GRS 410

CONFIDENTIAL

FM SANTIAGO 281530Z JUL 82

TO IMMEDIATE FCO

TELEGRAM NUMBER 365 OF 28 JULY

INFO IMMEDIATE MEXICO CITY PRIORITY WASHINGTON, UKMIS NEW YORK

BRASILIA, CARACAS, BOGOTA, QUITO, LIMA, LA PAZ, MONTEVIDEO,

ASUNCION.

MY TELNO 347 : FALKLANDS : MEXICAN INITIATIVE IN THE UN

RESIDENT CLERK

1. ZEGERS, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN POLICY, CALLED ME IN YESTERDAY TO PASS ON INFORMATION WHICH HE THOUGHT WOULD BE USEFUL TO US AND TO HAND OVER A COPY OF THE MEXICAN MEMORANDUM OF 2 JULY LAUNCHING THIS INITIATIVE (TEXT BY BAG TO FCO ONLY). HE SAID THAT, PROVIDED THE FORMAL LETTER TO THE UN SECRETARY GENERAL IS DRAFTED IN TOLERABLY NEUTRAL TERMS, HE UNDERSTOOD THAT ALL LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES (EXCEPT EX-BRITISH CARIBBEAN) WOULD PROBABLY JOIN MEXICO AND ARGENTINA IN SUPPORTING INSCRIPTION OF THE ITEM. ZEGERS ADDED THAT THE MAIN ELEMENTS IN ARGENTINA'S CASE FOR INSCRIPTION WERE:

A) THE FALKLANDS DISPUTE HAD LED TO WAR AND WAS THEREFORE A

CASE FOR INSCRIPTION WERE A) THE FALKLANDS DISPUTE HAD LED TO WAR AND WAS THEREFORE A THREAT TO PEACE OF THE SOUTH AMERICAN CONTINENT AND TO THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM SMI CLN B) IT WAS A COLONIAL PROBLEM WHICH HAD BEEN UNDER CONSIDERATION IN THE UN LONG BEFORE THE CONFLICT SMI CLN C) WITHOUT PRE-JUDGING THE QUESTION OF SOVEREIGHTY, THE RESOLUTION SHOULD DEMAND NEGOTIATIONS ABOUT THE PROBLEM UNDER UN AUSPICES. 2. ZEGERS STRESSED THAT CHILE HAD MADE NO DECISION ON THE MATTER AS YET. HE DID NOT REPEAT NOT REGARD THE CONFLICT AS A THREAT TO PEACE IN THE CONTINENT IN ANY REAL SENSE. HOWEVER, IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT FOR CHILE TO STAND OUT ALONE AGAINST ALL FELLOW LATIN AMERICANS. HE ALSO MADE THE POINT THAT PREVIOUS UN RESOLUTIONS ON THE FALKLANDS HAD APPLIED EQUALLY TO SOUTH GEORGIA AND SOUTH SANDWICH ISLANDS AND SUGGESTED THAT IT HAD BEEN UNWISE OF BRITAIN TO ALLOW THIS EQUIVALENCE TO GO UNCHALLENGED. LIKE ALL HISPANIC STATES OF SOUTH AMERICA AND BRAZIL, CHILE HAD TO ACCEPT THE LEGAL BASIS FOR ARGENTINA'S CLAIM TO THE FALKLANDS SINCE THE UTI POSSIDETIS DOCTRINE WAS FUNDAMENTAL TO THEIR EXISTENCE AS STATES. BUT THE CLAIM TO OTHER TERRITORIES HAD A TOTALLY DIFFERENT BASIS AND, BY IMPLICATION, WAS NOT VALID IN CHILE'S VIEW. 3. I SAID THAT OUR POSITION WAS THAT ALL THESE ARGENTINE CLAIMS WERE BAD AND IT WAS NOT EASY TO SEE HOW WE COULD DISTINGUISH BETWEEN TWO ILL-FOUNDED CLAIMS. IT WAS NEVERTHELESS VERY HELPFUL TO BE MADE AWARE OF CHILE'S THINKING ON THE MATTER. ZEGERS DID NOT SPELL OUT THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF HIS APPROACH TO ME BUT NO DOUBT IT WAS TO PREPARE THE WAY FOR, AND TO TRY TO EXPLAIN TO ME. CHILE'S VOTE IN FAVOUR OF INSCRIPTION. I LEFT HIM IN NO DOUBT ABOUT OUR OPPOSITION TO THIS. HICKMAN NNNN SENT AT//RECD AT 282044Z P L N //MNJ