



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 77: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS; REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

*\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.*

*Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.*

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 77: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS (continued)

1. Mr. PAPADOPOULOS (Greece) said that the purpose of United Nations peace-keeping and peace-making operations was to defuse crisis situations and promote political solutions in accordance with the Charter and General Assembly resolutions. Nevertheless, certain doubts had been expressed about the real contribution made by the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). It had even been said that UNFICYP's presence was a deterrent to the willingness of the parties involved to seek a negotiated solution. As the Secretary-General had pointed out in his report to the Security Council (S/18880, para. 73), that argument was fallacious and dangerous.

2. In view of their significant contribution to the aims of the United Nations, peace-keeping operations should receive the whole-hearted support, especially financial support, of all Member States. The problem of financing was less acute for peace-keeping forces whose expenses were covered from assessed contributions. In that regard, Greece noted with satisfaction that one of the larger contributors had begun to take steps to settle its arrears. UNFICYP was financed through voluntary contributions, however and although many countries had responded generously to the Secretary-General's appeals, its financial situation remained precarious. As a result, troop-contributing countries had been forced to assume a much greater part of the financial burden. Greece regretted that Sweden had felt obliged to withdraw most of its contingent, but was gratified that Austria and Canada had increased their contingents to make up for those cutbacks. Greece had supported the Secretary-General's proposal that UNFICYP's expenses should be covered through assessed contributions.

3. The presence of peace-keeping forces could not remain hostage to measures of budgetary or financial constraint. Peace was the main obligation of the United Nations. Greece hoped that the increased awareness of the importance of the United Nations in the area of peace would also be reflected in UNFICYP's finances. For its part, it would not fail to assume further duties in order to arrive at a solution which secured the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus.

4. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Hungary) said that the role and authority of the United Nations must be strengthened. The only possible solution to the global problems of mankind was the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, as proposed by the socialist countries, in which United Nations peace-keeping operations could play a significant role.

5. His Government was confident that peace-keeping operations could be used more effectively if agreed guidelines were drawn up. The success of such operations also depended on the continuous support of the Security Council and of the parties concerned.

(Mr. Karbuczky, Hungary)

6. As a member of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, Hungary reaffirmed its support for a constructive exchange of views on how to enhance the effectiveness of United Nations peace-keeping operations. The work of the Special Committee, which was the appropriate forum for joint efforts, should be reactivated and accelerated and his delegation therefore supported the renewal of its mandate.
7. Mr. FISSENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his country, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on a comprehensive system of international security, subscribed to the idea of the indivisible nature of security put forward by Mr. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in a recent speech. In that regard, the socialist countries were proposing the implementation of a programme which was based on the principles of the Charter and would restore the United Nations role as the main instrument of peace.
8. His country understood the financial problems confronting United Nations peace-keeping operations and had recently paid its assessed contribution for 1987 to the Organization's regular budget.
9. With regard to the Secretary-General's statement in the annex to document A/42/512 that potential causes of conflict must be monitored, that task should remain in the hands of the Secretary-General, who must have all the necessary means to fulfil it.
10. Conditions existed for a useful exchange of ideas on the conduct of peace-keeping operations and on enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in that area. The Special Committee should reactivate its work and his country considered it timely to adopt a resolution which included a recommendation to that effect.
11. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) expressed his belief that the United Nations Charter continued to provide a solid basis for creating conditions conducive to international peace and security. He emphasized the increasingly important role played by the United Nations in peace-keeping and in harmonizing collective efforts to achieve peace, security and economic advancement.
12. Swaziland had listened with dismay to the report of the Chairman of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, however, and joined those delegations which had urged that the Special Committee resume the work entrusted to it.
13. With a view to preventing the resumption of armed conflicts, he appealed to Member States to show greater political will and provide concrete financial guarantees for safeguarding international peace and security. He also hoped that all nations would refrain from the use of force and exercise maximum restraint in their international relations.

14. Mr. TRIPATHI (Nepal) said that his country believed in the preservation of peace through the prevention of war. It endorsed the Secretary-General's view that timely and effective multilateral action must be taken before problems reached crisis proportions and that the United Nations future peace-keeping capacity must be strengthened. Nepal had been participating in United Nations peace-keeping operations since 1957. Only recently, two Nepalese soldiers had sacrificed their lives in the cause of peace in southern Lebanon. Nepal's contribution had not been limited to the sacrifice of human lives, however. Despite its status as a least-developed country, Nepal continued to bear a very heavy financial burden as a result of its contribution to peace-keeping operations. In that regard, it appreciated the initiative taken by the Soviet Union and other countries to pay their assessed contributions, and hoped that all States would fulfil their financial commitments.

15. The success of peace-keeping operations depended on the drafting and strict observance of practical guidelines for such operations. As one of the countries contributing troops to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Nepal hoped that the formulation of basic operational guidelines would be reactivated. Such guidelines would help broaden the theoretical framework, thereby enhancing the safety and effectiveness of peace-keeping operations.

16. Mr. MENON (Singapore) said that the term "peace-keeping operations" did not appear in the United Nations Charter; it had come into general use only in the 1960s, to describe a concept and practice that had evolved out of necessity. Peace-keeping operations had become an important instrument of the United Nations in preventing local or regional conflicts from escalating. He agreed, however, with the representative of Nigeria that peace-keeping operations could only stabilize conflict situations pending the attainment of acceptable political solutions.

17. In spite of their proven value, peace-keeping operations had to face an increasingly serious financial situation since, to date, the arrears owed by certain Member States totalled approximately \$US 400 million. A large proportion of that sum was owed by certain permanent members of the Security Council, without whose agreement peace-keeping operations would not have been established in the first place. It was baffling that those permanent members should now refuse to pay their share of assessed contributions because they did not approve of such activities. On the other hand, many small States which had no say in the establishment of peace-keeping operations, were dutifully paying their share. His delegation welcomed the recent decision by the Soviet Union to pay its outstanding contributions amounting to \$US 197 million and hoped that other permanent members of the Security Council and other Member States which still owed contributions for the various peace-keeping operations would follow that example.

18. Mr. KHAN (India), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the statement by the representative of Pakistan concerning the presence of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) in a disputed area and pointed out that the UNMOGIP base in India was situated in sovereign territory.

19. Mr. SHAH (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his country's position on the question of Kashmir was well known.

20. Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the statement by the Greek Cypriot representative that UNFICYP had failed to prevent the invasion and occupation of Cyprus by Turkey in 1974 and said that he wished to set the record straight. Accordingly, he drew attention to the statement made by Archbishop Makarios to the Security Council on 19 July 1974 in which he had described the intervention of Greek troops in Cyprus as a violation of the independence and sovereignty of the Republic. The Greek Cypriot representative had, in a sense, been right when he had noted that UNFICYP had failed to prevent the invasion of Cyprus, because otherwise Archbishop Makarios would not have had to make the statement he had made to the Security Council. He wished to recall the events which had led to the creation of UNFICYP by the Security Council in 1964, namely, the atrocities and terror which had caused Turkish Cypriots to flee their villages en masse, abandoning homes, lands and herds. He also wished to point out that, simultaneously with the arrival of UNFICYP contingents in Cyprus in 1964, the island had been clandestinely invaded by an incomparably larger force, consisting of no less than 20,000 Greek troops.

21. Although Turkey had heard with interest the Greek side's views on the proposed dispatch of an international peace force to Cyprus, he believed that the problem of Cyprus required a negotiated solution rather than another peace force on the island. A comprehensive framework for a negotiated settlement existed, namely, the Draft Framework Agreement on Cyprus presented by the Secretary-General in March 1986, which had not yet been accepted by Greece. The Greek Cypriot representative had also attempted to underline the importance which his country supposedly attached to the withdrawal of non-Cypriot forces from the island. That particular aspect of the problem was covered in unambiguous terms by the Secretary-General's document. The Greek Cypriots, therefore, had only to join the Turkish Cypriots and the Secretary-General, who had been waiting for them for a long time at the negotiating table. The Turkish Cypriots, as everyone knew had declared their readiness to create a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation in Cyprus, based on the equal political status of the two peoples on the island. As in the past, the Greek side would have to choose between a negotiated settlement and another Pyrrhic victory.

22. Mr. VIKIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed regret that Turkey had turned a question as important as United Nations peace-keeping operations in Cyprus into an occasion for polemics and propaganda. Perhaps the little that the representative of Turkey had said about certain issues raised by Cyprus, specifically the proposal to demilitarize Cyprus and establish an international peace force on the island, could be interpreted to mean that Turkey was considering the proposal. Turkey had refused to comply with many Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions on, inter alia, the withdrawal of Turkish occupation troops from Cyprus. The representative of Turkey was trying to convince the Committee that the Turkish military occupation of 37 per cent of the territory of Cyprus over the past 13 years was a peace-keeping operation. It was surprising that he had not asked the Committee for voluntary contributions for

(Mr. Vikis, Cyprus)

the maintenance of the Turkish peace-keeping forces, which totalled some 35,000 men and 300 tanks. If the maintenance of some 2,000 UNFICYP soldiers had created a large deficit, Turkey would have to request substantial assistance in order to maintain those occupation forces in Cyprus.

23. Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that when the Greek Cypriot representative argued that UNFICYP had failed to prevent the invasion of Cyprus in 1974, he was attempting to accuse Turkey of having invoked certain rights which were simply contractual obligations clearly laid down in the Treaty of Guarantee. His complaint was tantamount to recognizing that the Turkish intervention had provided unconditional support for the security of Turkish Cypriots in their own home land. Turkey was proud to accept that accusation.

24. The Greek Cypriot representative had wished to give the impression that he was speaking on behalf of an independent and sovereign entity. To refute that claim, he wished to read out a resolution adopted unanimously on 26 June 1967 by the Greek Cypriot Parliament, which established as the final objective of the Greek Cypriot community the integration of the entire island of Cyprus into the Greek State. That that resolution had never been rejected or annulled spoke for itself.

25. Mr. VIKIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to refer to only one point raised by Turkey: the right of that country to invade Cyprus under the Treaty of Guarantee. In response, he drew attention to the statement by the representative of Cyprus in the Security Council accusing Turkey of violating the purposes and principles of the United Nations, particularly Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter which called on Members of the Organization to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The consequences of the 1974 invasion proved that the Turkish initiative had not been appropriate to the functions of a State party because its objective had not been to restore constitutional order in Cyprus. It should be pointed out that under article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee States parties undertook to consult together and, if concerted action proved impossible, each State party had the right to take action with the sole aim of restoring the state of affairs created by the Treaty. Contrary to Turkey's claims, article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee neither referred to nor authorized military actions or the use of military force, otherwise that article would conflict with Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which was a higher norm of international law.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.