforts, building on the tentative and informal agreement already reached for the purpose of: first, implementing an immediate cessation of hostilities; secondly, reaching agreement on the modalities for the implementation of resolution 502 (1982); and thirdly, setting up a framework for negotiations, which will be held with his participation.

148. This is the least that the Council should do and that is what the international community expects of it.

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

150. Mr. CALLE y CALLE (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is pleased to extend congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We are sure that your diplomatic skill, calm impartiality and acknowledged

wisdom will ensure that the serious and urgent problem before us will be tackled in a just manner and that a mutually agreeable way will be found to restore peace in the South Atlantic, thus fulfilling the loftiest purpose of the United Nations.

151. I extend our congratulations, too, to Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, of Zaire, on the skilful and wise way in which he conducted the affairs of the Council last month.

152. I also wish to offer the cordial and respectful greetings of the delegation of Peru to the Foreign Ministers who are honouring us with their presence: Mr. Nicanor Costa Méndez, of Argentina, Mr. Jorge Illueca, of Panama, and Mr. José Alberto Zambrano Velasco, of Venezuela, who participated in yesterday's meeting.

153. I have express instructions from the Foreign Minister of Peru, Mr. Javier Arias Stella, to say that urgent official business has prevented him, after his return from an official visit to the sister Republic of Venezuela, from attending this meeting personally.

154. This is not the first time that the delegation of Peru has spoken in the Council on the crisis over the Malvinas Islands. On 3 April [2350th meeting], we had occasion to set forth the Peruvian position and we feel it is timely to sum up that position now. Peru supports the sister Argentine Republic in its claim regarding a colonial situation which is a throw-back to former times and a violation of the territorial integrity of a country which for 149 years has been claiming its sovereign rights and has made innumerable efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement. Peru, a peaceful and peace-loving country, wants a final solution to the problem to be found by peaceful means. We regret that the use of force has already led to the loss of many lives, and we have worked and are continuing to work for concerted efforts to bring about a satisfactory solution to this dispute, which, to everybody's regret, has now become an open conflict of major proportions.

155. It is not necessary to give an account of the facts that have led to the present critical situation. It is clear to Peru, as indeed it is clear to the great majority of the Members of the United Nations, that this problem did not suddenly occur on 2 April. It dates back to the first half of the last century, when some European Powers considered that their interests could be extended by deploying their fleets. In 1833, the Argentine authorities and people were expelled from the Malvinas Islands by force. With independence, the Argentine Republic had inherited possession of and sovereignty over the islands and peace had been maintained there until the British occupation. If there had been a Security Council at that time it would have demanded the withdrawal of the British forces.

156. The United Nations is not a mere bystander; it is an active protagonist in the decolonization pro-

cess, which is not far from completion. As this is recent history, it is perhaps fitting to recall that that process certainly did not move forward through the goodwill and willing co-operation of the colonial Powers. The application of various labels to peoples and territories subject to the domination of the colonial Powers does not change the substance of the problem. It is also fitting to recall that several colonial situations were ended by long and bloody wars of liberation.

157. Peru has been very active in this matter for essential and unalterable reasons: we support the Argentine Republic, a sister nation since independence, and we support its just claim to regain the exercise of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and the dependent archipelagos, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands; we ardently desire a peaceful settlement which will be a credit to both countries in the conflict, prevent further bloodshed and put an end to a dispute between parties which have so much in common.

158. This is not a question of two nations disputing a territory over which sovereignty remains to be determined. It is clear to all that when Argentina became independent more than 170 years ago, the islands were part of its territory and were united with it politically, juridically and administratively. They were, however, wrenched from Argentine sovereignty by an act of force followed by administrative provisions issued by the British Government and the implantation of settlers, which leads the British Government now to assert that its position is valid. But it has never been recognized as such by the majority of nations of the international community, as has so often been made clear in many resolutions adopted overwhelmingly within the United Nations system. As the representative of Brazil so aptly put it [2360th meeting], no arbitral award, international legal ruling or treaty has conferred legal validity on the occupation, which has lasted for 149 years.

159. It cannot, then, be held that Argentine sovereignty has lapsed. Argentine rights and titles are fully as valid today as they were in 1833. Over the past 15 years or more, efforts at peaceful negotiation were exhausted. What followed was an act of lawful recovery of land that had always belonged to Argentina.

160. How can that lawful act of recovery by Argentina be held to be more serious than the act of force by Britain which is the origin of this colonial problem, a problem which would never have existed if the territory of a nation of the Americas had not been thus dismembered at the beginning of the last century?

161. Colleagues have said that Council resolution 502 (1982) is imperfect. That is true. First of all, it takes a partial approach to the problem, and it does not recognize the origin of the problem, which has, in fact, been recognized in resolutions of the General

Assembly on decolonization, in particular resolutions 1514 (XV), 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII). Those resolutions recognize that the situation is essentially colonial in nature. Council resolution 502 (1982) is faulty, too, because it has not contributed to the promotion of a peaceful settlement of the dispute, for the British Government has escalated the war.

162. Furthermore, resolution 502 (1982) is at odds with the letter and spirit of the General Assembly resolutions I have mentioned. It endeavours to maintain the *status quo ante*, which had been condemned by the international community precisely because it was anachronistic and colonial in nature. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that resolution 502 (1982) was proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom, that country has not abided by it.

163. But the situation I have described becomes even more serious when one realizes that another permanent member of the Security Council, which by its vote contributed to the adoption of resolution 502 (1982), has pledged political and material support to the United Kingdom. This position of the United States is deplorable. In addition to going against the letter and spirit of paragraph 1 of resolution 502 (1982), it has, with its support and co-operation, made it possible for the Government of the United Kingdom to feel encouraged to carry out and capable of carrying out wide-scale armed actions against the Argentine Republic. Yet the majority of international public opinion, and even its trading allies in the European Common Market, have opposed those actions.

164. Not only because of its deep and age-old bonds with the sister Argentine Republic, but also because of its deep commitment to and firm support for the cause of peace, Peru has viewed the evolution of this crisis with growing concern. Right from the start, the constitutional Government of Peru led by President Fernando Belaúnde Terry involved itself in the constant search for formulas to avoid, first, the initiation of hostilities and a direct confrontation through the establishment of a 72-hour truce that would then facilitate the peace efforts undertaken by the Secretary of State of the United States. With the failure of Mr. Haig's efforts, all of Peru's efforts were devoted to plans to bring about a cessation of hostilities and to lay the foundation for negotiations between both sides that would make possible a just and lasting settlement of the colonial question of the Malvinas Islands.

165. On 3 April, the Government of Peru set down its position in a communiqué that contained three fundamental points: first, Peru's support for the Argentine claim to the Malvinas Islands, based on statements and resolutions adopted by the United Nations; secondly, its repeated assertion of commitment to the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with and out of respect for treaties in force; and thirdly, its appeal to the parties to enter

into negotiations and seek a peaceful solution to the situation.

166. On 12 April, the Government of Peru formally proposed to Argentina and the United Kingdom [S/14966, *annex*] that, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Council resolution 502 (1982), they should establish a 72-hour truce pending the continuance of the good offices undertaken by the United States Secretary of State and accepted by both parties. The purpose of that Peruvian initiative was to prevent an armed confrontation that was at that time increasing the gravity of the situation, which already constituted a serious threat to international peace and security.

167. That appeal by the Peruvian Government was welcomed by the Government of the Argentine Republic. For its part, the British Government, through a telegram dated 13 April from its Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to the Foreign Minister of Peru [S/14974, *annex*], said that it appreciated the interest shown by the Peruvian Government in supporting efforts aimed at bringing about a diplomatic solution, and it insisted on its questionable argument that the armed confrontation was caused by Argentine action in occupying the Malvinas Islands. As a concrete response to the Peruvian idea, the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom said that the first prerequisite for any solution was for Argentine forces to withdraw from the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies, after which he was confident that Peru would persuade the Argentine Government of the need to comply with its obligations under international law. In other words, the reply avoided reference to the Peruvian point about a truce.

168. On 14 April, the Foreign Minister of Peru repeated the proposal for a 72-hour truce to the British Government [S/14981, *annex*]. After pointing out that due consideration had been given to the reasons cited by the British Government, and taking into account the dangers of an imminent conflict, which was of profound concern to the international community, the Peruvian Foreign Minister insisted on his proposal that there be a truce, arguing that it was necessary precisely to create the optimum conditions to permit work to go forward towards a diplomatic solution by reconciling the positions of both parties.

169. As can be seen, Peru's intention was to make it possible for negotiations to take place in a climate of peace, in order to make more viable the narrowing of the respective attitudes and positions. As subsequent events have shown, once hostilities were begun and both parties had inflicted serious damage and military losses, the possibility for negotiation became much more remote and difficult because of the natural hardening of attitudes.

170. In an attitude which has already been clearly indicated, the British Government, on 14 April, once again replied [S/14987, *annex*] that the first condition

that it required to be met was the withdrawal of Argentine forces from the Malvinas Islands and their dependencies, and that until such a withdrawal took place there would not exist the necessary conditions for a negotiated solution to the dispute. For reasons which I have no need to go into now, the British Government again wanted to return to the *status quo ante*, which, if Argentina had accepted it, would have meant that it admitted that there did not exist any clear-cut change of circumstances which made it indispensable to renegotiate the destiny of the Malvinas Islands.

171. Consistent with its repeated endeavours to promote the search for a formula that would make possible the acceptance by both parties of such indispensable negotiations, the Government of Peru, at the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS, which, at the request of Argentina, took place in Washington between 26 and 28 April, submitted a draft resolution that, with a view to considering the optimum efficiency of the machinery for peaceful solution provided for in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, sought fundamentally to bring about an effective cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a period of truce that would make viable a new process of negotiation between the parties and, at the same time, open the way to participation by the Secretary-General. Similarly, the draft resolution repeated the right of Argentina to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and called for the suspension of the economic sanctions imposed on that Latin American country.

172. On 28 April, the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation approved, with some modifications, the resolution proposed by Peru and co-sponsored by Brazil, Costa Rica and Honduras [S/15008, annex].

173. As the tireless endeavours of the United States Secretary of State met with no response and did not yield the results hoped for by the parties, the Government of Peru, because of its profound concern at the aggravation of the conflict, considered it indispensable to continue exploring possible formulas for bringing the parties together and preventing a further deepening of the crisis already existing between Argentina and the United Kingdom. For this reason, the President of Peru, on 1 May, made to both Governments a proposal aimed at establishing a truce, the mutual withdrawal of the forces of both parties, the immediate opening of negotiations within the context of the resolutions of the General Assembly on the Malvinas Islands and the resolution approved by the Twentieth Meeting of Consultation and the temporary administration of the islands by the United Nations, with the support of an international peace-keeping force.

174. That Peruvian initiative, which from the very beginning earned the acceptance of both parties, was the subject of intense negotiations between the Gov-

ernments directly involved, which availed themselves of the good offices offered by Peru.

175. That proposal and its subsequent modifications did not yield the desired result, due fundamentally to the fact that its final acceptance was impeded by the renewed outbreak of hostilities and, in particular, by the sinking of the Argentine cruiser *General Belgrano*, 36 miles outside the exclusion zone imposed by the United Kingdom.

176. As hostilities in the conflict were assuming proportions which could grow out of the control of the parties and extend to cover a wider area, thus exacerbating the grave threat to international peace and security, and as other peace initiatives, particularly those of the Secretary-General, with the support of the President of the Council, encountered obstacles which it has been impossible to overcome so far, the President of the Republic of Peru proposed to the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom, on 20 May, a new formula to bring about peace in the South Atlantic. The idea of that formula was that, it being impossible so far to achieve a formal agreement, the parties would subscribe separately to the latest proposal for agreement submitted by them to the Secretary-General, and that would bring about compliance with those clauses on which there existed common ground. For example, there could be a cease-fire, the mutual withdrawal of forces and the administration of the islands by the United Nations or by a contact group made up of several countries, within an agreed time-frame.

177. Similarly, the Secretary-General, or the contact group accepted by the parties and proposed by the Secretary-General, would have the task of organizing and presiding over negotiations aimed at bringing about a permanent solution, at the same time supervising the immediate evacuation of the zone of conflict by the forces of both countries.

178. That last Peruvian plan, which was supported by the Presidents of Colombia and Venezuela, has already earned the acceptance of the President of the Argentine Republic and has not been rejected by the United Kingdom. The Government of Peru therefore hopes and believes that it is viable and still open, because it preserves those points on which both parties have indicated agreement, and it is highly desirable to preserve the many gains that have been achieved with such difficulty, thanks to the invaluable and tireless work of the Secretary-General.

179. Another reason favouring the viability of the Peruvian proposal is the recognition by a number of representatives that the Secretary-General should continue to conduct, with the skill that he has demonstrated so far, the negotiations that he has undertaken and that were so close to bearing fruit. The Government of Peru therefore agrees with all those countries that have said that the Council should call for an

immediate cease-fire and give the Secretary-General a broad and clear mandate to continue his efforts to restore peace, because that is ever more necessary, in that the most recent development of hostilities gives room for no doubt that we cannot delay a single moment in the urgent search for a negotiated, peaceful solution to the conflict, which today is creating such consternation and distress among all peace-loving nations.

180. To conclude, I call on those countries that bear the high responsibility of membership of the Council to produce as soon as possible, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, a draft resolution setting out actions which will make possible a just and lasting peace between those nations which are the protagonists today in a bloody confrontation in the South Atlantic.

181. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The events that have occurred in the past 24 hours are very serious. There has been much loss of life, the extent of which has not yet been accurately determined, and the conflict has intensified, because of the colonial presence of an extra-continental Power which has come 8,000 miles from its land to Latin America to create all sorts of disruptions in our relations.

182. It is not possible to view this very serious situation with calm and serenity at a time when the Argentine nation is suffering from an aggression which requires that the Council take concrete action in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation believes that it is necessary that the Council take action on this, although, naturally, there is likely to be an objection and a veto by the United Kingdom. But this should not be an obstacle to the Council's fulfilling its responsibilities under the Charter.

183. Panama has expressed its confidence in the Secretary-General and considers that, if he is given a mandate to continue his efforts to bring about, by a decision of the Council, the restoration of peace in the Latin American continent, that mandate can only be carried out when there has been a cease-fire and a separation of forces. Otherwise, this would simply expose the Secretary-General to an unpleasant situation, and because of its respect for the United Nations and for the Secretary-General, my country does not wish him to be so exposed.

184. Negotiations with the United Kingdom have not made headway because of the intransigent attitude of the United Kingdom. Ambassador Parsons yesterday [2362nd meeting] made certain statements which really cannot be allowed to go unanswered. Ambassador Calle y Calle of Peru has just given an account of the efforts that have been made. I took note of what Ambassador Calle y Calle said, very objectively, to the effect that the United Kingdom and the British Government persistently and inflexibly

maintain, have maintained and continue to maintain that the first condition is that Argentina withdraw its forces from the archipelago of the Malvinas. But that is not the first condition; it is the only condition, because what the United Kingdom has done is to present an ultimatum, as clearly emerges from the statements that the British Prime Minister made publicly on Monday of this week.

185. The representative of the United Kingdom referred to the language used by spokesmen of certain Latin American countries. I believe that the language that has been used has been moderate, because no language can reflect the indignation and the resentment felt by the Latin American peoples as a result of the action taken by the United Kingdom and its allies against the Latin American peoples. British obstinacy has created a sequence of conflicts, upheavals and crises, not only of a military nature but also of a legal and psychological nature, which have caused great damage to the relations of the peoples of this hemisphere with the European nations and with nations in other parts of the world which, in a manner that I will not describe, have sided with the United Kingdom in this absurd, anachronistic, colonial venture which has no meaning or justification in our day. Lest there be any doubt of this, let me cite what Mrs. Thatcher said last Monday. I will quote from the official text; if I am asked why I say that it is official I shall answer later. Mrs. Thatcher said in an interview on 17 May on Independent Radio News:

"We've been negotiating now for about six weeks. We've looked at six sets of proposals and tried to put our view on each. They've got nowhere."

186. To a question from the correspondent of the Independent Radio News she replied:

"But you know the task force is there; it's being very active. You saw the result of that commando raid, and one just hopes that that will have some influence on the junta in Argentina, and perhaps get a settlement where what had happened before wouldn't [happen again]."

What the Prime Minister was talking about in that public statement was a position of force. But that is not all. She was then asked if this meant that the United Kingdom had gone as far as it could and that Argentina must take some action. She answered:

"We've gone as far as we can . . . If they want peace they can have it by withdrawing."

187. That is the plan; that is the outline followed by the Prime Minister in all talks.

188. But let us continue, because it does not stop there.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

189. Then there is language—which I will not repeat—language that is very disrespectful to the Government of Argentina—and I respect the glandular system of women, because one must always be very respectful towards women—another question is put. She is asked whether she is prepared to sacrifice lives. She says, referring to the President of Argentina:

“Therefore he has to go, and he won’t go by negotiations. He has to leave, and we have to take military action to ensure that he does.”*

190. That is the language, the language advocating force—and I tell Ambassador Parsons that I am quoting this textually so that there can be no doubt about it. I could even give him the document.

191. She is asked:

“Does that mean we make him go whatever the cost?”*

And she answers:

“The cost is very much less than of having other invasions . . . So he has to go.”*

192. I think that yesterday we saw the Vice-Minister of Argentina reply in a very gallant and appropriate manner to the observations put forward by Ambassador Parsons.

193. Further on the Prime Minister says:

“It is very difficult to know who you are negotiating with. You negotiate at the United Nations with a Mr. Ros.”*

194. “A Mr. Ros.” Ambassador Ros deserves great respect. He has won our affection and our admiration, because he is an institution in the United Nations and in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. He is a man deserving of great respect. Yet this is how “civilized” Governments treat others.

195. The Prime Minister also says:

“But, you see, we were already negotiating with him back in February.”*

In other words, the idea that they had talked with him in February did not make much difference. Then something more serious is stated, something that really should give cause for thought, because this disruption, this upheaval, this poisoning of international relations has unwisely been brought to her most important ally, the Government of the United States.

196. She says, in a reply:

“President Reagan telephoned President Galtieri to say: ‘We hear you are making plans to invade. Don’t.’”*

197. Where do you see, in relations between free and sovereign peoples, the President of a State, no matter how powerful the State might be, telling another leader: “No! You can’t do this; you have to do what I want you to do”? That is simply abandoning one’s sovereignty. It is humiliating. It is unworthy. There is no word for it. I do not know whether this is the truth or a lie, but the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has no right to put President Reagan in a position which will cause resentment in Latin America. I am not the only one saying this. Today’s issue of *The New York Times* has a prominent report on page 1, headed as follows:

“U.S. Sees Setback to its Latin Ties” and

“U.S. Fears the Crisis Is Damaging Its Relations With Latin America.”*

198. This is what one of the most important newspapers in the United States and in the world says. We are Latin Americans—we are not from Saturn or Mars, not from another planet. It would be disgraceful for a Latin American member of the Council to ignore words of such importance without any comment.

199. *The New York Times* says in an editorial that bloodshed has occurred and that it must be stopped. What we find here is actually put in the mouths of officials of the Government of the United States. I am going to read some of the paragraphs contained in that article to make it perfectly clear that indeed there is profound and growing resentment in Latin America against the United Kingdom, against the United States, because it has taken the United Kingdom’s side, and against the member countries of the European Community that have also sided with the United Kingdom, without considering that Latin America is a continent of peoples with standing and who deserve respect.

200. The article goes on to say that officials of the United States Government think that:

“American political leadership in the hemisphere has been dealt a serious blow by the decision to side with Britain politically and to a limited extent militarily, and that blow may be irreparable. In the short term, it may be much more difficult to gain Latin backing for projects in Central America aimed at countering Cuban influence and subversion.

“The Soviet Union, which has for years been seeking opportunities to gain influence in South America, will undoubtedly be looked to by many countries as an alternative source of military supplies and a market for South American exports, a trend that had been under way in recent years anyway.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

"Washington's backing for Britain is already being regarded in Latin America in racial terms, with the 'Anglo-American-Europeans' being seen as contemptuous of 'Latins', and this could increase hostility toward the United States in the hemisphere."*

201. That is the assessment of United States officials, according to *The New York Times*. Further on, the article states:

"It was recognized, an official said recently, that the United States would pay a price in its relations with the Latin Americans for siding with Britain and offering military assistance.

" 'We were prepared to pay those costs,' he said. 'It was our judgment that if you compromised principles, the costs would be far greater.' "

202. Those costs are high—politically, socially, psychologically and culturally. Here it says that a major effort has to be made to open new markets for Latin Americans so that there can be more mature relations and dialogue can begin.

203. As I said yesterday [*ibid.*], there is a failure to appreciate the cultural values of Latin America and Latin Americans.

204. But this invasion, this loss of life, this aggression against the people of Argentina, which is aggression against Latin America, is taking place in a form which, although it is being told here—in this article, by United States officials—is not being said publicly; the truth is that it has been told to the press, and has leaked out.

205. According to *The New York Times* article:

"Aware of the implications of a pro-British policy, the Administration has sought to limit its public support of the British position. Its repeated public statements have been in favour of a negotiated solution rather than a British victory. And it refuses to discuss what aid, if any, it will give the British."*

206. But can they hide here in the United States what the Government is doing? Yesterday I was in the Miami airport and I bought a newspaper called *The Miami News*. I should like to tell the delegation of the United States that what I am doing here is being done with a clear purpose: that it should weigh very carefully the consequences of a conduct, an attitude, policy, and realize the effects it has on Latin America. When friendly relations exist, one must speak directly and frankly at any cost, whatever the consequences. This is especially the case when a small country such as mine is involved. We have learned a good deal. We certainly respect the values of the

United States, but we are also pained when they commit errors, for when friendly relations exist, one must say what one feels when the other side is not moving in the right direction and when certain fundamental principles are being violated. That is what friendly relations and good-neighbourliness are really all about.

207. In that newspaper, *The Miami News*, there was a truly horrifying report. The headline read, "U.S. Arms Made Ready for Britain". This is not a case of a feverish lie or something offhand, because the source is the New York Times News Service. It says:

"The United States has earmarked arms, including missiles and radar, for transfer to Britain if forces get bogged down in a long struggle for the Falkland Islands, Administration officials said."*

It adds that American equipment would be sent directly to the South Atlantic, and goes on:

"Officials said several KC-135 aerial tankers had already been assigned to Britain."*

208. It says that the United States has increased its intelligence support by furnishing information on weapons sold to Argentina and that this will enable the British to meet an Argentine threat more effectively.

209. This is not a question of some romantic notion of aid, since sanctions were taken and concrete aid provided, which is a matter of real concern.

210. It is particularly serious because this means that there was an understanding even before the attack to establish the beachhead. The article says that officers of the United States Navy had discussed this matter with the Royal Navy.

211. The article says:

"United States Marine officers said Royal Marines with the British task force would probably be able to gain a beachhead on the Falklands. But the Americans suggested Britain might face a long, costly fight."*

212. This assessment, military officials said, was behind a contingency list prepared by United States and British officers. The equipment on the list had been identified for rapid shipment to Ascension Island, where it would be loaded on to British vessels for trans-shipment to the expeditionary force. The officials of the Administration—the Reagan Administration, of course—had said that the contingency list included surface-to-air missiles and land-based radar. This would make it easier for the British forces to defend themselves against Argentine planes.

213. The Council can imagine the reaction in Latin America if Argentine planes were shot down as a result

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

of technology, plans, technical assistance and equipment furnished by the United States. There must be a mistake here, although *The New York Times* gives this information. It is so terrible, so offensive to the Latin American conscience, that a country with which a series of treaties exists could not only side with the aggressor against Argentina and Latin America but could go even further, to these terrible lengths. Any human being is bound to be appalled by this. But the list does not stop there. The Administration officials went on to say more. Portable tanks were mentioned, which could be used to provide fuel for the Harrier jets should the United Kingdom acquire control of a landing-strip on the Malvinas Islands. It adds that other *matériel*—engineering equipment, heaters, generators and munitions—are also included.

214. I believe that this is truly serious, particularly now that a war of major proportions is going on in connection with a colonial situation that is terribly damaging to a fraternal Latin American country and is seriously injuring relations in the hemisphere.

215. I am saying all this because it is essential that this message reach Washington, reach the international community; that the African countries, which are anti-colonialist although they belong to the Commonwealth, realize that we too are anti-colonialist, even though there may be a Queen or may be a commonwealth or may be a country that says it is more civilized than we are. Very well, let them say that. But colonialism has been proscribed by the United Nations, and our Arab brothers must hear this, as well as our Asian brothers and our Latin American brothers.

216. Lives are being lost. An entire system of coexistence and friendship that existed in this hemisphere, in Latin America, is being sacrificed. The United Kingdom and those countries that side with it seem to consider that the peoples of Latin America are second- or third-class peoples and that they can do what they wish with our fate. But they are wrong. Latin America has a mission. It is developing. It is progressing. It has its own place, one not based on world affairs. We must recall men like Carlos Sanz de Santamaría, Mayobre, Prebish, Felipe Herrera, who in that famous Document of the Four said that Latin Americans must organize and have their own institutions and unite again.

217. More, too, could be said about the things Prime Minister Thatcher said, but I do not wish to prolong this meeting. I should however like to stress the seriousness of the situation and the terrible damage that is being done to the United Nations system. I should like to stress that this is truly a crisis in the inter-American system and that there is a crisis also in the relations among many peoples and nations that are Members of the United Nations. We have to put our cards on the table. Are we or are we not against colonialism? Are United Nations resolutions worth anything?

218. Mrs. Thatcher says:

“The Falkland islanders are British citizens” (she speaks of the Falklands, but for us they are the Malvinas). “If they can’t look to their own country to protect them, what future is there for anyone in this world?”*

219. Well, her country is the United Kingdom. But how can they talk about the self-determination of these colonial employees, who are British citizens? It is senseless. And how can they unleash a cruel, terrible war with tremendous loss of life and other consequences, simply because the United Kingdom wants to have a group of its citizens on Argentine territory, violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity and independence of Argentina?

220. In connection with the United Nations resolutions, the Prime Minister says that there are many United Nations resolutions which are not binding. This is conveyed, moreover, in a manner which suggests that the United Nations is not worth all that much to the United Kingdom and that is why these acts of force are engaged in. She also says:

“You see, the fact is that (the) United Nations resolution on its own won’t get those Argentine soldiers off those islands. It ought to, but it won’t. There aren’t many mandatory resolutions in the Security Council.”*

221. Well, of course there are not. She also says:

“The trouble is that the United Nations has not the power or authority to act to ensure that they are adhered to. So, if we can’t get them off by diplomatic means or by economic means, we’ll have to get them off by military means.”*

222. There are no resolutions of the United Nations which are binding. Why? Because there is the right of veto, and that is precisely the situation which we are facing here. I am sure there are some countries that say to themselves that they will not support a draft resolution that is going to be vetoed by the United Kingdom. So that is inadmissible. If there is a crisis in the United Nations, let us face it; let us not deceive ourselves. Are we going to carry out the responsibility of the Council or not? If the veto is applied, then at least there is a possibility of going into a special emergency session of the General Assembly. But let us not confer on the United Kingdom this overwhelming authority which has gone beyond the super-Powers, so that it can be the king and lord of the Security Council. That would be truly inadmissible.

223. In conclusion, I quote Mrs. Thatcher again:

“Unfortunately, there are far too few democracies in the world . . .”*

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

224. One of these is bound to be the United Kingdom. "Too few", she said. This applies not only to Latin America but also to Africa, Asia, Europe, to all the countries of the world. Well, democracy is a relative concept. There are some professors here who can explain it, but we know it is a very relative concept. Mrs. Thatcher, asked why Ambassador Parsons had returned, said:

"And that's why our Ambassador has gone back to the United Nations this week. . . . to see if we can persuade them to pull back. For people like us, it's difficult to see why they don't pull back . . . If they don't decide to withdraw, then I'm afraid we have to use force to get them out."*

225. And then the correspondent asked:

"And so that's the final message from our envoys to the Argentinians at the United Nations? Pull back or face the consequences?"*

And she said:

"Yes, that is the correct message."*

226. From the same source we learn that at a meeting of NATO there was a lot of confusion concerning the problem of the Malvinas. Then we are presented with this conflict, this terrible dilemma, that pits the United Kingdom against its major ally, which has to take sides with NATO, thus making the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance ineffective. Rather striking words were used to describe this, as members of NATO said that they support the United Kingdom, that they know all about what that country is doing and that this was an operation that was entirely supported by NATO. Why should Latin America have to bow to these kinds of actions?

227. I have said what I have said in order to bring out the seriousness of the problems we are facing and, at the same time, to underscore the extreme gravity of the crisis. We, the spokesmen of our countries, are not insensitive. We cannot be indifferent to the massacre that is going on in the South Atlantic, on an Argentine insular territory. We must stop that massacre. We must say to the United Kingdom, "You must stop the hostilities. You cannot continue attacking the Argentine nation. You must bring about a cease-fire. You must pull back your forces", and when that occurs, give a mandate to the Secretary-General, not before then, because that would simply be a farce.

228. If one examines the thinking of the United Kingdom as expressed in the words of the Prime Minister, one realizes that there are obsessive feelings there. "If you want peace, you must leave. If you do

not leave, there will be war." And that is directed not just against Argentina, but also against the United Nations, which in 1965 said to the United Kingdom: you must sit down and negotiate the decolonization of the islands. That showed that the British claim to them was not valid.

229. Decolonization was called for, but that does not mean that the formula presented by the United Kingdom has to be accepted, a formula that is part of an ultimatum: Argentina goes back to its territory 400 miles from the Malvinas; the British fleet goes 150 miles away. This—150 miles—is absurd, because when the Argentines leave, then the fleet could return again and the Argentine troops obviously could not cover the 400 miles in time to resist them. Reference has been made here to good and bad faith, but we cannot award a prize for good faith to the United Kingdom in this matter after 17 years of prolonged negotiations, or to any other colonial Power.

230. How can we allow the United Kingdom to say that they will only agree to the Secretary-General's going to the Malvinas and establishing an administration with the help of civic legislative councils established by the United Kingdom? That is no true invitation, and it is not the kind of role that we should give to the Secretary-General. If there is going to be a United Nations transition administration, it has to be an administration to put an end to colonialism in this region.

231. I conclude by saying that the situation is serious and that the prestige of the Council is involved, especially the prestige and responsibility of its permanent members. We cannot ignore this situation and remain indifferent to it.

232. The bloodshed will eventually be a burden on our own consciences—and I do not mean that rhetorically. It will be a burden on the conscience of every country represented here if we fail to face up to our responsibilities and allow the crisis to continue to worsen and the prestige of the United Nations to deteriorate. There must be a categorical, decent, honourable action, showing respect for the humiliated peoples of Latin America and Argentina.

233. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Chinese*): I shall now call upon those members of the Council who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

234. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): We have heard this morning a large number of statements expressed in more or less moderate language, and I had for a long time been existing under the illusion that I might not have to speak at the end of the debate in exercise of my right of reply. I regret very much that I now feel obliged to do so, and I shall not detain the Council long.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

235. I shall not allow myself to be carried into the realm of verbal pyrotechnics which the Foreign Minister of Panama has been inhabiting for the last half hour or so. I should simply like to make two points.

236. First, I stand by every word that I have said so far in this debate, both yesterday evening in exercise of my right of reply [*ibid.*] and the day before in my main statement on behalf of my Government [2360th meeting].

237. Secondly, I welcome the wide publicity which the Foreign Minister of Panama has given to the views of my Prime Minister, with which, I need hardly say, I whole-heartedly agree. His presentation was selective and it was introduced by personal remarks which were, to say the least, in poor taste. I should simply like to choose two further selections, in conclusion, from my Prime Minister's statement to the House of Commons last Thursday. They relate directly to the negotiations which had been held under the aegis of the Secretary-General. My Prime Minister said:

"The Government believes that they"—that is to say, our final proposals—"represent a truly responsible effort to find a peaceful solution which both preserves the fundamental principles of our position and offers the opportunity to stop further loss of life in the South Atlantic."

At a later stage in her statement, she said the following:

"Although this interim agreement does not restore things fully to what they were before the Argentinian invasion, it is faithful to the fundamental principles

I outlined earlier [in my statement]. Had the Argentinians accepted our proposals, we should have achieved the great prize of preventing further loss of life. It was with this in mind that we were prepared to make practical changes that were reasonable but we were not prepared to compromise on principles."

238. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to speak very briefly in exercise of my right of reply. I would not have done this had it not been for the fact that the representative of the United Kingdom said that certain of my comments were in poor taste. So I would formally ask the Council to clarify something which appears in the records of the Council and which is in rather poor taste. There are 15 members of the Security Council, and in the Council's records we find "Mister" before the name of each one except the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. He—and this is in very poor taste—appears as "Sir Anthony Parsons". I think it should simply be "Mr. Parsons". In the United Nations, we do not have any monarchical system; we do not have a system of privileges and titles. I make this request formally.

The meeting rose at 2.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/36/23/Rev.1), chap. XXIV.*

² *United Nations, Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.