

**The Duality of British Policy:
Resolution 502 and the United Kingdom's Response to the 1982 Falklands War**

Jason Gordon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
BACKGROUND.....	5
ARGUMENT.....	7
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	9
<i>The United Kingdom's views towards the Falkland Islands.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Pursuing a Resolution and Positions of Security Council Members.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>UN Security Council Resolution 502.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Aftermath.....</i>	<i>18</i>
CONCLUSION.....	20
WORKS CITED.....	22

INTRODUCTION

On 2 April 1982, Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands over a decades-long territorial dispute with the United Kingdom. Less than thirty-six hours later, the United Nations Security Council passed a UK-sponsored resolution swiftly condemning Argentina's actions and demanding the Argentine withdrawal from the islands. The speed of the response immediately displayed international support for the British position and that the international community believed Argentina deserved punishment for its actions. This response was reminiscent of how the UN would respond to an invasion of a state's core territory, an argument only bolstered by the British using the logic of self-defense in its military retaliation. However, the Falklands were no ordinary territory of the United Kingdom; it was a Non-Self-Governing Territory (NSGT), designated by the United Nations as a territory to eventually obtain self-governance. In the United Nations, the UK seemed to acknowledge this special status and compromised on the resolution's wording — which advocated for a mutual diplomatic solution — when, in reality, the British responded with force. The United Kingdom's response is inconsistent with the UN resolution it wrote, calling into question why the British were so intent on passing a resolution in a body that expected the UK to treat the Falklands as a territory destined for self-governance when it had no intention of granting any autonomy.

Before the Argentine invasion, the international community debated at length over the islands' fate, and the United Kingdom and Argentina tried and failed multiple times to find a mutually acceptable solution. The undecided nature of this dispute allowed Argentina's new government to attack the Falklands, creating a distraction from its internal issues. In response, the United Kingdom did everything it could to promote a favorable resolution to garner public support while humiliating the Argentines. The UK had the institutional standing to push a

Security Council resolution through, for the United Kingdom is one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, and it leads the Commonwealth, an organization including many of the UK's former colonies. With these positions, the UK had a broad international foundation it could utilize. However, the Falkland Islands' NSGT status could have also worked to the detriment of the UK, for if the UK responded too forcefully, it would have lost support and had its intentions questioned. The United Kingdom needed to preach peace to obtain votes from the Non-Aligned Movement, which it needed to meet the nine-vote threshold to pass a resolution. Thus, the United Kingdom compromised with language to move towards peace despite wanting war to secure a resolution to isolate the Argentines and win international favorability, even if it needed to act against its internal stance on the Falklands' status.

LITERATURE REVIEW

British decision-making determined that while a military response was required to recapture the islands from Argentina, a diplomatic approach would be vital to secure the international support it needed to take unilateral action. As a result, the United Kingdom opted to pursue a United Nations Security Council resolution due to its binding properties, further isolating Argentina internationally when it inevitably refused to respond. Security Council resolutions — while not enshrined in a legal system — put significant political pressure on the nations they affect, allowing the United Kingdom to punish Argentina by passing a resolution, even if Argentina ignored it.

The United Nations Charter dictates the powers of Security Council resolutions in Articles 24, 25, and 26. It gives the Security Council the final authority to make decisions to maintain international peace and security and the ability to make a plan to carry out its resolutions. Notably, it requires UN member states to implement Council decisions under the charter in Article 25.¹ These clauses function as a framework for governance, dictating that nations must follow what the Security Council states. However, nations are sovereign, raising the question of whether the United Nations has the authority to make such decisions over the affairs of a nation.

Sally Morphet's article "Resolutions and Vetoes in the UN Security Council: Their Relevance and Significance" discusses the realistic power of Security Council resolutions, arguing that since it is the primary international body, UNSC resolutions carry weight. She claims that the cost of abandoning the United Nations is unacceptably high, pointing to the effects of the Soviet boycott of the Security Council on the Korean War.² When the Soviets

¹ United Nations. *United Nations Charter (Full Text)*, 1945, <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.

² Sally Morphet, "Resolutions and Vetoes in the UN Security Council: Their Relevance and Significance," *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 4 (1990): 355.

ignored the Council, the UN worked against its interests by defending South Korea. Hence, Morphet argues, the Security Council has undeniable power since all UN members accept the body's power over them. Morphet further discusses the explicit power of Security Council resolutions as solutions to international issues. Here, she notes that once a resolution passes, it is impossible to ignore, and settlements arbitrated by the United Nations take on an "aura of legitimacy" that sets a background for dispute settlement.³ Because of its universal membership and perceived power, UNSC resolutions carry political weight, often preceding more substantial negotiations. Even though nations are sovereign, Morphet claims that these resolutions have the legitimacy members gave to the United Nations upon joining.

Thus, UN resolutions have power through political perception, even though the United Nations is an international body. A nation can ignore the United Nations and violate Article 25, but the consequences of its neglect hurt its position. As a result, the United Kingdom could use the power of a Security Council resolution to punish Argentina for its invasion — regardless of the Argentine response. With the resolution, the British pushed for an immediate denial of Argentina's goals in the Falklands, ensuring that, accept or deny, Argentina would suffer consequences.

³ Morphet, "Resolutions and Vetoes in the UN Security Council," 356-8.

BACKGROUND

To address the contentious issue of nations having colonies in a post-Second World War era, the United Nations established Non-Self-Governing Territories (NSGTs) in Chapter XI of its charter to organize existing nations' colonies and manage decolonization. These NSGTs have an Administering Power (AP) that runs their affairs, and the UN designated the colonizers as the APs of their respective NSGTs since they held the territory. Unlike traditional colonialism, the AP has responsibilities it must commit to, including protecting the territory's citizens and culture, developing self-government, and regularly transmitting information to the UN. One of these territories is the Falkland Islands, and the UN designated the United Kingdom as the islands' Administering Power under Resolution 66(I) in 1945.⁴ The UK controlled the islands and maintained its sovereignty over the islands for over a century before the dispute. However, past colonial claims meant other countries also claimed the islands.

International bodies discussed the Falklands and its surrounding islands before 1982. In 1955, the International Court of Justice heard a case about the UK's South Atlantic islands, which have a similar history to the Falklands. The UK argued that it officially incorporated the islands in 1843 and received recognition in 1908.⁵ However, Argentina argued that Spain claimed the islands before the British, which transferred to Argentina post-independence. The ICJ could not deliver a decision since Argentina refused its jurisdiction,⁶ and the dispute resurfaced a decade later in the UN through General Assembly Resolution 2065.

Before the Falklands War, A/RES/2065 was the most significant response to the dispute. It invited the UK and Argentina to discuss a path forward for the islands' self-governance under

⁴ United Nations General Assembly, *Resolution 66 (I): Transmission of Information under Article 73e of the Charter*, A/RES/66(I), 1945, [http://undocs.org/A/RES/66\(I\)](http://undocs.org/A/RES/66(I)).

⁵ International Court of Justice. *Pendings, Oral Arguments, Document: Antarctica Cases (United Kingdom v. Argentina; United Kingdom v. Chile)*, 1955, <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/26/institution-proceedings>. 13, 21-24.

⁶ International Court of Justice. *Communiqué 56/5 (Unofficial)*, 1956, <https://www.icj-cij.org/public/files/case-related/26/12361.pdf>.

the more general speech of Resolution 1514.⁷ Because both states claimed the islands, finding a mutually agreeable solution was vital, even though only the UK administered the territory.

The UN was not the only international organization to discuss the Falkland Islands; the Organization of American States (OAS) also commented on the islands and strongly favored Argentina. In 1976, the Inter-American Juridical Committee (CJI), an advisory body of the OAS, declared that the islands undeniably belonged to Argentina.⁸ Using this international backing, Argentina argued that the United Kingdom was occupying Argentine territory, using the CJI decision to advance the argument and legitimize any actions toward reclaiming the Falklands. If Argentina invaded, it was simply liberating its territory from foreign occupation. However, military action was unthinkable, as that would mean war with the United Kingdom — a cost most Argentine governments were unwilling to pay.

Despite this, domestic strife and instability led Argentina to invade the Falklands. The armed forces took over the Argentine government in 1976, and the resulting junta struggled to gain legitimacy. As a result, invading the Falklands had merit to the new government, as it would distract the Argentine populace from domestic issues and unite them behind the government through a national resentment of the British.⁹ It could also cast itself as helping the world decolonize by liberating the islands from UK rule.¹⁰ However, this stance was ineffective, as the British argued that Argentina's methods were aggressive and unnecessary and that Argentina's invasion was hurting international peace and security rather than helping it.

⁷ United Nations General Assembly, *Resolution 2065 (XX): Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)*. A/RES/2065(XX), 1965, <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/2065%28XX%29>.

⁸ "Text of O.A.S. Resolution on the Falkland Islands," *The New York Times*, April 29, 1982, sec. World, <https://www.nytimes.com/1982/04/29/world/text-of-oas-resolution-on-the-falkland-islands.html>.

⁹ The National Archives. *Argentina Falklands (Part 3)*, PREM 19/614, 1 April-5 April 1982, <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/PREM19/1982/PREM19-0614.pdf>, 111-12.

¹⁰ The National Archives Website: Discovery: PREM 19/635, *Argentina. The Falkland crisis: surrender of Argentinian forces on the Falkland Island; proposals for the repatriation of Argentinian prisoners of war; part 24*, 1982, <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C13317726>, 64-5.

ARGUMENT

General Assembly Resolution 2065 (XX) attempted to get Argentina and the United Kingdom to work towards a resolution to the dispute, but in the end, it was in vain. The nations had opposing historical claims to the Falkland Islands, and neither was willing to concede. The dispute seeped into the general population, fueling animosity between Brits and Argentines, and Argentina's government used that division to repair its reputation by invading the Falklands. The United Kingdom responded to the aggression with words implying the islands were an NSGT with special status but with actions indicating otherwise. In the United Nations, the British preached peace, arguing for a non-combative resolution to the conflict, in line with Article 73(c)'s declaration that the Administering Powers of NSGTs should work towards furthering international peace and security¹¹ and avoiding the issue of self-defense. However, it contradicted its peaceful demeanor by taking military action, justifying its response under the self-defense language of Article 51 — now treating the Falklands as sovereign British territory with no special status. Once again, this duality raises the question of how the Falkland Islands' NSGT status changed the United Kingdom's UN response and how its status changed the overall reaction from the United Nations to the incident.

The United Kingdom could have resolved the conflict peacefully inside the United Nations but decided against doing so, instead choosing to use force to expel the Argentines from the islands. The Falklands were vital to British interests in the South Atlantic; letting Argentina occupy them and use them as a bargaining chip in negotiations was not an option. Instead, the British defended the islands as if they were still a colony — which, to the UK, they were, despite UN labeling. Thus, the United Kingdom's domestic stance conflicts with its official international position, for it supported a peaceful settlement of the conflict inside the United Nations and

¹¹ United Nations. *United Nations Charter (Full Text)*, 1945, <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.

called for such with Security Council Resolution 502, which passed the day after Argentine forces invaded the Falkland Islands. The duality in responses allowed the United Kingdom to win diplomatically and militarily, for it cast itself as preferring peace while fighting back, responding to Argentina's aggression on all fronts. It was not only able to do this due to its influence in the United Nations as a permanent Security Council member and as a leading member of NATO but also by changing the words and actions in the resolution to secure the nine votes necessary to pass it.

Inspecting British actions clarifies what the UK thought of these islands — they are sovereign British territory, crucial for the UK's diplomatic and security interests. As a result, Argentina's invasion was unacceptable, and the United Kingdom needed to respond forcefully. Therefore, it was essential to retaliate militarily and embarrass the Argentines diplomatically in every way possible, which included internationally via a United Nations resolution. However, the UK needed to navigate international public opinion to secure the votes required to pass a resolution.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The United Kingdom's views towards the Falkland Islands

The United Kingdom viewed the islands as a sovereign territory of the United Kingdom and defended it as such. A draft speech by the Prime Minister for the day after the invasion openly stated the UK's stance: “[The Prime Minister] should state to the House that Her Majesty's Government continue to regard the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Island Dependencies as British territory”.¹² Here, the official British view is apparent — this is a British territory, and invasion is not an option without retribution. The speech unequivocally claims that the Falklands have no special status; it is merely another British territory. Not only did the United Kingdom perceive the Falkland Islands as its territory, but the British additionally saw it as a critical territory to protect due to the dispute, even sending ships to the South Atlantic to assert its control in 1976.¹³ The disagreement with Argentina over the islands only seemingly furthered British resolve to hold the islands, and when Argentina invaded, it responded accordingly.

Argentina's invasion further exposed British views on the Falklands. The United Kingdom wanted to use the UN's legitimacy to bolster its position and shame Argentina, but the UK also wanted to take back the islands themselves without the international community meddling in the dispute's settlement. Once the invasion was imminent, the British gave the ambassador to the UN two orders, the first being to call an emergency meeting of the Security Council to take pre-emptive action against Argentina and the other to concentrate on the illegitimate use of force instead of anything else.¹⁴ Essentially, the UK wanted to use

¹² The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 3 April 1982, 217.

¹³ The National Archives Website: Discovery: PREM 16/743. *Falkland Islands: Dispute with Argentina; future policy*, 1974-76, <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C11299000>, 21.

¹⁴ Anthony Parsons, “The Falklands Crisis in the United Nations, 31 March-14 June 1982,” *International Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1983): 169–78, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2619933>, 170.

international public opinion to humiliate Argentina so it had the legitimacy to fight back against an aggressor while preserving its reputation. To do this, it would argue that Argentina was using illegitimate force to invade the islands, which would sway international opinion to favor the UK. With this position, the British would take back the islands militarily through what it saw as a legitimate use of force. The British needed to take back the islands, as Argentina had leverage through its control of the islands, and it could use military control as a bargaining chip in negotiations. However, the United Kingdom did not want the United Nations' involvement beyond swaying public opinion, as anything beyond that would require the UK to reject a proposal for UN help. Even if UN military assistance entirely consisted of British combatants, the United Nations would hold the Falklands rather than the United Kingdom through peacekeeping, which the UK viewed as unfavorable. Denying United Nations involvement would expose the United Kingdom politically and reveal its strategy.¹⁵ Thus, it was vital for the British to keep the UN involved to get a resolution passed; however, it also wanted to defend its territory against the Argentinians without the UN complicating the aftermath.

Pursuing a Resolution and Positions of Security Council Members

The United Kingdom wanted a UN resolution to ensure international support and obtain the legitimacy it needed to take further action. If the UK passed a resolution, it would show that the world was behind them. With this position, the British could persuade other nations to act in solidarity through economic and political measures.¹⁶ While the UK preferred using force to defend the Falkland Islands per the self-defense clause of the UN Charter, the Falklands' NSGT status made it difficult to justify going to such extreme lengths instead of pursuing diplomatic

¹⁵ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 109.

¹⁶ Parsons, "The Falklands Crisis in the United Nations, 31 March-14 June 1982," 1983, 172.

means to settle the dispute in the United Nations. So, the UK sought a resolution to preemptively counteract other nations questioning its motives when it inevitably took military action to reclaim an NSGT. Otherwise, Argentina could obfuscate the origins of the conflict and frame the UK as an aggressive power attempting to hold onto its colonies, turning public opinion against the British.¹⁷ Therefore, passing a resolution and controlling international public opinion was critical to British strategy in the Falklands, and it was able to muster the support it needed through its connections as both a leading NATO member and the head of the Commonwealth. However, the UK could not obtain the nine votes required to pass a resolution from these connections alone, and the UK had to determine who else it could count on by weighing other nations' interests.

As the leader of NATO and a staunch ally of the UK, the United States could have been on board with a British resolution without question, but its interests in Argentina complicated its vote. The United States helped install the current Argentine regime, providing an incentive to block further British involvement, as Argentina holding the Falklands would allow the Americans more control over them. To resolve the conflict without angering either side, the United States offered to broker a peaceful solution due to its ties to both nations — one being a longtime ally, the other being a US-sponsored regime. However, when the British insisted on a military reclamation, the United States stepped aside, allowing the British to land planes on Ascension Island and choosing not to intervene in the conflict.¹⁸ The US also supported the United Kingdom diplomatically in the United Nations, advocating for a peaceful settlement of the dispute on the UK's terms.¹⁹ American guarantee of noninvolvement was vital for the British;

¹⁷ Parsons, "The Falklands Crisis in the United Nations, 31 March-14 June 1982," 1983, 178.

¹⁸ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 5 April 1982, 10-11.

¹⁹ The National Archives Website: Discovery: PREM 19/633. *Argentina. The Falklands crisis: further diplomatic activity including ceasefire proposals; conversation between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States in Paris; part 22*, 4 June 1982, <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C13317724>, 40.

its interests in Argentina gave it interests on both sides of the conflict. If it supported Argentina, the British diplomatic position would be challenging. Moreover, the US held similar alliances to the British, and American opposition would not only cause the immediate failure of the UK's resolution in the United Nations but also lead to international isolation if the British invaded. American support or nonintervention regarding the Falklands was crucial for international backing, and the British secured that due to Argentina's role as the aggressor.

While the United States preferred to stay officially neutral, the Commonwealth strongly supported the British. Sri Lanka, Singapore, and Australia all directly invoked the UN Charter in their letters of support for the British position.²⁰ Moreover, New Zealand, Canada, and Australia took diplomatic action against the Argentines, whether by breaking off relations or recalling ambassadors.²¹ The near-unity in the Commonwealth's pro-British position gave the United Kingdom a large base of nations to call upon if needed, and the intensity of the support allowed the British to have a wealth of international backing in the United Nations. Furthermore, the Commonwealth pushed for United Nations involvement to assist the British, arguing that Argentina broke international law by invading, allowing the United Kingdom the right to act in self-defense.²² The Commonwealth had the most robust support of the British, and nations of the Commonwealth showed their support through condemnation and diplomatic isolation. The Commonwealth provided essential support for the British in gaining public support. Most of these nations were not on the Security Council, though, and the United Kingdom needed nine votes in the UNSC to pass its resolution, so it would have to find support elsewhere.

²⁰ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 3-5 April 1982, 16, 33, 85. (respectively, for each nation)

²¹ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, April 1982, 52.

²² The National Archives, PREM 19/635, 5 April 1982, 63-68.

In 1975, the Non-Aligned Movement passed a pro-Argentine statement regarding the Falkland Islands, which would make it difficult for the UK to secure its support.²³ However, the Non-Aligned Movement strongly opposed the use of force, meaning that while it generally supported Argentina's position on the Falklands, an invasion could be enough to secure the votes of its members — provided that there was no military retaliation.²⁴ This aversion to force provided a pathway for the United Kingdom, allowing it to obtain Non-Aligned assistance if it omitted its preference to use force to defend itself in the resolution. However, it was a necessary concession; the UK needed Non-Aligned support to get nine votes to pass a Security Council Resolution, and specifying a peaceful resolution was required to sway these votes.

While the British could influence the bulk of the Non-Aligned Movement to support the resolution by focusing on nonaggression, the subset of Latin American Nations in the movement proved more challenging to persuade. These nations supported Argentina because they had similar interests regarding British territorial disputes or merely believed in Latin American solidarity, as evidenced by Chile being the only nation in this group to condemn Argentina's invasion. Thus, unlike the rest of the Non-Aligned Movement, the British would have difficulty securing any Latin American support.

The UK also faced issues with Spain, a non-permanent member of the Security Council at the time of the resolution. Spain had interests in British-controlled Gibraltar, and the British worried that if it was too passive with the Falkland Islands, Spain might see an opportunity and seek a return of Gibraltar, a strategically important territory for the British.²⁵ Instead of relying on support through both being democratic and having similar general interests, the British instead needed to try to get Spanish support or abstention through other means.

²³ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 5 April 1982, 16.

²⁴ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 108.

²⁵ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 5 April 1982, 28-30.

The final group that could affect the resolution's passing was the communist bloc, specifically the Soviet Union. Both the Soviets and the Chinese could veto the resolution as two of the five permanent members of the Security Council, so the UK needed either abstention or a favorable vote from them. The Soviets could have preferred the Argentine position due to the Soviets importing a significant amount of Argentine grain and because siding with Argentina would oppose the UK and NATO more broadly. However, the USSR also worried about the Americans using its role in setting up Argentina's current government to set up military bases on the Falklands if Argentina secured them, and the Soviets preferred to keep the status quo where it could not control the situation. The Russians did not have a directly beneficial position and thus would hesitate to stand alone, especially if other parties like the Non-Aligned movement did not support Argentina. If the resolution had overwhelming support from these nations, the Soviets — and the other communist states — were likely to stand aside and let the UK have its way.

Therefore, the British faced a predicament — the UK had Western support secured, but the resolution could not meet the nine-vote threshold with just Western support. Instead, it needed to hope the Communists would not intervene and get the necessary votes from the Non-Aligned Movement by removing any mention of force.

UN Security Council Resolution 502

United Nations Security Council Resolution 502 (S/RES/502) was the outcome of British lobbying for an anti-Argentine resolution. It described the United Nations as deeply disturbed by the Argentine invasion and found a breach of peace in the Falklands. The UK chose this terminology to punish Argentina, framing the UN's response to its actions with a sense of disgust and anger. The resolution then urges Argentina to withdraw its forces and calls on both nations to

cease hostilities and find a diplomatic solution to their issues.²⁶ The wording in S/RES/502 strongly supports the British as intended. It worked to isolate Argentina, secure moral high ground for the United Kingdom, and force Argentina off the islands to rob them of any leverage in negotiations. The resolution allowed the British to take an active stance against the Argentines and eventually served as backing for military retaliation if Argentina did not withdraw.

While the result was a Security Council resolution, the British had considered taking other actions; in the end, though, it decided that going through the Security Council was the best path forward to secure a diplomatic victory. One option was to go to the International Court of Justice again, as it had done in 1955, and argue its case. However, Argentina had control over the islands, and the United Kingdom could not cleanly retake the Falklands if negotiations moved to the ICJ. Moreover, Argentina could again reject the ICJ's jurisdiction, rendering the process useless and forcing the court to table the case. Finally, the UK could not easily influence the ICJ, which risked the court ruling against the United Kingdom — something the British could not allow. Alternatively, the UK could seek an Advisory Opinion from the ICJ, but that also had disadvantages. Much like an ICJ ruling, the United Kingdom risked an unfavorable outcome with an Advisory Opinion, and if it rejected the opinion it requested, it would tarnish the UK's public image. Thus, neither option was viable to the British, for it did not have the influence needed to secure a guaranteed positive outcome.

Unlike the other options, the United Kingdom could influence a UNSC resolution, and while Argentina did not have to accept it, its insubordination would face condemnation. A resolution would force the burden of rejecting peace on Argentina, giving a basis for British military retaliation. After the Argentines ignored the resolution, the UK could pass a resolution

²⁶ United Nations Security Council, *Resolution 502 (1982)*, S/RES/502, 1982, <https://undocs.org/S/RES/502%281982%29>.

to involve the ICJ in resolving Argentina's disobedience, further providing grounding for retribution. However, there were downsides to this plan. It would take time to show noncompliance if Argentina ignored the resolution, and the ICJ could reject the case or give an unhelpful position.²⁷

Despite the issues, the UK decided to move forward with a resolution — but it needed to move fast. If it took too long, Argentina could stall, and the United Kingdom would lose control of the situation — long-term negotiations would not work. Instead, the UK needed to pass a resolution immediately, bypassing many intermediate steps that would have delayed its passing. In the end, the United Kingdom turned in the draft resolution without asking for amendments and insisted on a vote within 24 hours of tabling. The rushed schedule allowed the British to maintain control of the situation. The UK gave the Security Council a resolution and pressured the other members to accept, reject, or abstain without much time to debate and consider the draft.

A second strategy the United Kingdom used was speaking for peace to garner support — specifically from non-aligned nations. It kept quiet on any military action and instead endorsed a peaceful resolution. While support for a Chapter VII action would be a preliminary to military retaliation, the Non-Aligned Movement would not support aggressive language.²⁸ The United Kingdom instead needed to call for peace if it wanted to get votes in favor of the resolution, of which it received ten, with four abstentions and one non-permanent member voting against.²⁹

Ultimately, a 10-1-4 vote was the best outcome that the United Kingdom could have had. Spain and the three communist members of the Security Council all abstained, and Panama voted against the resolution. Panama was one of the Latin American members of the Non-Aligned

²⁷ The National Archives: FCO 73/520. *Falklands: FCO United Nations Department minute*, 3 April 1982, <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/226004>, 1-3.

²⁸ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 108-9.

²⁹ United Nations Security Council, S/RES/502, 1982.

Movement, and it supported Argentina's position. In defense of its vote, Panama indicated its support for the CJI's decision in 1976 that the islands were Argentine and claimed that this intervention was taking back rightful territory. Moreover, Panama argued that the United Nations' support for decolonization aligned with the invasion, and Argentina restoring its sovereignty provided a solution to both the dispute and the question of decolonization in the region.³⁰ Spain abstained due to its involvement in Gibraltar; its similar dispute made a vote in favor unthinkable. The Soviets, Chinese, and Poles all abstained due to the same reasoning — while they did want to support Argentina as it was the anti-NATO position, they did not want to upset the status quo in a situation they could not control.

The Falklands' NSGT status partially influenced the resolution's outcome. The United Kingdom could claim that it acted on its responsibilities of being an Administering Power by using Article 73(c) of the UN Charter, which obliges APs to maintain international peace and security in the NSGT. Thus, the United Kingdom attacking Argentina was its way of keeping the peace and security the islands enjoyed as a British NSGT. Furthermore, the UK argued that it attempted every path for peace, but the Argentine government resisted all attempts. For the British argument, Argentina's noncooperation led them to take any action necessary to secure international peace, remaining in Article 73(c) of the UN Charter.³¹ The United Kingdom's advocating for peace certainly falls within this section, and the Falklands' NSGT status could influence the UK to take a public stance for nonaggression. However, this stance — alongside the resolution's wording — could be a way to appease the Non-Aligned Movement and get the votes it needed to pass the resolution. Since the Non-Aligned Movement did not want any use of force, the UK's argument of using every viable path for peace could instead be a way to sway

³⁰ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 116-17.

³¹ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 3 April 1982, 168-71.

these nations to the UK's side and get them to support the resolution.³² The Falklands' NSGT status could have influenced S/RES/502's wording, but it could also be a tool to gather support and votes to pass the resolution. The United Kingdom needed votes, so it ceded whatever it needed to pass the resolution.

Aftermath

While the United Kingdom was able to pass S/RES/502 to isolate Argentina and rebuff its rationale for invading, the United Nations lacked the means to force Argentina's withdrawal; the UK needed support from the Non-Aligned movement, so it omitted any Chapter VII action, which would have allowed the UN to use force. Instead, the United Kingdom government pushed Argentina out on its own,³³ using Article 51 of the UN Charter to support its position, which permits nations to defend themselves.³⁴ Its self-defense argument revealed that the British viewed the islands without its special Non-Self-Governing Territory status. The United Kingdom's actions also illustrated that it was willing to propose diplomacy to pass a resolution, but it would pursue an aggressive response to an attack on its territory despite what it said in the United Nations. The United Kingdom was also unwilling to allow UN peacekeeping to enter the islands unless the Falklands were under complete British control, demonstrating its reluctance to seek international support unless it had a favorable outcome.³⁵ Argentina could always use its control as a bargaining tool, so the UK hesitated to involve the UN until it pushed Argentina out of the islands. Thus, the British chose to settle the matter unilaterally after passing the UNSC

³² The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 108.

³³ The National Archives, PREM 19/635, 15 June 1982, 66.

³⁴ Parsons, "The Falklands Crisis in the United Nations, 31 March-14 June 1982," 1983, 172.

³⁵ The National Archives, PREM 19/614, 4 April 1982, 110.

resolution and selectively implemented S/RES/502 to benefit it the most; it included the UN in favorable situations and excluded the body otherwise.

CONCLUSION

At the onset of the Falklands War, the United Kingdom's argument in the United Nations deviated from its internal views on the Falklands. The United Kingdom considered the Falkland Islands a sovereign British territory, and when Argentina attacked the Falklands, the British responded militarily, defending itself under Article 51 of the UN Charter — which preaches self-defense. However, it did not want others to know it would respond aggressively, as that would cost the UK its reputation. Instead, the British advocated for peace in the UN to secure the minimum nine votes needed to pass a Security Council resolution, giving it a position it could use to argue for its unilateral action. A resolution would also isolate the Argentines and prove that the world favored the British, and the British risked the least by working through the Security Council rather than an alternative multilateral body. The problem with passing the resolution was that it needed nine votes to succeed, so the United Kingdom needed support from the Non-Aligned Movement, who favored the Argentine case for the Falkland Islands but disliked war more. The United Kingdom used this disdain for war to secure the necessary votes and pass S/RES/502.

The resolution's passage was the result of British lobbying. The United Kingdom was pushing for S/RES/502 to pass, and it was willing to use whatever means were necessary to pass it, which included modifying the wording to advocate for peace. Moreover, the United Kingdom could have argued that its role as the Falklands' Administering Power required it to secure peace and stability for its NSGT under Article 73(c) of the UN charter, even though the UK thought of the Falklands as no different from the rest of the country.

Once the UK passed the resolution, it sidelined the United Nations as it took unilateral action to retake and secure the Falkland Islands. The British wanted to ensure future control over

the islands, and a multilaterally negotiated settlement risked the UK losing its sovereignty over the territory, as the United Nations partly supported the Argentine claim.

The British duality in its stances effectively portrays how national interest can manipulate the NSGT system. In this case, the British used its sway to influence a favorable outcome and ignored a peaceful resolution to the dispute until it suited its needs. However, the system could perpetuate colonial ideas, as Administering Powers could control the islands without any intention of working towards eventual self-government or independence. The risk of this happening is high when the AP considers its Non-Self-Governing Territory without its special status. If an AP receives a resolution that could benefit an NSGT at the AP's expense, it could veto the proposal, as three of four APs are permanent members of the Security Council. Thus, an Administering Power's perception of the NSGT is critical, as the AP manages and governs the territory, determining its future how it sees fit, and can ignore or even veto resolutions that do not suit the AP's wants.

WORKS CITED

- International Court of Justice. 1955. *Pendings, Oral Arguments, Document: Antarctica Cases (United Kingdom v. Argentina; United Kingdom v. Chile)*. Netherlands: International Court of Justice Official Records. <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/26/institution-proceedings>.
- International Court of Justice. 1956. *Communiqué 56/5 (Unofficial)*. Netherlands: International Court of Justice Official Records. <https://www.icj-cij.org/public/files/case-related/26/12361.pdf>.
- Morphet, Sally. "Resolutions and Vetoes in the UN Security Council: Their Relevance and Significance." *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 4 (1990): 341–59.
- Parsons, Anthony. "The Falklands Crisis in the United Nations, 31 March-14 June 1982." *International Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1983): 169–78. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2619933>.
- The New York Times. "Text of O.A.S. Resolution on the Falkland Islands," April 29, 1982, sec. World. <https://www.nytimes.com/1982/04/29/world/text-of-oas-resolution-on-the-falkland-islands.html>.
- The National Archives Website: Discovery: PREM 16/743. *Falkland Islands: Dispute with Argentina; future policy*, 1974-76, <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C11299000>.
- The National Archives Website: Discovery: PREM 19/635. *Argentina. The Falkland crisis: surrender of Argentinian forces on the Falkland Island; proposals for the repatriation of Argentinian prisoners of war; part 24*, 1982, <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C13317726>.

The National Archives. 1982. *Argentina Falklands (Part 3)*. PREM 19/614, 1 April-5 April.

Margaret Thatcher Foundation,

<https://www.margaretthatcher.org/PREM19/1982/PREM19-0614.pdf>.

The National Archives. 1982. *Falklands: FCO United Nations Department minute*. FCO 73/520,

3 April. Margaret Thatcher Foundation,

<https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/226004>.

United Nations. 1945. *United Nations Charter (Full Text)*. 26 June. San Francisco: UN.

<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.

United Nations General Assembly. 1965. *Resolution 2065 (XX): Question of the Falkland*

Islands (Malvinas). A/RES/2065(XX), 16 December. New York: UN.

<https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/2065%28XX%29>.

United Nations General Assembly. 1945. *Resolution 66 (I): Transmission of Information under*

Article 73e of the Charter. A/RES/66(I), 14 December. New York: UN.

[http://undocs.org/A/RES/66\(I\)](http://undocs.org/A/RES/66(I)).

United Nations Security Council. 1982. *Resolution 502 (1982)*. S/RES/502, 3 April. New York:

UN. <https://undocs.org/S/RES/502%281982%29>.