



**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 55:

Question of Cyprus (*concluded*):

- (a) Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus;
- (b) Complaint by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus . . . . . 271

**Chairman:** Mr. Victor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

**AGENDA ITEM 55**

**Question of Cyprus (A/3120 and Add.1, A/3204 and Add.1, A/C.1/788, A/C.1/789, A/C.1/L.168 to A/C.1/L.172) (*concluded*):**

- (a) Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus;
- (b) Complaint by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus

1. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) said that it was not from any lack of interest in the question under consideration that the Indonesian delegation had not participated in the general debate. On the contrary, its abstention had been motivated by a deep desire to facilitate the search for a constructive and just solution of that complex problem. Now the stage of considering the draft resolutions before the Committee had been reached. While there was much in the draft resolutions that the Indonesian delegation could support, none of them offered as adequate a solution to the problem as might have been hoped for. Of course the Indonesian Government was in full agreement with the need to establish in Cyprus conditions of freedom and peace, not only in the interest of the people of Cyprus, but also in the interest of that entire area of the world.

2. Unfortunately, the question was not any closer to a solution than it had been at the General Assembly's ninth session, when for the first time the problem had been debated at the United Nations. On the contrary, arbitrary colonial actions and the continuing struggle for freedom in the island had resulted in a worsening of the situation to an extent which made the matter of great concern for every Member of the Organization. It was undeniable that a quarrel or dispute existed over Cyprus which demanded a peaceful solution as soon as possible. Such a peaceful solution demanded, in the first place, a recognition of the right of the people of Cyprus to freedom and self-government. Freedom and self-determination could not be denied for reasons of pride or prestige. Nor could they be denied on the so-called grounds of strategic interests. The truth was that

if Cyprus was of strategic interest to anyone it was to the neighbouring countries of Asia Minor, whose security was understandably and justifiably involved with regard to Cyprus. Historically, the island had always been a gateway to Asia Minor and that fact, while not effacing the right of the Cypriots to freedom and independence from foreign domination, deserved, however, careful and serious consideration.

3. As stated in the first Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.168), the people of Cyprus should be given the opportunity to determine their own future by the application of their right to self-determination in accordance with the principles of the Charter. In the exercise of that right of self-determination by the Cypriots, the rights of the Turkish minority should, of course, be protected. For that reason, while fully supporting the principle of self-determination, the Indonesian Government believed that that principle must be applied in such a way as to meet satisfactorily the interests of all parties concerned.

4. His delegation believed that the essential ingredients of a solution were the end of colonial rule by the United Kingdom over Cyprus, the recognition of the right of freedom and self-determination for that island, and protection for the minority in Cyprus, so that the interests of all the people of Cyprus might be adequately respected, as well as the peace of the neighbouring countries. In order to accomplish such a programme it might be useful for a United Nations commission to make a careful study and report on the situation in Cyprus with all the complex factors involved. Therefore, the Indonesian delegation had no objection to establishing a fact-finding committee such as the one proposed in the second Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.170), although the United Nations might very well give such a committee a wider task than that envisaged in the draft, that is, a mandate to report on the entire situation in Cyprus, rather than on merely one facet of it. That also seemed to be the intent of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Panama (A/C.1/L.171), which called for an on-the-spot United Nations study of conditions in Cyprus. The Indonesian delegation could also support the ideas explained by the representative of India (855th meeting) and laid down in the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.172).

5. Mr. PICCIONI (Italy) said that the Italian delegation wanted to associate itself with those delegations which did not believe that it was useful for the United Nations to be called upon to intervene in questions which, like that of Cyprus, concerned the territory of a Member State and, in addition, some particular ethnic groups. Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter ruled out intervention by the United Nations in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. Moreover, United Nations intervention in the question of Cyprus appeared undesirable at the present stage, because the possibility still existed of reaching an agreement on that difficult problem by means of direct

negotiations between the parties concerned and in conformity with the interests of the population of the island.

6. Of course the Italian delegation had no illusions about the seriousness of the present situation in Cyprus, nor was it indifferent to the sufferings of the Cypriot people. His delegation further felt obliged to state that neither in Cyprus nor elsewhere did the solution of problems lie in violence and threats. That observation was even more pertinent since in the statements made by the representatives of Greece, the United Kingdom and Turkey—in spite of the polemic tone of those statements, which was, of course, inevitable—one could find certain encouraging elements which indicated that there was a possibility that agreement might be reached if negotiations were continued.

7. The delegation of Greece had called for the application of the principle of self-determination to the population of Cyprus in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The reply of the United Kingdom delegation on that point was clear. It affirmed (848th meeting) that the Government of the United Kingdom had always recognized that principle with respect to Cyprus, and a declaration by a member of the Cabinet had recently confirmed the statement in the House of Commons. The Turkish delegation had also emphasized that Turkey had never opposed and was not now opposed to self-determination for the population of Cyprus (848th meeting). Efforts for the realization of agreement had been made in the past between the Government of the United Kingdom and the representatives of the Cypriot people, as well as between the representatives of the three Governments most directly concerned. Those efforts could be resumed and continued because the higher interests of mutual co-operation among those Governments and the spirit of goodwill would be able to lead, in the view of the Italian delegation, to satisfactory results for all and to particularly satisfactory results for the order and welfare of the people of Cyprus.

8. Italy was inspired by the most sincere feelings of friendship for the Governments involved in the dispute, as well as the greatest sympathy for the population of Cyprus. The Italian delegation believed, however, that the draft resolutions submitted by Greece (A/C.1/L.168 and A/C.1/L.170), the United Kingdom (A/C.1/L.169) and Panama (A/C.1/L.171), following a debate in which the polemics had sometimes been impassioned, did not represent a useful contribution to the solution of the problem. On the other hand the Italian delegation viewed with favour the draft resolution which had been submitted by India (A/C.1/L.172) and which was inspired by principles which would promote the resumption and development of direct talks among the parties concerned in a loyal spirit of reciprocal goodwill.

9. Mr. BIOY (Argentina) stated that the draft resolutions which had been submitted made it difficult for a country like Argentina, a sincere friend of all parties, to decide which of them to vote for. His delegation therefore, would be forced to abstain on the draft resolutions submitted by the parties. However, the Argentine delegation would vote in favour of any draft that gave a hope of consultations among the parties. Since the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey all recognized each others essential virtues, there was hope that they would agree to such a draft, and as a consequence such an attitude gave hope to the possibility of some reconciliation of views.

10. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that there was no shadow of doubt in his mind that the General Assembly was competent to discuss the question of Cyprus and also competent to make recommendations and suggestions which would lead to a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the problem since its international scope was more obvious than ever before. It was an incontestable fact that Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory and as such fell within the purview of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter, which laid down that the interests of the inhabitants of those territories were paramount and, therefore, the metropolitan country was under the obligation to help the peoples to self-government. The mere existence of such provisions in the Charter made it absolutely impossible, juridically speaking, to consider such matters as problems essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. That being the case, Article 2, paragraph 7, should not have been invoked to argue the non-competence of the General Assembly to deal with the question of Cyprus.

11. As a proof of the fact that the efforts made on the part of the General Assembly, or by some of its Members, were not entirely futile, there was the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom (847th meeting) that his Government firmly accepted the principle of self-determination as the guide for its policy in Non-Self-Governing Territories. The recognition by the United Kingdom had been specifically given in regard to Cyprus. That already was tremendous progress on the path leading to the solution of the problem—a solution which did not necessarily mean the annexation of Cyprus by Greece, but which might be the independence of the island or the continuation of the present status if the population of the island so decided.

12. The recognition on the part of the United Kingdom of the right to self-determination of the Cypriots was not, however, sufficient to assure a solution of the complicated problems of the island. The United Kingdom and Turkey had certain reservations with regard to the holding of a plebiscite. The former invoked the argument of the strategic position of the island in relation to the defence of the United Kingdom and its interest in that region; the latter was concerned with the fate of the Turkish minority in Cyprus. All those arguments proved that there was a long way to go before the question of Cyprus would be satisfactorily solved.

13. With regard to the complaint of the United Kingdom against the Government of Greece (A/3204 and Add.1) his delegation would be unable to give its views for or against the Government accused until it had received sufficient evidence of the guilt which the United Kingdom Government imputed to Greece.

14. With regard to the draft resolutions, his delegation found a number of acceptable suggestions in the first Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.168). That also applied to the draft resolution of Panama (A/C.1/L.171). However, because of its brevity and its simplicity—thus reflecting the fundamental ideas expressed in the debate—the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.172) was more acceptable. Therefore El Salvador would vote in favour of the Indian draft. However, if a vote was called for on the second Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.170), El Salvador would vote in its favour because it considered that, in order to permit the General Assembly to decide on the complaint of the United Kingdom, an investigation should be carried out and clarification should be given. Then, at the

twelfth session of the General Assembly, the First Committee should have enough evidence and enough facts to prove whether the complaint was well founded.

15. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) expressed the sympathy of his country for the people of Cyprus, who were engaged in a struggle for the rights of self-government and self-determination, although the methods of violence employed by them for the realization of their political and nationalist aspirations might be disapproved of. The interest of the people and the Government of Greece in the heroic struggle of Cypriots of Greek origin was to an extent legitimate and justifiable. However, the alleged campaign of hatred and incitement against the United Kingdom and Turkish Governments by Radio Athens and the alleged supplying of arms to the Greek Cypriots, if those charges could be proved, could not be defended.

16. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece had made an eloquent plea for self-determination for the people of Cyprus. The Government of Nepal had always stood by the principles of self-government and self-determination for all peoples, as laid down in the United Nations Charter. In the present case, however, it appeared that the United Kingdom Government had already conceded in principle the right of self-determination to the people of Cyprus and now it was merely a question of how and when it was to be implemented. His delegation had no doubt that the Government of the United Kingdom would show the same insight and wisdom in dealing with the problem of Cyprus that it had always shown in handling colonial questions in the past. The representative of Turkey, for his part, showed an understandable concern for the protection of the rights of the Turkish minority in Cyprus, which, in the opinion of Mr. Shaha, should be adequately provided for in any scheme of self-government for Cyprus. However, it should be remembered in that connexion that the minority could not be allowed to block the progress of the majority towards self-determination and self-government.

17. After having listened to the long debate on the question, his delegation had come to the conclusion that the question was one which could be solved by quiet diplomacy and negotiations among the parties mainly concerned rather than by resolutions and public debates in the United Nations. Therefore Nepal was not in a position to take a stand on the four draft resolutions which had been submitted by Greece, the United Kingdom and Panama. The draft resolution which had been submitted by India (A/C.1/L.172), on the contrary, seemed to meet the requirements of the situation as it was intended to help the early resumption of negotiations among the principal parties concerned, and for that reason it should receive the support of the Committee as a whole.

18. Mr. KOTO MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that, in the view of his delegation, the aspirations of the Cypriots could not be dismissed lightly to the extent that they were genuine. Lord Radcliffe's description of the people of Cyprus seemed to confirm this view. In his report he had stated:

"The people of Cyprus, I have reminded myself, are an adult people enjoying long cultural traditions and an established educational system, fully capable of furnishing qualified administrators, lawyers, doctors and men of business."<sup>1</sup>

Genuine aspirations coming from a people described in such a way deserved deep sympathy. Endeavours should be continued, therefore, to meet the aspirations of the Cypriots in so far as that could be reasonably and lawfully done. The Japanese delegation felt that British common sense should be trusted on that point. On the other hand, it was to be hoped that efforts would be resumed on the basis of mutual concessions and compromise—in other words through negotiations—and of course in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

19. The Japanese delegation had heard with sad consternation the acrimonious exchanges of charges. Such a procedure was certainly not conducive to the atmosphere necessary to a sober solution of the problem. It was with that in mind that the Japanese delegation hoped that three of the most respected nations of the free world would be able to come to a peaceful settlement.

20. After careful consideration, the Japanese delegation had decided to support the draft resolution submitted by India (A/C.1/L.172) because it felt that that draft was most likely to serve the purpose mentioned above, and would vote for priority for that draft.

21. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) said that the Republic of Panama, in submitting its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.171) to the Committee, had done so because it wanted to contribute to a conciliatory solution of the problem of Cyprus. His country also bore very much in mind the welfare, the future, and the very existence of the people of Cyprus.

22. There had been some misunderstanding on the part of the Indian delegation as to the setting up of a Committee to make an on-the-spot study of the Cyprus question as suggested in the Panamanian draft. It was the intention of his delegation, to suggest the establishment of a study committee which might help to create an atmosphere of peace, conciliation and justice to the benefit of the people of Cyprus and of the good relations between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece. That type of study committee had a definite precedent in the work of the Organization, and undoubtedly the representative of India was fully aware of the existence of such committees.

23. The delegation of Panama did not object to priority being given to the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.172), but it wished only to see the First Committee accept the fact that the Panamanian draft resolution was seeking practical results. Some representatives considered that more study was not necessary, but looking into the question, one came to the conclusion that the problem was most complex and that a study committee might contribute greatly to elucidating matters and might present adequate solutions within the competence and jurisdiction of the General Assembly, so that the parties affected, especially the people of Cyprus, might benefit by the work of the Organization.

24. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) said that his delegation would fully support the draft resolution submitted by India (A/C.1/L.172). The entire spirit of the debate had been reflected in the Indian draft. The representative of Panama to a large extent had waived his right as sponsor of a draft resolution in favour of priority for the Indian draft. If the sponsors of other drafts had the same kindness as the representative of Panama and would withdraw their drafts, they would contribute to the solution of the problem. That was why the Spanish delegation had limited itself to sup-

<sup>1</sup> Lord Radcliffe, *Constitutional Proposals for Cyprus* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1956), Cmd. 42, p. 8.

porting priority for the Indian draft resolution. Under the circumstances the Spanish delegation felt it unnecessary to give its opinion on the other draft resolutions.

25. Mr. THORS (Iceland) said that it had become increasingly clear that the people of Cyprus were not happy or satisfied with their present political status or the circumstances prevailing in the island. Unrest, strife and struggle were in fact reigning in Cyprus and many lives were being lost. This situation must not be allowed to continue. Living conditions must be normalized. The atmosphere of fear and hatred must be swept away. Those must be the first steps towards a final solution of the problem.

26. The Icelandic delegation had been very happy to hear the representative of the United Kingdom declare that Her Majesty's Government had in principle accepted the right of self-determination of the people of Cyprus in due time. That was an attitude that could be expected and was appropriate for the statesmen of Great Britain, whose wisdom never failed when an urgent decision confronted them. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the people of Cyprus would in the not-far-distant future be given the opportunity of deciding for themselves on their own fate and future. Until the situation was ripe for such a decision, the Cypriots and the British must themselves find a way to live in peace and understanding. By the word "Cypriots" both the people of Hellenic extraction and those of Turkish origin were meant. The three Governments concerned—those of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey—were under the obligation to make every effort to stop the fighting and the struggle, and to stabilize peace.

27. With those considerations in mind, his delegation could approve of only those drafts which would relieve and help the people of Cyprus and enhance their desire for self-determination. It should also be stated that, in the opinion of his delegation, self-determination did not mean annexation to any country.

28. The draft resolutions presented by Greece (A/C.1/L.168 and A/C.1/L.170) and by the United Kingdom (A/C.1/L.169) would not contribute to the successful solution of the Cyprus question to the best interests of all concerned. Therefore, Iceland could not give its approval to any of those drafts. The same applied to the draft resolution presented by Panama (A/C.1/L.171), although the good intentions behind it were to be appreciated. The Icelandic delegation, on the other hand, was extremely happy to be in complete accord with the delegation of India, and it felt thankful to the Indian delegation for having taken the lead in presenting its own draft resolution (A/C.1/L.172), which might lead to a compromise in an otherwise very difficult and almost insoluble problem. In case there was any doubt whether any formal move had been made to give priority to the Indian draft resolution, the Icelandic delegation would now make a formal motion to that effect.

29. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the 854th meeting the Soviet Union delegation had stated that the United Nations must take measures to ensure the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Cyprus, as well as the human rights provided for in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In accordance with that position, his delegation would vote for the first Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.168) on that subject. As regards the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.1/L.169), his delegation

would vote against it, because it distorted the essence of the situation and depicted as acts of terrorism the national liberation movement of the Cypriots. His delegation would vote in favour of the second Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.170), providing for a fact-finding committee of the General Assembly. In that connexion, he pointed out that Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory which, under Chapter XI of the Charter, was under the observation of the United Nations.

30. The Soviet delegation considered the draft resolution submitted by Panama (A/C.1/L.171) to be inadequate, as it would postpone a decision on Cyprus for at least a year. However, as the procedure proposed by Panama might possibly promote a solution of the Cyprus question, he would vote in favour of that draft. The Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.172), which limited itself to expressing the hope that negotiations would be continued, was also inadequate. However, in spite of all its inadequacies, the Indian draft made it possible to keep the door of the United Nations open to the question of Cyprus. He understood the draft to mean that negotiations would be held with the representatives of the people of Cyprus. If his interpretation was correct, he would vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution.

31. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that priority had been requested for the Indian draft resolution. If there were no objections, he would assume that the Indian draft resolution had been accorded priority.

*It was so decided.*

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by India (A/C.1/L.172).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

33. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), speaking on a point of order, said the Committee could congratulate itself on the results of the vote. The unanimity of the decision constituted a solid foundation for the possible success of future negotiations. In order that that unanimity be maintained, he appealed to the delegations of Greece, the United Kingdom and Panama not to press their draft resolutions to the vote.

34. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece), Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) and Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) agreed not to press for a vote on their respective draft resolutions.

35. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) said that, in his view, the Committee had shown a sense of realism and a desire for moderation in adopting the draft resolution which had just been passed without dissent. It was no secret to any member of the Committee how active the representative of Thailand had been in the last few days in promoting a satisfactory outcome. He also expressed the thanks of his delegation to the representative of India for his constructive and helpful intervention at the 855th meeting. His delegation was sure that the draft resolution reflected the sincere desire of the Committee to further the prospects for a peaceful solution of the problem of Cyprus. That was an end which Her Majesty's Government had constantly pursued, and all the measures it had taken in the island and outside it had been directed to that purpose. It was in order to facilitate such a solution that his Government had brought the question of support for terrorism in Cyprus before the United Nations. Nothing had given greater pain in Great Britain than the sufferings of the peoples of Cyprus, enmeshed as they were in the passions

which had been aroused by that highly complex problem. The debate had illustrated the complexity of the various issues involved and the undeniable interest of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey in the solution of the problem had been fully acknowledged.

36. The draft resolution which had just been adopted recognized three things. First, a solution of the problem required a calm atmosphere. Incitement to violence, support for terrorism, and other impediments to freedom of expression must be eliminated, since peace and freedom of expression went together. A first necessity was to eliminate the terrorism and support for terrorism. Secondly, the draft recognized the complexity of the problem and the need for the three Governments concerned to resume negotiations by such means as they thought fit. Thirdly, essentially, the problem was one which must be settled by all the parties concerned. Thus, the draft resolution met the considerations upon which his Government based its approach to the problem of Cyprus, and therefore had received the favourable vote of his delegation.

37. Finally, his Government was not merely willing, but anxious to contribute all it could to a solution of the problem. His country was not afraid of change, as history had proved. He was grateful for the generous comments on that point made by many representatives in the course of the debate. With good will and determination on all sides, a solution could be found for the tragic quarrel between friends and allies.

38. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) said that the draft resolution adopted by the Committee followed closely the suggestion made by his delegation (845th meeting), which had been acted upon by the General Assembly, on the question of Algeria. A peaceful solution, called for in the draft resolution just adopted, presupposed a dialogue between those directly concerned. A democratic solution must be based upon the will of the majority and the scrupulous observance of the legitimate rights of the minority. It precluded the oppression of a majority by a minority and the subjection of minorities to the will of a majority. It implied the eventual application of the principle of self-determination, which his country had always upheld. In conclusion, his delegation felt that the draft resolution was conciliatory and constructive, and he hoped that it would be adopted by the General Assembly in the interests of peace and tranquillity on the island of Cyprus.

39. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey) observed that the facts that had emerged from the debate were the following. First, no one questioned the fact that, because of the geographic proximity of Cyprus to Turkey and because 120,000 Turks lived on the island, Turkey could not weaken its interest and vigilance in any problem related to the island. In fact, a great many delegations had recognized that Turkey for many reasons, including those of security, had a primary concern in Cyprus. Secondly, the population of Cyprus was a mixed one, composed of two distinct communities, and the equality of their rights, political and otherwise, should be guaranteed. Thirdly, the majority of the Committee had rejected annexation of Cyprus by Greece, by direct or indirect means. Fourthly, terrorism did not create an atmosphere for freedom of expression. Fifthly, negotiations with a view to arriving at a satisfactory solution of the problem should be resumed between the three countries principally concerned. Those points represented the quintessence of the debate on the question of Cyprus.

40. The draft resolution adopted must be interpreted as taking into account the principles of the Charter regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes. It called for negotiations among the interested parties, namely Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, in an atmosphere of peace, an atmosphere free from terrorism and intimidation. The draft resolution took into account the general consensus of opinion of the Committee.

41. On that understanding and for the reasons outlined above, his delegation had voted for the Indian draft resolution. He expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Indian representative and to the representative of Thailand and Iran for their valuable contribution in finding a solution acceptable to all parties concerned.

42. Mr. CHAVEZ ORTIZ (Bolivia) said he had voted for the Indian draft resolution, because it had been drafted in a conciliatory spirit and offered a formula acceptable to the parties directly concerned and because he understood that, in resuming negotiations aimed at a solution of the problem, the interests of the Cypriots would be definitely taken into account, their aspirations to independence and freedom would not be overlooked, and the security of the minorities would be adequately safeguarded. The conclusion drawn from the general debate was that those most directly concerned were the Government of the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus, which sought the right to determine its own future.

43. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) thanked the members of the Committee for their interest in the problem of Cyprus. He paid tribute to the efforts made by the representatives of Iran, Thailand and India to achieve a conciliatory draft resolution. He welcomed the statement of the United Kingdom representative to the effect that his Government was resolved to find a settlement in an atmosphere of peace and harmony. That achievement depended upon the existence of conditions of freedom and the good will of both sides, and he was sure that if such conditions existed the Cypriots would show the necessary good will.

44. He noted that the Indian draft resolution approached the problem from an angle different from that of the Greek draft resolution, which was that the principle of self-determination must be applied to the people of Cyprus. The Indian draft approached the question from the point of view of the quickest possible establishment of a democratic régime as a result of negotiations between the occupying Power and the people to whom the island lawfully belonged. The Greek Government had always admitted that there could be a transitional period before the granting of self-determination to the people of Cyprus. Furthermore, the Greek Government had never contended that Greece was a party directly concerned in regard to that issue. Indeed, the only parties concerned in the question were, on the one hand, the Government which controlled the island, and, on the other hand, the suffering people of Cyprus, who were the true sovereigns of the island. The Greek Government fully shared the view expressed by the representative of India (855th meeting) that the Turkish minority must be given full and complete guarantees. The Indian draft resolution had made it clear that the solution of the problem was one between the people of Cyprus and the Government of the United Kingdom.

45. The Greek delegation, consistent with its general approach and with its decision to resort to moderate means in speaking on behalf of the Cypriots, felt

obliged to state that, without withdrawing its draft resolutions, it would not press for a vote on them. He hoped that those draft resolutions would not have to be revived at a later stage and that, when the General Assembly reconvened, peace and democracy would be established on Cyprus.

46. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in a spirit of conciliation. He was very encouraged by the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by an almost unanimous vote, including the votes of the representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom. That fact was encouraging because it represented a step forward towards a peaceful and just solution of the problem, one that would satisfy the desires of the Cyprus people in accordance with principles of the Charter. He hoped that the parties concerned, which included the people of Cyprus, would begin the negotiations envisaged in the draft resolution as soon as possible.

47. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) said he had abstained on the draft resolution. He had not voted against it because it was based on the principle of negotiations, which his country supported. He had not voted in favour of it because it lacked reference to the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination.

48. Mr. GARIN (Portugal) said that he was happy to see that the views he had expressed in his statement at the 853rd meeting were not inconsistent with the draft resolution just adopted. Therefore, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

49. Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia) joined in the general satisfaction at the result of the vote. His delegation had voted for the Indian draft resolution since it met the requirements of the situation and reflected the consensus of the Committee. The draft resolution emphasized a just and peaceful settlement of the question, taking into account the rights both of the majority and the minority. It also pointed to the methods of negotiations between the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom as the most adequate way of reaching the desired solution.

50. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, because it implied, as interpreted by the previous speaker, that negotiations would be resumed between the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom Government, with a view to achieving a peaceful, democratic and just solution in accordance with the principles of the Charter. He felt that negotiations had been upset by outside influences, by the interference of two Powers which admittedly had interests in the island, but which should leave the question to the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom Government to solve.

51. With that in mind, he had been very pleased to hear the interpretation of the draft resolution given by the representative of Greece. He would have been also pleased if the representative of Turkey had spoken in a similar manner. The delegation of Ecuador felt that the Governments of Greece and Turkey should be excluded from the negotiations, since they had vested interests in the island and had not concealed their emotions about the problem. Negotiations should be left entirely to the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom Government, which had accepted that delicate and complex task. He requested the Chairman to ask the representative of India what he had in mind when he had drawn up his draft resolution and whether the interpretation given by the delegation of Ecuador was the correct one.

52. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said he was gratified at the virtually unanimous approval of the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and expressed his appreciation of the magnanimity of the sponsors of the other draft resolutions in not pressing them to a vote. It was important, however, to remember that the draft resolution adopted did not solve the issue of Cyprus. To think otherwise would be to indulge in political romanticism. What the draft resolution had done was to open the way to speedier, peaceful and just settlement of the question.

53. In the view of his Government, the discussion of the question of Cyprus at the General Assembly had brought to the British mind the existence of a Cypriot nationality. He had confidence that the present leaders of the United Kingdom Government would follow the wisdom of British statesmen who spoke of conciliation when confronted with similar problems in the past. He had no doubt that the vast volume of public opinion in the United Kingdom, combined with the wisdom of the Greek Government, which had moved away from the idea that self-determination signified the union of Cyprus with Greece, would promote a solution.

54. He stressed that his Government had sought to project the position of the Cypriot people, and he wanted to say categorically that India recognized a Cypriot nation, irrespective of any question of language. He hoped that through conciliation the latent sovereignty of the people of Cyprus would become a reality, and that soon an independent Cyprus would take its place in the United Nations.

55. His delegation had submitted the draft resolution because it had sensed that behind all the discussions there was a desire to find a solution through negotiations based on national freedom.

56. The only justifiable interest other parties might have had in the question of Cyprus was that motivated by the desire for the welfare and independence of the people of Cyprus. Any other motivation would be contrary to the Charter, which proclaimed the right of national independence. The Cypriots had been a nation all through their history and a nation did not cease to be a nation because it was conquered. England itself had once been conquered. In conclusion, he said that the draft resolution placed the responsibility for finding a solution to the problem of Cyprus on the United Kingdom Government and on the people of Cyprus.

57. The CHAIRMAN reminded the representative of India that, according to rule 129 of the rules of procedure, the author of the draft resolution was not allowed to explain his vote.

58. Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) said that his delegation had thought of abstaining in the voting until the representative of India had removed the obstacle that impeded progress in the debate by submitting a conciliatory proposal.

59. He expressed his appreciation for the efforts of the representatives of Thailand and Iran in finding a compromise solution, particularly the motion by the representative of Iran that no vote be taken on the other draft resolutions in order to avoid jeopardizing the unanimity achieved in the case of the Indian draft resolution. His delegation felt that, as in the case of Algeria, the draft resolution adopted on the question of Cyprus was almost a perfect solution. Both had expressed either hope or desire. He felt that in matters which, under one guise or another, fell within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, there was no other recourse than to express hope and desire. The



policy of his Government was a policy of principle, and in voting for the Indian draft resolution, his delegation again stated its position that the competence of the General Assembly to take cognizance of matters claimed as essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States was not in question.

60. Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon) explained that he had voted for the Indian draft resolution because he had hoped that its adoption would create the necessary atmosphere for the rightful solution of the question. As far as his Government was concerned, there were only two parties to the situation, the United Kingdom Government and the people of Cyprus. The other two

parties which had intervened in the dispute had waived their claims. He had no doubt that in solving the problem, the United Kingdom would show the same wisdom it had displayed in other countries where minorities existed. He was confident that British statesmen would produce a solution that would do justice to both sections of the population. He hoped that the United Kingdom Government would follow its normal method, and in consultation with the people of Cyprus, evolve a constitution that would guarantee peace and prosperity for Cyprus and would give it a lawful place in the community of nations.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p. m.