

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UN. LIBRARY

12 DEC 1957



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.929
10 December 1957

ENGLISH

Twelfth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 10 December 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOH

(Iran)

The Cyprus question 58 (continued)

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

Mr. Gunewardene	(Ceylon)
Mr. Averoff-Tossizza	(Greece)
Mr. Fawzi	(Egypt)
Mr. Prica	(Yugoslavia)
Mr. Makivchuk	(Ukrainian SSR)
Mr. Lodge	(United States)
Mr. Noble	(United Kingdom)
Mr. Mezincescu	(Rcmania)
Mr. Zuleta Angel	(Colombia)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.929. 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. GUNewardene (Ceylon) : The question of Cyprus has come up once again for our consideration, ten months after the General Assembly, by its resolution 1013 (XI) of 26 February 1957, expressed

"the earnest 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, and the hope that negotiations will be resumed and continued to this end."

It is in the sincere belief that a peaceful, democratic and just solution can be found to this problem that I wish to make a contribution to the debate today.

At the very outset we had the advantage of a sober, factual statement made by Her Majesty's Minister of State, Mr. Noble, in which he indicated the steps by which his Government tried to give effect to the resolution that was adopted at the last session of the Assembly. We had also a moving appeal made by the Foreign Minister of Greece, in which he indicated the steps that Greece had taken in respecting the wishes of this Assembly. I should like to pay tribute to Greece for the atmosphere of calm that its good offices have made it possible to bring about. The Ambassador of Turkey has placed the case for Turkey in the most admirable manner, and I do not think that a stronger case could have been made by any person, whatever views may be held on the subject.

The Committee will, I am sure, appreciate the fact that at this stage it is not at all necessary to go into the question of atrocities, on the one side, or repressions on the other side. What is known as terrorism, as we all understand, is only a manifestation of frustration and desperation: it is the indication of a cancer in the body politic. What is known as repression is an answer to terrorism, a kind of desperate effort to bring about law and order by the administering country. We might, therefore, for the purpose of this discussion eliminate this chapter altogether because, happily for us, it is a different chapter with which we begin now.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

The Committee will appreciate, I know, the fact that the problem of Cyprus, in most of its facets, represents a close parallel to the problems that faced my country prior to its gaining its own independence. I shall, therefore, in the course of my remarks be compelled frequently to draw an analogy -- which to me seems natural -- in the hope that I can in some small measure contribute to the peaceful solution of the question of Cyprus as our own difficulties have been solved with such happy results.



Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations endorses the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as being "necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations".

The International Covenant on Human Rights contains an article recognizing the right of peoples to self-determination, based on a resolution to that effect passed at the sixth session of the General Assembly in 1952.

Furthermore, the seventh session of the General Assembly adopted resolution 637, by which it recommended that:


"1. The States Members of the United Nations shall uphold the principle of self-determination of all peoples and nations;

"2. The States Members of the United Nations shall recognize and promote the realization of the right of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories who are under their administration and shall facilitate the exercise of this right by the peoples of such Territories...through plebiscites or other recognized, democratic means, preferably under the auspices of the United Nations."

Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has had more experience in the field of developing Non-Self-Governing Territories toward the ultimate goal of self-government and independence than perhaps any other Government represented in this august gathering of nations. I am sure that her record in that field is adequate testimony to the principles that the United Kingdom has always recognized and applied wherever the question of the independence of non-self-governing peoples has arisen in the past.

It is because the principle of self-determination has been accepted and applied that countries such as India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Ghana and Malaya are today fully independent and sovereign nations, sitting here as Member States of the United Nations in their own right. It is also, I believe, for the same reason that Nigeria and the proposed Caribbean Federation of the West Indies will, within a short time, become Members of this Assembly.

Cyprus is, in constitutional law, what has been described as a Crown Colony. This was precisely the constitutional status of all the countries I have just mentioned before they gained the status, with the assistance and guidance of the United Kingdom Government, of independent and sovereign units.



I cannot therefore see how the fundamental basis of British colonial policy throughout the years, as illustrated in the specific instances I have cited, could in any way be regarded as contrary to or inconsistent with the principle, which we all recognize, of the right of peoples to self-determination.

If my interpretation of British policy in this matter is correct, then there cannot be any reason why the people of Cyprus should not eventually determine their own future, as the people of Ceylon were given the opportunity of doing in 1948.

I would wish straight away to invite the attention of the Committee to our view that the two parties to this problem are the Government of the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus. I can see no justification whatsoever, whether by reason of history or logic or even of expediency, for the complication of this problem by introducing, or seeking to introduce, the views of parties other than the people of Cyprus itself.

It is true, as we all know, that the population of Cyprus consists of two ethnic groups, namely, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. It is also true that the Turkish Cypriots have raised certain objections in regard to certain possible dangers that may arise from permitting the principle of self-determination to be applied to the territory. Whether the parties are Greek or Turkish Cypriots, we cannot escape the feeling that they are, in the first instance, Cypriots -- meaning people of the island of Cyprus.

In my own country, in Ceylon, there were in 1948 approximately one million citizens of Indian origin, out of a total population of 8.5 million people. The Committee will appreciate that such a proportion of Indian inhabitants in Ceylon would, on the basis of the argument now adduced on behalf of the Turkish minority in Cyprus, have justified the Government of India in making assertions similar to the position we are informed has been taken by the Government of Turkey in the present question. Happily, it did not do so.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

As every one knows, the Government of India did not take up any such position, nor, on that occasion, did the Government of the United Kingdom seek the views of the Government of India regarding the question of the Indian minority in Ceylon, as it now seems to have done in this case in seeking the views of the Government of Turkey on the future of Cyprus.

The question of the Indian minority in Ceylon was a factor taken into consideration by the Royal Commission on Constitutional Reform which visited Ceylon for the purpose of advising the United Kingdom Government, and I am sure that the position of the Turkish Cypriots similarly will be taken into consideration and adequate constitutional protection given to them if they decide to continue to remain as Cypriot citizens in any democratic arrangement for the future of Cyprus.

The course of history has often been very untidy. It is because of this lack of neatness in the historical process that the world today is faced with several problems, not the least important of which is the so-called problem of minorities in multi-racial States. We recognize the affinity which may exist between the minority of one country and their close neighbours beyond their territory in the fields of culture, language, religion and racial origin. To recognize this, however, is not to subscribe to the principle that the minority is justified in asserting a loyalty which is a loyalty other than to the country to which they have been a part and parcel for so long. The Cypriots, whether they be of Greek origin or of Turkish origin, must always regard themselves, in the first instance and primarily, as people of Cyprus who owe their allegiance to the territory of Cyprus. There is not a country which at some time or other in its historical evolution has not been faced with problems of minorities. We have only to take our minds back to the early centuries of European development to see that even the countries of Western Europe had their own problems of racial minorities which fortunately have now been satisfactorily solved. Even as late the beginning of the twentieth century problems of racial groups in areas such as Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein not only created problems for individual States but became serious problems for the entire world. But, all these problems have been satisfactorily overcome with patience, with understanding and with recognition of the right of minorities.




(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

The problem of the minority in Cyprus is one more case of such problems which have existed and which still exist in almost every part of the territories in Asia and Africa. Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom has successfully and commendably overcome them in all the former Crown Colonies which have now become independent countries. In my own country there was a similar problem by reason of the fact that the population comes from two main racial groups, the Singhalese and the Tamil. The latter, who were ethnically and culturally, as well as by religion and language, closer to the people of South India than to the Singhalese, asserted a claim to autonomy on the ground of these differences. The fear was expressed by them that the grant of self-determination to Ceylon might result in a swamping of their rights by the majority race.

With characteristic statesmanship, the Government of the United Kingdom sent a Royal Commission to Ceylon to examine the problem which had arisen, and I am happy to say that as a result of the unanimous recommendation of that Commission we became a sovereign, independent State in February 1948, under a unitary constitution which guaranteed all rights and freedoms to all the minorities, whether racial or religious. The consequences, had the recommendation of the Commission been otherwise, as anyone can well imagine, would have been detrimental to all the parties concerned. Much suspicion, recrimination and bitterness would have followed had the country been divided into two racial units.

If in Cyprus the question was approached from a recognition of the existence of two separate units, called the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots, one cannot in logic avoid the conclusion that Cyprus, small as it is, must necessarily be divided, a course of action which would do harm not only to both the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots, but also to those other neighbours of Cyprus who have a legitimate interest in that area and to whom a prosperous, united and satisfied Cyprus is of supreme importance.

The world is now struggling with the problem of three territories artificially divided by political action. I refer to Germany, Korea and Viet-Nam. Every one in this chamber will agree with me that we do not in any way wish to contribute to the creation of a fourth territory artificially divided in the same way. This Organization is based on the ideals not of division, but of unity, not of separation, but of reconciliation. Any action of ours, therefore, which would in any way contribute to the creation of wounds rather than to the healing of existing wounds would be, in my view, an act of great disloyalty to this entire Organization



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

and to the ideals upon which it has been established. It is for this reason that I said earlier that the only correct, proper and just approach to the so-called problem of minorities in Cyprus is the only reasonable one of considering the inhabitants of Cyprus as Cypriots rather than as Greek or Turkish Cypriots. Any negotiations, therefore, must be bilateral negotiations between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Cypriot people.

I should like to refer next to the suggestion -- I can hardly call it an argument -- which was made last year and which is again being made that, by reason of the proximity of the island to the territory of Turkey, it is in the strategic and other interests of Turkey to maintain the present status quo. If my contention, which recognizes the Cypriots as people of Cyprus and not as Greek or Turkish, is valid, I am unable to see how Turkey could be made such an interested party as to prevent the execution of an otherwise reasonable and logical process of constitutional development.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

Apart from the interest which every Member State of the United Nations must be expected to show in any problem which has become an international one, it is difficult to see on what basis either Turkey or Greece should regard themselves, or be regarded by others, as interested Powers. It has been said that the Government of Turkey would view with disfavour any application of the principle of self-determination to Cyprus because of the geographical proximity of Cyprus to Turkey. Apart from the fact that there are other Islands, governed by Greece, very much closer geographically to the Turkish mainland than Cyprus, this argument would make nonsense of the territorial contiguity of different sovereign States and would prevent anything like common frontiers; for each country would, under such a dispensation, refuse to have a neighbour. One has only to dip into the history of West Asia in the nineteenth century and to look at the present political map of that region to realize how numerous are the areas which were under the Ottoman Government then and which are now sovereign States having common frontiers with Turkey today. The argument based on geographical proximity is not, I am afraid, an argument which convinces me or my Government.

I would like next to touch briefly on the strategic aspects of the problem of Cyprus. Both Greece and Turkey are linked with the United Kingdom in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Both Greece and Turkey are members of the Balkan Pact. Their interests in safeguarding peace and stability in that region are identical with each other and with the interests of the United Kingdom. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why, for reasons of pure strategy, either Greece or Turkey should see any danger to their territorial integrity or to their physical safety if Cypriot people were permitted to determine their future as they wished. Whatever the pure strategical considerations attached to any given territory may be from a military point of view, it is common sense that if the inhabitants of that territory are discontented and, therefore, become indifferent or even disloyal, the strategic asset of such a territory would be considerably restricted, both psychologically and otherwise. The first consideration from a strategic point of view should be the loyalty of the people of the territory. This was amply demonstrated in the Second World War, both in the European and in the Far Eastern theatres of war.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

We appreciate that when violence stalks the land, any Government must take firm measures to restore law and order. But we also realize that movements springing from the soul of a people can never be effectively stifled by police action and by legislation which sometimes, by its very harshness, promotes what it is intended to prevent. Many of the more repressive regulations and legislative acts have now been gradually withdrawn. I would urge Her Majesty's Government to withdraw the earlier harsh measures introduced into the Statute and to declare a political amnesty for those involved in acts of terrorism and for extreme political conduct. A release of political offenders would prove the sincerity and good will of the United Kingdom in the days that lie ahead. The terrorism and violence that have unfortunately characterized the Cypriot scene during the last year or two have, fortunately, become less serious and less persistent during the past few months. An atmosphere of comparative tranquillity has prevailed except for a few sporadic outbursts during the last two or three days. It would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, as well as the leaders of the Cypriot people, did not seize this opportunity of entering into negotiations with a view to finding a just and lasting solution to an unfortunate and, I sincerely hope, a passing chapter in the history of this region.

His Excellency, Sir Hugh Foot, the new Governor of Cyprus, has, from all reports, started his tenure of office in an atmosphere of co-operation and understanding, which we welcome as a good augury for the future. I cannot help drawing a parallel once more with the contemporary history of my own country where, at a crucial point of time in its evolution, the United Kingdom Government sent to us a distinguished British Governor, Sir Andrew Caldecotte, to examine the entire situation with an open mind and advise the Government. It was as a result of his recommendation that a Royal Commission, headed by a very distinguished British statesman, Lord Soulbury, arrived in Ceylon for the purpose of examining the situation. I, for one, sincerely hope that the dispatch of Sir Hugh Foot by the United Kingdom Government to Cyprus will be the beginning of a new and happy period in the history of that Island.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

We believe that the next logical step would be for Sir Hugh Foot, after exhaustive and impartial observation, to recommend to Her Majesty's Government the desirability of appointing a Royal Commission to decide the future of Cyprus, having regard to the views and desires of the people of Cyprus. Such a Commission, I am sure, after an on-the-spot investigation, would realize, as such a Commission did in Ceylon, that to apply the principle of self-determination separately to the Greek Cypriot majority and to the Turkish Cypriot minority, would be disastrous to everyone from every point of view. To partition an island territory as small as Cyprus on a misinterpretation of the term "self-determination" would be not only creating further problems in attempting to solve one, but would, in my view, constitute a permanent cause of friction between Greece and Turkey, thereby perpetuating a further complicated factor in the already tense state in which that region finds itself. To interpret the principle of self-determination in such a way would be, in theory, to make a travesty of it and, in practice, to sow the seeds of disharmony where, with a little understanding, conciliation could so easily be effected.

The Commonwealth of Nations is an institution which -- everyone will agree with me when I say it -- is unique and has no historical parallel or precedent. The credit for its conception, as well as for its very successful practical application in the modern world, is no doubt due mainly to the wisdom of British statesmanship through the years. It would have been inconceivable fifty years ago, having regard to the tremendous feeling which existed in the Asian and African countries then under British rule, that these same territories, after gaining sovereign independence, would continue not only to be associated freely amongst themselves and with the United Kingdom in a constitutional framework, but even to recognize the Sovereign of the United Kingdom as their Sovereign too. Who, in the 1920's and 1930's, would have been prophet enough to have predicted that India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Ghana and Malaya would of their own free will decide to continue to recognize the Queen of England as the Head of the Commonwealth? Who, indeed, would have expected these countries to maintain such happy relations with the United Kingdom as they now do, despite considerable differences in policy as well as in political attitudes? Within the next five years I am sure that we shall see



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

Nigeria and the West Indian Federation join this happy family. Would I be rash if I expressed the hope that Cyprus might well follow the path that a similarly placed little island, with similar minority problems and of similar strategic importance -- meaning my own country, Ceylon -- followed and is still following? Grant to the people of Cyprus, regardless of whether they be Greek Cypriots or Turkish Cypriots, the right to determine their own future. Thereafter, let them have the right to associate themselves with any Power or group of Powers they wish to. I have little doubt that the people of Cyprus will do what is best and wisest in the interests of Cyprus as a whole. I refuse to subscribe to the view that British statesmanship is so bankrupt as to continue the present state of uncertainty which now exists in Cyprus. As I said earlier, the arrival of Sir Hugh Foot at this time is an auspicious event. I am sure that, with patience and with some clear thinking, we can all contribute to assisting the parties concerned to see hope where hitherto there has been none.



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

Cyprus is a Crown Colony. There is no getting away from that fact. The two parties concerned are therefore the people of that Colony and the Government of the Administering Power. We urge Her Majesty's Government to keep always in view the basic consideration that any lasting and permanent settlement of the question of Cyprus must and can only be built upon the foundation of an understanding between the Cypriot people and the Administering Government. The Twentieth Century has seen, after each of the two World Wars, a wave of idealism which is only natural after wars which have been fought for freedom and right of peoples to determine their own future. Determination of the Second World War saw this wave of idealism sweeping through the hitherto untouched continents of Asia and of Africa. In Asia, with very few exceptions, most of the one-time subject peoples are now self-governing and sovereign. The theatre of nationalism has now moved to West Asia and Africa. It is therefore not difficult to understand the feelings of the people of Cyprus. It would be unwise, it would be more than unwise -- it would be tragic -- to ignore the force of historical movements. Whatever individual opinions we may have, whatever the considerations that motivate governments may be, history moves forward inexorably. We are now the witnesses of such a march. We could ignore it at our peril. I would therefore earnestly urge Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, without delay, to co-operate with the people of Cyprus and to hammer out a basis of understanding, a method of procedure, and an objective of policy, which would commend themselves not only to the people of Cyprus, not only to the United Kingdom, but which in the last analysis must also commend themselves to all of us assembled here.



Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) (interpretation from French): Today I should like to reply to the representative of Turkey rather more thoroughly than I have heretofore. Yesterday I only brought out some points which did not require careful refutation. I can easily prove that the Turkish argument is fallacious, but I will find it difficult to imitate Mr. Sarper's tone and attitude. I will not engage and I would find it difficult to engage in personal attacks, which Mr. Sarper did engage in. I do not know whether this is to the taste of the Turkish Government and public. It is certainly not mine. It is not the usage of the General Assembly; it is not the usage of official Greek persons or my country. Nor is it certainly one of my personal habits to engage in things like that. I leave this manner of discussion to Mr. Sarper and I shall confine myself to arguments.

But before taking this up, there are some points which he raised yesterday afternoon which I must dispose of. To begin with, and generally speaking, the substance and form of the speech of Mr. Sarper reminded me of the substance and form of some speeches of Foreign Ministers and other Turkish statesmen. There were threats which sometimes were not even hidden by discourse between the lines. It is perfectly obvious that it is threats that are meant and the intimidation that is wished. But we are not scared. Threats will not intimidate us.

Force has been mentioned twice. Political consequences were mentioned. I weigh my words and say that we are prepared to face the consequences of our policy. Let no one therefore talk to us about that. We know the possible consequences and I say officially that we are prepared to face them. We are prepared to face them because we are championing a just cause, which will be just regardless of any adversity, and we are in duty bound not to betray it. We are prepared to face the consequences of our policy, because not only is it a fair and just and ethical policy but also because we have always applied it by peaceful means.

Can the Turkish Government cite one case where we proffered threats? Can it cite one case where a Thracian or Dodecanese Turk, whom we regard as brethren, has been attacked in his person or in his goods even when all Greeks in Constantinople were suffering outrages? Can he cite one case of frontier incidents or territorial water incidents where Turks might have lost their lives or suffered grave losses or damage? I can continue these questions with regard to acts which we did not commit against others but which were committed against our people.



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

I will not continue. Suffice it to say for me that we have done damage or harm to no one. I want to make it clear that we sincerely and profoundly desire good relations with both the United Kingdom and Turkey. We have repeatedly stated that the past ties us closely to these two countries. If Mr. Sarper found it fit yesterday to kindle the fires from old ashes, we would like to say that we want to forget the ashes. We are looking at towns and villages where Greeks and Turks lived together in brotherhood for centuries despite these ashes.

As for the United Kingdom, there is no need for me to state that we are thinking back with nostalgia to the lengthy and beautiful days of our friendship and co-operation, and parenthetically may I add that we do not need the testimony of others to tell us about the honour of British soldiers. We know this better than anyone else, and even while making accusations against some torturers in Cyprus, I myself have always paid tribute and continue to pay tribute to the British people and British soldiers. We want their friendship and we always have wanted their friendship; and for these friendships we have paid a high price and we continue to pay it.

The present price which we are paying is called calm and patience despite everything. But other prices are asked of us; for example, to betray our brethren in Cyprus; to accept that 18 per cent should determine the final destiny of 80 per cent; to accept the notion that people of Cyprus should forever live under some sort of colonialism. This is the price which Greece will never pay -- never, and for the sake of no one's friendship. If this is the price of the friendship of Great Britain and Turkey -- a friendship and amity which we cherish -- then the die is cast. Our choice is made and we will not pay this price, and that is that. It is no use trying to intimidate us. We are not afraid. We will not betray, no matter what happens.

The causes for this policy, the reasons for it, have been outlined by me at length. There is one, however, which Mr. Sarper flagrantly misunderstood, and that is the one of our heavy sacrifices from 1940 to 1949. Mr. Sarper attributed to me words and intentions which have never been mine. He said that I said that we asked the United Nations to annex Cyprus because of these heavy sacrifices which we offered.



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

But let Mr. Sarper look up the record. I said and I repeat that the sacrifices are not worth more than those of others, but that after having sacrificed almost a tenth of its population in the name of liberty, the Greek people felt that it had the right to ask in its own name that liberty should also and at last be vouchsafed to the Cypriots.

In the fire of a rather inelegant attack, Mr. Sarper surely presented his case with sincerity. I do not question his sincerity, but perhaps he did not have before him the text of my speech and he may not have grasped exactly what I meant to say. At all events, I wish to repeat it in the name of our sacrifices, which surely have been heavy. We ask nothing for Greece. We did not make these sacrifices as mercenaries. We offered them up with pleasure for our country and for liberty, and this fact gives us no right to claim a recompense. It gives us the right, however, to demand liberty for our brethren in Cyprus.

No one can deny this right to us, no one, large or small, belligerent or non-belligerent in the last war, respected and dear friend or threatening friend. Whether freedom means annexation, that is a point that I will study later on, and I believe that the ineluctable conclusion is bound to be negative. Liberty does not necessarily mean annexation.



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

But before dealing with this question, which is worthy of a rather high-level discussion, I should like to say just a few words on one point which I must say astonished me, the strange accusation that my delegation co-operates with Archbishop Makarios and that the Greek Government utilizes Archbishop Markarios or is utilized by him. The Greek Government deals with this colonial problem in the name of the 80 per cent of the people of Cyprus, and it is understood that it co-operates with its great representative of those 80 per cent of the people of Cyprus. Certainly I shall seek to elicit his advice and opinions without asking anybody's authorization. We have sought to elicit his advice, we have requested his advice, even when we were officially threatened and insulted before his return from the Seychelles. I shall not refer to these arguments. Even though if I am forced to do so, I shall have to revert to this matter, but this sort of argument is not at the proper level of our debate. It is not isolated sentences that may have to be cited but long texts may have to be read in order to make it clear what the state of affairs really is. But this would lead us into paths far different from those that are the reason we are here. That is why, ignoring certain other details, I shall address myself to another set of Turkish arguments.

The first argument is an original one, strange and unprecedented: the thesis of the total suppression of the notion of the majority and the minority. This notion was established, recognized and consecrated by international law in international practice. This, we are told, is of no importance. These notions displease Turkey and the Turkish representative sweeps it away in a rather cavalier fashion. On Cyprus, the majority of four-fifths, 80 per cent of the population, is not really a majority; we are told it is merely one community among others, a Greek community. By the same token, the minority of one-fifth or rather a minority of eighteen per cent is not a minority; it is a Turkish community. As between these two communities, under the Turkish version of international law, there would be full equality of rights and fact.

Those among the Members here which have minorities in their countries should ponder well the prospects of the new Turkish version of law. From now on their national unity is no longer composed of the great majority of the population



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

plus some minorities, but their nations henceforward shall be a number of communities, of different races and religions, all of them equal in law. Each of these minorities would have not only the right to secede at will from the national body, but also of subjecting the destiny of other minorities and communities to its caprice. The diktat which Mr. Sarper had the poor inspiration of citing in his speeches is not the will of the majority which, under democratic conceptions that are generally recognized, has the right of decision, but the arbitrary will of an acting minority, and, as I shall prove later, it is the Anglo-Turkish intention to transform the Turkish minority in Cyprus into an acting minority. It is true that the representative of Turkey does draw a certain distinction. He spares independent States, at least those are allowed to exist and to function on the basis of the notions of majority and minority. The Turkish community theory does not affect them, at least for the moment. It is, however, applicable to Non-Self-Governing Territories. The peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories must deal from now on with this new calamity which the new Turkish discovery reserves for them. Not only must they endure the yoke of colonial administration, but also they must henceforward face another obstacle which arises on the path of their emancipation. Within these populations of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the ethnic, religious or other minorities are said to constitute distinct communities, to constitute peoples which, according to this new theory, would have the right of self-determination. Needless to say, under these circumstances the liberation or independence of colonial peoples would become more than problematic, if not impossible. Ponder the consequences of these theories.

What are these Non-Self-Governing Territories? Who are the peoples that the Turkish representative wants to force to pay so dear a price for Turkish designs on Cyprus? These colonial peoples are those that we hope to see seated among us some day. The Turkish representative insisted vigorously on the liberalism and anti-colonialism of his country. Verbal professions of faith are easy, but in fact Mr. Sarper did nothing other than to give legal expression to the colonial maximum of "Divide and rule". The Turkish representative, wishing to recognize the right of self-determination of a minority -- note well the word "minority" -- and not finding in the Articles of the Charter regarding self-determination anything which supports his thesis -- certainly had to fall back on Article 73



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

of the Charter. Now Article 73 does not deal with the right of self-determination. To the contrary, it is a declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. We must necessarily refer to this charter of Non-Self-Governing Territories since we are dealing with the functioning of a colonial regime. This has nothing to do with the problem posed by the abolition of that regime in implementation of the right of self-determination as applied under Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. Under the terms of Article 73 of the Charter, the obligations of colonial administrations are one thing and the right of enslaved peoples to liberty and independence is another. These two questions should not be confused. Mr. Sarper, who has had long experience in the United Nations and who surely is not naive, knows full well that all colonial questions under Article 73 are referred to the Fourth Committee while problems relating to the application of the right of self-determination, political problems par excellence, are usually referred to this Committee. These problems are all under Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. The legal basis of all these appeals to the Assembly, those of Tunisia and Morocco some years ago, those of West Irian, Algeria and Cyprus at the present time are cases in point.

Mr. Sarper asks us why we do not refer to Article 73. Very simply because the people of Cyprus considers itself ripe for independence and does not address itself to the United Nations to ensure that Article 73 should be implemented in that island in one sense or another. What the people of Cyprus wants is that Article 73 should cease to be applied, and we found nothing in the Charter or elsewhere which could be construed as justifying the thesis that minorities are endowed with the right of self-determination.

All of us remember the debate on Algeria; it stirs a living echo in our minds. During that debate did anyone ever suggest that the European minority in Algeria enjoyed as a minority the right of self-determination and that, because of this fact, it also has the right not only to secede from the remainder of the indigenous population, but to carry away half of the national territory with it?



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

Even France never went so far as to formulate so preposterous a thesis. On the contrary, through the loi-cadre and the single electoral roll, it had consecrated the notion of the complete fusion of minority and majority. What will the Algerians, their Arab friends and those who support that cause say here of the gift which Mr. Sarper offers to them -- that they had not thought of Article 73 of the Charter and that they should heed this new theory.

I think that examination of this matter is a waste of time. But out of sheer curiosity I must say I was anxious to find out how the Turkish argument was supported even within the framework of Article 73. Let us look at this Article. It is interesting to note Mr. Sarper's efforts to obtain from that text meanings to which it does not lend itself.

Article 73 b tells its readers that Powers administering Non-Self-Governing Territories should undertake the obligation:

"To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;"

What does this paragraph say? It says that in certain Non-Self-Governing Territories there may be one or more peoples whom the Administering Authority should take into consideration according to their varying stages of advancement. We are talking here about the obligations of the Administering Power. But what has this to do with the application of the right of self-determination and the rights of these populations? Is it suggested that the Charter, in this paragraph, eliminates the notion of majority and minority in Non-Self-Governing Territories?

It is interesting to note the attitude of the United Kingdom in another United Nations forum two years ago when, through its representative, Mr. Hopkinson, Under-Secretary of State for Colonies, it officially declared:

(continued in English)




(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

"In such a small territory as Togoland under British administration, it might have been assumed that the peoples of the territory should follow the normal procedure when their wishes were being consulted -- that the views of the majority should prevail over the views of the minority. That was what was understood by normal democratic processes. It was also the usual conception of a plebiscite."

(continued in French)

I will not read a great deal of what Mr. Hopkinson said. He stated further that the Royal Commission which went to Togoland opted for a plebiscite according to the will of the majority. That plebiscite took place. It was heeded and observed despite the fact that the southern section of Togoland did not vote with the majority. There was a distinct section of the country which voted against the majority. However, it was the totality of the votes of all the provinces that was taken into consideration in order to solve the question of Togoland. And this was done according to the will of the Government of the United Kingdom and the principles which it deemed fit to follow. At that time we took occasion to express the pleasure of the Greek delegation at the fact that the United Kingdom Government and delegation again so solemnly affirmed these principles. We expressed the hope that the United Kingdom would observe them in all other questions in the future and on other occasions. I must say that the General Assembly is worthy of a somewhat greater solicitude and respect when arguments are presented to it.

Turkish-Greek hostility in Cyprus had been invoked by some here. I immediately gave a brief answer. As the question is of some importance, it should be analysed, albeit briefly.

Greek-Turkish hostility in Cyprus is a figment of the imagination. It is fabricated and produced ad hoc by colonialist policy. For more than three hundred years, the most complete concord, harmony, co-operation, friendship and amity prevailed. However, the British colonial administration has sown discord and rancour. It hoped that this seed would yield bitter fruit. Hatred and blood  were hoped for as the harvest to be reaped. The Committee can be sure that I am not exaggerating the facts and that the record is more eloquent than words.

(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

The day that Greece gave in to the insistence of the Cypriots and agreed to place their case before the United Nations, the British Government decided to forge the instrument of discord between Greeks and Turks. More than ever before in Cyprus it egged on the Turks against the Greeks in accordance with the best practice of the Colonial Office and especially of the local colonial authorities.

The instrument of police repression in Cyprus was formed by the mass utilization and enlistment of Turks in the body of the so-called auxiliary police, which is composed almost exclusively of Turks. Elements of the Turkish minority are recruited for that force. Thus the Administration has chosen from among the least desirable elements of the Turkish population. Most Turks in Cyprus, of course, are good, honourable and decent people. They would never have accepted to serve in this sort of a body. But the level of recruitment of the auxiliary police among the Turks is a blot of shame on the records of colonial history.

I have a sad record full of detailed reports in the consideration of this question which I shall hold at the disposal of those who may wish to study it.

The fact remains that the auxiliary police was used against the Cypriot population. A large number of torturers were Turks from this minority. We believe that in so doing the colonial Administration has been guilty of a genuine crime. The transformation of a small minority into an instrument of oppression against the overwhelming bulk of the population was tantamount to making an attack against the unity, dignity and life of the majority of the population of Cyprus.

The Colonial Administration went further. Before the half-closed eyes of the authorities, strange acts have taken and continue to take place. Despite the fact that the Cypriot combatants have engaged in a campaign against the British forces for more than two years, which proved that they had the facilities to act if they had wished to do so, only Greek houses and stores in Cyprus were set on fire. Not one Turkish shop or residential building was set on fire. This is quite significant.



(Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Greece)

What is revealed every day and what reaches even the international Press is more dangerous yet and concerns the immediate future. It is obvious that the struggle of the population against the British forces is to be transformed into an armed internecine struggle between Turks and Greeks on Cyprus, whereupon the British, as indispensable spectators on Cyprus, will speak of a fratricidal struggle and will say, "We have to be here in order to keep these people apart." A few days ago, all the newspapers of the world published a Reuters despatch to the effect that a new Turkish organization had issued a proclamation promising to assist Archbishop Markarios if he were to return to Cyprus. This is something which is fraught with grave consequences.



(Mr. Avereff-Tossizza,
Greece)

It is sad but sinister to note that six silver bullets had been reserved for the Archbishop. This is supposed to be elegance I suppose; lead bullets would not be good enough. This information has been distributed and broadcast by Reuters. But what could be the consequences of these dangerous games? Greek-Turkish enmity in Cyprus could have the most grave consequences. It is a danger to the peace of the world, and I thought it was my duty to draw this to the Committee's attention.

Colonialism in Cyprus is busily preparing another attempt against the security of this region and against peace at large. We trust that the London Government will take all necessary measures against these dangerous activities. We hope also that those who have assumed the heavy responsibility for the defence of peace and security throughout the world will take all necessary measures to prevent the worst from happening, and the United Nations, for its part, must do its duty before it is too late.

What are the other main points in Mr. Sarper's speech? Well, we hear the refrain of enosis which we have been hearing here since 1954, and I must say that this tedious repetition sounds a note which becomes more and more false. Why all these attempts to collect evidence -- phrases out of context, snatches of conversation, and so on? And to prove what? To prove that in Cyprus and in Greece there are those who want enosis. Well, nobody denies that. Are there not those in Turkey who proclaim that Cyprus is Turkish, despite the fact that 80 per cent of the population of the island is Greek? Is there not in Turkey an organization entitled "Cyprus is Turkish"? And were not the horrible events in Constantinople in September 1955 due to that organization and its activities?

I do not wish to bore the Committee with these idle findings. Whether or not there are supporters of enosis in Greece we have repeatedly declared here on behalf of the Greek Government -- and we declare anew in the form of a solemn undertaking -- that we will respect the decision of the people of Cyprus, whatever it may be. As far as Greece is concerned, that will settle the question for good. Why will the Turkish representative not make a like statement here? That would be the only statement which would be in conformity with democratic principles and in keeping with our Charter. Instead, he comes



here and states that the 18 per cent Turkish minority will not accept a decision of 80 per cent of the population; that the Turkish minority of 18 per cent is not a minority; that the Greek majority of 80 per cent is not a majority; that the Turkish minority is a community, and so on and so on.

If sophistry was invented in Greece, which may well be, surely it is practised in Turkey with much more consummate skill than anywhere else. The representative of Turkey invoked the case of Trieste in stating that partition would be an applicable solution for the Cyprus problem since it was a formula that had been successfully applied in the solution of the dispute which involved two of our good friends, Yugoslavia and Italy. I showed yesterday that another example he invoked to support his thesis -- that of the Aaland Islands -- was poorly chosen indeed because it was utterly dissimilar in substance from the problem before us: 300 islands there, with 21,000 inhabitants, as against one island with 500,000 inhabitants here. But as far as Trieste is concerned, I will say this. In Trieste partition was, in fact, practicable because the two populations resided in distinct portions of the territory. The bulk of the inhabitants of the city itself were, in fact Italians, while the hinterland, as it were, was populated by persons of Yugoslav origin. In these circumstances the partition of the territory corresponded to a separation of the population which existed already and was established by the status quo, and it was that fact which made it possible. But to claim that such a formula could give the same results in the case of Cyprus, where the Turkish minority is completely mixed up with the overwhelming Greek majority, and where there is not a single district, however small, with a Turkish majority, would be to display a lack of realism and a political disingenuousness with which, I am sure, Turkish statesmen are not endowed.

The Turkish representative, speaking yesterday of the alleged recrudescence of violence in Cyprus, told us among other things that three Turkish Cypriots had been found murdered near Paphos, and that they had been the victims of EOKA. Responding to analogous allegations made by the representative of the United Kingdom, I said that I had no information on that score, but that nevertheless, I doubted that those acts had been committed by EOKA. I even mentioned one case where a Greek almost certainly was not the



author of a certain incident. Now in the case of the three Turkish Cypriots assassinated near Paphos the Cyprus radio, under British control, has announced that two Turkish Cypriots have been arrested and are under indictment or investigation on charges of having perpetrated the triple murder. In this case, as in others, an attempt was made to create false impressions for purposes of propaganda. No scruples were shown in distorting the facts.

What is clear is that for the past two and a half years there has been an organizations which has been combating the dominant colonial force. There has been not one Turkish shop or house burned down; there have been many Greek ones.

Speaking of the territorial status quo established by the Treaty of Lausanne, the Turkish representative added that the authors of that Treaty created a balance which any subsequent change would break. The exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Cyprus, he suggested, would break that balance and therefore could not be accepted by Turkey. In this connexion, I should like to remind Mr. Sarper that his Government's response has not been the same whenever the upsetting of a balance or equilibrium was involved. The case of the Sanjak of Alexandretta is characteristic because it shows strikingly how the Turks are wont to respond to such matters. In this case what was involved was the annexation by Turkey of a district which, under the Treaty of Lausanne, did not fall within the frontiers of Turkey -- frontiers which that Treaty purported to draw definitively. At the time of the annexation, which was carried out over the vigorous protests of Syria, the Turkish Government displayed no scruples with regard to the breaking of that balance -- for the good reason that it happened to be in its own favour.

That was the annexation of a territory, the Sanjak of Alexandretta, which was inhabited by a number of distinct populations -- nine to be precise -- of which persons of Turkish origin made up hardly 39 per cent. But with the votes of a part of the other populations, Turkey obtained a majority of 53 per cent in the election.

Thus Turkey uses two yardsticks, two sets of weights and two measures in determining its position towards the maintenance of the balance established by the Treaty of Lausanne.



(Mr. Fawzi, Egypt)

The delegation of Greece has put before us a draft resolution which, in the opinion of my delegation after a thorough study of the draft, is both appropriate and constructive. We shall vote in favour of it and we trust that it will meet with the enthusiastic approval of the Assembly.

In spite of the violence, the excesses, the impatience and the intemperance, in action and in expression, which have taken place in relation to this question, we shall not abandon our confidence that common sense, foresight and the norms of civilized international life will in the end prevail.



(Mr. Fawzi, Egypt)

It will be a happy day indeed when, as the Greek draft resolution puts it, the people of Cyprus will be given the opportunity to determine their own future by the exercise of their right to self-determination. This would obviously be a source of pride and of optimism for the United Nations and it would be a definite improvement and an added element to the structure of world peace and security. It would also be still another reaffirmation and consecration of the honoured and vital principle of self-determination and a recognition which we owe to the valiant and noble people of Cyprus of their right to live in dignity and in freedom.

Mr. PRICA (Yugoslavia): We find ourselves confronted once again with the question of Cyprus at this session of the General Assembly and we are compelled to note that no progress towards a solution of this problem has been made since the last session, although the General Assembly, in resolution 1013 (XI) of 26 February of this year, recommended such a solution. The strained situation in Cyprus continues and directly affects relations between three Member States of the United Nations which otherwise maintain close and friendly ties. The Yugoslav delegation cannot but view this situation with concern. That is understandable, because we take a direct interest in the relations prevailing in an area to which the people of Yugoslavia are linked by close geographical, historical and political ties, and also because of our friendly relations with Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, the three countries involved in the issue.

However, I should like to emphasize that my delegation, in its approach to the problem of Cyprus, has above all been guided by reasons of principle. In other words, it has been guided by the desire to see the problem solved in full conformity with the objectives of the United Nations, which include the peaceful settlement of disputes and the right of peoples to self-determination. That is why we consider the approach of the Greek delegation to this problem to be constructive and positive. It was clearly pointed out in the speech made by the chairman of the Greek delegation, the Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, and also in the draft resolution submitted by Greece, that the most important factor in solving the question of Cyprus, in fact, the key to its solution, lies in the full and free decision of the Cyprus population in the application of their right to self-determination.

No one will deny that the people of Cyprus so far have never had an opportunity to decide their own destiny, since historical circumstances have forced solutions upon them very much against their will. Most certainly, the economic, cultural and political level of the people of Cyprus entitle them to exercise their right to self-determination in the same way as the populations of those countries and areas which long ago achieved their right to self-determination, together with other political and national aspirations which the implementation of this right entails. My delegation, therefore, does not think it right that the future of Cyprus should be decided in terms of maintaining a state of affairs which took shape in entirely different historical circumstances or was dictated by transitory political and strategic considerations.

Such a policy, as we have had ample opportunities to see, have never led to any positive results in the solution of international problems generally. Such a policy, as has clearly been revealed by the developments of the last few years, cannot bring closer a solution of the question of Cyprus.

Can the many adverse developments in Cyprus, which we have witnessed during the past years, give way to a normal democratic life? In the opinion of my delegation, it certainly can. To achieve this, however, the problem should not be considered in terms of the maintenance of the state of affairs and institutions inherited from the past, irrespective of how they came about, but in terms of the development of a living and active organism of the people of Cyprus themselves. If we agree that this development cannot be artificially halted, that it cannot be kept within the narrow framework and obsolete institutions of the colonial system, and if we are prepared to recognize that the people of Cyprus are the decisive factor in determining the present and future status of the island, then I am confident that we shall be well on the way to achieving what we have not been able to achieve in the past, namely, a democratic and just solution of the problem. Such a solution, in the opinion of my delegation, could not infringe the properly conceived and lasting interests of any of the countries concerned. In fact, it would be an illusion to think that these interests can be safeguarded by keeping this question open, with all the negative consequences that that would entail. Of course, any attempt to solve this problem in a way which did not respect the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination and which was



prompted by the motives that have actually led to the present adverse situation could only have negative and unfavourable consequences for all concerned.

It is not my purpose here to examine in detail possible ways and means for a solution of this question. The scope and character of the concrete measures to be taken in this respect can be determined in direct negotiations between representatives of the people of Cyprus and of the United Kingdom Government. That is the approach proposed by the Greek draft resolution which, to my mind, is a realistic and constructive one, since it gives priority to the recognition of and the implementation by the people of Cyprus of one of the most precious of human rights, the right of self-determination. This, I think, also refutes all the objections to the effect that requests involving territorial or other changes are being advanced.

At this point, I feel it necessary to say that neither the Cypriot people nor the Government of Greece, which asked for the problem of Cyprus to be inscribed on the agenda of this session, are setting forth any categorical requests or formulating any preconceived answers. On the contrary, they have offered sufficient proof that they are prepared to accept any genuine advance in the implementation of the right of peoples to self-determination. This provides us with a sound basis which we should take as our starting point when we formulate our recommendations on this problem.

May I add that my delegation at the last session of the General Assembly expressed the view that the implementation of the right of self-determination by the people of Cyprus must include full and clearly defined guarantees with respect to the future status of the Turkish minority in Cyprus.

Finally, I should like to stress that the Yugoslav delegation will give its support to every proposal for a solution of the Cyprus question along the lines of ensuring the right of self-determination to the people of Cyprus.



(Mr. Prica, Yugoslavia)

My delegation hopes that the endeavours which we are making at this session of the General Assembly to find reasonable and realistic recommendations moving closer to a solution of the problem of Cyprus will be marked by a spirit of restraint and conciliation, which, we believe is the only way to secure the success of our deliberations.

Mr. MAKIVCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The question of Cyprus has been discussed a number of times in the United Nations, so that this is not the first time in this room that voices of alarm and concern have been raised -- and quite justifiably, in view of the events which, with increasing violence, have been unleashed in Cyprus under British colonial oppression.

As is well known, the population of Cyprus has never declared itself to be in agreement with colonial domination. The struggle of the Cypriots to attain their inalienable right to self-determination has become increasingly serious and has intensified since the end of the Second World War. This is a struggle for liberty and freedom and, in attempting to suppress this struggle for independence, the British colonialists have devoted themselves to police oppression and the liquidating of those who are struggling for freedom. They have used armed force and have unleashed a full-fledged colonial war in that region. Obviously, the United Nations cannot but react to such a situation.

Measures have been taken in an attempt to find a solution to the Cyprus question. The General Assembly has addressed itself to the parties concerned with an appeal to solve this acute problem by peaceful, democratic and just means. Resolution 1013 (XI) of 16 February 1957, adopted unanimously by the Assembly, stated that in order successfully to solve the Cyprus question, an atmosphere of peace and freedom of expression was required.

From the date of the adoption of that resolution, more than nine months have passed; but the results have been nil. The situation in Cyprus has not improved. Tension has not abated.

Now, who are the culprits? Let us look at the record. Perhaps the Cypriots are the guilty ones. Perhaps their obduracy is at fault in the lack of progress towards a solution of the problem. If we look at the record we are bound to see



(Mr. Makivchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

that the culprits are not Cypriots. The leaders of the resistance movement in Cyprus have responded affirmatively to the appeal of the Assembly and have displayed full readiness to settle the situation peacefully. Intent on creating a peaceful atmosphere and the necessary conditions for the carrying out of negotiations, the EOKA organization, which leads the Cypriot resistance movement, announced the cessation of all hostilities and, on 14 March 1957, declared its readiness to introduce a truce in Cyprus. But the United Kingdom Government repudiated the proposal for a resumption of negotiations with the representatives of the Cypriots and took renewed measures for maintaining the regime of colonial oppression, depriving the population of Cyprus of their inalienable right of self-determination. Despite the EOKA statement about the cessation of hostilities and the institution of a truce, the British colonial authorities persevered in their punitive expeditions against the Cypriots. Cruel occupation legislation remained in force in Cyprus, calling for the most severe penalties for mere participation in the national liberation movement, and even for the expression of sympathy for the peoples struggling for self-determination.

A terroristic regime is maintained in Cyprus. Gaols and concentration camps are filled with thousands of men, women and even children, whose only crime is that they wish for and demand freedom.

In the teeth of these facts, the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Noble, asserted in his speech that Her Majesty's Government had striven sincerely to take constructive measures in the spirit of the above-mentioned resolution of the General Assembly. But where have these constructive measures been hidden? What measures? He did not tell us; these measures remain invisible to us. He asserted that some progress had been made towards implementing resolution 1013 (XI). Progress forsooth. Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom regards as progressive and encouraging the fact that, after the adoption of this resolution, the emergency measures with regard to Cyprus have not been revoked; the curfew is still instituted in Cyprus. He may regard as a boon the present state of affairs in Cyprus, where mere communication with people possessing weapons is punished by penal servitude. He may regard as a boon the colonial decrees in force under which Cypriots can be detained without judicial procedure, under which the right of assembly, the right



(Mr. Makivchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

to strike, are reduced to naught, under which hundreds of Cypriots are pining in gaol without any judicial warrant, while innocent people are being subjected to tortures.

We will not regard black as white, nor will we regard as normal a situation in which whole villages have collective penalties imposed upon them, while punitive expeditions roam the country unpunished, and while a state of siege is made to prevail in Cyprus. This is far from a peaceful atmosphere. This is an occupation regime if there ever was one. This is colonialism of the first water.

I have listened carefully to the statement of the representative of Turkey, Mr. Sarper, and, having listened to it, I cannot fail to agree with the Foreign Minister of Greece, who told us yesterday that it was difficult to establish to what extent British assertions are Turkish, and Turkish assertions British. But let us leave this vexing puzzle aside and touch upon two points made in the statements of the representatives of the United Kingdom and Turkey as the weightiest arguments designed to justify the maintenance of a colonial regime in Cyprus.

First of all, both speakers repeatedly invoked the Lausanne Treaty. But these references are not impressive if only because the Lausanne Treaty was concluded behind the backs of the population of Cyprus. Nobody consulted them as to whether they were content to pass from Turkish domination to British domination, or whether, on the contrary, they would prefer to manage their own destiny in their own way.

Time was when the colonial powers found it easy to have numerous countries and peoples at their beck and call; but these times have gone into the darkness of the past. History marches on. Life does its work. The colonial system of yore is vanishing irrevocably, even though that system in the past was confirmed through treaties and legal instruments without number. This process of historic development finds its support and bulwark in the Charter of the United Nations, which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination and obliges States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories to respect the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories and to foster their advancement, taking due account of their political aspirations and development of their own institutions according to the particular circumstances of the Territory itself.

(Mr. M. Kivchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

Therefore, when we are told that international treaties must be observed, this solicitude had best be displayed for the observance of such an international treaty as the Charter of the United Nations, which, as it says in its own text, shall prevail over all other or conflicting international treaties. Article 103 of the Charter says specifically:

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail."

Moreover, the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of Turkey sought to represent the just struggle of the Cypriot people for self-determination as mere outrages by terrorists and extremists who, we are told, enjoy no support, let alone influence, among the population. These assertions are neither original nor convincing. It is patent that the supporters of colonialism would make this accusation against all patriots who fought colonial domination.

As early as the end of the eighteenth century, when the population of the British colonies in a continent called "America" rose up against foreign domination, the patriots in the war for independence were likewise called terrorists by the British colonialists. The fighters in Kenya, Algeria, Amman and Cyprus are all lumped into the grab-bag of terrorism, though it is evident that if the mere actions of a wilful band of terrorists were involved in these countries, the colonial Powers would find no need to keep whole armies under arms in those countries and wage colonial wars for years on end and without issue.

The Cyprus people have been waging a determined and resolute struggle for self-determination for years now. My delegation has in its possession numerous letters and addresses and communications which make it quite clear that the movement enjoys the broad support of the most diverse strata of the population, of public political and religious leaders and social organizations.

In September of this year we received a letter from Limassol, signed by twenty-six inhabitants, including the Mayor and Deputy-Mayor of Limassol, as well as the municipal councillors, lawyers, tradesmen, merchants etc. The writers of



(Mr. Makivchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

the letter declare that the population of Cyprus seeks to exercise its right to self-determination. They expressed the hope that this just demand will command the support of the delegations of the General Assembly.

The leader of the Cyprus Federation of Trade Unions, in his communication to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the President and representatives of the twelfth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations writes that the British colonial authorities, which administer Cyprus, flouting the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of Cyprus, have violated all the principles of declarations and promises and statements of the United Kingdom and of the United Nations which consecrate the right of peoples freely to determine their political future.

The Ukrainian delegation is profoundly convinced that the Cyprus problem would lose its complexity and difficulty if the Government of the United Kingdom would let simply the Cypriots decide their own fate. We consider that so eminently reasonable a solution would answer the interests of peace and international security and would be in keeping with the spirit and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): For more than three years the question of Cyprus has been before this Assembly. The United States has made clear on each occasion its conviction that those directly concerned must themselves work out the eventual settlement. We do not think that Cyprus presents the kind of problem which can be solved by United Nations deliberations in the absence of agreement among the parties. But this does not mean that our discussion here cannot be helpful.

As we completed our consideration of this item last February, we had high hopes that those most directly concerned would be able to enter into fruitful negotiations. It was generally recognized that no settlement was possible that did not take full account of all pertinent interests. These interests involve three of our closest allies and the people of this troubled island. It is because of the very character and divergency of the interests of those involved that the United States has constantly maintained, and still believes, that "quiet diplomacy" held the greatest promise for the development of a solution.



(Mr. Lodge, United States)

As a matter of fact, the United Nations Charter in Article 33 emphasizes that the parties to any dispute

"...shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." The United States does not believe that all of these avenues have been exhausted. Indeed, there has been some progress during the past year towards improving the circumstances in which any one or more of these avenues might be followed. In these circumstances, it would be a mistake for us at this time here in this General Assembly to endorse any specific solution.

Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): In resolution 1013 (XI), which was unanimously adopted in the course of the eleventh session, the General Assembly of the United Nations expressed its earnest desire that a peaceful, democratic and just solution would be found in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Yet the question of Cyprus comes back to the General Assembly without any progress having been achieved along the path of solution. This is so not because solutions in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter would be difficult to find, but because the party primarily responsible for the existence of this problem, the United Kingdom Government, has taken a negative stand regarding the application of the principles of the Charter in the case of Cyprus.



(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

The fact that the recommendations of the General Assembly have been left on the shelf to gather dust cannot be taken as confirming the pessimistic prophecies regarding the efficiency of the debates on this problem. It proves only that the Assembly must make new and greater efforts to understand the question and to persuade the parties concerned.

Of course, it is not an easy thing to solve problems which arise from situations that are not equitable and which have lasted for decades or even hundreds of years. These circumstances have given rise in the minds of many people to the conviction that things cannot be other than what they are. The practice of the United Nations shows clearly how stubbornly certain States defend ideas which contradict the spirit of the time in which we live. But if it is true that the problem of Cyprus comes under the category of problems which are difficult to solve, it is equally true that the United Nations Charter clearly indicates the solution to these problems. That is why the Romanian delegation is convinced that the United Nations could have a favourable influence on the evolution of the Cyprus problem if it acts in conformity with the aims and principles on which it was founded. To this end, it is indispensable to avoid any confusion on the nature of the conflict which is the essence of the problem of Cyprus. This would obviously permit the United Nations to indicate with all the necessary clarity the paths to be followed in order to solve the question.

Without in any way diminishing the importance and the international consequences of this problem, the Romanian delegation is of the opinion that the essence and the international character of the question of Cyprus does not reside solely in the fact that certain Member States have different views regarding the problem. The problem of Cyprus is a colonial problem and in circumstances where the liquidation of colonialism is included in the agenda of present-day history with the blood of oppressed peoples, any colonial problem has an international character that overrides all other aspects. The colonial essence of the problem of Cyprus is sufficient to have it legitimately discussed in the United Nations.



(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

It is the conflict between the people of Cyprus and the foreign administration of the island which is submitted for consideration by the United Nations. The exceptional measures, military and police, which the British administration of Cyprus has taken for nearly three years and which are still in force in the island, prove quite clearly the character and the proportions of this conflict. It gives to this island, to repeat the words of two Australian jurists who visited it, the aspect:

"of an enemy-occupied country in which the ruling foreign administration is cut off by its own acts from contact with the people".

This is the very essence of the problem, and that is why, over and above everything, the United Nations must consider this problem.

The fact that this problem has been submitted for discussion in the United Nations following the request of the Greek Government in no way changes the basic facts of the situation.

It seems perfectly natural to us that the sufferings of an oppressed people should find an echo in world public opinion and that this echo leads to the taking of positions and reactions from the governments of different countries, and chiefly from countries situated in that part of the world. In the specific case which we are now considering, it seems to us entirely legitimate that the sufferings of the people of Cyprus have found its most powerful echo in the Greek Government and Greek people by reason of the indisputable national affinities of community, language and culture of the two peoples.

It is the colonial nature of the Cyprus question which must finally guide the judgement of the Assembly as to the rights and interests of the parties engaged in this dispute.

The Romanian delegation considers that respect for international law is a natural development of relations between States. The principle of respect for obligations assumed under treaties is a basic principle which guides the Romanian Government in its relations with other States. But we are not convinced by those who bring up agreements signed in 1878 between Turkey and England, the Order-in-Council of 1914 or the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923 as a basis of law to prevent the people of Cyprus from exercising its legitimate right of self-determination.

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

These juridical acts cannot be raised against the people of Cyprus; these people were not included as being subject to international law at the time these treaties were concluded, but these were agreements and acts of governments concluded or undertaken without their consent.

That was a time when transactions concerning peoples and countries was a current happening. The question of Cyprus is a sad illustration of this, and we Romanians know from our own history exactly what this means. At that time things happened in a certain way, but today things have changed completely and the state of affairs which existed in those days cannot be taken as a general guide for today as regards international law and morality. If all that we have inherited from that time has not been eliminated so far, it does not mean that it cannot gradually be eliminated or that it will not be eliminated in the future. This is the essence of the great process that is taking place these days. The United Nations has contributed in a certain measure to the acceleration of this process and must continue to do so.

If the rights of the Administering Power of the United Kingdom on Cyprus stems from certain treaties and acts of the Government itself which are in contradiction with the spirit of the Charter, the present conflict and the aspirations of the Cypriot people are based on the right of the people there to self-determination, a right that the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly have recognized as a fundamental right of peoples.

The resolution adopted at the previous session of the General Assembly in no way specifically mentions the principles of the Charter whose implementation can lead to the just solution of the problem of Cyprus. But it is obvious that this question cannot and will not be solved as long as the people of Cyprus are not allowed the right of self-determination and as long as they are not granted the freedom to exercise this right without any limitations.

The defenders of colonialism have tried to present the conflict between the British administration and the people of Cyprus as the result of the action of isolated elements and of encouragement received from outside the country. They even went so far as to cast doubts on the aspirations of the people of Cyprus to a free national life.



(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

The Romanian delegation wishes to remind the Committee in this regard that the military and police measures against the population of Cyprus were taken after a plebiscite organized under conditions that were certainly not the most favourable but which, nevertheless, left no doubt whatsoever regarding the force of the national aspirations of the Cypriot people.

From the point of view of the Romanian delegation, the strategic interests of the United Kingdom in this region cannot in any way justify its refusal to grant the right of self-determination to the Cypriot people. The Romanian delegation is of the opinion that the strategic interests of a State -- whatever their nature may be -- cannot justify the depriving of a people of its fundamental rights. The right of a people to freedom cannot be subordinated to foreign Powers. Utilization of Cyprus as a military base of colonial aggression represents another reason for solving this problem and also for eliminating, at the same time, the possibility that Cyprus may be used in the future as a base for aggression.

The existence of national minorities also cannot be taken as a reason for not giving the people of Cyprus the right to exercise self-determination and to determine its own destiny in a democratic way. In order to be able to decide this in all freedom, it must first of all be liberated from foreign domination. To try to establish in advance the decisions which must be taken by the people in question would be to contest the exercise of this fundamental right.

The Romanian delegation is convinced that the people of Cyprus which, by its heroic struggle of liberation, has already given us a tremendous proof of its political maturity, should be allowed to organize its life in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and in accordance with its national aspirations, if it is granted the right to self-determination.



(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

The Romanian delegation feels, however, that it is not the international situation that makes the solution of the Cyprus question difficult. On the contrary, it is the fact that this problem is not solved that international tension seems to increase. The elimination of this source of tension would, without any doubt, have a favourable effect on the development of the situation in the Near and Middle East and on the international situation as a whole.

The Romanian delegation feels that it is the interest of peace and security that must be taken into account. It is in these interests that the United Nations must utilize all its influence so that the people of Cyprus will be freed from colonial domination. The people and the Government of Romania, particularly concerned as we are for peace to reign in this part of the world, are convinced that the elimination of colonial domination over Cyprus will create the most favourable conditions for the solution of all other aspects of this problem and will strengthen peace and international co-operation in this part of the world.

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): My remarks this evening will be directed to the speeches delivered by Mr. Averoff-Tossizza yesterday. At a later stage, I may have something further to say about the remarks which the Foreign Minister made this afternoon after I have had an opportunity of studying them.

I must say at once that I was disappointed by the speeches made so far by the Foreign Minister of Greece. I had hoped that this debate would be uncontentious and that it would promote rather than hinder progress towards agreement between all the parties concerned on a solution. I still think that this is the right way to approach the question.

The riots of the Greek Cypriots followed by the riots in retaliation of the Turkish Cypriots which have just taken place in Cyprus show only too clearly how delicate and dangerous the situation is and how important it is to discuss the problem quietly without acrimony and with the intention of promoting a solution.

I should have no difficulty in disposing in detail of a stream of charges and assertions which flowed from the Foreign Minister of Greece, but I do not think it will be conducive to an atmosphere of calm and statesmanship if I were to join issue on points which are far removed from the objective we have in view. I will therefore confine myself to one or two statements of fact.



(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

The first relates to the situation in Cyprus since the February resolution. The Foreign Minister of Greece contended that EOKA has responded satisfactorily to the hopes of this Assembly for a peaceful atmosphere on the island. Unfortunately, the facts do not bear this out. True the terrorist organization which was seriously disrupted at that time declared a truce and refrained for a period from actual murders. During the last two months, however, the number of murders carried out by the terrorists per week was the same as that for many periods preceding the February resolution. In addition to murders and attempted murders, there has been a good deal of violence against moderate Cypriots, and the population has been threatened by broadcasts, by letters and physically by masked men carrying arms.

There has been a large number of announcements by EOKA, the terrorist organization. I will quote from just one or two of their recent ones. This is one announcement:

"I call upon the people of Cyprus to be ready for new struggles. The struggle will now be waged in all fields -- struggle with the gun, struggle with our passive resistance, struggle everywhere, all-out struggle. Now we shall play all our stakes."

That quotation came from an announcement signed by the EOKA terrorist leader Dighenis which was distributed on 17 November of this year. The following quotation comes from another EOKA leaflet which was issued only last week:

"The only slogan which the Cypriot people has adopted is: 'Either now or never.' It will continue its struggle with Dighenis until it achieves what it is fighting for."

I do not think I need say more to show that the terrorist organization is still exercising intimidation and violence in Cyprus.

I must now turn reluctantly to the allegations which have been made by the Foreign Minister of Greece regarding the conduct of the authorities in Cyprus towards suspected terrorists. As I said at the outset of this debate, Her Majesty's Government had hoped that nothing would be said that would in any way impede the efforts which we are making to procure a just and lasting settlement of this complex problem. It is not my wish to strike a new or a contentious note, but I hope it will be understood that I simply cannot allow the allegations made by the Foreign Minister of Greece to pass uncorrected.



(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

Mr. Averoff-Tossizza has alleged that British troops and authorities in Cyprus have been guilty of atrocities. That is a grave charge, one which he has no way substantiated. It is very easy for anybody to reel off a list of charges of this kind against an administration responsible for maintaining law and order in the face of terrorist activities. I think that the Foreign Minister of Greece might have mentioned that his own Government was brought before the General Assembly on similar charges during the civil war in Greece; and my country was among those which defended Greece against those charges at that time.

Many might suppose, I think, that the United Kingdom's reputation is a sufficient refutation of the charges which Mr. Averoff-Tossizza has seen fit to air. Many may also think that it is neither right nor helpful to discuss such allegations in this Committee. But I do not want to give the Committee the impression that I am unwilling to answer the Greek charges. It would have been much more helpful if the Greek Government had brought these charges to the attention of Her Majesty's Government before giving them wide publicity.

On those which are new, I must reserve my right to reply. Many, however, are very old. They have, for the most part, been fabricated long after the time at which the incident was alleged to have occurred, solely for the purposes of the political and propaganda campaigns for enosis and also in order to divert the security forces from their task of eliminating political violence and fear from the life of the island.

The great majority of the accusations which the Greek Foreign Minister has made before the Committee are the same as those which the Greek Government have frequently publicized before. The Cyprus authorities have investigated every allegation which was precise enough to make investigation possible. They will continue to investigate any new allegations as they arise.

As Mr. Selwyn Lloyd showed in his speech to the General Committee this year, many of the charges are plainly ridiculous, and I shall not quote again here the examples that he gave. The Committee then decided not to inscribe the Greek item on atrocities on the agenda.

In one or two isolated cases where there has been some irregularity, the authorities have not hesitated to prosecute. Investigations have shown, however, that in the majority of instances the allegations have been deliberately trumped up for political ends. I do not wish to describe at length the methods of intimidation and terrorism which have been used to produce these fabricated charges.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

On page 9 of document A/C.1/803, circulated by the permanent representative of Greece, it is claimed that the Abbot of Machaira was cruelly tortured in February 1957. Now complaints about this case were made three weeks later by a Greek Cypriot lawyer. As soon as the complaints were received a senior official discussed the question with the Abbot himself. The latter stated that he had not asked the lawyer to visit him and that he had not had any intention before the visit to make a complaint. He continued that when it became known in Nicosia that he had been interrogated by the security forces the church, which was very powerful, had sent the lawyer to see him and that he had had to find some excuse for the admission he had made to the police regarding his association with the terrorists. The Abbot was a very frightened man and told the official that he could not forget what had happened to a brother abbot who was murdered by EOKA terrorists in his own monastery in front of the monks. Having explained his predicament, this unfortunate Abbot withdrew the allegation which he knew to be false, and which he had made only under severe pressure.

Having said that, I would point out that it is important to maintain a sense of objectivity and balance. The Foreign Minister of Greece quoted some correspondence exchanged between Mr. Rossides, the representative of Archbishop Makarios, and Her Majesty's Ambassador in Athens. But he did not quote the last letter in that correspondence. It was a letter from Her Majesty's Ambassador to which there was no reply, and part of it reads:

"In your previous letter of 6 July you made it clear that in the Archbishop's view Turkish representatives should only be permitted to take part in talks concerning their minority rights and safeguards, and that he would regard as unacceptable their participation in talks on the future status of the territory in which they lived. Her Majesty's Government, however, consider that the Turkish Cypriots are entitled to a proper say in the future of the island. If that is now Archbishop Makarios's view Her Majesty's Government will welcome it as a step forward".

And I repeat that there was no reply to that letter.



(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

I have tried to give some of the realities of the situation. Although the Foreign Minister of Greece did not say much about what his Government would be prepared to do to promote an improvement in international relations and in the situation in Cyprus, he did speak at some length about the British position. The British position is, in fact, somewhat different from the description given by the Foreign Minister of Greece. I should, therefore, like to correct any misconception there may be about our position.

As I have said before, the Cyprus situation is a complex one. We may regret this complexity, but there is nothing to be gained by ignoring the difficulties and realities of the present situation. The Greek Cypriot leaders want to join Greece, and the Turkish Cypriot leaders oppose this. The Greek and Turkish Governments have, in various ways, played and are continuing to play a considerable part in the Cyprus question. The United Kingdom has been and is trying to maintain peace and stability in the island, between allies in dispute and in the area as a whole. In our view there must be a solution agreeable to all concerned -- that is, to both communities in Cyprus and to all three Governments.

In my opening speech I described at some length the great variety of procedures which we had initiated over a number of years. We have had talks with both Governments, sometimes in conjunction with talks with leaders of both communities, and sometimes separately. We have also had separate talks with the leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots without the Governments. We neither exclude any of the parties nor give any of them a favoured position. Our offers of discussion with the Cypriot leaders of both communities remain open. As I say, for some months now we have been negotiating with both the Greek and Turkish Governments. We believe that some progress has been made in the spirit of the February resolution. What is now required is further talks in a quiet atmosphere, and more progress along the same lines.



Mr. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The Colombian delegation has listened with great respect to the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, as well as the extremely interesting statements made by representatives who have spoken before me. In the course of this discussion certain questions have been raised in regard to which the Colombian delegation would like to make known its viewpoint very briefly.

First, mention has been made of the respect due treaties setting forth the juridical condition of the Island of Cyprus. The Colombian delegation wishes at this moment to reiterate its unshakeable adherence to the rule acta sunt servanda, which we consider to be one of the essential bases of international law. At the same time, we wish to say that the aspirations of the Cypriot people to decide their own future in no way run counter to that rule upon the sacrosanct character of treaties.

It is true, in fact, that the juridical situation of the United Kingdom was very clearly outlined in the treaties mentioned in the course of the discussion. What is that juridical situation? By virtue of those treaties the Island of Cyprus was recognized as a Crown Colony of the United Kingdom, and the Charter of the United Nations has labelled that type of territory a "non-self-governing territory". That was the situation which obtained when the United Kingdom ratified the United Nations Charter. In so doing, the United Kingdom committed itself to respect the principle of self-determination as specifically set forth in Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter. In agreeing to the Charter the United Kingdom also committed itself to the provisions of Article 73, which deals with non-self-governing territories. Among the principles contained in Article 73 is the commitment to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement.

That being the case, if on the one hand the United Kingdom acquired certain rights, which none can deny, by virtue of the treaties which have been mentioned here, as a counterpart the United Kingdom committed itself to certain obligations regarding the territories that formed part of the Kingdom when the



(Mr. Zuleta Angel, Colombia)

Charter was signed, so that in the question which we are discussing there is really no problem connected with the setting aside of international treaties. That is not the question at issue. The situation is crystal clear; the only thing that we have to deal with is the fulfilment by the United Kingdom of the commitments contained in the Charter of the United Nations which, as is known and as is generally admitted, is an international treaty too. I do not think that there can be any shadow of doubt regarding this aspect of the question. I repeat, this is in no sense a question that can be ranked as one concerning the revision of international treaties, and I also repeat that the Government of Colombia has staunchly maintained the principle of the sanctity of treaties.

Second, the principle of self-determination, as I said earlier, appears very clearly in the Charter of the United Nations. In point of fact it is a right, but I feel that it is not an absolute right. By this I mean that the enjoyment of that right must obviously be subject to certain regulations. An abuse of the right to self-determination would lead to extremes that would obviously be contrary to the unity and security of States. For a people to achieve self-determination, my delegation is of the opinion that certain conditions must be fulfilled before the principle can be applied, conditions dealing with cultural, political, demographic and social factors and the life of the people, so that a political entity can be set up of sufficient stability and respectability in the world. I believe it is to this idea that Article 73 b refers when it provides for a process of education, for a process of progressive development, and these processes must be gone through before a people can achieve self-government. In fact that paragraph says that among the obligations of the administering authorities are the following: "To assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

I believe that in regard to the Island of Cyprus there can be no doubt whatever about the state in which it finds itself in regard to its possibility of deciding its own future. I understand that it has sufficient population, about 500,000 inhabitants, and nothing need be said about the cultural condition and civilization of the island, which as is common knowledge are an integral part of the history of mankind.

I therefore believe that the principle of self-determination as I have just outlined it is perfectly applicable to the Island of Cyprus. I have listened with profound gratification to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He made a very calm and serene statement, and in it he confirmed that his Government is still in favour of that policy which is inherent in the principle of self-determination. The representative of Ceylon observed a short while ago, and quite rightly, that the Government of the United Kingdom had not only been one of the champions of that principle but in numerous cases had given it practical application. With that we all agree; it can be doubted by none. Therefore we trust and hope that the United Nations recommendation that negotiations should take place will lead to a fulfilment of that principle.

Third, a State cannot aspire to the annexation of territories by invoking the principle of self-determination of peoples. The Charter of the United Nations was drafted in order to permit peoples to become independent of foreign domination, but it was not drafted simply to achieve a change in domination. That is why I consider that there would be no justification whatsoever for territorial claims being made and based by any State upon the principle of self-determination. On this point I recall the saying of a distinguished French international jurist who, when referring to the abuses committed on the basis of the principle prior to the Second World War, stated that the principle of self-determination of peoples was becoming a right to dispose of people.



(Mr. Zuleta Angel, Colombia)

My delegation is in favour of the right of peoples to dispose of themselves, but we can never countenance the right of anyone to dispose of peoples. I make this remark because very often, and even in the course of this very discussion, mention has been made of so-called enosis or annexation, if the time arrives, of Cyprus by Greece. But my delegation has taken note with great pleasure of the definitive statement made on this question by the representative of Greece. On this point, Colombia trusts in the word of Greece -- a word given to the United Nations at a tremendously important moment in its international life. The representative of Greece has said that he came to us here as the spokesman of a people that is unable to make its views known directly in the United Nations, that he came to us entrusted with a message. He said that he did not come to us with claims other than the claims which were entrusted to him to voice.

Fourth, we listened with all due respect and attention to the concern expressed by the representative of Turkey regarding the fate of the Turkish minority that finds itself in Cyprus. On this point, the suggestion was voiced that a partition of the island be effected, taking into account the different nationalities coexisting on the island. Furthermore, the representative of Turkey said that Article 73 of the Charter provides for countries' taking into account the political aspirations of peoples, and he said that this makes it obvious that consideration must be given to the situation that obtains when people of different nationalities find themselves in any of the Non-Self-Governing Territories mentioned in the Charter.

With all the respect that I pay to other people's opinions -- and specifically, in this case, with all due respect to the principles expressed by the representative of a friendly nation -- I should like to make the following remark, which I deem to be elementary:

In one of the territories which the Charter calls Non-Self-Governing, there may well be persons of different nationalities. But how is the principle of self-determination to be applied? It seems clear to me that there is only one method by which to apply it: the traditional democratic method whereby the will of a people is found out -- and that is to find out the will of the majority.



It would be extremely difficult to imagine dividing territories into different states, taking into account different nationalities. The population of the territory concerned must express its views by majority vote, and it is that majority vote that must decide on the future state of the territory.

I appreciate at its full value the concern of the representative of Turkey and the Government of Turkey regarding the Turkish minority that finds itself in Cyprus. That is a different problem. The national minorities, in accordance with the principle of the rights of peoples that is known to all of us, warrant special protection. National minorities may require that fundamental human rights be granted to them, that freedom be granted to them, on an equal footing with the nationals of the States that coexist with them. The rights of minorities as far as equality of situation is concerned are rights to which no one can possibly object. On the other hand, it would be extremely dangerous to recognize to a national minority within a State the claim that, because it is a national minority, it has a right to set up a state within a state. Therefore, on the day when the independence of the peoples of Cyprus is achieved, account will have to be taken of the legitimate interests, the sacred rights, of the Turkish minority that finds itself in that territory.



(Mr. Zuleta Angel, Colombia)

Therefore, I believe that this is simply a question of the protection of minorities and, I repeat, it is the majority of the population which, in accordance with established democratic usage, must decide its future fate.

At the last session of the General Assembly a resolution was adopted on the question of Cyprus. This resolution stated:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Cyprus,

"Believing that the solution of this problem requires an atmosphere of peace and freedom of expression."

Unfortunately, it would appear that that atmosphere of peace does not yet sufficiently prevail in the island. The United Nations appealed to the parties to set up an atmosphere which would be propitious for the renewal of negotiations and that would at least permit the realization of one of the fundamental principles of the Charter. The resolution continued:

"Expresses the earnest 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."

May I interject here that I believe the resolution very clearly means, although it does not use the words, that the General Assembly is expressing the sincere desire that one of the purposes of the Charter will be fulfilled, namely, the self-determination of peoples. The resolution goes on to express the hope "that negotiations will be resumed and continued to this end". The representative of the United States a few moments ago said that the proper procedure was that of negotiations between the parties concerned; I agree. I agree because it is the process most in keeping with the spirit of the Charter. In fact, the provision of the Charter that the United States representative cited states that the parties have to try to achieve direct agreement on the basis of negotiation, conciliation and so on.

On this point, however, there is one question to which I should like to draw the attention of the Committee. Mention has been made of negotiations or, rather, of proposals for the holding of negotiations between the United Kingdom,



(Mr. Zuleta Angel, Colombia)

Greece and Turkey. I do not believe that that is the procedure most indicated. It is not those three Powers which should decide upon the fate of the people of Cyprus. It is not for them to do so. The future of the people of Cyprus must be decided by the people of Cyprus themselves. I did not have the honour of being a member of this Committee when the resolution I read out was adopted, but I believe that at that time it was understood that when mention was made of the resumption and continuation of negotiations it was tacitly implied that the negotiations should be between the United Kingdom and the people of Cyprus. Those are the two parties directly and primarily concerned. It is those two parties who have to solve the question.

Fortunately, the United Kingdom through its representative on this Committee, has voiced the very high purposes and ideas of his Government in its desire to fulfil the resolutions of the General Assembly, and those efforts must be continued. We understand only too well that in the course of only a few months it was not possible once and for all to end the state of tension that existed in the island of Cyprus at the time when resolution 1013 (XI) was adopted, but I believe that the parties can continue making all efforts to fulfil the provisions of the resolution. By doing so, the United Kingdom would be abiding by its commitments under the Charter and it would also be living up to its own convictions, since it is a great country, a profoundly liberal and democratic country.

My delegation wishes to reserve its right to speak again in this debate if we deem it necessary to do so. At present, I wish merely to state that we will support any draft resolution on the Cyprus question which is intended to implement the right of self-determination of peoples. Thus, my delegation ratifies its faith in and adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.



The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before adjourning the meeting, I wish to inform the Committee that I intend to close the list of speakers on the Cyprus question at noon tomorrow, if the Committee agrees.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.



UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Press Release No. 2842
December 10, 1957

Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Representative,
in Committee One, on the Cyprus Question.

For more than three years the question of Cyprus has been before this Assembly. The United States has made clear on each occasion its conviction that those directly concerned must themselves work out the eventual settlement. We do not think that Cyprus presents the kind of problem which can be solved by United Nations deliberations in the absence of agreement among the parties. But this does not mean that our discussion here cannot be helpful.

As we completed our consideration of this item last February, we had high hopes that those most directly concerned would be able to enter into fruitful negotiations. It was generally recognized that no settlement was possible that did not take full account of all pertinent interests. These interests involve three of our closest allies and the people of this troubled island. It is because of the very character and divergency of the interests of those involved that the United States has constantly maintained -- and still believes -- that "quiet diplomacy" held the greatest promise for the development of a solution.

As a matter of fact, the United Nations Charter in Article 33 emphasizes that the parties to any dispute "shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." Now, Mr. Chairman, the United States does not believe that all of these avenues have been exhausted. Indeed, there has been some progress during the past year towards improving the circumstances in which any one or more of these avenues might be followed. In these circumstances, it would be a mistake for us at this time here in this General Assembly to endorse any specific solution.

All of us here in the General Assembly should be moderate and avoid actions and statements which might make a solution harder. We hope also that those directly concerned will seek to create an atmosphere more conducive to further negotiations. Each of them can make their own special contribution. This includes the people of the island of Cyprus who must also have an opportunity at an appropriate point to make their views known. No lasting settlement can be made which does not have their full cooperation.

MORE



We hope also that on the island of Cyprus itself there will be stability and tranquility. He said last February that "Violence or any external interference will only heighten tension and lead to more violence."

We intend to apply one standard to any proposals made in this debate: Will they help to create conditions which will facilitate an eventual solution?

For our part we have assisted the governments and peoples concerned in getting together for further discussions during the past year. We stand ready to do so again when circumstances will make it useful.

* * * * *