



General Assembly

Distr.: General
15 September 2015

Original: English

Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Summary record of the 6th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 25 June 2015, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Lasso Mendoza (Ecuador)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org).

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

15-10511 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/AC.109/2015/19 and A/AC.109/2015/L.7)

2. **The Chair** drew attention to aide-memoire 05/15 concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), which contained four requests for hearing. He took it that the Committee wished to accede to those requests.

3. *It was so decided.*

4. **The Chair** informed the Committee that the delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Uruguay, the Observer for the Holy See and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) had indicated their wish to participate in the Committee's 2015 session as observers. He drew attention to the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/AC.109/2015/19) and to a draft resolution on the issue (A/AC.109/2015/L.7).

Hearing of petitioners

5. **The Chair** said that, in line with the Committee's usual practice, petitioners would be invited to take a place at the petitioners' table and would withdraw after making their statements.

6. **Ms. Rendell** (Legislative Assembly of the Falkland Islands) said that while the Falkland Islands had travelled along the road of political development, they had not attained independence like their South American neighbours: the daily threat from Argentina, which made no secret of wanting to control the Territory against its wishes, had prompted it to choose, by referendum, the internationally recognized status of a British Overseas Territory. Islanders would never forget the 1982 invasion by Argentina and the traumatic consequences thereof, yet Argentina spoke flippantly of resuming talks on sovereignty. The administering Power respected the right of the Falkland Islanders to self-determination and would not discuss their sovereignty with anyone against their wishes. In their modern self-governing relationship with the United Kingdom, the Falklands Islands currently had

their own system of government and local legislation, and could therefore no longer be described as a colony. Their current Constitution was in line with the Charter of the United Nations, establishing the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, the right to self-determination and the right to exploit their natural resources. The Legislative Assembly approved and continuously updated laws to ensure that legislation met the needs of the population and complied with international law.

7. Since 1982, and despite Argentine restrictions and interference, the economy had grown year-on-year from a government expenditure budget of approximately £5 million per annum to £60 million in the current financial year with a GDP of £150 million. An additional £20 million was being spent on infrastructure and development projects. The Falkland Islands fishery, licensed to locally owned and registered companies, was the biggest contributor to the economy, as taxes on its profits remained in the Islands. However, the Argentine Government made it illegal for Spanish companies in Argentina to work in the Falklands fisheries and had stopped sharing scientific data on straddling fish stocks, the sustainable management of which was internationally important. That lack of cooperation over a shared fishery was a detriment to all. Income from tourism was approximately £8 million per annum and could grow even further if charter flights from Chile were not banned by the Argentine Government. Flight restrictions denied a small community access to necessary goods and services, and Argentina turned a blind eye to violence committed in Argentine ports against cruise ships that visited the Falkland Islands. Through agrarian reform, land was owned by Falkland Islanders and passed on through inheritance or sale; close to 80 farm businesses produced fine wool or processed mutton for export to the European Union market. Furthermore, contrary to the Argentine delegation's statements at the meeting in Managua, land previously owned by the Falkland Islands Company had been purchased by her Government and was currently operated as a Statutory Corporation and managed by a board of directors resident in the Islands.

8. With regard to the exploration and potential exploitation of hydrocarbons, the areas of geological interest for oil companies lay more than 100 miles to the north and east of the Falkland Islands and companies applying for licences were required by law

to operate in accordance with high international standards. Such licences were awarded solely by the Falkland Islands Government and all fees and potential income would be paid to it, in line with the Constitution. Claims by the Argentine authorities that oil exploration in the waters of the Falkland Islands constituted unilateral action by the British Government were therefore wholly false and misleading. The only unilateral actions of relevance were the Argentine Government's recent threats of punitive fines and imprisonment against international oil company workers and contractors. Any attempts to apply Argentine domestic legislation to the Islands would be counter to international law and incompatible with the rights of Falkland Islanders under the Charter. She urged the Committee to reject firmly the latest attempt by Argentina to strangle the economy of the small island community. The Falkland Islands had every intention strictly to control offshore activities in their exclusive economic zone so as to protect the environment and, contrary to recent outrageous statements by the Argentine Government, were fully committed to protecting the rich marine resources and wildlife in the South Atlantic.

9. Industrial revenue had ensured high standards of health and education, enhanced infrastructure and guaranteed the financial autonomy of the Falkland Islands. Revenue from the exploitation of hydrocarbons would lead to long-term financial security and existing industries would also benefit from further investment that would ensure sustainable income beyond the life of hydrocarbon production. The Falkland Islands received no aid from the United Kingdom; they depended on the administering Power only for defence and foreign affairs. Were it not for the threat from Argentina and its refusal to recognize both the existence of the Falkland Islands and their right to self-determination, there would be no need for a British military presence.

10. The highly diverse population of the Falkland Islands was content with its status as a British Overseas Territory, as unanimously endorsed by the 2013 referendum, and had no wish to be associated politically with any other country. However, good neighbourly relations with nearby countries were welcome. It was the duty of the Committee to assist Non-Self-Governing Territories in attaining a status satisfactory to their peoples. It was therefore the Committee's duty to acknowledge the rights of the

Falkland Islanders and not support those who coveted the Territory. She reiterated her invitation to the Chair to prepare a mission to visit the Falkland Islands to discover first-hand all that had been achieved.

11. **Mr. Summers** (Legislative Assembly of the Falkland Islands) said that year after year, the Falkland Islands' continued success and economic growth — progress that should be a source of satisfaction for the Committee — was overlooked in the relevant annual draft resolution, which failed to even mention self-determination and contributed nothing to the Territory's development or the peace and prosperity of the region. The Committee had failed to deliver on its responsibility to help the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories to reach a post-colonial status that was acceptable to them, because it prioritized the interests of certain Member States over the wishes of the people it was supposed to assist. The geopolitical realities behind such partisan positions were not relevant to the Committee, which had no mandate to discuss or judge the competing claims of Member States over his country and, therefore, lacked any moral authority. However, some of its members upheld the principle, in the face of increasing pressure, that self-determination was a universal human right and that the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories had a right to be involved in all discussions about their future.

12. The eradication of colonialism was an ambition shared by all; differences arose, however, in the assessment of when a colonial situation existed and how it should be ended in such a way as to benefit the people involved. The Argentine Republic insisted that the Falkland Islands were a colony of the United Kingdom, not because it cared about the Falkland Islanders, but to advance its case for territorial expansionism. Statements by the Argentine Foreign Minister referring to Falkland Islanders as a "non-people" reflected that Government's colonial thinking.

13. Argentina regularly stated that its claim to the Falkland Islands, which had never been accepted by the United Kingdom, had run continuously from the 1820s. However, for years Argentina had been silent, shamelessly raising the issue only when Britain was at its most vulnerable or to divert attention from political and economic turmoil at home. An impassioned speech to the United Nations by the Argentine Ambassador in 1965 had given a false account of history and had been

the basis for the repeated propaganda, rhetoric and untruths that sought to re-establish the lapsed claim. Emotional appeals to brotherhood and solidarity from neighbours and other former colonies had replaced historical facts. The truth was that Spanish sovereignty over the Falkland Islands had not been settled in the treaty of 1771. Britain had not expelled the Argentine population in 1833, but had removed an illegal garrison. There had been international agreements confirming British possession of the Falkland Islands, and Argentina had ceased to protest that possession by signing the Convention of Settlement in 1849. Furthermore, the Falkland Islands had demonstrably never been part of Argentina; therefore the latter's territorial integrity had clearly not been violated.

14. The new line of rhetoric involved the militarization of the region in what was a zone of peace. Ironically, the Falkland Islands had been peaceful prior to the 1982 invasion, while mainland South America had been ruled by authoritarian military dictatorships. It was Argentina that had refused to comply with Security Council resolution 502 (1982) demanding the immediate withdrawal of all Argentine forces from the islands. It was Argentina that had recently tried to purchase new fighter aircraft and had purchased a new Malvinas class corvette and 110 armoured vehicles from China and naval tugboats from the Russian Federation. The United Kingdom therefore retained a defence establishment, which had decreased substantially in the light of current geopolitical commitments, to deter aggression and in proportion to the perceived threat from Argentina. The impassioned accusations of militarization were therefore baseless and were designed to deceive the international community into seeing a non-existent threat to the region.

15. The false claim by Argentina that the United Kingdom Government refused to enter into negotiations on the Falkland Islands was a further attempt to manipulate international opinion. The British Foreign Minister's offer to meet with his Argentine counterpart in London in 2013 and Mr. Summers' own attempt to deliver a letter of invitation to discussions at the Committee's 2012 session had been refused. The United Kingdom and the Falkland Islands had demonstrated willingness to discuss matters of mutual interest; it was Argentina that refused to come to the table.

16. The Falkland Islands had transformed itself from a former colony into a thriving economy with full internal self-government, save for foreign affairs and defence. The proud and resourceful Falkland Islanders were confident in their rights and in their future. If the Committee supported Argentine colonial aspirations, it would be complicit in that country's harassment, in the strangling of the Falkland Islands economy and trade and in continuing to deny peaceful coexistence and responsible stewardship of the ecosystem. Surely, no Government could have such intents. He urged the Committee to visit the Islands; it had been formally invited many times before. If Argentina objected once again, the reason could only be that it was still afraid of the truth, of transparency, and of the power of basic human rights. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had said that concrete action and tangible results were essential. The Committee must discharge its duty to all Non-Self-Governing Territories and heed their peoples for the way forward; to do otherwise would be to risk making the Committee irrelevant.

17. **Mr. Patterson** said that the Argentine Government and people had maintained their tradition of respecting the lifestyle, culture and values of all their territory's inhabitants. However, the United Kingdom had refused to resume dialogue on the issue of sovereignty with the appropriate authorities, thereby hindering the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

18. The sole justification provided by the British Government for its failure to comply with the relevant resolutions was the supposed self-determination of the inhabitants of the islands in question, a claim rejected by the General Assembly. The islands' inhabitants were not a colonized people, but a community of British citizens that did not constitute a party to the dispute separate from the United Kingdom. Argentina had no doubt about its sovereign rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, and the country had the support of the General Assembly and other international forums that recognized the existence of the dispute. The British Government's grounds for refusal to resume dialogue, especially its argument that the transfer of sovereignty would force the islands' people to become Argentine, were baseless. Argentina had a tradition of respecting its people's human rights; for example there was a population of Welsh origin living in Patagonia that had managed to

blend into Argentine society while maintaining its traditions.

19. The years that had followed the restoration of democracy in 1983 had been a period of renewal and political change, and yet there had been no change with regard to the country's position with respect to the interests of the islanders. The lack of progress with regard to the question of the Malvinas Islands was incomprehensible. Argentina was willing to engage in dialogue with the United Kingdom. At one time, both countries had enjoyed a fruitful relationship, but the unlawful unilateral actions taken by the United Kingdom with regard to the area's natural resources had made it impossible to continue the provisional bilateral understandings reached under the sovereignty umbrella.

20. The General Assembly had recognized the existence of a colonial situation in relevant resolutions. While Argentina had made visible efforts to comply with General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) in particular, the United Kingdom, which had periodically changed the justification behind its claim to sovereignty, had not. It was time to begin a new phase in their relationship that would allow them to resolve the sovereignty dispute. He therefore requested that the Committee should continue efforts to encourage the United Kingdom to agree to negotiations for the benefit of the region's inhabitants.

21. **Mr. Clifton** said that the United Kingdom had shown an unwillingness to negotiate the issue at hand despite repeated requests. Over the years, British exploitation of the region's renewable and non-renewable natural resources, which had grown to the point where it seriously affected the population levels of certain species, including those outside the area under illegal British occupation, demonstrated that the United Kingdom's true interest lay in the control of the region's resources.

22. The draft resolution currently before the Committee recognized the existence of a sovereignty dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina. The crucial issue was one of territorial sovereignty; accordingly, the Committee's recommendations should be centred exclusively on that issue. The United Nations had never acknowledged that the right to self-determination applied in the case of the Malvinas, as there was no subjugated people, but only a handful of British citizens. The Committee should continue to call

for dialogue between the relevant parties until the issue of sovereignty was definitively resolved. Failure to resolve that issue undoubtedly harmed Argentina's territorial integrity.

23. Since its forcible seizure of the islands under discussion, the United Kingdom had maintained a strict policy intended to keep the territory under illegal British authority by excluding Argentine citizens. As a result, the current inhabitants were not a native population and therefore had no legitimate relationship to the territory. They were beneficiaries of colonialism as opposed to victims, and resolution of the situation was not in their interest. While Argentina's rights over the territory in question were based on a number of legal considerations, including several treaties, the United Kingdom could invoke neither the right of first occupancy nor cession of sovereignty by Spain. It was his wish that the efforts of the Committee would lead Argentina and the United Kingdom to swiftly resolve the sovereignty dispute.

Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.7: Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

24. **Mr. Olguín Cigarroa** (Chile), introducing draft resolution [A/AC.109/2015/L.7](#) on behalf of the sponsors, said that the definitive resolution of the question of the Malvinas Islands was of fundamental importance to the nations of the Latin American and Caribbean region. Those nations had issued a number of declarations expressing their support of the legitimate rights of Argentina in the sovereignty dispute regarding the Malvinas Islands. Colonialism was an anachronism that should be brought to an end. His Government and the other sponsors of the draft resolution regretted that direct diplomatic negotiations between the two parties had not been resumed with a view to swiftly resolving the dispute.

25. The sponsors, in addition to supporting the legitimate sovereignty rights of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, also considered that the only way to resolve the dispute was through bilateral negotiations. They reiterated their call to Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume, without delay, negotiations to that end. As the draft resolution was a faithful reflection of United Nations doctrine in the matter, the sponsors trusted that it would be adopted by consensus.

26. **Mr. Timerman** (Observer for Argentina), Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Argentine Republic, said that during a recent meeting between the countries of the European Union and Latin America, British Prime Minister David Cameron had spoken on the Malvinas Islands in a way that demonstrated a distressing lack of knowledge of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Also of concern was the absence of the United Kingdom from the current meeting. Argentina had published all the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations and other regional organizations in order to avoid that type of confusion, which reflected either ignorance or an attempt to create an alternate reality. He requested that the Chair should send those resolutions to the delegation of the United Kingdom in the hope that the British Prime Minister would receive and duly study them before speaking on the topic in future.

27. He thanked the Committee for its tireless efforts and called once again on the United Kingdom to fulfil its obligations under international law. The controversy dated back to 1833, the year in which the United Kingdom had begun its unlawful occupation of the Malvinas Islands, expelling the legitimate authorities and the Argentine population, hindering their return and replacing them with British subjects. That had taken place eight years after the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation, a time when the possession by Argentina of the territories currently in dispute had been public, peaceful, unquestionable from the point of view of international law, and uninterrupted since the country had inherited the territories from Spain. Argentina had never ceased to contest British occupation of that part of Argentine territory or to demand restitution of the islands at all international forums. Moreover, the Latin American and Caribbean countries had also demonstrated support for Argentina's rights immediately following the British usurpation of the islands, accompanying Argentina in its call for restitution.

28. General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) recognized that the question of the Malvinas Islands was a case of colonialism. The British claim that the principle of self-determination applied to the population that it had implanted in the Malvinas Islands was diametrically opposed to the purpose which the international community had had in view when it had recognized the right to self-determination. That claim represented an attempt to use the principle

of self-determination to perpetuate colonialism instead of ending it. The two amendments to that effect which had been proposed by the United Kingdom in 1985 to the relevant General Assembly resolution had accordingly been rejected. Also of concern was the United Kingdom's continued policy of implantation of peoples, evidenced by the fact that 90 per cent of the inhabitants of the islands were citizens of the United Kingdom or one of its overseas territories, even though only 47 per cent had been born in the islands.

29. Resolution 2065 (XX) also urged the two parties to the dispute, Argentina and the United Kingdom, to seek a peaceful solution as quickly as possible through bilateral negotiations, duly taking into account the provisions and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and resolution 1514 (XV), as well as the interests of the population. That resolution had been followed by over 40 others adopted by the General Assembly. Both parties to the dispute, as founding Members of the United Nations, had deemed the principles of the Charter essential to international order, in particular the United Kingdom, which was one of the Organization's main actors and a permanent member of the Security Council. Argentina therefore wondered under what authority the United Kingdom could continue to demand that all other States should comply with the principles of the Charter when aspects of its own behaviour, such as in the case of the Malvinas Islands, clearly negated those same principles. Even more surprisingly, the United Kingdom and Argentina had already made efforts to implement resolution 2065 (XX) in the past. Negotiations had taken place for several years, with the two parties reporting back to the Secretary-General. However, no results had come of those negotiations. In fact, not only was the United Kingdom not complying with obligations that it had already recognized, it was actively aggravating the dispute. It had, for example, increased its military presence in the South Atlantic, was exploiting the region's non-renewable natural resources, and was carrying out an ongoing campaign to distort the perception of the population it had implanted in the Malvinas Islands.

30. There was no reason the United Kingdom should have such vast military capacity in the area, including naval deployments with atomic submarines capable of transporting nuclear weapons. That military presence was a destabilizing factor that was unanimously rejected by all the countries in the region, including

those on both sides of the South Atlantic. However, the United Kingdom used an alleged “Argentine threat” as justification for its increased spending on its illegal military presence in Argentine space.

31. Argentina, on the other hand, would continue to rely on diplomacy and multilateralism. For the past 32 years, since the restoration of democracy in the country, Argentina had not been involved in any conflict, in contrast to the United Kingdom. The real challenges to international peace and security were not to be found in the South Atlantic, but in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, fundamentalism, and environmental degradation. Argentina had given the clearest possible guarantees that it would ensure full respect for the interests and lifestyle of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands, as unconditionally set out in the Argentine Constitution. The only hostility against the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands was the British policy of misleading that population as to its true political and legal situation, which was incompatible with such basic international norms as the obligation to resolve international disputes in accordance with the principles of the Charter. By refusing to resume negotiations, the British Government was, in fact, claiming that international law could be violated if the population implanted in a territory so desired.

32. Conditions had considerably worsened in that the unilateral actions on the part of the British Government had forced Argentina to take all measures allowed by Argentine and international law, including administrative and criminal proceedings, to stop the irresponsible actions taken by the United Kingdom, and those measures had received overwhelming support.

33. Argentina invited the United Kingdom to end its denial of reality. There was a sovereignty dispute and both Governments were called upon to resume dialogue. Recommendations by the international community in that regard had been made repeatedly and eloquently. Argentina would continue to rely on international law, diplomacy and multilateralism. It invited the United Kingdom to commit to the same path and return to the family of nations that hoped for an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

34. **Mr. Fornell** (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States

(CELAC), said that, at each Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, regional leaders reiterated their support for the legitimate rights of the Argentine Republic concerning the question of the Malvinas Islands, along with their abiding interest in the resumption of negotiations between the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. He also recalled that the Presidents pro tempore of CELAC, the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) and the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) had expressed similar interests in meetings with the Secretary-General and the Chair of the Special Committee in 2013. The claim of Argentina regarding its legitimate rights in the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands was further supported in the special declaration adopted at the Third Summit of CELAC, held in January 2015. The declaration highlighted the upcoming fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), which had been subsequently renewed through successive resolutions, and called on the Secretary-General to renew his efforts to carry out the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the General Assembly, with a view to the resumption of negotiations to find a peaceful solution to the dispute. It also reiterated the importance of compliance with General Assembly resolution 31/49 and highlighted the permanent constructive attitude and willingness of the Argentine Government to reach, through negotiations, a peaceful and definitive solution to the anachronistic colonial situation on American soil.

35. **Mr. Ramírez Carreño** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the occupation of the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas by the United Kingdom clearly showed that colonialist and imperialist practices were alive and well almost 200 years after the proclamation of independence of the Argentine Republic, and that military force continued to be used in violation of international law, the principles of which reaffirmed Argentine sovereignty over the disputed territories. Fifty years after the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), the United Kingdom was the occupying Power in 10 of the 17 unresolved cases of colonization.

36. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela supported the sovereignty rights of the Argentine Republic over

the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas and urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful, negotiated solution to the sovereignty dispute in line with international law and the relevant General Assembly resolutions. In refusing to come to the negotiating table, the United Kingdom was not only turning a deaf ear to the calls of the international community, but also violating the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation aligned itself with the many United Nations resolutions on the issue, including General Assembly resolution 31/49, and recalled the mandate which the General Assembly had given to the Secretary-General.

37. Argentina did not stand alone, for many regional and international bodies, ranging from the Organization of American States to the Group of 77 and China, had expressed support for its legitimate sovereignty claim. He joined the Argentine Republic in its rejection of unilateral British measures, including the exploration and exploitation of oil and other natural resources on the Argentine continental shelf, which were in violation of United Nations resolutions. He also rejected the conduct of military exercises and missile launches in and from the Malvinas Islands, which violated General Assembly resolution 31/49 as well as the maritime safety standards established by the International Maritime Organization.

38. The question of the Malvinas Islands could not be addressed without mentioning the cunning attempts of the United Kingdom to justify its occupation by organizing a referendum on self-determination that was void of any legal basis. That poll had been orchestrated by the British Government to allow a group of British citizens to express their wish for a militarily occupied territory to be recognized internationally as British. Such claims were absurd and unacceptable. The United Nations considered the question of the Malvinas Islands a violation of the territorial integrity of Argentina; none of its relevant resolutions had ever referred to the principle of self-determination, which did not apply because there was no subjugation or exploitation of a people by a foreign Power. Reiterating its firm support for the Argentine Republic with regard to the sovereignty dispute, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela remained convinced that the repeated and legitimate calls for a peaceful solution to the dispute must be addressed and that the military

occupation of a part of the people's America by a foreign Power would end.

39. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the political ramifications of the continued existence of 17 Non-Self-Governing Territories decades after the establishment of the Special Committee on decolonization needed to be discussed and should prompt the Committee to intensify its decolonization efforts, since colonialism was a crime against humanity. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution, whose adoption by consensus would reaffirm that the sovereignty dispute should be settled peacefully. The Syrian Arab Republic supported the principles of self-determination and territorial integrity, as established in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), but not the selective use of the principle of self-determination to justify the occupation, which had violated the territorial integrity of Argentina since 1833. The right to self-determination did not apply to foreign settlers in a territory. His country therefore rejected the unilateral measures taken by the United Kingdom in the Malvinas Islands, which violated United Nations resolutions and undermined attempts to find a peaceful solution.

40. His delegation reiterated its support for the legitimate rights of the Argentine Republic in relation to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas. The British colonial occupation should be ended in accordance with General Assembly resolutions stating that the situation was a special and particular case of colonialism involving a sovereignty dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina, which could be resolved only through peaceful negotiations. The Secretary-General should continue his mission of good offices in accordance with his mandate under the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant General Assembly resolutions. The United Kingdom should implement the 33 resolutions on the Malvinas Islands adopted by the Committee and begin dialogue with Argentina. It should engage seriously with and regularly report to the Committee on the measures it had taken to implement the resolutions.

41. **Mr. Wang Min** (China) said that the question of the Malvinas Islands was a relic of the colonial past. Over the years, the General Assembly and the Committee had adopted resolutions calling on Argentina and the United Kingdom to conduct negotiations based on the fundamental principles of the

Charter of the United Nations with a view to resolving the matter peacefully. The settlement of international territorial disputes through negotiations was in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation hoped that Argentina and the United Kingdom would start a constructive dialogue with a view to reaching a peaceful, just and appropriate negotiated solution in the near future. China supported the sovereignty claim of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands and would therefore support the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

42. **Ms. Rubiales de Chamorro** (Nicaragua) said that, to express support for Argentina and its claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, a ceremony had been held on 10 June to celebrate the Day of Central American Solidarity with the Argentine Malvinas Islands.

43. The Bolivian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America had also expressed strong support for Argentina's sovereignty claim. The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas had been usurped forcibly in 1833 by the British, an act Argentina had never ceased to denounce. It was unacceptable that, despite the passage of time and numerous appeals for compliance with General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), the United Kingdom continued to refuse the resumption of dialogue with Argentina on the issue of sovereignty.

44. In addition to its failure to comply with the resolution, the United Kingdom was also illegally exploiting resources that belonged to the people and Government of Argentina, a fact that Nicaragua condemned. She wished to endorse the statements made in support of Argentina's right to pursue legal recourse against companies that carried out such unauthorized activities.

45. The Latin American and Caribbean region suffered not only from the occupation of that part of Argentine territory but also from the militarization of the entire South Atlantic. Recently, in a clear act of provocation, the British Minister of Defence had announced an increase in the military spending earmarked for the Malvinas Islands while alluding to a supposed threat from Argentina. Recalling Argentina's repeated appeals for dialogue and negotiation, she said that the idea of an Argentine threat was implausible and unjustified. It was simply a tactic to increase the

British military budget and further consolidate the growing militarization of the islands. As the Government of Argentina had stated, such substantial funding should be used instead to benefit the British people by combating unemployment, improving education and health care, and increasing social inclusion.

46. Nicaragua joined other countries that rejected the militarization of the South Atlantic by the United Kingdom. She also underscored Argentina's willingness to negotiate, which had been reiterated at every level and in every possible forum, and expressed the hope that the United Kingdom would display similar readiness to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions. Nicaragua urged the British Government to return to the negotiating table. It was time for colonialism and imperialism to be removed from the Malvinas Islands, for international justice to prevail over brute force, and for the territories to be returned to Argentina, the legitimate owner.

47. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that the representative of Argentina had given an outstanding presentation on the historical background of Committee discussions on the topic. It was important to acknowledge that invasions did not create rights; that was one of the Organization's fundamental principles. British authorities had expelled the Argentine population from the islands in question, and in 1965, resolution 2065 (XX) had explicitly recognized the existence of a sovereignty dispute, inviting the two parties to negotiate to find a peaceful solution. Over 40 resolutions had since been adopted. One reason for the presence of Member States in the meeting room was to assert their respect for the principle of equality. The United Kingdom should have been present and listening attentively to what other countries had to say about its colonial attitudes. However, unfortunately, the powerful not only failed to heed resolutions, but also tried to distort the concept of self-determination. Those who had been freed from other empires on the basis of that principle were offended by such attempts. They would never be persuaded that a group of occupiers were a people or could enjoy the right to self-determination.

48. During his tenure as Chair of the Group of 77 and China, he had had the privilege of visiting that inalienable part of the Latin American and Caribbean region. Discussions about the islands were discussions about Argentine and Latin American and Caribbean

identity. That was why the Committee and regional organizations would continue to support Argentina's just demands. History, law, legitimacy, geography, and truth were all on Argentina's side. The Malvinas Islands were and would remain Argentine.

49. **Ms. King** (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) said that the question of the Malvinas Islands predated the Charter of the United Nations and even the League of Nations. The General Assembly had long given voice to the international community's insistence that the British and Argentine Governments should expedite negotiations concerning the sovereignty dispute. The lack of political will to negotiate in good faith on the matter had been the root cause of military and diplomatic tensions over the years. The General Assembly had also repeatedly acknowledged that the central issue was not the will of a colonized population under alien control but rather the competing claims of sovereignty over islands located a short distance from the Argentine coast.

50. Her Government remained deeply concerned and frustrated with the ongoing failure to achieve progress in the long-standing sovereignty dispute over the territory in question. It was time for the international community to remember why it had founded the United Nations and to reflect on the contents of the Charter, which should guide the conduct of all Member States. Like all nations in Latin America and the Caribbean, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines remained deeply committed to the just and peaceful resolution of the dispute and called on the Argentine and British Governments to resume negotiations. Member States should identify the root causes of the failure to negotiate and bring all possible pressure to bear with a view to resolving the dispute.

51. *Draft resolution [A/AC.109/2015/L.7](#) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.