



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED  
A/C.1/FV.930  
11 December 1957  
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session  
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 11 December 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ABDOH (Iran)

The Cyprus question /58/ (continued)

Statements were made in the general debate on the item by:

Mr. Ullrich	(Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Quiroga Galdo	(Bolivia)
Mr. Najib Ullah	(Afghanistan)
Mr. Nisot	(Belgium)
Mr. Georges-Picot	(France)
Mr. Sarper	(Turkey)
Dr. Ismail	(Federation of Malaya)
Mr. Zeineddine	(Syria)
Mr. Shaha	(Nepal)
Mr. Novitsky	(Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Loizides	(Greece)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.930. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

## AGENDA ITEM 58

THE CYPRUS QUESTION (A/3616 and Add.1; A/C.1/803; A/C.1/L.197) (continued)

Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): This year the present session of the General Assembly is once again seized of the question of Cyprus. It is a problem which requires an urgent solution in the interests of the people of Cyprus who are striving for freedom, and also in the interests of peace and stability in the area of the Near and Middle East.

This is not the first time that the question of Cyprus appears on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Its discussion at the eleventh session of the General Assembly was concluded by the adoption of a resolution which reflected three fundamental considerations: the solution of this problem requires an atmosphere of peace and freedom of expression; the resolution expresses the desire that a peaceful, democratic and just solution should be found in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter; to this end, negotiations should be resumed and continued.

Since the adoption of this resolution on 26 February 1957, more than nine months have elapsed and during that period we have been witnessing unremitting efforts aimed at materializing the recommendations of the adopted resolution only on the part of the people of Cyprus and its political organizations and spokesmen.

On the other hand, the United Kingdom Government has failed to implement the recommendations of the resolution of the eleventh session of the General Assembly, in particular in creating a favourable atmosphere for the resumption of the suspended negotiations with the representatives of the Cypriot people. The British colonial authorities in Cyprus continue their policies which have aroused justified indignation on the part of the entire population of Cyprus and which have led to armed clashes within the island, bringing about a heavy loss of life of both British and Cypriot citizens. The curfew against the inhabitants of Cyprus has not been revoked thus far. The activity of political and other public organizations is outlawed. The persecution of Cypriot patriots continues unceasingly.

(Mr. Ullrich, Czechoslovakia)

Both the people of Cyprus and its organizations have devoted considerable efforts to achieving the resumption of negotiations with the respective British authorities. However, their initiatives have been repelled so that the negotiations envisaged in the resolution of 26 February of this year have not thus far taken place.

After having been released from British internment, Archbishop Makarios expressed, in his letter addressed to the British Prime Minister, his readiness to participate on behalf of the Cypriot people in bilateral negotiations for the solution of the problem of Cyprus on the basis of the right to self-determination in accordance with the United Nations Charter. However, his offer was rejected by the United Kingdom Government on the ground of alleged necessity of discussing at the same time other and wider interests while seeking a solution of the problem of Cyprus.

The unwillingness of the British authorities to create a more favourable atmosphere for the negotiations, as well as their refusal to enter into negotiations with the representatives of the people of Cyprus, give rise to serious apprehensions as to the future developments within the island, whose population is determined to bring its fight for the recognition of the right to self-determination to a successful end. The liberation movement of the people of Cyprus is of a nation-wide character and enjoys the widespread sympathies of all the peace-loving people of the world, the people of Czechoslovakia included.

Instead of seeking ways and means for a just solution of the question of Cyprus, the United Kingdom is putting forward plans that can in no way satisfy the national aspirations of the Cypriot people. It is well known that the United Kingdom Government intended to solve the question of Cyprus on the basis of the Radcliffe Constitution of December 1956, which was rejected by the Cypriot people as unacceptable because it denies it the right to self-determination and adheres to the maintenance of the colonial status of Cyprus for an indefinite time.

(Mr. Ullrich, Czechoslovakia)

Nor is the other plan of the United Kingdom Government for the division of Cyprus acceptable to the Cypriot people because this solution is fraught with the danger of giving rise to possible complications. The proposed division would have detrimental effects on the future political and economic developments of the island and would constitute a lasting danger of creating new clashes and unrest.

It follows from the statement made by the United Kingdom representative in this Committee on 9 December of this year that the right to self-determination is being denied to the people of Cyprus on military and strategic grounds above all other grounds. The island of Cyprus is, as was pointed out by the United Kingdom representative, of extraordinary importance to British interests in the Near and Middle East. This became manifest last year in particular when the United Kingdom, France and Israel unleashed aggression against Egypt and when British and French troops used the bases on the island of Cyprus for the preparation and carrying out of their aggressive actions.

However, the transformation of Cyprus into a military base is equally in the interests of the United States, especially after the ill-renowned Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine for the Near and Middle East area. That is why the United States supports proposals for the establishment of a so-called "independent Cyprus" whose sovereignty would be guaranteed by NATO.

(Mr. Ullrich, Czechoslovakia)

The aim of this plan is apparent: to subordinate Cyprus to the interests of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc and utilize its territory as a military base against the socialist countries and the Arab countries of the Near and Middle East.

The people of the island of Cyprus resolutely reject similar proposals as well as any forced mediation of NATO because it does not wish to become fettered by aggressive plans of the Western Powers. It is not willing to have its territory turned into an atomic base of NATO or a base of the aggressive forces of the Bagdad Pact against its neighbouring countries.

The people of Cyprus request compliance with the resolution of the eleventh session of the General Assembly and immediate resumption of negotiations with the participation of its representatives and on the basis of the recognition of its right to self-determination. Only negotiation pursued on such a basis may in the end lead to a peaceful, democratic and just solution of this urgent issue.

The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the problem of Cyprus may be solved if the parties concerned will show sufficient measure of good will to do so. The United Nations may perform a significant role by supporting the just demands of the people of Cyprus for the recognition of its inalienable right to self-determination.

Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): Once again for four consecutive years, I have to state the views of the delegation of Bolivia with reference to the question of Cyprus. Our position is very well known within the United Nations. Everybody here knows or understands fully that my country has no material interest in this matter and that we are not animated by unfavourable prejudice or feelings of adversity or animosity.

Today, as yesterday, we cultivate a very sincere friendship with the United Kingdom. We are determined to continue to strengthen the economic and trade links which, since the very beginning of our political independence, characterized Anglo-Bolivian relations. As far as we know, Greece too has inspired feelings of admiration in us, not only because of its glorious past but because Greece is unalterably attached to the cause of freedom, an attachment of which it has given so many proofs in resisting aggression or the attempts of the totalitarian Powers to win it to their side.

(Mr. Quiroga Galdo, Bolivia)

As for Turkey, it is enough for me to say that the Bolivian youth which fought to obtain economic independence was inspired frequently by the undying example of Kemal Ataturk. Let this statement of principle place my delegation in a field of complete impartiality and serene justice. I hope it will likewise prove that, as in the past, we continue to examine the facts clearly on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter and on the basis of the experience which subjected peoples have had in history and who attain freedom after many struggles.

In the view of the Bolivian delegation, the question of Cyprus naturally involves four different problems. We are faced with four countries which are directly interested in the matter. Each of them presents a series of facts which clearly reveal the motive of their participation in the Cyprus drama.

The United Kingdom presents a question from the point of view of colonialism. Its rights to the possession of the island are derived from a treaty signed between the vanquished and the victors after an international war. In accordance with the principles of public international law prior to the establishment of the United Nations, the United Kingdom has legal claims that are apparently irrefutable. The United Kingdom exercises its sovereignty over the island on the basis of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923 which made it the heir to a part of the territory which belonged to "the sick man of Europe, the Ottoman Empire, whose succession was marked by war during the years immediately prior to the First World War.

We do not intend to deny that there was a transfer of sovereignty which enabled the United Kingdom to annex Cyprus, and it became the administrator of the island because of the Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1878. However, one must note that, on the basis of the Lausanne Treaty, only Turkey recognized the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over Cyprus. The other States which had underwritten the Treaty merely took note of that bilateral agreement. On the other hand, as in 1878, the Cyprus people were not consulted when they were given a new master in 1923.

It is not my purpose to analyse the Lausanne Treaty in order to decide whether it conferred on the United Kingdom inalienable rights over the island. However, I wish to state without any subterfuge that I personally am not very much impressed with the pacta sunt servanda. We recognize the sanctity of

(Mr. Quiroga Galdo, Bolivia)

of contracts when they have not been imposed by force or when they do not maintain intolerably unjust situations. Everybody here knows that treaties, as a rule, have a fate similar to that of human beings; that is, they too grow old and die. Treaties cannot be eternal, much less so when they are the result of a war. Treaties cannot be maintained indefinitely within the strait-jacket of the agreements imposed by the victor. At a given moment these treaties must be revised or replaced by others which are in accord with the new situation created by the very development of the international community.

A proof of this is the present international condition of Cyprus in relation to the United Nations. The transmission of information by the United Kingdom to the world Organization clearly reveals that the juridical bond between the Metropolis and the colony is now being weakened or modified, as though the Lausanne Treaty which transferred sovereignty had become obsolete, and as though a step backward had been taken to the Anglo-Turkish Agreement of 1878, the provisions of which recognized for the United Kingdom its sole right to administer the island.

I wish to state clearly that I am referring to the validity and scope of the agreements of 1878 and 1923, not in order to question the rights of the United Kingdom to possess Cyprus, but simply to prove that in this matter that power raises the problem, the origin and characteristics of which are clearly colonial. Having presented this premise, we must now go on to the political aspect of the controversy. Since the signing of the Lausanne Treaty until latter days, a great deal of water has flown under the bridges of the Thames.

The British Empire has become a Commonwealth of sovereign and independent States. The East Indies has become the Republic of Indonesia. In Africa and Asia, many nations are now independent which, in the past, filled pages in the book of universal history with their greatness. Their representatives are here with us today and are determined, as we are, to preserve the peace of the world and to raise the standard of living of millions of human beings.

What does all this mean? It means what we all know: that colonialism has ceased to exist in the world.

We are now living at a time when nationalism is rampant and colonialism is in the twilight stage. Under the auspices of the Charter of the United Nations, the peoples that are still under colonial domination are preparing for or are fighting to obtain their freedom.

In the light of these events that give a new face to civilized humanity, what can the provisions of the Lausanne Treaty mean? They cannot retard the march of history. Such treaties have become obsolete because of the pressure of human events. The only multilateral treaty that is fully valid in our time is the United Nations Charter. In conclusion, we believe that the colonial problem of the United Kingdom in Cyprus can be solved only by applying the principles of the Charter, particularly the one regarding the right of peoples to self-determination.

The second problem which my delegation sees in the Cyprus question is based on the role played by the people and the Government of Greece. Rightly or wrongly, Greece has been attributed with active intervention in the rebellion in the island. It would be a resurgence of old claims with respect to certain territories which, because of the force of circumstances, remained outside the mother country. It was evident that, having attained independence in 1832, Greece gradually drew the boundaries of its political map by way of unification with territories occupied by Greek-speaking people. In this unifying process, language was a determining factor and played a decisive role. The old and highly treasured language of Homer, modified by the vocabulary of barbarians, was for many centuries the receptacle of a national soul. Hellenism survived innumerable vicissitudes because of the harmonious speech of its children. This is why, 2,500 years after his death, Homer continues to live because of the superb manner in which he mastered his mother tongue.



The Greek State reaffirmed once again its national personality when it heroically resisted the Nazi forces of invasion. It was not strange that when the political map of the world was being redrawn, there was the intention to reintegrate within that country the communities that spoke Greek, which was the case of the majority of the people on the disputed island of Cyprus.

It is true that Greek statesmen, particularly the Minister for Foreign Affairs who is present here, have emphatically declared that their country does not wish to annex Cyprus. On the other hand, it is no less obvious that events which have taken place in the island in the last seven years have accounted for the participation of Greece in the debate as a natural spokesman for its Cypriot brothers. And this raises tacitly if not explicitly a problem of reunification.

We cannot forget that in 1950 the plebiscite organized by the Archbishop of Cyprus was held. A total of 215,000 votes were cast, 95 per cent of which were in favour of union with Greece. This plebiscite cannot be fraudulent as the colonial authorities have stated since the United Kingdom has refused from that time to allow a similar act to be carried out under the auspices of the United Nations.

There can be no doubt that the repeated statements of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece truthfully states the foreign policy of his Government to renounce any policy of reunification. But can we doubt that the Greek nation persists in implementing the ideas of the movement in favour of enosis? This truth, which cannot be denied, gives rise, in the opinion of my delegation, to the existence of the second problem which I have just briefly analysed.

The third problem in the question of Cyprus is the result of the interest that Turkey has in the future of the 100,000 Cypriots of Turkish origin. My delegation fully understands the concern of the Government at Ankara. No one is entitled to censure the Turkish statesmen because of the efforts that they make to obtain a suitable status for their brothers. However, my delegation considers that any suggestion to partition the island is unacceptable. The fact that the island is inhabited by 400,000 Greeks and 100,000 Turks is not a basis for partition. It does not authorize us to apply a type of solemn justice, not allowing the island to have the benefits of geographical and political unity.

The 100,000 Turkish Cypriots facing the 400,000 Greek Cypriots raise a problem of minorities, but not of territorial partition.

The history of the last years teaches us that nothing is solved when territories are divided, territories which through the years have had a clearly defined political and physical geography. It would be absurd to add another case to the many that today constitute seeds of discord and endanger the permanent peace and security of the world.

The problem of the Turkish minority can have no solution other than the one indicated by historical experience: giving that minority a status that will guarantee its free development in accordance with its own national characteristics, particularly as regards its religion and language.

In general this is the third problem, namely, the problem of the minorities which has been raised in connexion with the Cyprus question.

The fourth problem constitutes the very essence of the Cyprus drama, and it has been raised by the main player: the Cypriot people.

So far, we have examined the question through the eyes of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey. Let us now examine it from the point of view of that suffering people.

What does the Cypriot people want? The history of my country has taught me that when a people rises in arms against foreign oppression, the purpose of the rebellion is always the attainment of freedom and political independence. The appearance of guerrillas, generally called bandits or wrongdoers, is a most favourable sign that the time of cowardice and scorn has ceased. The regular armies, with captains from the best military academies, can do nothing against these guerrillas. The history of Latin American rebellions is full of episodes that have become legends in which the humble priest places improvised weapons under his priest's garb and puts himself at the head of a group of peasants in order to attack the colonial representatives in the cities and in the countryside of his native land.

Something similar happened in Cyprus when Archbishop Makarios became the interpreter of and spokesman for the aspirations of his people. We saw him in New York in 1954 when he went among the sixty delegations which were then accredited to the United Nations. We were impressed with the faith and idealism that his noble personality radiated.

(Mr. Quiroga Galdo, Bolivia)

This does not mean that the Archbishop of Cyprus proceeded in the same manner as the Mexican or Bolivian priests. Undoubtedly, Archbishop Makarios has no sword; but nobody can deny that that prelate is the leading guerilla, the spiritual leader of the Cyprus rebellion and the personification of the ideas of freedom of half a million human beings. This was well understood by the authorities of the colony, who, in order to decapitate the revolution, deported him far from his country. However, this extreme measure served only to increase the impetus and the aggressiveness of those who had started the insurrection.

The influence of Archbishop Makarios on the inhabitants of Cyprus is proved by the fact that he could persuade those who had rebelled to suspend the fighting for an indefinite time. That means that Archbishop Makarios is the valid spokesman in negotiations which, taking account of the economic and strategic interests of the United Kingdom in Cyprus, would permit that island people to decide their political future freely.

In February this year, the eleventh session of the General Assembly approved resolution 1013 (XI), which recommended to the parties in conflict that they enter into direct negotiations in order to resolve the Cyprus question in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. On that occasion I stated, on behalf of the delegation of Bolivia, that we were warmly in accord with the terms of that resolution, but I also felt it desirable to give a note of warning that it was a respite being granted by the United Nations to those who had repeatedly stated that they were prepared to negotiate, without, however, having implemented their offers.

Unfortunately, ten months have already elapsed, and as we approach the closure of the twelfth session of the General Assembly we realize that that balanced resolution that we adopted has served for nothing. We find ourselves in exactly the same situation in which we were in February last. Freeing Archbishop Makarios, reducing violence in the island, replacing the military Governor with another British subject of a liberal spirit -- these are all special factors that might have created the proper climate for carrying out the desired negotiations. However, everything seems to indicate that there remains the will to impose and not to negotiate.

(Mr. Quiroga Galdo, Bolivia)

For all these reasons, it seems to us that the time has come when our Organization must state firmly the general desire that the parties in conflict resume negotiations so that the people of Cyprus may freely express their sovereign will. In our judgement, these negotiations should grant the holding of a plebiscite under United Nations auspices, a plebiscite in which the inhabitants of Cyprus of Greek and Turkish origin can pronounce themselves with respect to the essential points of the four problems that are raised simultaneously by the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey and the people of Cyprus. In our view, these points are the following. First, do the people of Cyprus wish to become a part of the British Commonwealth? Second, do they wish to be united with Greece? Third, do they wish to be united with Turkey? Fourth, do they wish to become a sovereign and independent State? Only when the inhabitants of Cyprus have pronounced themselves with complete freedom shall we know the real purpose of the suffering of thousands of men and women, and only then shall we be able to state with legitimate pride that, in accordance with the principle that recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination, half a million people have been able to find their destiny under the auspices of the United Nations.

Mr. NAJIB-ULLAH (Afghanistan): The Cyprus case is another problem which concerns our friends. We have old brotherly and cordial relations with Turkey and we also have most friendly and traditional relations with the United Kingdom and Greece. The discordance between these three friendly countries on this very problem has been regretful and a matter of concern to us. We have always wished to see the Cyprus problem resolved on the basis of justice and fairness and in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

The most important facet of the Cyprus problem is the aspirations of its population towards freedom by exercising its right of self-determination. This basic characteristic of the problem is considered by Afghanistan to be the most important because it involves the human conception which is, in our belief, the foundation of the principle of the equality of nations, freedom and democracy. These aspirations of the Cypriots are genuine, but, as is known, the people of

(Mr. Najib-Ullah, Afghanistan)

Cyprus do not form a homogeneous entity; they are composed of a great majority of Greeks and a very distinct minority of Turks. The distinction between these two communities is very pronounced, and the events of the last three or four years have clearly shown that these distinctions cannot be underestimated.

I do not mention this particular side of the Cyprus problem to insinuate the idea that the friendship and co-operation of these two communities are impossible, but I say this to emphasize that without consideration of this particularity the solution seems ambiguous. So, from the point of view of my delegation, while the future of Cyprus should be settled on the basis of the right of self-determination, we must emphasize that, through all reasonable, possible and democratic ways, the majority, as well as the minority, is entitled to the exercise of this legitimate right.

(Mr. Najib-Ullah, Afghanistan)

The delegation of Afghanistan appreciates and sympathizes with the natural feeling of the hellenic nation towards the Greek Cypriots, but at the same time it cannot ignore, nor can it have less sympathy for, the sentiments of the same nature which have been expressed by the Turks towards the Turkish community on the island. The cultural, historical and geographical considerations in this matter cannot be excluded from the other factors.

My delegation has no intention of going into the details of last year's troubles and tragedies of Cyprus, in which every side suffered heavily, but we are happy to notice, in the statement of Mr. Noble, the United Kingdom representative, the readiness of the British Government to envisage various future possible solutions of the Cyprus question on the basis of self-determination and through unconditional negotiations and broadmindedness. This characteristic of the statement of the United Kingdom representative gives us great hope that the problem will be dealt with in the future on the basis of the democratic principles of the United Nations Charter. We are also happy to notice that the attitudes of our Greek friends and of the Turkish Government, which were described so eloquently by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece and my friend and colleague Mr. Selim Sarper respectively, clearly show that they are basing their respective approaches to the problem on conformity with the right of self-determination and on a spirit of conciliation. These sincere expressions of the respective points of view of the three Powers indicate that, notwithstanding the existing differences, there is more hope now than ever before for a friendly and just settlement.

While we approve the interest and concern of the United Nations with regard to the Cyprus problem, and while we believe that that problem is one to be dealt with by the General Assembly, we do not think that a solution desired by all the interested bodies can be obtained through our debates alone. The Afghan delegation is of the opinion that all the interested parties should enter into negotiations on an objective and rational basis, being animated by their spirit of good will and long-standing cordial relations. Naturally, like all other faithful adherents to the Charter, we believe that in those negotiations the genuine and legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus, as well as the right of self-determination, should be an essential consideration.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The position of the Belgian delegation on this question has been stated previously. Since it has not altered, a brief recapitulation will suffice.

While it is frequently fairly difficult to provide evidence of the right of sovereignty, that is not the case with regard to Cyprus. British sovereignty over the territory results from clear-cut, unequivocal texts. It is certain, in the circumstances, that what is involved here is the exercise of that sovereignty. The questions raised here fall within the framework of constitutional organization -- that is, a realm essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United Kingdom. Article 2 (7) of the Charter is clear cut. It says:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State..."

Can it be argued in those circumstances that United Nations intervention is authorized by those provisions of the Charter which cover human rights and the principle of self-determination?

Nor can the international aspects of the question of Cyprus be invoked since they will not justify United Nations intervention in the realm of essentially domestic jurisdiction, the provisions of the Charter being stipulations entered into between States that are all international in character. Article 2 (7) of the Charter declares that none of these -- nothing contained in the Charter -- permits intervention in the field of domestic jurisdiction. The Belgian delegation remains convinced, therefore, that the United Nations is not competent to intervene in the question of Cyprus. Accordingly it will, as it has in the past, refrain from discussing this problem. It considers that the rule pacta sunt servanda, cited yesterday by the representative of Colombia, imposes respect for and compliance with the prohibitions of Article 2 (7) of the Charter.

Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has listened carefully to the speeches which have been made, and especially to those of the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, which in this matter are the parties chiefly concerned. We have been gratified by the character of those statements, which has been moderate in the main, since, in view of the complexity of the problem, we still think that a solution must be sought in a setting of tranquillity and calm reflection.

The French delegation wishes to note, as it did last year, how greatly it regrets that this dispute between three countries of Europe, which are allied in a number of regional organizations and with all of which France has had traditionally excellent relations, should again have come up before this Committee. We consider that there are more suitable procedures for the peaceful settlement of the question and that United Nations intervention, quite apart from any legal aspect, is not necessarily capable of fostering the development which all of us wish for. It is in this light that the French delegation will determine its final attitude to the draft resolutions which may be presented in the course of the debate.

The Cyprus question, in common with most of the questions presented to us, may be examined in the light of two different sets of considerations, the first relating to the law and the other to the facts.



(Mr. Georges-Picot, France)

As regards the law, there is no room for hesitation. The island of Cyprus is administered by the United Kingdom in full sovereignty, and I may add that this legal situation is conceded by the Greek Government itself. This is therefore an internal matter belonging to the domestic jurisdiction of the United Kingdom, and in virtue of this fact it is entirely outside the competence of this Organization. Once this point is conceded, and to the extent to which the British Government has not refused to have the Assembly deal with this dispute, which, in this matter, places the British Government in opposition to the Greek Government, the French delegation -- without abandoning the position of principle dictated by the Charter -- can deal only with the elements of fact.

Without entering into all the details, it seems to us that in this respect the situation in Cyprus over the past few months, that is, since the adoption of resolution 1013, far from having remained static, has in fact evolved in a favourable direction. This evolutionary character of the situation constitutes, in our opinion, the most important element. To cite only a few facts, which have indeed been cited by a number of delegations, the liberation of Archbishop Makarios, the attenuation of the emergency measures which have been imposed by circumstances, the considerable diminution of armed action in the island, the nomination of a civilian Governor-General, and particularly the continuation of talks between the Governments concerned, constitute so many particularly encouraging symptoms. Finally, we have heard statements by authorized spokesmen which have happily confirmed our feelings in that respect. The representative of the United Kingdom, for his part, recalled to us that the continuing policy of the United Kingdom was that self-government should be established in Cyprus. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece, on his side, told us repeatedly that his country has no territorial claims on the island of Cyprus, adding -- and I hope he will permit me to quote his words -- "we shall respect the will of the people of Cyprus, whatever its decision". Finally, the representative of Turkey, who, with a vigour which is very comprehensible, defends the interests and the rights of the Turkish minority, has not mentioned an extreme formula which has been envisaged on occasion and which would call for the partition of the island. It would seem to us that these are excellent starting points for a compromise solution.

(Mr. Georges-Picot, France)

In the meantime, the French delegation is convinced that we can and, in fact, must trust the Government of the United Kingdom. In the realm of the emancipation of non-self-governing peoples, the Government of the United Kingdom has given sufficient evidence of what Mr. Krishna Menon so aptly calls its political wisdom so that we here should not endeavour to complicate its task by our actions.

In order not to delay the course of the debate, I now come to an examination of the draft resolution presented by the Greek delegation in document A/C.1/L.197. In its operative part, that draft resolution refers to the Cypriot people's "right to self-determination". In this connexion, the French delegation, in its speech on the same subject at the eleventh session of the General Assembly, explained at length what it thought of the proclamation by our Assembly of a right which appeared to be thought of by some as having magical effects. The representative of the United Kingdom will surely authorize me to recall, in this connexion, that he himself very aptly declared during the eleventh session:

"The question of the circumstances in which the principle of self-determination can be applied in any of the territories of a Member State is clearly an internal matter for that State itself. It is clearly not a matter in which another State can ask the United Nations to intervene."

(A/C.1/PV.847, p.59-60)

This irrefutable argument is sufficiently well known to make it unnecessary for me to recapitulate it this year, and, if I thought it proper to bring out this point, it was only in order to emphasize that the draft resolution, at least in its present wording, would seem to me to serve no useful purpose and perhaps even to be dangerous. I say that it will serve no useful purpose because in this case the United Kingdom alone can judge the time and circumstances in which the Cypriot people can attain self-determination. I also say that it can be dangerous to the extent to which it might encourage new incidents on the spot, incidents which might ultimately boomerang against their initiators and run counter to the objective which they profess to seek. That is why a great measure of circumspection is called for in this matter.

(Mr. Georges-Picot, France)

These are the reasons why the French delegation will be unable to vote for the draft resolution. As I have already indicated, our attitude in this matter is prompted solely by our concern not idly or uselessly to complicate or to make more difficult the efforts of the United Kingdom Government, which alone -- in agreement with the parties concerned -- has the right to seek the elements of a peaceful, democratic and just solution, for which this Assembly has already appealed almost unanimously.

Mr. SARPER (Turkey): With the permission of the Chairman, I wish to use my right of reply to answer a few points raised yesterday by the Foreign Minister of Greece.

Mr. Averoff-Tossizza complained about the tone of the second part of the statement I made on 9 December. As a matter of fact, as I explained that day, the first part of my statement was the only one which I had prepared for this debate. In that part, I used the following words:

"It is the opinion of my delegation that the time has long since arrived for the Cyprus question to be stripped down to its bare essentials, so that it may be discussed in calm and serenity for the purpose of discerning the real issues involved, preparing a more appropriate atmosphere and exploring the possibilities which exist to achieve progress towards a solution satisfactory to all concerned." (A/C.1/PV.928, p.3)

This continues to be the opinion of my delegation. If, in the second part of my statement, which was in the form of a reply, I reluctantly had to mention certain facts, that was an unpleasant task, but I do not think that its initiation can be attributed to the Turkish delegation. However, I prefer to leave aside any recriminations and to answer a few points.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The Foreign Minister of Greece said in his statement that the Turkish point of view was that 18 per cent of the population -- by the way, this proportion is not correct, but I take it from Mr. Averoff-Tossizza -- should decide upon the fate of 80 per cent of the population of Cyprus. As a matter of fact, that statement has nothing to do with the Turkish point of view. We have never said that the Turkish Cypriots should decide upon the fate of the Greek Cypriots. We have said that if self-determination is applied in Cyprus, then, in the special circumstances of that territory, it should be applied equally to the Turkish and Greek-speaking Cypriots, so that each of those peoples could decide upon their own fate. Therefore, it is not we who demand that they should decide upon the fate of the Greek-speaking Cypriots, the situation is exactly the reverse. It is the Greek delegation that insists that the future of the Turkish Cypriots should be decided upon by the Greek community, even to the extent of incorporating more than 100,000 Turks under Greek rule against their will.

Ours is a conciliatory attitude which would recognize certain rights for each community in certain eventualities. The Greek attitude is an intransigent one which, in the special circumstances of Cyprus, is clearly against all rules of equity and of justice, as well as being an unrealistic approach.

In my first statement I mentioned the fact that unfortunately the Greek delegation has often sought to establish similarities between the situation in Cyprus and other situations which have nothing in common with that issue. In his statement yesterday, the Foreign Minister of Greece gave many illustrations which proved the point I have raised. Mr. Averoff-Tossizza spoke about sovereign and independent States and said that it would be a calamity to recognize the right of accession to minorities. My Government is in complete agreement with that point of view. Far from even implying such a state of affairs in regard to independent countries or to national entities in non-self-governing territories, I said exactly the opposite in my first statement. However, Cyprus is not an independent State nor is there a distinct Cypriot nationhood. Furthermore, it is not Turkey which has asked for a change of sovereignty in Cyprus. It is the Greek Government which has placed this question in the political arena. Therefore, even if the argument of Mr. Averoff-Tossizza were relevant to the question, it

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

would apply to the Greek position in this matter, and not to the Turkish position. In another part of his statement, the Foreign Minister of Greece claimed that if the Turkish Cypriots refused to be incorporated with Greece, this would be a new calamity to non-self-governing territories as it would create a precedent. It would hinder the prospects of independence for many lands which we hoped to see as new Members of the United Nations.

I really admire the great ability with which Mr. Averoff-Tossizza has tried to link the Cyprus question with a problem which all of us have very much at heart. However, even the most superficial examination of this argument will show that it is based on a fallacy. The Cyprus question is not a question which arises from the prospects of independence or of national entity. Cyprus is a land on which there is a Turkish community and a Greek-speaking community. Immediately north of Cyprus there is an independent Turkish nation, and 700 miles away there is an independent Greek nation. If the question of a change of sovereignty for Cyprus were to be considered in the form of the annexation of the land to one or the other of those two countries -- I say, if such an eventuality were to be considered-- the question under discussion would be the retracing of the frontiers between those countries. According to the Greek point of view, such an eventuality should exist.

In international law, this is a matter which has nothing to do with the independence of non-self-governing territories, and, therefore, can never form a precedent. Questions relating to accession to existing States are in a class by themselves in which a great number of circumstances have to be taken into account. In any case, if the disposal of territories having a mixed Turkish and Greek population were to create a precedent for other cases, with which I maintain they have nothing in common, the worst precedent would have been created by Greece, because, as I have already stated, Greece has annexed the Turkish province of Western Thrace, which had an overwhelming majority of Turks. This annexation was made through the refusal of the right of self-determination. If the annexation of territories of already existing States were considered as a precedent for non-self-governing territories aiming at independence, then Greece would have furnished the worst possible precedent. However, I continue to maintain that in international law these matters stand on completely different ground.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The position of the Foreign Minister of Greece with regard to the relations between the Turkish and Greek-speaking Cypriots has not been easy for me to understand clearly during the last two years in which he has pleaded the cause of Greece in the General Assembly. Sometimes he has said that these relations were good. At other times, as in the letters which he circulated last year, for example, he has said the opposite. Yesterday he expressed concern about the possibility of a tragic strife between the two communities and warned the General Assembly that the blame in such an unfortunate eventuality would be laid on the British. I hope that the eventuality mentioned by Mr. Averoff-Tossizza will never take place. There could be no greater calamity than an increase in the tension which has already caused such a strain, both in Cyprus and in the area. However, I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the main reason for the tension between the two communities in Cyprus has been explained in detail by my delegation during the last debate. The regrettable tension between the two communities has been heightened by the press campaign in Greece against the Turks in general and the Cypriot Turks in particular, of which I gave many examples last year. Furthermore, the hideous acts of Greek terrorists against innocent Turkish Cypriots has made the situation more dangerous. The propaganda and agitation for enosis have placed the Turkish Cypriots in a state of self-defence, in a state in which they feel they must do all that is in their power if they are not to find themselves under the rule of a Government which has taken a position so tragically against them.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

These are the real reasons for the tension between the two communities. These are the sources of danger which responsible statesmen in all the three Governments concerned should try to eliminate.

In the leaflets which are continually being distributed by the Greek terrorist organization, the Turks of Cyprus are promised a dire future if they fall under Greek rule. The insinuations in these leaflets tell them that their day will come. During the rioting which is now being organized by the Greek terrorists to impress the General Assembly, grave warnings have been made to the Turkish Cypriots. According to information which my delegation has received from the Turkish Consulate in Cyprus, on 8 December the Turks in the village of Mitsada were warned over loudspeakers to leave their homeland immediately. The Turks have asked for the protection of the Governor.

In such circumstances, how can it be expected that the Turkish Cypriots would place themselves under the custody of the Greek community? The Turkish Cypriots cite as an example the fate of the Turkish community on another island which was ceded to Greece. When, in 1898, Prince George of Greece was appointed High Commissioner to the then Turkish island of Crete, by international agreement, the Moslem population of this island diminished within the subsequent two years by more than 40,000.

There are other examples to which Turkish Cypriots point as causing their anxiety about their own future if they were placed under Greek rule. A lack of understanding of these anxieties will not be conducive to a satisfactory solution of the Cyprus question.

The Foreign Minister of Greece has also blamed the Turkish Cypriots for being more numerous in the Islands' auxiliary police force. The reason for this is that the Greek policemen were either killed or intimidated by the Greek terrorists if they co-operated with the Administering Authority. The terrorists have aimed at enforcing their own law, the law of terror, in Cyprus. As the Turkish people of Cyprus are the first target of such a disorder, how can they be blamed for co-operating on the side of law and order? Mr. Averoff has also insinuated that Turkish policemen were responsible for cruelties. Such assertions based on the evidence adduced by criminal terrorists are hardly worth an answer. However, I must point out that other unpleasant and unjustifiable accusations against the

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Turkish Cypriots have been made before by organs of the Greek Government. The foremost result of such unjustifiable accusations is to increase the ardour and determination of the Turkish Cypriots not to be ruled by those who show such a denial of justice towards them.

The Foreign Minister of Greece has stated that, during the explanation of votes in last year's debate, six representatives agreed with his own interpretation. I have not had the opportunity to study all of these statements again. However, whatever their contents may be, I have the deepest respect for them, as every delegation is entitled to its own understanding of a text, provided that no additional words are necessary in order to arrive at a certain meaning. I repeat, I have the deepest respect for the points of view of these delegations, but I cannot see Mr. Averoff's point in citing the names of these six delegations, since there were nine other delegations which took an explicitly different point of view during the course of the debate. Seven others expressed themselves implicitly in the same direction as those nine delegations. I do not wish to make a point about this fact because the text of the resolution and the conditions under which it was accepted by the interested parties are clear and require no explanation.

As I said during my first statement, if a sincere desire for a peaceful, democratic and just solution exists among all the parties directly concerned, this resolution does include all the necessary elements for co-operation to this end. On the other hand, if an intransigent attitude is assumed by one Government in the hope of imposing its own point of view upon the others, then the conciliatory efforts of the General Assembly will have been wasted, no matter what the wording of a resolution may be.

I may have to intervene again this afternoon or tonight in order to disclose the views of the Turkish delegation on the draft resolution which has been tabled by the delegation of Greece.

Dr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya): As my delegation listened to the debate in which the Committee is now engaged we were struck by the fact that certain salient features of the problem withh Cyprus is now facing have been resolved satisfactorily in the course of our march towards independence. I may add here that at one time many competent observers and commentators were in despair of our ever being able to solve our problems.



MW/jg

A/C.1/PV.930  
38-40

(Dr. Ismail, Malaya)

In our case, as is also the case in Cyprus, there was the problem of the relationship between a colony and a colonial Power; the problem of a racial minority; the problem of interested parties whose interests in the country would be altered by a change in the status of that country.

(Dr. Ismail, Malaya)

In Malaya and Cyprus the colonial Power is the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is offering to Cyprus almost the same conditions for independence as it did to Malaya. These conditions are mentioned in the speech of the representative of the United Kingdom, and I need not weary the representatives here by quoting it.

Our experience has shown that the United Kingdom of today is earnest and sincere in its desire to lead its dependent territories along the peaceful path to independence and nationhood. This is not to say, as the case of Malaya illustrates, that it and its dependencies will always see eye to eye on such questions as the pace with which independence should be achieved or the means of resolving such problems as communalism. However, these questions can and have been successfully resolved to mutual satisfaction, as is again illustrated in the case of Malaya.

We come now to the question of the racial minority. This is the problem which has delayed, or even hindered, many a dependent territory from becoming independent. This is because the people in the dependent territory think in terms of majority and minority in its fight for freedom. Actually it is wrong to speak of majority and minority in a dependent territory with a multi-racial population because in such a country, due to the past policy of a colonial Power to divide and rule, there are racial groups, each group possessing its own majority and minority opinions on such a vital issue as independence. It is the duty of the leaders who want to liberate their country from the colonial yoke to determine majority opinions in each racial group on the question of independence, and to weld these racial majority opinions into a national unity fighting for the independence of the country. In my country, as I am sure in other dependent countries, there were minority and majority opinions among the various racial groups on the question of independence. Through the leadership of our present Prime Minister, my country managed to obtain racial majority opinions on the independence of my country. I would suggest that the Greek Cypriots try to get a majority opinion among the Turkish Cypriots on the question of independence. This can only be achieved by peaceful, democratic means. Intimidation and terrorism will only breed hatred and reprisals. Furthermore, to harp on the point that because 82 per cent of the population

(Dr. Ismail, Malaya)

is Greek Cypriot and only 18 per cent Turkish Cypriot -- the latter being a minority must abide by the decision of the majority -- is to frighten further those Turkish Cypriots who would otherwise support the cause of independence.

I now come to my final point, the problem of the interested parties whose interests in the country would be altered by a change in the status of the country. The advice of my delegation to them is the same as the advice which we gave to the rulers of my country, namely, help the people of the country to achieve independence and their positions will be secure. We also gave this advice to the Malays not to complicate the issue by looking towards Indonesia, nor the Chinese to look towards China, the Indians towards India or the Ceylonese towards Ceylon.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): In the debate on the Cyprus question at the last session, the Syrian delegation made a modest effort to analyse the situation and to clarify Syria's position concerning it. The Syrian delegation also tried to indicate what in its view ~~was~~ the way to a solution of the Cyprus problem. We do not intend in this present statement to cover the ground previously covered.

May I be allowed, however, to resume the view of Syria on the Cyprus question and to deal in particular with the developments which have intervened since the resolution of the Assembly of last February, and to do so in the light of the statements made in the present debate by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey and other representatives.

The Cyprus question is essentially and by its very nature an issue of liberation from colonial rule. It is therefore strictly an issue to be settled primarily by the people of Cyprus acting in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly the principle of self-determination. In this issue the Cypriots are a party. Their national life is indeed at stake. The other party is the United Kingdom by virtue of its present colonial rule over Cyprus. Because the principle of self-determination is applicable to Cyprus, the people of Cyprus are entitled to make full use of that principle either by a plebiscite under United Nations supervision or by any other means.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The United Kingdom as a signatory of the Charter is enjoined to live up to the principles of the United Nations and to fulfil its obligations under the international treaty which is the Charter. The United Nations, on the other hand, is duty-bound to fulfil its mission and thus use all its influence in order to see that a Member State, the United Kingdom in this case, and other Member States concerned, apply the Charter in actual dealings concerning Cyprus. This applies to the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, Syria or any other Member State.

For the United Kingdom to hasten to cover itself behind domestic jurisdiction would be, in our view, a unilateral action on its part taken to frustrate or to forestall the legitimate activity of the United Nations. That erroneous concept of the United Kingdom's domestic jurisdiction as including Cyprus is already a forsaken concept for all practical purposes, and this concept appears to be hollow and devoid in the circumstances of real substance. It is therefore evident that in essence there are two parties to the Cyprus question, namely, the people of Cyprus themselves, who are the real party, and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The United Nations is also interested in seeing its Charter being applied. The co-operation of all three sources, the United Nations, the United Kingdom and the Cypriots, is necessary in order to arrive at a peaceful, just and democratic solution, as recognized by General Assembly resolution 1013 (XI) of 26 February 1957. Neither Greece nor Turkey, nor Syria for that matter, nor any other Member State, is a party to the Cyprus issue as a matter of liberation from colonial rule.

At the last session, the General Assembly indicated to the people of Cyprus and to the United Kingdom the path which the Assembly found appropriate, in its wisdom. That way was negotiations, so that the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus might arrive at a solution at the behest of the United Nations. Such negotiations were not held.

Developments on Cyprus have not altogether awaited that United Nations decision. Discussions between the United Kingdom and the Cypriots were undertaken with a view to a solution of the Cyprus question. Even before the Cyprus question was discussed at our last session, these discussions took place between the United Kingdom and Archbishop Makarios, representing the great majority of the people of Cyprus. But these discussions were not of the kind which satisfied the United Nations. The United Nations called for negotiations.

Prior to the February resolution of the General Assembly, the United Kingdom lacked the necessary realization of the sense of equality between the two sides around the discussion table. When the two sides failed to agree, the United Kingdom concluded the discussions by sending the other side, Archbishop Makarios, into exile. Discussions which are held in such a spirit and concluded in such a manner can hardly produce a democratic, just or peaceful solution. They can only indicate to us how ready one of the sides was to use duress against the other side as a final end to the argument.

The United Nations resolution calling for negotiations came into this background. The United Kingdom has not as yet responded to this goal. The British attitude, as we see it, is a negative one in answer to the positive invitation of the United Nations to negotiate. The people of Cyprus have responded favourably to the call of the United Nations. They certainly merit all our solicitude and sympathy. Their liberty is their right. Their readiness to negotiate is in line with the theme of the United Nations for a democratic, peaceful and just solution.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

We are all aware that the United Kingdom took the stand that it would not be possible for it to negotiate or to resume discussions as long as the so-called terrorism prevailed on the island. It would have been reasonable to imply that if the so-called terrorist activities would cease, then the United Kingdom would resume negotiations in a spirit of peace and would negotiate a settlement with the people of Cyprus.

What was going on in Cyprus, at the hands of the EOKA movement, was not terror but a full-fledged national revolt for liberation. But that activity of EOKA was nevertheless halted last March. Since then the United Kingdom has continued to evade true negotiations with the Cypriots. Whether there was fighting on the island or no fighting, the United Kingdom stand did not change.

The reasons given are quite varied, but they do not prevent our seeing the reality of the situation. The statement which was carefully prepared and made by the representative of the United Kingdom does convince us that the United Kingdom continues to be adamant as regards the application of the principle of self-determination to the Cypriots or as to negotiations with them. It is therefore necessary for the United Nations to resume its efforts at this session, which it is now doing, and to exert its influence for the future so as to prevail on the United Kingdom to abide by the Charter and the recommendations of the Assembly and to negotiate with the Cypriot people.

The existence in Cyprus of a large minority of Turkish culture gives to the Cyprus question a special aspect. This minority is not one which was recently formed by colon residents brought into Cyprus at the hands of the colonizing aggressive policy. The members of that minority are real Cypriots. In dealing with the problem it is therefore essential to consider the special aspect which results from the existence of that minority.

Turkey has expressed its concern over the future of that minority. To that extent the concern of Turkey is legitimate. But to use this concern to an extent that would go beyond safeguards for the future of that minority as a minority would, in our view, be an excess of concern, utilized for purposes other than those which are legitimately called for. There should be constitutional and international safeguards for that minority so as to ensure that that minority will continue to enjoy its cultural life in peace.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

But we fail to see how the existence of that minority could be a reason for depriving the vast majority of Cypriots from exercising their rights. That would be unrealistic, undemocratic and unjust. In no case can the existence of that minority be a good reason for denying the right of self-determination to the people of Cyprus, as one people, or for hindering them in achieving their liberty. Furthermore, we have been given to understand, and to understand clearly, by those responsible for the future of Cyprus, that they are prepared to provide legitimate safeguards of a constitutional and international nature which should make the minority legitimately contented.

So much for the question of the Turkish minority. Let me now turn to the incidents of the Cyprus question as regards the international field. The future of Cyprus is of some concern to the countries around it, particularly Greece, Turkey and Syria. The Greek and Turkish delegations have respectively explained the positions of their countries. May I now explain the position of Syria. May I say from the outset that no matter how important the future of Cyprus might be to either Greece, Turkey or Syria, the question of Cyprus which is now before us is essentially an issue of liberation. The people of Cyprus alone are the ones vitally interested. Syria therefore stands strongly in support of its definite view that the future of Cyprus must be determined by the people of Cyprus themselves and no other people. The inclination in Cyprus to realize a union with Greece in the future may eventually lead to enosis. Even then the matter would be one for the people of Cyprus freely to decide upon. Any course which the people of Cyprus would freely follow, whether it is enosis or some other course, would be their own affair. The people of Cyprus, in any eventuality, such as enosis or some other course, are supposed to act on their own, while taking into full consideration the best interests of the international community and particularly the interests of their immediate neighbours.

That international interest brings into the picture the possibility and feasibility of neutralizing or demilitarizing the island of Cyprus so that the island would cease to be used as a base from which attacks on other countries can be staged or carried out. The neutralizing of Cyprus or its demilitarization is, in our view, a justifiable concern of the States which are in the immediate vicinity of the island.

AW/ns

A/C.1/PV.930  
49-50

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The State which is nearest to the island is Syria. We are happy to know that Greece intends to view favourably the idea of demilitarizing or neutralizing the island. Of course, Greece is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Turkey is another member of NATO. Syria is not a member, nor does it intend to be a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or of any other bloc of Powers. But NATO is a transient thing, incidental to the cold war. It is already in many respects, obsolescent for many practical purposes. The very conditions which brought the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to include the Middle East are fundamentally changing.



(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

The liberation of Cyprus from British imperial rule would be a service to the cause of liberty and peace of the countries around Cyprus. It would at one and the same time set Syria at ease, allay tensions between Greece and Turkey and end the use of Cyprus by the United Kingdom as a military base to exert colonial influences all over the Middle East. It would also end tensions between the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus themselves. The liberation of Cyprus is therefore a necessity in all these respects.

Having considered the fact of the existence of the minority of Turkish culture on the island and having proposed that constitutional and international safeguards should be given to that minority, we can now visualize the effect of the Cyprus situation free from the question of the Turkish minority on other countries. Historically speaking, Cyprus and Syria were one country for about three-quarters of the time during the last 4,000 years. Cyprus was a part of Syria long before ancient or modern Greece or Turkey came into being. I said ancient Greece because even at that time Cyprus and Syria were one. Greece is an old country, but there are many countries that are far more ancient. When Athens came into being, Damascus was already a city which was 2,000 years old.

Ethnically speaking, the people of Cyprus and the Syrians are closely related. In modern times, Syria and Cyprus were one country together with Turkey until 1878 under the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire was not a Turkish Empire; it was an Ottoman one. Turkey was a part of it, as was Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and other parts. The heirs to the Ottoman Empire are those countries which formed it at one time down to the time when the Empire was dismembered. Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon, which were part of the Ottoman Empire, are therefore entitled to speak about modern historical ties with Cyprus. Turkey has no more right than Syria in that respect. That is the historical and legal position. Yet we of Syria do not make any claim on Cyprus of any kind whatsoever.

The Foreign Minister of Greece has made a lucid, sincere and able exposition of the situation at the last session and at this session. He sincerely tried to be objective. In our view, he was successful. We were very highly impressed by his convincing statements. Attacks on his opinion by other delegations are

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

their right, but contesting clear facts is not. Even less can there be a right to question the sincerity and legitimacy of the Greek position as expressed by the Foreign Minister.

From the geographic point of view, Cyprus is also closely related to Syria. One can see Cyprus from Syria with the naked eye. It is much further away from Greece than it is from Syria. But more important is another fact: we can also see how Cyprus was used as a base for attack on Syria when it was not one country with Syria. Over and over again in our long history Cyprus served as the door to invasion when the sea was not in our hands. History is useful in teaching us lessons.

We have had to fight some of our hardest battles on and around Cyprus or in defence of Cyprus. We felt at ease when, after 636, Cyprus reverted to Syria. This feeling continued to 1878 during which time Cyprus formed one country with Syria with the exception of short intervals.

Since 1878, however, the situation has changed. But the geographic position of the island has remained constant and now makes my country worry about military activities that are based or can be based on Cyprus. So recurrent was the fact that Cyprus in the distant past and in recent times was used by other powers to attack Syria or to exert military pressure on it that we are legitimately worried and we are entitled to be preoccupied. More recently, last year, Cyprus was used to stage attacks against the Arab homeland. Even this year, military might based on Cyprus or depending on it was used as a means of military pressure on Syria. That might was not used in any such manner against Turkey or Greece.

The island of Cyprus has at no time been a source of danger to the people of the British Isles. Syria is therefore entitled more than any other country to consider the future of Cyprus from the point of view of its strategic and other international implications with respect to the neighbouring countries. It is evident, therefore, that in any international negotiations concerning the future of Cyprus in its wide international aspects Syria is entitled to participate actively and fully. My country is as entitled or more entitled to do so than any other country of the area. This is our position on this aspect of the problem, a position which we take this opportunity to make clear before the United Nations and equally to Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

In conclusion, my delegation would like to sum up by stating the following:

First, the Cyprus question, being an issue of national liberation, is to be solved by the application of the principle of self-determination. The people of Cyprus are entitled to fashion their own destiny as they think fit.

Secondly, in order to facilitate the liberation of the island, negotiations between the two parties concerned -- that is, the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom -- should be entered into. The United Nations is in duty bound to insist that such negotiations be started and concluded in a manner which would ensure an agreed solution on the basis of liberty for Cyprus.

Thirdly, the Turkish minority should be given all those constitutional and international safeguards which would ensure the continued enjoyment of its life as a minority.

So much for the question of Cyprus per se. Let us now look to the effect of Cyprus on neighbouring countries. On that, our conclusions are the following: the countries neighbouring Cyprus can be legitimately concerned to the extent of seeing that Cyprus is not used by any power as a base to stage attacks against any other power in the area. This is imposed upon us by the geographic position of Cyprus. It is a matter which should set Syria, Greece and Turkey at ease. There are good reasons to demilitarize or neutralize Cyprus, and for that purpose international negotiations can be held. Syria, Greece and Turkey are surely entitled to participate in these negotiations if and when they are held. Yet it is clear in our mind -- and let me repeat this -- that such negotiations are not now under consideration except as an eventuality. The question before us is the liberation of Cyprus. This entails other negotiations which have already been called for by the United Nations. These negotiations are to take place only between the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus. No good reason of any kind has been put forward which allows us in the United Nations to hinder the exercise by the people of Cyprus of their right to self-determination.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

We are definitely in favour of the prompt liberation of the island, no matter what consequences that may have on other countries, including my own. The Assembly has used its conciliatory efforts in the past; they were unfortunately unsuccessful. While the Assembly may seek further conciliatory endeavours, it is now time for the United Nations to act according to the Charter and to prevail on all its Members to support their Charter and to act in such a manner as to help fulfil the mission of the United Nations.

Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): My delegation has listened with great respect and attention to the respective points of view presented by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey on this question of Cyprus. We have nothing but sympathy for the people of Cyprus, who have for some time been engaged in their life and death struggle for the right of self-determination. Although the methods employed for the realization of their legitimate aspirations by the Greek Cypriots might not always be approved by all, the interests of the people and the Government of Greece in this struggle of the Cypriots of Greek origin for self-determination is understandable.

The Foreign Minister of Greece has made an eloquent plea for self-determination for the people of Cyprus. My Government has always stood by the principle of self-determination for all peoples as laid down in the United Nations Charter. In the present case, my delegation feels that the United Kingdom Government has already conceded in principle the right of self-determination to the people of Cyprus and that now it is merely a question of how and when it is to be implemented.

The representative of Turkey showed an understandable concern for the protection of the rights of the Turkish minority in Cyprus, which in my opinion should be adequately safeguarded in any future governmental scheme for Cyprus. However, it must be noted in this connexion that the minority should not be allowed to block the progress of the majority towards self-determination and self-government. The right of self-determination in the case of the Cypriots should be exercised in accordance with the established democratic procedure in this respect.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

We do not think that the division of Cyprus will provide any solution to the question. Nor can a national minority in the ratio of one to eight ever demand a partition of the country as a safeguard of their rights, especially when that minority population is interspersed with the majority population and it is scattered all over the territory.

In our opinion, the question of Cyprus can best be settled if it is left to the Government of the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus themselves. The interest of the Greek and Turkish Governments respectively in the populations of Greek and Turkish origin is, within certain limits, justifiable and understandable, but their interest can never be treated or regarded as the over-riding factor in the solution of this question, because it is for the people of Cyprus to determine their future as they wish, without any pressure from anywhere.

In view of the attempts that were made by the Government of the United Kingdom after the passage of the resolution this year by the Assembly, we feel that, given patience and restraint on all sides, the question of Cyprus can be solved in due course through quiet diplomacy and negotiations among the parties concerned rather than through resolutions and public debates in the United Nations.

The charges and counter-charges of atrocities and terrorism might only spoil the atmosphere for negotiations, and, in my humble submission, recriminations and vituperation are alien to the purpose of finding a solution to this question. However, the hopeful and redeeming feature of the present debate has been that the Foreign Minister of Greece has welcomed the reference to progress towards self-government, coupled with a clear statement on the principle of self-determination, in the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom. In our opinion, such a formula will eventually make negotiations successful and solve this question to the advantage of all.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

We are confident that the Government of the United Kingdom will act in a spirit of fairness, justice and understanding, as has been its tradition in handling colonial questions throughout its history.

The considerations I have briefly set forth in the above paragraphs will determine our attitude towards the Greek draft resolution and other draft resolutions that might be brought before us.

Mr. NOVITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): At the eleventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Byelorussian delegation has already had occasion to put forward its point of view on the Cyprus question. At that time we pointed out that recent developments in the Near and Middle East have made a swift solution of the Cyprus question in accordance with the right of peoples to self-determination particularly urgent in the interests of peace and security in this region of the world. The present situation in Cyprus and in the Near and Middle East in general has been caused by the actions of the colonial Powers, and this requires the United Nations to take more effective measures to liquidate the dangerous situation there, which is fraught with serious consequences as regards the cause of peace.

In reality, we witnessed last year how the island of Cyprus was used as a base for the launching of the Anglo-French aggression against Egypt. At the present time there are increasingly frequent Press reports that the island of Cyprus has been assigned a special place in more dangerous plans which call for the transformation of Cyprus into an atomic weapon base for the NATO countries. The Daily Telegraph and Morning Post in April 1957 stated:

"It has long since been recognized that Cyprus is ideally situated as a military base and that that represents its one and only purpose. It represents an ideal base for guided ballistic missiles of intermediate range. If we ever again use Cyprus for operational purposes, it will be for purposes either in connexion with the Eisenhower doctrine or in connexion with the Baghdad Pact. In carrying out any of these assignments, Cyprus will be an unsinkable base for guided missiles. Guided missiles of intermediate range -- about 1,500 miles -- based on Cyprus could defend the whole area covered by the Baghdad Pact with the exception of Pakistan."

(Mr. Novitsky, Byelorussian SSR)

In an article published in a British newspaper in April 1957 it was also stated that British armed forces in the Middle Eastern region would in future include bomber squadrons, based on Cyprus, capable of launching nuclear weapons.

These facts were not denied by the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Noble, in his statement on 9 December in this Committee, and he could not deny them. He recognized that the Cyprus question was regarded by the United Kingdom Government from the point of view of military and strategic interests. Certainly military and strategic interests are not the least important in the view of the United Kingdom Government.

Mr. Noble said:

"We have strategic responsibilities in Cyprus which must be safeguarded effectively in any future arrangement. I need not specify what they are, since everyone knows that we have traditional friendships, alliances and interests in that area and that we are a member of two organizations of collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations." (A/C.1/FV.927, p. 16)

Apparently, he was referring to organizations for collective self-defence, and he meant, of course, such blocs as NATO and the Baghdad Pact.

We deemed it essential to dwell on the plans for utilizing Cyprus for the military strategic purposes of the colonial Powers because, in our opinion, they determine to a considerable extent the approach of those countries to the solution of the Cyprus question. The ruling circles of those countries give first place not to the interests of the population of Cyprus or to the strengthening of peace and security, but to military strategic considerations and plans for using Cyprus territory for aggressive purposes. All this accounts to a considerable degree for the determination of the ruling circles of the United Kingdom to retain and perpetuate colonial mastery over Cyprus at all costs. The retention of colonial mastery over Cyprus can only contribute to the carrying out of plans for the utilization of Cyprus for military purposes.

In statements in this Committee the representatives of the United Kingdom and Turkey have sought to convince us that the question before us now is not colonial in nature. Mr. Noble himself has said that the problem of Cyprus is not a purely colonial problem. Mr. Sarper, speaking for Turkey, repeated this point and stated that the true problems related to the Cyprus question have nothing in common with colonialism. But the record is at variance with these assertions of the United Kingdom and Turkey. A typical colonial regime has been established and maintained in Cyprus.

During the few months that have elapsed since the end of the eleventh session of the General Assembly the British colonial authorities in Cyprus, under the pressure of public opinion, have taken a number of measures which have created a semblance of a desire on the part of the colonizers to bring about an abatement



of tension on the island and to grant greater rights to its population. But, in practice, what has changed in Cyprus when compared with the situation which obtained during the eleventh session of the General Assembly? We may say that there have been no substantial changes. According to data presented by the Secretary-General of the Federation of Trade Unions in Cyprus and by the Greek delegation to the United Nations -- particularly in the very apt speeches in this Committee by the Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Averoff-Tossizza -- Cyprus is still being held in the throes of emergency legislation adopted a number of years ago. The arrest of persons without any sort of charges being made against them and without any kind of judicial proceedings being instituted continues. More than 900 persons are still being detained in concentration camps. Systematic dragnets and searches are being carried out in towns and villages. Those arrested are subjected to tortures and undignified, mocking treatment. Trade union leaders are subjected to persecution and oppression. All of this took place in the past as well.

In such circumstances, can one speak of progress or of an easing of the colonial regime in Cyprus? Small wonder that the population of Cyprus, in these conditions, not only has not reduced the intensity of its struggle against the colonizers, but has actually intensified it. The colonizers and their supporters seek to compromise the Cyprus people's movement for freedom and independence, calling its participants "terrorists". They try to represent matters as if the struggle against the colonizers was being waged not by the people of Cyprus but by small groups of men. But these assertions are neither new nor original. Wherever there is a struggle against colonialism the members of the liberation movement are represented to public opinion as mere terrorists.

In support of their position the British colonial authorities declare that the struggle of the people of Cyprus against colonial mastery is losing intensity. This was said also by the representative of Turkey, Mr. Sarper, in a speech he made on 9 December in this Committee. The argument is not a new one. But a few days ago American newspapers, and the New York Times in particular, published reports speaking of serious clashes between Cypriots and British troops, during which dozens were wounded and arrested.

Whatever the colonizers may say, and however hard they may try to represent their desires as reality, they will not succeed. The struggle of the colonial peoples for independence and liberation from colonial oppression is growing and becoming more intensified. The struggle is a just one; therefore, it enjoys the support and sympathy of peace-loving mankind. For its part, the United Nations must take all measures to see to it that all colonial peoples secure the right to self-determination and independence.

At its last session the General Assembly adopted a resolution which provided a basis for the solution of the Cyprus question in accordance with peaceful and democratic principles and in conformity with the right of peoples to self-determination. However, as events prove, the United Kingdom Government has done nothing to implement that resolution. The population of Cyprus remains under colonial domination, and is still being deprived of the right to decide its own future.

In advancing various unrealistic plans for the solution of the Cyprus problem, the colonizers endeavour to ignore the will of the Cypriot people and to foist upon it unilateral conditions beneficial only to the colonizers themselves. The problem of Cyprus cannot be settled in that way. The present session of the General Assembly must take all measures to ensure that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the people of Cyprus shall have the right to exercise self-determination. That would be a serious contribution to the strengthening of peace and the elimination of tension in that part of the world.

Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece): The position of the Greek delegation on the Cyprus item has been stated by the head of my delegation, the Foreign Minister of Greece. I am speaking as a member of the delegation, but, being a Cypriot, I should like to give some first-hand facts on this problem and to make an appeal to my fellow representatives in this Committee. In doing so I feel obliged to stress, first, the fact that the Cyprus question is a question primarily concerning the Cypriots themselves.

The Cypriots, on their own initiative, knocked at the door of the United Nations long before the Greek Government decided to sponsor their item. It was in 1950 -- as I am sure will be remembered by my fellow representatives who attended the fifth session of the General Assembly at Lake Success and Flushing Meadow -- that a Cypriot delegation was seen for the first time in the United Nations enlightening representatives on the Cyprus question and asking for moral support. As a member of that Cypriot mission of 1950 I cannot forget the kindness of our very distinguished colleague, Mr. Entezam, who, after his election as President of the fifth session of the General Assembly, received the Cypriot mission and listened to it in a very courteous manner. Since it is a privilege to be an old and permanent Member of this august Assembly, then I feel obliged to mention that the same courteous attention was extended to our Cypriot mission of 1950 by His Royal Highness Prince Wan of Thailand and by Mr. Belaunde of Peru -- I mention the representatives who are present now at this session of the General Assembly -- Mr. Romulo, of the Philippines, and Mr. Thor Thors of Iceland, who are the ones I can remember after so many years.

At that time, in 1950, Greece did not want to sponsor the Cyprus item, believing in a friendly solution outside the United Nations. The next year, at the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris, a Cypriot delegation again gave a reminder of the existence of a Cypriot question. At the seventh session, in 1952, the Archbishop of Cyprus, Makarios, personally appeared in United Nations circles and got into touch with many delegations. Again, Greece decided not to sponsor the demand of the Cypriot people for self-determination, trying once more to find a solution outside the United Nations.

(Mr. Loizides, Greece)

During that seventh session, on 16 December 1952, a resolution was passed by the General Assembly -- resolution 637, which we had the pleasure of hearing mentioned yesterday by the representative of Colombia -- recommending to the administering Powers the application of the principle of self-determination in the non-self-governing territories. Cyprus is a non-self-governing territory. The Cypriots naturally requested the administering Power to respect this resolution -- of course, in vain.

On 12 August 1953, therefore, Archbishop Makarios, on behalf of the Greek Cypriots, who constitute 81 per cent of the whole population of the island, submitted a petition to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, asking for the realization of the right to self-determination so far as the Cypriot people were concerned. The petition had to be sponsored by a Member State in order to have the possibility of being included in the agenda. Once again, Greece did not desire to sponsor it, continuing its efforts to find a solution outside the United Nations.

The Cypriots therefore decided to try to find another Member State willing to become the sponsor. I myself was authorized to come to the United Nations and appeal to delegations of several Member States to undertake the sponsorship. As a matter of fact, I did come here and I got in touch with some delegations and discussed the matter with them. I wrote a letter to the Asian-African group, which at that time was the champion of self-determination, asking for permission to appear before them and speak to them. His Royal Highness, Prince Wan of Thailand, who at that time -- in September 1953 -- was chairman of the group, kindly answered that my request would be put before the group for consideration.

At that moment, however, the Greek delegation declared in the General Assembly that the Cyprus petition concerned Greece but that Greece was looking forward to having bilateral negotiations with the United Kingdom and that, if that effort proved of no avail, then it would ask for inclusion of the Cyprus question in the agenda of the next session. Greece did try to have bilateral discussions but met with an obstinate refusal on the part of the United Kingdom Government. That was a further mistake of the United Kingdom Government, which was later reproached repeatedly in the House of Commons. After that British refusal, Greece was obliged to sponsor the Cyprus demand before the United Nations at the ninth session of the General Assembly in 1954.

(Mr. Loizides, Greece)

What was the result? As is known, the item was included in the agenda, but the General Assembly decided not to pass a resolution recommending a solution of the Cyprus question. That was also a mistake on the part of the United Nations. This hesitation in assisting a people demanding respect for the principles and purposes of the United Nations amounts, I think, to responsibility for the developments which followed in the island. The Cypriots, receiving no response either from the United Kingdom or from the United Nations, were driven to active resistance against their colonial status. This resistance stopped after the General Assembly, in its resolution of 26 February 1957, expressed the desire "that a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations". But, unfortunately, the desired result has not been achieved. Therefore, you are once again faced with the Cyprus question, and you are, we believe, fully conscious of the consequences of your present responsibility.

Yesterday we heard the representative of the United States advising us to have patience and to solve the question through quiet diplomacy. You have heard about the evolution of the Cyprus question. I have heard about quiet diplomacy for solving our problem since I was a school boy in Cyprus. We waited and we waited. Our patience, the patience of my generation -- my patience -- was already exhausted in 1931, when we had the first uprising and when I was exiled from Cyprus because I took part in that uprising. Again, the Cypriot people showed patience. A second World War came. But now again their patience is exhausted. You have seen that we meet with no response, either in the United Kingdom or in the United Nations. That is why the Cypriot people are driven to what is called violence. We do not like violence, but we are driven to it after so many years in which we have tried to find a solution through peaceful means.

Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom will remind you that Mr. Loizides is connected with the present "terrorism" in Cyprus or that his brother is in prison because of that "terrorism" in Cyprus. I am obliged to say that I consider it an honour that I am a fighter for the freedom of my country. In 1931, I was called a ring-leader; now we are called terrorists.

(Mr. Loizides, Greece)

If you knew the Cypriot students, their intellectual and moral level, you would understand for what ideology these people are fighting. Our Foreign Minister mentioned the other day the case of Evagoras Pallikarides, a young man who was executed in Cyprus, and he referred to the last letter that Pallikarides wrote to his mother. This letter reminds me of a certain American "terrorist". In a train going from New York to Detroit recently, I saw a large coloured picture showing British soldiers prepared to execute a young man and, under that picture, were the words: "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country". The words were uttered by Nathan Hale, the American "terrorist". Such are the "terrorists" of today in Cyprus.

I might mention that fortunately the majority of the British public has a different opinion from that of the British Government. When that young man was executed in Cyprus, we read poems in the British press praising him as a hero and a patriot.

After this brief introduction, I should like to proceed to the main body of my statement, dealing with the relations between the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus. First, however, I should like to ask the Chairman whether he wishes me to continue now or at the beginning of the afternoon meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): It might be preferable if the representative of Greece were to continue his statement at this afternoon's meeting. I should also like at this time to provide some clarification: Representatives who participate in the debate are supposed to represent the delegations of which they are members. They can only participate in the debate in the name of the delegation which they represent.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.