ACLARACION DE www.radarmalvinas.com.ar

El siguiente documento se encuentra en el sitio

http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk

en donde usted puede leerlo directamente en su formato original y acceder al resto del sitio.

Copyright © 2012 National Archives UK

Se refiere a:

28ABR82 - Omand a Wright. Comentario del MoD al borrador de propuesta de Haig.

(PREM 19/645) (desclasificado DIC 2012)

A efectos de preservarlo como documento histórico para el caso en que el archivo original o el sitio que lo contiene no figurasen más en internet, a continuación se ha realizado una copia.



SECRET



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
MAIN BUILDING WHITEHALL LONDON SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 2111/3 (Direct Dialling)

01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

MO 5/21

28th April 1982

Dear Said,

MILITARY COMMENTS ON DRAFT "MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

The amended text of the draft
"Memorandum of Agreement" was circulated
last night under cover of OD(SA)(82)31. The
Chief of the Defence Staff has now sent us
the attached note giving his view on the
military implications of aspects of the draft
Agreement. You will wish to be aware of
these and they may be drawn on if it is
decided to produce any further commentary on
the proposals.

2. I am copying this letter and enclosure to John Coles (No 10) and to Brian Fall (FCO)

July Common (D) BOWAND)

David Wright Esq

SECRET



CDS NOTE

COMMENTARY ON DRAFT HAIG AGREEMENT : WITHDRAWAL

SECRET

- 2.2.1 "within seven days each withdraws half of forces inside MEZs" not even-handed:
 - we have two SSNs
 - they have over 7,000 troops and ancillary equipment in addition:
 - the UK TF withdraws to 2,000 nm (7 days at 12k)
 - the Argentinians withdraw to the mainland (400 nm) and place themselves in a condition such that they cannot be reinserted in 7 days. How? How can this be verified?

It would be acceptable if the timing was \underline{two} days steaming at 12k (570 nm) and the same period applied to Argentinian reinsertion.

2.2.2 "within 15 days each withdraws remaining forces to usual operating areas or normal duties"

Acceptable depending on our interpretation of usual operating areas or normal duties. We would take this as the high seas.

It might be argued that these proposals are acceptable because the Reagan letter provides a US guarantee of withdrawal and against reintroduction (para iii). This guarantee is not part of the agreement (which is bilateral) and has no legality.