



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.933
12 December 1957
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 12 December 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOH

(Iran)

The Cyprus question [58] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.933. 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. WANG (China): I have listened to the debate with the greatest attention. I must compliment the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey on the eloquence and clarity with which they have stated their respective cases, on their moderation and temperance, and on their constructive approach to the Cyprus problem -- a problem which has aroused so much passion and ill-feeling on all sides.

As a newcomer to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I am free, I hope, from all preconceived ideas on the Cyprus problem. I approach the problem with a fresh mind. On the basis of the statements I have heard, I am convinced that, although the principal disputing parties still hold widely divergent views, a solution acceptable to all concerned is not impossible to find. After all, this is a dispute among States bound together by ties of friendship and alliance. With sympathy and understanding, much that seems difficult, insoluble and perplexing will vanish. I am sensible of the psychological and emotional factors that now stand in the way of fruitful negotiation and compromise. But passion must give way to reason, and the spirit of compromise and co-operation must in the end prevail.

Cyprus is a Crown Colony of the United Kingdom -- one of the very few such colonies that still remain. The Cypriots are now demanding the right of self-determination. This demand has not fallen on deaf ears. Mr. Noble, the representative of the United Kingdom, has told this Committee that his Government is prepared to carry out discussions with the Cypriots for the determination of their political future. What is needed at present is the "atmosphere of peace and freedom of expression" called for by resolution 1013, adopted on 26 February 1957, at the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

The United Kingdom Government, as we all know, is not without experience in the application of the principle of self-determination to dependent peoples. Since the conclusion of World War II, a number of formerly colonial countries have become independent sovereign States. They are now valued Members of the United Nations as well as partners in the free association of States known as the Commonwealth. Judging by past performance, we have no reason to question

(Mr. Wang, China)

the sincerity of the United Kingdom Government in its pledge to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Cypriot people.

No solution of the Cyprus question, however, can be real without taking into consideration the interests of another group of people on that island. I refer to the Cypriots of Turkish origin. They have lived on the island for centuries; they have taken deep roots in the Cyprian soil. They are justly apprehensive of their future, once the political status of the island is changed. Any realistic solution of the Cyprus problem cannot leave them out of account.

(Mr. Wang, China)

This debate has been useful in clarifying certain issues and in airing certain grievances. China has always been a staunch supporter of the principle of self-determination. However, we believe that the important thing at this juncture is to create the kind of atmosphere needed for a peaceful and conciliatory settlement of the problem. The best we can do here now is to exert our moral pressure on the parties for an early resumption of negotiations in the search for "a peaceful, democratic and just solution in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations". I am sure that by means of what Mr. Lodge calls "quiet diplomacy", new ideas about the solution of this vexed problem may be found. In any case, the divisive influence of this dispute should not be allowed to get out of hand and thus undermine the foundation of an alliance on which the peace of so vital a part of the world depends.

These considerations will determine our vote.

Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): I regret having to make another brief statement this morning, but we have received this morning some new information which compels me to speak again.

I wish first to make a few further comments on the Greek draft resolution. Yesterday, I mentioned that this Greek draft resolution and the manner in which it is being interpreted by Greek extremists in Cyprus and in Greece would result in an increase in violence and bloodshed, with no prospects of a solution. The information I have received today proves that this draft resolution is not only "fraught with danger", to use the expression of the draft resolution itself, but that its adoption would be fraught with disaster and calamity. The very fact of the presentation of such an extremist draft has encouraged the members of the Greek terrorist organization of EOKA to organize violence, bloodshed and disaster in a manner unparalleled before. Pressures, intimidation, threats and murders against the Turkish Cypriots have increased to a degree which renders this situation intolerable for the members of this community.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

In spite of the radio broadcast mentioned by the Foreign Minister of Greece, the last incident which I had previously mentioned, the murder of three Turkish villagers, is also the work of EOKA, like the other crimes. In this connexion, the Turkish Government has requested the United Kingdom Government to do all in its power to protect the Turkish Cypriots who have been placed in a state of anxiety for their self-defence. The outrage against the Turkish couple going to their wedding has also been confirmed. The prospective bridegroom was murdered and his fiancée seriously wounded.

The riots, threats and violence all over the island, organized by Greek terrorists, are causing unrest, instability and danger of disaster in the island. Today, I have received information that the leader of the Turkish community in Cyprus, Dr. Fazil Kucuk, has sent telegrams to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Secretary-General of NATO, and to the Prime Ministers of Turkey and the United Kingdom, informing them of the danger in which the Turkish community of Cyprus finds itself, expressing his fears that a civil war is being prepared by Greek terrorists, and again explaining that the Turkish Cypriots, who are unarmed and who have to face a well-armed and organized conspiracy of terrorists, appeal to the above-mentioned persons occupying high offices to do all in their power for the protection of the Turkish Cypriots,

The adoption of this Greek draft resolution would not only delay any solution of the Cyprus question by encouraging Greek extremists to persist in their actions designed to bring about a unilateral diktat, but it would also be falsely interpreted as a justification by those who prepare civil war and disaster in Cyprus.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I appeal earnestly to the sense of justice and equity as well as to the deep sense of responsibility of the General Assembly not to encourage extremist tendencies, and, therefore, to vote against the Greek draft resolution.

Mr. AVEROFF-POSSIZZA (Greece) (interpretation from French): In availing myself of my right of reply, I shall refrain from entering into the substance of the question anew. I believe that the Committee is adequately enlightened as to the substance of what is involved. I am, however, obliged to make a brief reply to the points which Mr. Sarper has brought up at the eleventh hour when we are about to vote.

The answer is simple. According to communiqués published even in the Press of this city, no Turkish fortune has been burnt down. Greek fortunes have been lost in fires in Cyprus.

As to Greek leaders, I read to the Committee yesterday a strong proclamation by the Mayor of Nicosia, Mr. Gervis, who is surely a leader of the Greek community in Cyprus. Representatives will have read in New York papers that Governor-General Sir Hugh Foot visited the Mayor after this proclamation which called for peace. I can inform the Committee now that the visit was made for the purpose of thanking the Mayor of Nicosia for his view of the situation and for his appeal to the population to maintain calm -- a calm which is difficult when surrounded by provocation and by the burning of property.

So much for the attitude of the Greek leaders in Cyprus.

This is all I have to answer to Mr. Sarper: first of all, that Greek property has been burned and Turkish property has not; and, secondly, that the United Kingdom Governor-General personally visited the mayor to thank him for his assistance.

Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): The Foreign Minister of Greece has spoken about destruction of property. I am speaking about destruction of life. The destruction of property was a kind of reaction to the assassinations which I mentioned a few moments ago.

As to the visit of Sir Hugh Foot to the Mayor of Nicosia, our information is again different. He went to make an appeal to the Mayor to do his best in influencing the Greek population of Cyprus, especially the terrorists of

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

EOKA, to be a little more moderate. That is my answer to the representative of Greece.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the representative of Greece, I wish to make an appeal to both the representative of Greece and the representative of Turkey not to go into details too much on the aspects of this question which, although they have their importance, might nevertheless give rise to a very detailed debate, and this, at this late hour, might further delay our work.

Mr. AVEROFF-POSSIZZA (Greece) (interpretation from French): It was, in fact, Mr. Sarper who opened this discussion. I merely wish to point out that the visit of Sir Hugh Foot to the Mayor of Nicosia took place after his appeal to the people to preserve calm.

Secondly, as regards the three Turks who were killed, two other Turks were arrested and they are being questioned in order to ascertain whether they are guilty of the incidents involved.

Mr. NESBITT (Canada): My delegation has been moved to speak very briefly at this late stage in the debate on the Cyprus question merely to explain in as few words as possible our reasons for co-sponsoring the amendments to the Greek draft resolution, which amendments have just been tabled in our name in conjunction with the names of Chile, Denmark and Norway. We have only done so after listening to all sides of the debate and, in particular, to the many interventions by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey.

Like other delegations, we have been gratified at the general moderation of the debate on such a difficult and complex issue, and we share the belief expressed by many other delegations that a solution can presently be found along the moderate lines of the statements. The representative of Greece himself has called attention to certain parts of the United Kingdom statement which his Government would accept.

(Mr. Nesbitt, Canada)

In these circumstances we feel that it is especially important for the General Assembly to do nothing that would come in the way of direct negotiations between the parties most concerned. Therefore, whatever one may feel concerning the competence of the Assembly to discuss this item, it will surely be agreed that any resolution adopted should be one which will further opportunities of agreement between the parties.

It is our contention that certain amendments are necessary to render the draft resolution which has been submitted by the delegation of Greece conformable to this criterion.

The first amendment which we propose is that the preamble should reaffirm resolution 1013 (XI). We have been struck by the fact that representatives of all points of view in this debate have referred to last year's resolution as one laying down a proper direction for progress in this dispute, and we feel that this common ground should be re-emphasized in this year's resolution.

In our second amendment we suggest an expression of concern that more progress has not been made towards the solution of this problem. Our delegation finds it difficult to understand the contention of the Greek draft resolution that no progress has been made. Indeed, the Foreign Minister of Greece himself called attention to recent developments: most recently, the appointment of a new civil Governor, Sir Hugh Foot, and the relaxation of some of the emergency measures in Cyprus. Surely all delegations will agree that it would be regrettable for this Committee to judge these developments as constituting no progress whatsoever. On the other hand, we agree on the need to express concern at the present situation, and we hope that this amendment at least can be unanimously supported by the Committee.

The essence of our third and fourth amendments is, in effect, to refer to our common wish for a solution in conformity with the principles of the Charter and to refer to this not merely in the preamble, as does the draft resolution of Greece, but to refer to it in the operative paragraph of the draft resolution itself. The operative paragraph would thus refer to the purposes and principles of the Charter, rather than specifically and uniquely to one of these principles, namely, the right of self-determination. If there is one thing that this debate has proved, it is that there can be agreement on the value of self-determination in principle, and yet be no agreement at all as to the precise manner in which self-determination should be interpreted in the problem presently before us.

The representative of Malaya, in an address to which we listened with the very greatest attention, has shown that self-determination in the present instance must be related in some way to the position of minorities as well as to the majority. The right to self-determination, however interpreted, is only one of the principles raised by this tragic problem. My own country is very sensitive of the rights that must be accorded to minorities as well. Therefore, to seek out one right only, namely, the right of self-determination, is to that extent to prejudice the issue. Therefore, our amendment would look forward to a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

In so doing, we are not in any way denying the relevance of the principle of self-determination. Just as it is one of the important principles in the issue now before us, so it is also one of the important principles of the Charter itself. I am sure that all of us gathered here are only too well aware of that point.

On the other hand, we are confronted with a complex problem just as the Charter itself, the product of many minds working many months, is a complex document. It is only by seeing all the principles therein expressed in their organic and interrelated context that a fully equitable and, in the best sense, democratic solution can be found. I do not think that anyone would suggest that this Committee will find such a solution today.

What we can do in our draft resolution is to point to the principles involved without prejudging the many aspects of this difficult question and express our heartfelt wish that the parties most concerned will be able to give these principles some lasting and meaningful application.

Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece)(interpretation from French): It is with surprise that I must add my remarks to what has been said by the representative of a country that is very close to us, Canada.

It is extraordinary to read these amendments although I will say that the preambular amendments I accept with pleasure. However, with regard to the amendment to the operative paragraph, I must say that this amendment is no longer an amendment; it is something that changes completely the contents of our draft resolution.

I shall not raise here the question whether, according to rule 131 of our rules of procedure, we have the right to submit amendments that completely change the sense of a draft resolution. That would lead us to a very long discussion. I believe that in the past, unfortunately, we have accepted the idea that the very substance of resolutions can be twisted and changed by amendments. However, I shall not insist on this for I have no desire to provoke a useless discussion.

Nevertheless, I want to say that such a proposal is absolutely unacceptable to my delegation. Our mission in coming here was to seek, for the first time in the United Nations, a vote on the question of self-determination. We shall not leave that mission by the wayside. I regret to say that, in the case of Cyprus as in many other cases, the submission of amendments has become a manoeuvre designed to block resolutions by modifying their sense. I have the right to reply to this manoeuvre by a counter-manoeuve because I must insist absolutely that a vote be taken on the word "self-determination". This counter-manoeuve is perfectly simple and entirely in keeping with our rules of procedure. Therefore, I wish to submit a sub-amendment that will be voted on before the amendments submitted here. This sub-amendment will not deal with the preambular part of the draft resolution; it will only refer to the operative part and it will read as follows, to replace the formula presented by Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway:

"Expresses the earnest hope that further negotiations and discussions will be undertaken promptly in a spirit of co-operation with a view to applying the right of self-determination in the case of the people of Cyprus".

Although my amendment is a counter-manceuvre, it is a sub-amendment to the amendment of the four Powers because it does preserve the new ideas introduced in this four-Power amendment; it keeps the words "negotiations and discussions", "promptly" and "spirit of co-operation".

I do not want to betray the mandate that has been entrusted to me of insisting on the word "self-determination". In this regard, I should like to make an appeal to the great Powers, who are great in their power, and to the small Powers that have the right and which must rally around principles, for principles are their force, and tell them: do not adopt such a tactic as has been suggested here. I represent a country that is alone and which alone is fighting for a people

which is suffering under a colonial regime; we are fighting for a principle. I am not lucky enough to belong to a national family. The Algerian question was defended by eleven brothers of the same young and vigorous family. If a Latin American question were to be discussed here, it would be defended by the countries of the new world that Stefan Zweig called "the world of tomorrow", and which I would call, correcting Stefan Zweig, "the world of today". Greece is not that lucky. It does not belong to such a family. I come here alone, with the strength of my right, the right of this people which has lived through anguished hours under a colonial regime; I fight here with the strength given me by principles. I will insist on this for I feel in this Committee a little like the miller of Potsdam when Frederick the Great wanted to buy his mill to make his garden bigger. The miller refused to sell and, when Frederick the Great insisted, he said: "There are judges in Berlin". Well, I am the representative of a small mill, and I say to you: "There are judges in New York, there are judges in Manhattan, on the East River".

That is why I insist on this point. But this is a question that is very close to me, and I speak to you with profound emotion because I feel all alone here. However, beside this problem which is mine, there is another question that is yours: Where are we going? Are we going to become, after so many beautiful hopes, after all the blood that has been shed during the last war, will this very important committee become an organ which manufactures resolutions that each one can interpret at his pleasure? Is this to be our role? Are we going to follow this dangerous path? Are we going to be the body which produces amendments and counter-amendments which block decisions upon which we have to vote, and are we then only going to vote on decisions that either say nothing or say what each one wants it to say?

I have asked my question. It is for you to ask your question of yourself because this is a very serious time. It is the hour in which, for the first time, we are called upon to vote and to take a position on a principle.

Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (interpretation from French): There is no doubt in my mind that the sponsors of the amendments which have just been proposed, the delegations of Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway, have presented them in a spirit of conciliation to find a solution of the problem before us. The role of these delegations in the United Nations has been characterized by a moderating influence, to which we must pay tribute.

On this occasion, however, my delegation regrets that it is unable to share their views on this question. These eleventh-hour amendments, in my opinion, completely modify the sense of the Greek proposal, and Greece has told us that it rejects them.

I would like to draw the attention of the sponsors of the amendments and of the Committee to the fact that this proposal is not in line with the provisions of rule 131 of the rules of procedure, which reads in part:

"A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal."

If you will look at paragraph 4 of the amendments presented by Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway, you will see that it is proposed that the following paragraph be substituted for the operative paragraph:

"Expresses its earnest hope that further negotiations and discussions between those concerned will be promptly undertaken in a spirit of co-operation with a view to finding a peaceful, democratic and just solution, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." (A/C.1/L.199)

The present operative paragraph of the Greek proposal reads as follows:

"Expresses the wish that the people of Cyprus will be given the opportunity to determine their own future by the application of their right to self-determination." (A/C.1/L.197)

If you compare these two paragraphs, you will find that it is difficult indeed to contend that the new paragraph is really an amendment. It is not an addition to the Greek proposal and it does not delete from or revise part of that proposal. It is, in fact, a new proposal which is entirely different from the proposal originally presented by Greece. In our opinion, this new

(Mr. Loutfi, Egypt)

paragraph is therefore no amendment at all. I ask the sponsors to reconsider their amendments, especially as this is a matter of principle. In particular, I ask them to reconsider paragraph 4, which, in my view, does not fall within the purview of rule 131 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): My delegation views with great regret the introduction of these amendments to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Greece. No matter how good the intentions may be of the delegations which submitted these amendments, their proposals amount to an attempt to introduce vagueness instead of clarity into the draft resolution because vagueness in the circumstances is convenient. It is an attempt to introduce a repetition of the resolution of the last session which, unfortunately, was of such a tenor that it helped to solve practically nothing. This attitude of trying to suit actions of the United Nations to convenience diminishes the possibility of this Organization of helping the parties concerned to arrive at the kind of resolution that satisfies the Charter.

Let me explain further. On looking at these amendments, what do we find in paragraph 4 which amends the operative paragraph? We find a repetition of the resolution of the last session, plus a statement that further negotiations and discussions between those concerned will be undertaken for the purpose of finding a peaceful, democratic and just solution recognized last year. The negotiations that have taken place have put the attainment of this purpose further away than ever.

The Cyprus question is complicated by the fact that, on the one hand, it is essentially a question of the liberation of a people from colonial rule. In that respect, negotiations that could and should be held are limited to the people of Cyprus themselves, the party that is really interested and whose national life is at stake, and to the United Kingdom, which is a party by virtue of its colonial rule over Cyprus. Negotiations of that kind have not as yet been carried out. They should be limited to the people of Cyprus and the United Kingdom so that, through negotiations, the parties could find a way to apply in practice the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus as one people.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

In this question there are other aspects which I may call rather strange to the matter per se. There is the aspect of interest in the island of Cyprus, which involves more than one country. Over and again in history, Cyprus has been a staging ground for attacks upon the neighbouring countries, and particularly upon Syria. In that respect, the question would be not the liberation of Cyprus which we now have before us, but how to end the use of Cyprus as a place from which to stage attacks against the neighbouring countries -- in other words, how to demilitarize and to neutralize Cyprus. The negotiations concerning the demilitarization or the neutralization of Cyprus should not be limited to the United Kingdom, to which Cyprus has never been a danger. They should not be limited to Greece and Turkey, but they should include, as we tried to state yesterday, Syria and other countries neighbouring Cyprus which are also heirs to the Ottoman Empire.

We therefore have two different questions. One is the question of liberation with which we are now dealing. The other is the effect of Cyprus on the neighbouring countries if and when that liberation is realized. The second question will be considered eventually. It is not the one before the United Nations.

These amendments before us bring the two matters together because they make the question so complex as to render it difficult of solution. The more we get of such amendments the further away we will be from the real solution of the Cyprus problem. These amendments, therefore, are not a step in the right direction. They do not amend the draft resolution. They steer the question in a different direction -- from that of liberation to the more complex and different issue of trying to compose differences between the various parties that are interested in the future of Cyprus. We strongly oppose this step. We find that the Greek amendment which amends the amendments is one which might help us to return to the path of liberation, which the people of Cyprus deserve.

While the United Nations might continue its conciliatory efforts, it is essential, we find, that this Organization should feel that it is already time to act, and to act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, not in

MA/mlw

A/C.1/PV.933
19-20

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

accordance with convenience or expediency so as to find a means of complicating the problem further instead of solving it. I do not want to make any reflection upon the good intentions of the delegations which submitted these amendments, but it is our definite view that such a trend would render the solution of the Cyprus problem almost impossible.

Mr. St. LOT (Haiti)(interpretation from French): The delegation of the Haitian Republic deliberately did not take part in the general debate. The debate, in fact, took such a form that in our opinion full light was cast on this delicate problem of Cyprus which has been presented to us. It seems to my delegation that the parties concerned were more or less agreed on the existence of the right of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

We noted the formal statement by the representative of the United Kingdom and the formal statement by the representative of Turkey, as well as the one by the Foreign Minister of Greece. The three parties agreed. My delegation was, therefore, prepared to support the draft resolution proposed by the Foreign Minister of Greece. In its operative part, that draft resolution recognizes the right of self-determination for the people of Cyprus. This operative part is in keeping with the formally expressed will of the parties concerned. It is likewise in keeping with the principles of the Charter. My delegation felt that recognition of this right would be one accomplishment in this debate and, even if negotiations were to continue as urged by this draft resolution, these negotiations would proceed from a specific basis, which would be recognition by all the parties involved of the right of self-determination.

However, this morning we have an amendment before us. We shall not vote for that amendment, because, in its operative part, the only achievement from the present debate would be nullified, that is, the consensus of the Assembly and the agreement of the parties as to the existence of the right of self-determination. This right is deleted and brushed aside, so to say, by the amendment. There is one thing, however, which must be said. Representatives with legal training know full well that the existence of a right is one thing but the exercise of a right is another. In an Assembly like ours, we may well recognize a right as set forth by the Charter and we may say that a people is entitled to benefit from that right. We cannot judge the situation. All we are affirming is the existence of a right. We do not wish to demand the exercise of a certain right. The exercise of a right may be prevented by natural or legal obstacles. The Declaration of Human Rights states that every human being is entitled to participate in the formation of the government of his country. This is the existence of a right; but the exercise of that right is conditional upon a host of natural or juridical factors. There are certain

(Mr. St. Lot, Haiti)

requirements and conditions for the exercise of a right. With the sub-amendment of the Foreign Minister, we could still affirm the existence of the right of self-determination for the people of Cyprus, or, if you please, the peoples of Cyprus. As for the modalities of implementation, these have to be determined in the course of and as a result of negotiations. We cannot refuse to admit this unless we are prepared to lacerate the Charter of the United Nations and say that the right of self-determination, about which so much has been said and which is one of the greatest achievements of the universal conscience of the present day, is a mere figment of the imagination, a soap bubble, because, when it is actually invoked, it is argued away by subtleties and procedural stratagems. If this goes on, the people will simply lose confidence in us. Let us affirm the existence of the right and leave its exercise to the parties concerned. This is the least that we can decently do.

Therefore, I shall vote in favour of the sub-amendment proposed by the Foreign Minister of Greece. The operative part would then be in conformity with the statements of the parties involved and it would also be in keeping with the formal provisions of the Charter; moreover, it would be in harmony with the aspirations of the martyred people of Cyprus.

Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): I shall try to be as brief as I can. The fourth amendment states:

"Expresses its earnest hope that further negotiations and discussions between those concerned will be promptly undertaken in a spirit of co-operation with a view to finding a peaceful, democratic and just solution, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

(A/C.1/L.199)

I do not need to remind the Committee what the Charter of the United Nations contains in its wording and what the spirit of the Charter is in general. It has been contended that this last amendment is a repetition of resolution 1013, which the General Assembly adopted last year unanimously. Actually it is not. It goes further than the resolution that was adopted last year.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

However, even admitting for the sake of argument that it is a repetition, I must say that there was nothing wrong with resolution 1013 which the Assembly adopted last year unanimously. That resolution contained all the elements necessary for an agreed solution. I could even say that it contained all the elements which are included in the Greek draft resolution presented this year.

If the success of the resolution adopted last year was limited, if it could not be implemented in all its aspects, it is not the fault of the resolution, it is not the fault of the General Assembly. The responsibility for its limited success lies squarely on the intransigence of our opponents, on the shoulders of our opponents.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The Assembly, we honestly believe, should leave sufficient latitude for all concerned to achieve an agreed solution. If at this session we adopt a resolution merely for the sake of adopting a resolution I doubt very much if that will have an effect on the solution that we all desire. There are at least half a dozen resolutions of the United Nations, and of the Security Council even, which could not be implemented simply because some of them were adopted just for the sake of adopting a resolution, without examining all the aspects of its relation to the international situation, and so on. As far as we are concerned, we do not want to assist in the adoption of a resolution whose implementation will be made impossible because it will not be in conformity with realism and with the possibilities of the very complex situation in Cyprus.

The Foreign Minister of Greece made a very eloquent appeal, but his appeal was directed to the emotions rather than to reason. For our part, we want to act reasonably and in a way which will be conducive to the solution of the Cyprus question in a manner which will give satisfaction to the General Assembly and to all concerned, including the delegation of Greece. But in order to be in a position to do that the General Assembly must, I repeat with all respect, leave the necessary latitude which will be conducive to the achievement of constructive work.

I say, again with all respect to the Foreign Minister of Greece, that the Greek amendment (A/C.1/L.200) to the four-Power amendments (A/C.1/L.199) is, as he admitted himself, a tactic. His tactic has been confirmed by his own admission, but in the opinion of the Turkish delegation the amendments presented by Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway are not a tactic. These latter are the sort of amendments which, as I have said, will leave sufficient latitude to the parties concerned, and particularly to the administering Power, to make contact with the other interested parties and with the peoples of Cyprus in order to achieve an agreed settlement.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

In contrast to the appeal which was made to the emotions by my Greek colleague -- and I hope that he will permit me to call him that for, although I am not a Foreign Minister, we are, after all, all representatives here -- I make an appeal to the reason of this Committee. We should never forget that the very name of this Committee is "the Political Committee". We must be politically-minded; we must be practically-minded. We must deal with realism; we cannot afford to ignore the international implications of this extremely complex question which we call today "the question of Cyprus".

Believe me, no one in this Committee would be more happy than I if we could reach an agreed solution of the question of Cyprus, but it is not -- as Mr. Averoff-Tossizza admitted -- through the tactics of the Greek delegation and by appeals to the emotions of the General Assembly that we can achieve that. We are a political committee; we must, as I say, deal with realism, and we must be politically-minded. I appeal to your reason, gentlemen. Leave us the necessary latitude which will be conducive to the solution of the Cyprus question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the next speaker I must remind the Committee that we are discussing the draft resolution and the amendments thereto. I should like, therefore, to entreat representatives to limit themselves to the draft resolution and the amendments. I feel that the discussion of them should not give rise to a repetition of the general debate. Having said that, I call on the representative of Norway.

Mr. ENGEN (Norway): I shall address myself very briefly to the draft resolution and the amendments submitted thereto. At the outset may I just say that I listened with some surprise to the intervention by the Foreign Minister of Greece when he commented on the amendments (A/C.1/L.199) which my delegation has had the honour to co-sponsor together with the delegations of Canada, Chile and Denmark. I was somewhat surprised by his contention that the motives underlying our submission of those amendments would have to be considered as in the nature of a technical manoeuvre. With all sincere respect for the representative of Greece, I do not think that my delegation can accept that contention.

(Mr. Engen, Norway)

As I said in an intervention when we were discussing the previous item on this Committee's agenda, the Algerian question, the overriding consideration for my delegation when making up its mind with respect to a proposal which is before the Committee is the following. A delegation has submitted an issue to discussion by the United Nations. I assume that the purpose of submitting that issue is to have it discussed and dealt with in accordance with the rules of procedure and with the purposes and principles of the Charter of this Organization. The main function of the United Nations is, of course, to be not only a forum for debate but also one where the various views can be harmonized. It does not appear to me to be the most natural thing in the world to contend that it is the duty of the Members of this Organization to take a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of a country which is a party to a dispute, regard it as being the last word in the discussion and vote yes or no on the outcome which that particular delegation feels would be the proper outcome in this Organization.

(Mr. Engen, Norway)

My delegation -- together with the other delegations here, I am sure -- has listened very carefully to the views expressed by the parties most directly concerned, namely, the delegations of Greece, the United Kingdom and Turkey, and it is our sincere opinion that the text submitted by one of those delegations, that is, the Greek delegation, while it is, of course, altogether understandable from the point of view of the Greek Government, does not appear to us to be necessarily the best solution to emerge from this debate. I say that with all respect, and I do not think it is the view of the Greek delegation that it is not the privilege of other delegations here to submit for the consideration of the Committee language which differs from the language submitted, in this instance, by the delegation of Greece, without running the risk that its motives will be doubted in any sense of the word.

We have joined in proposing these amendments because we feel very honestly and very sincerely that they express in a better way the feeling or the opinion of the Members here assembled. If that is not the case, it is for the Committee to decide otherwise. If the majority of the Committee feels that this is the better way of expressing itself, then it will, in accordance with our rules of procedure, vote accordingly. If it is in disagreement with us, it will show that by its vote.

I noted with great pleasure that the Foreign Minister of Greece accepted the first three amendments that we submitted. That leaves the fourth amendment, which deals with the operative part of the Greek draft resolution and represents, of course, the crux of the matter. In that regard, I would say this: Statements have been made -- very eloquently and, I think, correctly -- as to the value and importance of the right of self-determination. For our part, we do not for one second, of course, deny anybody this right, and we do not for one second dispute the fact that the right of self-determination of peoples is one of the basic points in the Charter of this Organization. But there are other basic features of our Charter which, we feel, should not be pushed aside when one is dealing with a question of such complexity as this problem of Cyprus. We feel that, in order to solve this problem, all the basic rights embodied in the Charter of the United Nations should be brought into play -- and not only the statement of the right of

(Mr. Engen, Norway)

self-determination. To say this, I repeat, is not to deny anybody the right of self-determination. But we think that reference should be made to the broader rights included in the Charter of this Organization and that these rights, all of them, should be applicable to the whole population of Cyprus -- its majority and its minority. We feel that this idea is better expressed in the wording of the operative paragraph which we have taken the liberty of submitting to the Committee. That has been our whole idea in referring to the rights of the peoples of Cyprus in the way we have done in the fourth of our amendments. We are asking that, through negotiations and through co-operation between all the interested parties, an effort be made to find a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. And that Charter, as I have said, entails more rights than simply the right of self-determination.

I should now like to say a few words about the amendment which the Greek delegation has submitted. I must confess that this proposal puts the Committee in a rather strange situation as far as the parliamentary rules are concerned, because it is presented as an amendment to our amendment -- whereas, of course, it is in substance a re-introduction of the operative paragraph which we have sought to amend. If we are to permit this to be considered as an amendment to our amendment, the Committee would be in for a long series of amendments and sub-amendments, and I do not know where we would end. If it is the privilege of the Greek delegation to re-introduce its operative paragraph in the way it has done, that is, in the form of a sub-amendment, then it is, of course, our privilege to re-introduce our amendment as a new sub-amendment, and we could go on in that way for a very long time. I therefore respectfully request the Chairman to take under very serious consideration whether, under the normal parliamentary rules, the amendment submitted by the delegation of Greece is actually in order.

Mr. VELA (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, as well as all the others in this hall, recognizes that principles are the prestige and power of the United Nations. I was reading a statement made by Mr. Lester Pearson when he received the Nobel Prize, in which he referred to defensive alliances and said that they could only be a secondary substitute to the United Nations, which has the task of establishing and preserving peace, although it may be that at the moment the United Nations is a battle field for the cold war.

(Mr. Vela, Guatemala)

Guatemala believes in these principles, and we believe also in the principles and purposes of the Charter. As a small Power, we are also aware of the fact that all our moral force resides in defending such principles and in adhering closely to the rules of procedure of the United Nations. Therefore, although we wish to pay tribute to the good intentions of the Powers submitting amendments to the Greek draft resolution, I must refer to the procedural aspect of the question and also the substance of the amendments themselves.

Regarding the procedural aspect, my delegation is of the opinion that this document is not an amendment in accordance with the last part of rule 131, which reads as follows:

"A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal."

Of the amendments submitted, the preambular parts could be considered as amendments. I think that therein lay the reason which led the representative of Greece to say that he did not object to having the preambular paragraphs amended.

(Mr. Vela, Guatemala)

I would even go so far as to say that, in a spirit of compromise, the movers of the amendment should not be unwilling to accent the preamble of the original draft resolution, because that is not where the resolution really lies. Although no one can deny the usefulness of a preamble, the resolution itself really lies in its operative part. In this case, the operative part of the Greek draft resolution is the fourth paragraph, and the amendment submitted by Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway would wholly change the tenor of the Greek draft resolution. I need not explain this, since the text of the original draft resolution is crystal clear and requires no explanation.

If it did require an explanation or if it did lend itself to different interpretations, the Foreign Minister of Greece has emphatically stated to the Committee that what we are being asked to vote upon is a principle that is set forth in the Charter, a principle that, during the twelve years of the existence of the United Nations, has not been objected to by anyone, nor has it been put through the acid test of a vote in the General Assembly.

We respect principles so highly that in the course of the general debate we stated that the Guatemalan delegation saw no objection to voting in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Committee by Greece. Furthermore, being influenced only by our love for the principles of the Charter, we appealed to the Committee to unanimously adopt the draft resolution.

So far as procedure is concerned, we believe that the substitution of the operative paragraph of the draft resolution would not be an amendment. The operative paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1013 (XI) is repeated in practically the same words in the text of the amendment, and while the amendment would insert, as the second paragraph of the preamble, a reaffirmation of resolution 1013 (XI) of 26 February 1957, that would add nothing because the suggested operative paragraph is almost an exact repetition of that General Assembly resolution. The amendment expresses the earnest "hope" while the General Assembly resolution expressed the earnest "desire". I do not think that the United Nations or this Committee can be asked to be satisfied with the few results achieved by resolution 1013 (XI).

(Mr. Vela, Guatemala)

In the specific case of Cyprus, there is a definite reason for applying the principle of self-determination, because none of the parties who have spoken have stated their sovereignty over the island, and more than one of the parties have expressed their desire to recognize the right of self-determination for the people of Cyprus. Perhaps, as the representative of Haiti has said, the question is "how" and "when", and, so far as the question of Cyprus is concerned, that would be solved by negotiations. It might also be true that the problem is complex, but the basis and the essence of this problem is the fate of a people, and, in considering it here, the Committee and the General Assembly must recognize that it can only be settled on the basis of the moral and human values of liberty and justice. Although we agree that the question may be surrounded by interests and by responsibilities that we fully appreciate, we nevertheless believe that those interests and those moralities can be negotiated once the outline of the negotiations has been set, and that outline is the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination and to the expression of their desires for the future. That is the question confronting us, and all the interests, which here seem to be so opposed because of the complexity of the problem, might better be understood if this Committee and the General Assembly were this year to take a step forward in the field of law and of right so as to make effective the affirmation of a principle contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

We are of the opinion that this problem could be solved by good will on the part of the parties concerned, and let us remember that the only party that can speak regarding the justice of its cause is the people of Cyprus, however much we understand and respect the interests and the responsibilities of the other parties concerned in a region which, politically and strategically speaking, is important.

To return to the proposed amendment to paragraph 4, the deletion of the paragraph in the draft resolution and its substitution by another paragraph would not satisfy the aspirations of the people of Cyprus. It cannot satisfy the aspirations of those of us who wish to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, nor would it favour a solution of the problem, since General Assembly resolution 1013 (XI) certainly did not obtain the degree of understanding that it was supposed to have done.

Though we may recall the previous resolution and though good will still exists on the part of the parties concerned, negotiations will not be possible until this Assembly has pronounced itself, as it should, clearly on the crux of the problem, that is, the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination.

For these reasons, Guatemala will be unable to vote in favour of the amendment. Firstly, we do not wish to create a precedent which would be contrary to our rules of procedure, and this we would do if we voted in favour of an amendment which is not really an amendment but rather a completely new proposal submitted out of order. Secondly, the amendment is unacceptable to us because the principles of the Charter are not being respected and followed. We have to prove that the principles contained in the Charter are not merely words wielded in the field of debate. We have to maintain peace, we have to promote freedom, and we have to encourage justice all over the world. Although in this Committee we are told that we are a political committee, we are a senate of the highest and most noble politics, and as such, we cannot be divorced from the principles of the Charter.

Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru)(interpretation from Spanish): The words of the Foreign Minister of Greece always touch me very deeply, but some of his words this morning have brought great sorrow to my heart. He said that Greece is a country that stands alone; that it does not belong to a family of nations; that it is not a member of any group. With all due respect, that I cannot accept. I cannot go along with that assertion by the Foreign Minister of Greece. Is his noble country not a member of the United Nations family, of the Greco-Latin family, of all the countries that are proud of having received the immortal message of Greece, the Saxon countries which, perhaps more than the Latin countries, have cultivated Greek literature? We have all gone along with Greece not only in the cult of the glory that was Greece, but also in our enthusiasm for the heroism of Greece in the last wars. I might say with pride that my delegation argued with considerable fire with Mr. Manuilsky when we were discussing Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, and so on. We are all brothers here and we still continue to be friends, and we have discussed with deep concern the return of Greek women and children.

I trust that the Chairman, in his kindness, will forgive me for this digression. I take part in this debate with a feeling of great affection for Greece, as well as with affection and great respect for the positions of the United Kingdom and Turkey. But in judging proposals, I must make use of a certain yardstick.

The Cyprus question cannot be simplified; we cannot use the mathematical means of isolating an unknown, or the physical method of isolating an element; nor can we use the method of certain philosophical theories. In diplomacy, there is no isolation of facts, no division of international complexities, no placing of any matter between brackets. The United Nations is confronted with an integral reality with its essential nucleus and its surrounding circumstances, with its adherent elements which are inseparable. It would be a grave error if, when confronted by a problem, we were to follow the parenthetical or process of elimination method of discussing situations. Our first interest must be that of the people of Cyprus, comprising Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Their interests must be termed paramount.

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

The second interest is that of the country at present exercising sovereignty over Cyprus, and having responsibilities and obligations regarding the western world and regarding peace in the whole world. This cannot be set aside or overlooked. We would be less than statesmen were we to overlook this interest.

There is another aspect: the hope of Greece, which is most admirable, that Cyprus might wish to join Greece; the sacred interests of Turkey; and the peace of the world itself.

Although there are visible, tangible factors, there are also invisible and intangible factors. After all, are the ambitions of other Powers not also directed towards the Mediterranean? If the Cyprus question is a complex one, I must say, in all friendship, that we cannot give it a unilateral solution. We cannot say: take one principle of the Charter, apply it to Cyprus, and that is that. There is the modus operandi because there are other problems involved, because there are the interests of the Cyprus people. Let us suppose that tomorrow Cyprus were to express its will publicly: how is that principle to be applied, and how are we going to implement such a desire expressed by the people if there is no agreement between Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom as regards the interests of Cyprus? Obviously, it would give rise to a new situation in Cyprus.

Therefore, as far as I am concerned, the main defect in the original draft resolution is the absence of any mention of negotiations. There is one aspect of the draft resolution which I respect. It does reflect the concern of Greece, but I cannot share to the methods outlined in the draft, and that is why I have studied the amendments most carefully. I am not worried about procedural questions. In his great intelligence, the representative of Greece said that he would be able to accept three of the amendments. For that I congratulate him. It shows a wide understanding of the facts. I think that the language of the amendments is more friendly, more conciliatory. It is the kind of language that we should use in the United Nations. We are united; these words surely mean something. We must not be disunited. We may be separated at times, but our tendency is towards unity, towards unanimity, because unanimity or overwhelming majority is the only guarantee of the moral influence of a resolution. That is why we put every effort into reaching unanimous decisions. Sometimes we make

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

eloquent speeches, but at others we prefer quiet, subtle negotiations in the corridors in order to find what might appear to be a vague formula, but one that is filled with a deep meaning which reflects the entire mandate of world public opinion in favour of conciliation, peace and understanding.

These amendments are not manoeuvres; they are not tactics. Tactics are used for predominance, but when some Powers are trying to bring together differing points of view they renounce predominance. What they desire is conciliation. That is what the United Nations is for. Our duty, after discussing problems at great length, after discussing them in the three stages which I have mentioned -- first, the interests of our people; second, the interests of the United Nations; and third, the finding of a solution -- our efforts then must tend towards a solution. Words may be imperfect, but behind their imperfections lies the spirit of the United Nations. Declarations made in the debates at times may not be exactly right, and perhaps the words used by the delegations of Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway do not mention self-determination; but those words were used by the United Kingdom representative as well as by practically all other speakers.

(Mr. Belaunde, Peru)

They have said, and the representative of Norway has said: If we do not use the word self-determination it is because it is not the only principle in the Charter and because this principle, which is dealing with a complex population, can give rise to different interpretations. However, the principle is there, accepted by all, and when we speak of the Principles of the Charter, we may say not only in conformity with the Principles and Purposes of the Charter, but also we may say in fulfilment of the Principles and Purposes of the Charter.

Thus I frankly do not find the four-Power amendment to be bad. We are not speaking of the other paragraphs, which have been accepted and, in my view, very appropriately by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece. Let us concentrate our attention on the fourth amendment. Naturally we are all extremely pleased to have the principle of self-determination. We should all like this principle to be applied universally without immediately having different implications come up, without having reservations, without having doubts as to the implementation of this principle. But we do have the Charter of the United Nations which contains purposes and principles and which says: The solution must be found in conformity with the Principles and Purposes of the United Nations Charter, and expressing not only the hope -- and in this I accept the very timely amendment submitted by the representative of Spain -- but the desire, and I would continue to say the earnest desire that further negotiations and discussions between the parties involved -- and the parties involved are not only the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, but also the Greek and Turkish population of Cyprus -- without prejudice to this debate being continued, and I believe that some magic formula should be sought. We are in duty bound to find that formula. But at the moment my delegation is in favour of the amendments which have been submitted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before calling on the next speaker, the representative of Greece, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the deadline of the Assembly forces us to speed up our debates on the Cyprus question. We still have another item on the agenda that we are in duty bound to examine fully. That is why I am ready to propose to you the following procedure. On the list of speakers there is Greece, El Salvador, Uruguay, the United Kingdom, Tunisia, Canada, Bolivia, Iceland and Iran.

After we have heard the representatives of Greece and Turkey, I propose to adjourn this meeting and to meet again this afternoon at 3 p.m. After we have heard these speakers, I shall close the debate on the draft resolutions and the amendments to the draft resolutions and then we will go on to the vote.

I will follow that procedure with the consent of the Committee. Since there is no objection, that procedure is adopted.

It was so decided.

Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece)(interpretation from French): As I was not aware that there were so many speakers on the list and since I may wish to exercise my right of reply, I would prefer not to speak now but later, at the end.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In view of the statement that has just been made by the representative of Greece, I propose to adjourn the meeting and to continue the debate on the draft resolution and the amendments...

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): I will be very brief, but I think it would be convenient that I should explain to the Committee how my delegation will cast its vote on the amendment introduced this morning by the delegations of Canada, Chile, Denmark and Norway, and the sub-amendment introduced by the Foreign Minister of Greece.

In my previous interventions in this debate, I have tried to set out the Cyprus problem as we see it. As I have said, it is not a straightforward colonial problem; because of the campaign for enosis it has become an international problem.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

We in the United Kingdom were not responsible for that. The responsibility lies with those who promoted the campaign. But we in the United Kingdom are faced with the responsibility for the international problem created in this way. It is not, in our view, an insoluble problem, given the will on all sides to work for a solution. We believe that there is ground for a compromise but it is, as I have said, a difficult and a complex problem. I would emphasize this: If it is handled wrongly, grievous consequences could follow both in the island and elsewhere. It is not, in our view, for the Committee to endorse any particular solution or indeed -- and I think this is very important -- even to point the way to such a solution. This must be worked out between the three Governments concerned and the two communities in Cyprus. What the Committee, in our view, should do, since the problem has become so acute, is to point to the procedures which should be followed in the search for a solution. In doing this, the United Nations should bear in mind the full complexity of the problem. It should not single out one aspect of it. Least of all, should it endorse the campaign for enosis which, as we all know by now, is being waged here under the banner of self-determination to the detriment of that principle itself. As I have said before, it is not that we do not support the principle of self-determination, but as many representatives have pointed out, in addition to myself, it is the application that is always difficult, and that is especially so in this particular case of Cyprus with its international complications.

I shall therefore vote against the Greek sub-amendment. If it is rejected, I shall support the four-Power amendments. And if they are carried, I shall support the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall meet again this afternoon at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

[Illegible text block containing a letter or document body]

[Illegible text block containing a signature or closing line]

[Illegible text block containing a name or title]