

CONFIDENTIAL

DESKBY 050130Z (PEKING TOKYO)
DESKBY 050500Z (MOSCOW UKDEL VERSAILLES)
DESKBY 050630Z (PARIS)
DESKBY 050700Z (KAMPALA AMMAN)
DESKBY 050730Z (MADRID KINSHASA WARSAW)
DESKBY 050800Z (UKDEL NATO)
DESKBY 050830Z (DUBLIN ACCRA)
DESKBY 051230Z (HAVANA)
DESKBY 051300Z (PANAMA CITY GEORGETOWN)
DESKBY 051400Z (WASHINGTON)

MW

FM UKMIS NEW YORK 050107Z JUNE 82
TO FLASH FCO

TELEGRAM NUMBER 933 OF 4 JUNE

AND TO IMMEDIATE UKDEL VERSAILLES

INFO IMMEDIATE WASHINGTON, DUBLIN, MADRID, PARIS, KAMPALA, KINSHASA,
ACCRA, PANAMA CITY, GEORGETOWN, WARSAW, AMMAN, TOKYO, MOSCOW, PEKING,
HAVANA, UKDEL NATO.

UKDEL VERSAILLES TEL NO 3 TO YOU (NOT TO ALL): FALKLANDS:

SECURITY COUNCIL.

SUMMARY.

1. A SLIGHTLY AMENDED VERSION OF THE PANAMANIAN/SPANISH DRAFT FAILED TO SECURE ADOPTION THIS EVENING (4 JUNE) BECAUSE OF VETOS BY THE UK AND US. THE VOTING WAS 9 - 2 (UK, US) - 4 (FRANCE, GUYANA, JORDAN, TOGO). THE RESOLUTION SECURED NINE VOTES ONLY BECAUSE OF A LAST MINUTE SWITCH BY JAPAN. AFTER THE VOTE, MRS KIRKPATRICK ASTONISHINGLY STATED THAT SHE HAD BEEN ASKED BY HER GOVERNMENT TO SAY THAT IF IT WERE POSSIBLE TO CHANGE A VOTE ONCE CAST, THE UNITED STATES WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE ITS VOTE FROM A VETO TO AN ABSTENTION.

DETAIL.

2. UPON RECEIPT OF THE TELEGRAM UNDER REFERENCE, I INFORMED DE PINIES (SPAIN) AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL THAT WE WOULD NOT BE PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE PANAMANIAN/SPANISH DRAFT OF LAST NIGHT. BOTH SIDES SAID THAT IN THAT CASE THERE WAS NO ALTERNATIVE TO VOTING THIS AFTERNOON (4 JUNE). THERE FOLLOWED A DELAY OF ABOUT 2 HOURS WHILE BOTH SIDES COUNTED HEADS, AND MRS KIRKPATRICK MADE SEVERAL EFFORTS TO PERSUADE HAIG IN VERSAILLES TO SWITCH FROM A NOT TO ABSTENTION. WITH ABSTENTIONS ASSURED FROM GUYANA, JAPAN, JORDAN AND TOGO, AND PROBABLY FROM ZAIRE, IT LOOKED AS THOUGH DE PINIES WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO GET HIS NINE VOTES. BUT, AT THE LAST MINUTE, MY JAPANESE COLLEAGUE, TO HIS OBVIOUS CHAGRIN, RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM VERSAILLES TO SWITCH FROM AN ABSTENTION TO A VOTE IN FAVOUR. HE TOOK WITH HIM ZAIRE, AND NEARLY JORDAN AS WELL. DE NANTEUIL (FRANCE) LEFT THE SECURITY COUNCIL AT THIS POINT TO RETURN TO HIS MISSION TO TELEPHONE VERSAILLES IN AN EFFORT TO GET THE JAPANESE INSTRUCTIONS CHANGED. BUT IT WAS TOO LATE AND HE COULD NOT DEFER THE VOTE ANY LONGER.

3. THE DRAFT VOTED ON WAS A SLIGHTLY REVISED VERSION OF THE TEXT IN MY TEL NO 926, WITH THE FIRST AND SECOND OPERATIVE PARAGRAPHS RUN TOGETHER AND WITH AN UNHELPFUL CHANGE TO THE THIRD OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH (REVISED TEXT IN MIFT, TO YOU, VERSAILLES AND WASHINGTON ONLY). I SPOKE FIRST IN EXPLANATION OF VOTE BEFORE THE VOTE (TEXT IN MY SECOND IFT, TO YOU AND COI ONLY). UGANDA, JAPAN, IRELAND AND ZAIRE ALSO SPOKE BEFORE THE VOTE, DECLARING THEIR INTENTION TO VOTE IN FAVOUR. JAPAN'S STATEMENT WAS BRIEF AND PAINED: JAPAN WOULD VOTE IN FAVOUR ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT ARGENTINA WOULD WITHDRAW ITS FORCES WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME: SHE WAS DISTRESSED AT THE PROSPECT OF FURTHER BLOODSHED: SHE APPEALED TO ARGENTINA TO WITHDRAW, SO THAT ARGENTINA'S TIES OF FRIENDSHIP COULD BE RESTORED AND STRENGTHENED. DORR PRODUCED 15 MINUTES OF HIS USUAL SELF-CONGRATULATORY DRIVEL.

4. THE VOTE WAS AS REPORTED IN PARA 1 ABOVE. GUYANA SPOKE AFTER THE VOTE - AN ADMIRABLY ROBUST STATEMENT. DE PINIES (SPAIN) WAS SURPRISINGLY MILD: VARIOUS AMENDMENTS HAD BEEN MADE TO THE DRAFT TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS' VIEWS: ALTHOUGH A BALANCED TEXT, IT HAD NOT BEEN ADOPTED: THIS WAS NOT A FAILURE FOR ITS SPONSORS BUT FOR PEACE: THE RESPONSIBILITY LAY WITH THOSE WHO HAD PREVENTED ADOPTION.

5. MRS KIRKPATRICK (USA) SPOKE NEXT. IT WAS A TRULY ASTONISHING STATEMENT. SHE SAID THAT THE COUNCIL'S DECISION WAS YET ANOTHER FAILURE TO MEDIATE A 200 YEAR OLD CONFLICT. IT REPRESENTED ONE MORE STEP IN THE PROCEFS OFGESCALATION. PHASE ONE HAD ENDED WITH THE ARGENTINE INVASION: PHASE TWO 'MIGHT WELL END' WITH BRITISH

REOCCUPATION OF THE ISLANDS: WHERE WOULD PHASE THREE END? THE VOTE HAD AFFIRMED THE WISH OF THE MAJORITY FOR NEGOTIATIONS AND PEACE. THE US VETO, TO WHICH SHE WOULD RETURN, HAD AFFIRMED DISAPPROVAL OF THE USE OF FORCE BY ARGENTINA. SHE THEN READ OUT A POEM (ABOUT THE HORRORS OF WAR) BY THE ARGENTINE POET BORGES. THE FRIENDS OF ARGENTINA, OF THE AMERICAS AND OF WORLD PEACE HOPED THAT THERE WOULD BE 'NO SUCH OFFERINGS' FROM THE BRESENT WAR. THEY HOPTED THAT COOPERATION COULD BE RESTORED AND FRIENDSHIPS MENDED. THE US GOVERNMENT HAD WORKED HARD TO MEDIATE THE CONFLICT. IT HAD BEEN RENT BY A CLASH OF VALUES, LOYALTIES AND FRIENDS. THAT CLASH HAD CONTINUED RIGHT DOWN TO THE PRESENT VDBE. SHE HAD BEEN TOLD THAT A MEMBER COULD NOT CHANGE ITS VOTE ONCE IT HAD BEEN CAST. BUT SHE HAD BEEN ASKED BY HER GOVERNMENT TO STATE THAT I IT WERE POSSIBLE TO CHANGE A VOTE THE UNITED STATES WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE ITS FROM A VETO TO AN ABSTENTION. THIS STATEMENT HAD AN ELECTRIFYING EFFECT, REVIVING MEMORIES OF CARTER'S VOLTE FACE OVER THE US VOTE ON JERUSALEM IN 1980.

6. KAM (PANAMA) RANTED ON FOR A WHILE IN THE STYLE OF HIS MASTER, ILLUECA. HE NOTED THAT THE UNITED STATES HAD CORRECTED ITS VETO. SO ADOPTION OF THE RESOLUTION HAD BEEN BLOCKED BY THE UK ALONE. THE WORLD NOW KNEW WHO STOOD FOR PEACE AND WHO FOR WAR. NINE COUNTRIES

HAD SHOWN WORLD OPINION THEIR CONCERN FOR PEACE, FOR LATIN AMERICA'S HONOUR, FOR THE SOLDIERS OF ARGENTINA ETC ETC. PANAMA RESERVED ITS RIGHT TO ASK FOR FURTHER CONSULTATIONS OF THE COUNCIL.

7. DE NANTEUIL (FRANCE), IN HIS NATIONAL CAPACITY, MADE A LIMP STATEMENT. TODAY'S DRAFT HAD POSED ONLY THE QUESTION OF WHETHER ITS ADOPTION WOULD SERVE TO SETTLE THE CONFLICT. IT HAD CERTAIN POSITIVE ELEMENTS. BUT ONE COULD NOT DISREGARD THAT SCR 502 HAD BEEN ADOPTED TWO MONTHS AGO BUT NO START HAD BEEN MADE TO IMPLEMENT IT. FRANCE THEREFORE UNDERSTOOD WHY ONE PARTY FELT THE NEED FOR FURTHER SAFEGUARDS. NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD HAVE CONTINUED IN THE SEARCH FOR CONSENSUS.

8. ROS (ARGENTINA) CONDEMNED "THE UK VETO" IN PREDICTABLE TERMS. THE UK ALONE WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL FURTHER DEATHS IN THE CONFLICT. THE MACHINERY FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY COULD NOT WORK IF PERMANENT MEMBERS USED THE VETO ONLY TO SERVE THEIR OWN ENDS. TODAY IT WAS THE MALVINAS, YESTERDAY IT HAD BEEN NAMIBIA. WHAT WOULD IT BE NEXT? I REPLIED BRIEFLY THAT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CRISIS LAY SOLELY IN ARGENTINA'S INVASION: RESPONSIBILITY FOR FURTHER LOSS OF LIFE WOULD LIE IN ARGENTINA'S REFUSAL TO WITHDRAW AS DEMANDED BY SCR 502. THAT ENDED THE PROCEEDINGS.

9. COMMENT OS IN MY THIRD IFT.