

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED  
A/C.1/PV.848  
18 February 1957  
ENGLISH

Eleventh Session  
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 18 February 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

Question of Cyprus [55] (continued)

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

Mr. Noble (United Kingdom)  
Mr. Sarper (Turkey)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.848. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

QUESTION OF CYPRUS (A/3120 and Add.1, A/3204 and Add.1; A/C.1/788; A/C.1/L.168, A/C.1/L.169) Agenda item 55 (continued)

- (a) APPLICATION, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, OF THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL RIGHTS AND SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES IN THE CASE OF THE POPULATION OF THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS
- (b) COMPLAINT BY THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND OF SUPPORT FROM GREECE FOR TERRORISM IN CYPRUS

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): The Foreign Minister of Greece has said that his Government has scrupulously avoided encouraging the Cypriot terrorists. I must ask the Committee to compare this with the broadcasts specially written by Athens Radio for Cyprus, which I have already quoted this morning. The Greek Foreign Minister went further; he said that his Government had "gone so far as to take all measures possible to prevent Greeks from sending arms to their brothers in Cyprus". (A/C.1/PV.847, page 33) I really must ask the Committee to compare this assertion with the evidence that I have set forth showing that serving Greek army officers had been actively encouraged in supporting terrorism. I must also ask the Committee to remember that some of the arms and explosives used by the terrorists have been paid for with money from Greek Government sources.

Now, I believe that I have shown that this movement was organized and financed with Greek help, that it was encouraged and even guided by Greek propaganda -- in particular, by Athens Radio -- and that it was supported and exploited by the Greek Government in the international field in order to further the campaign for Enosis.

All this was being done in total disregard for the well-being of Cyprus itself; for the maintenance of good relations between the two main communities on the island; for relations between Greece and my own country; for relations between Greece and Turkey; and for the wider interests on which the freedom of Greece, as the rest of the free world, depends.

My Government is not without knowledge or understanding of the great pressures to which successive Greek Governments have been subjected in this matter, from many quarters. But here, at the United Nations, no one can plead extenuating circumstances of that kind. We must all accept responsibility for the actions of our Governments, however awkward the position in which they are placed.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

My Government, therefore, is fully entitled to ask the United Nations for redress against the Government of Greece. My Government asks this with all the more insistence because it has been grappling for years with the problems created, both inside and outside the island of Cyprus, created by the Greek claim for Enosis, and now by Greek support for terrorism.

We are not, after all, without some experience of the world and its ways. We believe in practical solutions for practical problems. We do not deny that there is a problem, of a very special kind in Cyprus, and we have sought long and diligently to find a solution for it.

After the war, the British Government put forward liberal constitutional proposals. The first proposals made some progress, but in 1948 the Communists and the Orthodox Church leaders in Cyprus both drew back.

Nevertheless, my Government continued to work for self-government in Cyprus and our offer remained open until we made a fresh one in 1954. The declaration which we then made of our readiness for new constitutional discussions with the Cypriots met with a disappointing response.

Despite these setbacks, the economic measures which my Government vigorously pushed forward in Cyprus raised the standard of living there to a point well above the average for the Eastern Mediterranean. British justice, British government and British progress were appreciated. I think the emigration figures show where the Cypriots thought their best interests lay. In 1955, the latest year for which there are complete figures, 4,469 Cypriots emigrated to the United Kingdom; 1,098 to other Commonwealth countries; 109 to the United States of America; and none to Greece.

Here at the United Nations, it was decided at the ninth session not to consider the Greek claim further, and at the tenth session it was decided not to include the item on the agenda of the Assembly. The Committee will no doubt recollect that the present Greek item is identical with that which the United Nations rejected at the last session.

In 1954 and 1955, my Government was increasingly concerned at the probable international consequences of the Enosis campaign which was being waged from Greece.

In the summer of 1955 -- that was six months after the United Nations had decided not to consider further the Greek demand for so-called self-determination -- my Government invited the Governments of Greece and Turkey to a tripartite

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

conference in London. At this conference, my Government put forward proposals for liberal self-government in the island, and for a tripartite committee to keep watch over developments.

In the light of subsequent events, it is sad that these proposals met with no acceptance.

My Government then attempted to reach an agreement with Archbishop Makarios, and with the Turkish leaders in Cyprus.

We kept the Greek and Turkish Governments closely informed of the development of these negotiations. We hoped that both Governments would use their influence to secure moderation. Unfortunately, the talks broke down on the intransigence of Archbishop Makarios. He refused to make any move to discourage violence. Indeed, the fact that he was generally known to have refused to denounce terrorism was widely interpreted in Cyprus as positive support for ECKA.

My Government has evidence that this interpretation of the Archbishop's conduct was only too accurate. Captured documents confirmed that the Archbishop had been privy to the whole organization of EOKA and had provided it with large sums of money for the purchase of explosives. He went even further. It was he who finally ordered Grivas to begin terrorism. In these circumstances, his removal from Cyprus and from the leadership of EOKA has been a positive contribution to the restoration of law and order.

Nevertheless, last summer we made a new attempt to find a solution. At the end of the most recent meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, on 6 July 1956, a statement was issued which contained the following passage:

"The Prime Ministers were informed of the situation in Cyprus, and welcome the unceasing efforts of the United Kingdom Government to find a solution acceptable to all concerned."

That is what we have been doing all along, trying to find a "solution acceptable to all concerned."

In July, Lord Radcliffe agreed to draw up new constitutional proposals for the island. He is a jurist of wide experience and of the highest international reputation. He visited Cyprus twice, and, after careful study, produced his report last November. This report seemed to chart a middle course between the conflicting interests involved. It did more. It created means for reconciling these interests, and my Government accepted it as a whole. We therefore made a new approach to the Governments of Greece and Turkey on the basis of this report.

That was in December.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies himself flew out to Athens and Ankara to discuss the position with the two Governments. He made plain our anxiety to press ahead with self-government at the earliest possible moment. He also expressed our ideas for the more distant future. These were based on the principle of self-determination for both the Greek and Turkish communities when international and local conditions permitted. Mr. Lennox-Boyd told each Government that we wanted to keep in close touch with them and would welcome their constructive comments on the constitutional proposals.

All this was in spite of an atmosphere in Greece which could hardly be regarded as propitious. Well before Lord Radcliffe's report had been drawn up, Athens Radio was abusing him personally and urging the Cypriots to reject all constitutions. On 6 October, for instance, Athens Radio declared:

"The constitution which they are preparing will never be implemented. It will only remain a scrap of paper."

Nevertheless, we hoped that the Greek Government would consider the new proposals seriously. We expected that they might have questions to ask, and we were ready to answer them. We were prepared also to give the Greek Government facilities to send an emissary to Archbishop Makarios.

The Greek Government has constantly claimed to be the "mandatory" of the Greek Cypriots. It was therefore scarcely conceivable that it should express an opinion on the proposals until it knew the views of the Cypriots themselves. We certainly had the right to expect that they would do nothing to prejudice anyone in Cyprus against the proposals.

But what, in fact, happened?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd gave the Greek Prime Minister a copy of the Radcliffe Report on 13 December. He outlined our broader proposals and said that if the Greek Government found points of difficulty or doubt, we would be ready for further discussions. He explained that the report would not be presented to Parliament in London until Wednesday, 19 December, and he appealed for a sympathetic welcome of it by the Greek Government.

Yet, on 14 December, after only twenty-four hours in which to study so detailed a document as the Radcliffe Report, the Greek Government rejected it and the British proposals which accompanied it. The next day, Saturday, 15 December -- which was still four days before the Report was published in Cyprus -- Athens Radio broadcast this in a special message to Cyprus:

"If, for reasons of simple politeness, and if, following the request of the British Minister, Mr. Boyd, the Greek reply is not published before next Wednesday when the British Government will make an announcement on its proposals in the House of Commons, this is nothing but a detail; the fact is that the Government, having carefully studied the Radcliffe constitution, has rejected it as unacceptable."

I leave it to the judgement of this Committee whether this was a responsible reaction to serious proposals on an issue which had been plaguing the relations of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom for years, and whether this showed any dispassionate interest in the welfare of the inhabitants of Cyprus. This immediate rejection of the proposals of which the Radcliffe Report forms a part, without any form of consultation with anyone in Cyprus, and this immediate attempt to influence opinion in Cyprus against these proposals, certainly came very strangely from a Government which professes to believe in self-determination -- that is, in the right of peoples to make up their own minds about their own future, free from all forms of pressure or intimidation.

I will not weary the Committee with a detailed analysis of the Radcliffe proposals, nor would it be proper for me to do so, since nothing belongs so essentially to the domestic jurisdiction of any State as its constitutional arrangements. But for the sake of convenience the Committee may like to have a brief outline of this further attempt to establish self-government in Cyprus.

The general scheme which these proposals seek to realize is twofold. On the one hand, all powers of self-government would be entrusted to a Legislative Assembly popularly elected, except those powers which must be retained by Her Majesty's Government as necessary to its foreign relations and to the security of its strategic base in Cyprus. On the other hand, a structure would be built up on the self-governing side which satisfies the reasonable anxieties of the smaller communities in the island, that the majority power of the larger, the Greek Cypriot community, should not be used to their prejudice. Thus, the executive power on the self-governing side would be in the hands of a Chief Minister and Cabinet of Ministers responsible to the popular Assembly; the taxing power and the control of the Budget would be vested in the Assembly, and so would the general power to make laws for Cyprus. All the usual departments of internal government, except the police department, would thus be under popular control.

Three subjects were to be reserved to the British Governor: foreign affairs, defence, and internal security. It was, however, proposed to establish a body to be known as the Joint Council of Cyprus, presided over by the Governor, for the discussion of matters or policies that lie upon the boundary between the two fields of power, and, with good will and understanding on both sides, there is no reason why a harmonious working arrangement should not result.

grs/3

A/C.1/PV.848  
14-15

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

The Greek Cypriots were to have an over-all majority in the Legislative Assembly - a point to which great importance has been attached in the past. But the provisions for securing to the smaller communities a fair share of the life and activity of the island were many and various. For instance, the Turkish Cypriots were to have a proportion of seats guaranteed to them in the Assembly, and a standing member of the Cabinet to take care of their community interests. Legislation affecting those interests was not to be passed without the consent of two thirds of their elected members. There were to have been constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion, education etc., and of freedom from discrimination. The guardians of these guarantees were to be the Supreme Court, in the case of legislation, and a Tribunal of Guarantees, in the case of executive action.



(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

Lastly, there were to be those institutions that have to be insulated from political control if among these different communities confidence was to be retained in government as a whole. There was, of course, to be an independent judiciary. There would be a civil service, appointments and promotions in which would be controlled by an independent commission. There would be broadcasting independently conducted by its own board of directors. And, while the separate Greek, Turkish and Armenian schools would be under the full control of their own communities, there would be a new body under control of the Governor. This new body would maintain and support, out of funds which it was proposed that the United Kingdom should provide, education for boys and girls of the two communities, without racial distinction.

I must, just for a moment, make a brief comment on the Greek Government's criticism of these proposals. This criticism centres on two main points. First, that "the proposals do not provide for exercise of self-determination". Of course, the Radcliffe proposals did not do so. The terms of reference given to Lord Radcliffe were to work out a system of self-government under the British Crown. But that was not the whole story. It was not intended that this step forward should prejudice the ultimate future of the island. I have already referred to the statement made by the Colonial Secretary when he introduced the Radcliffe proposals in the House of Commons on 19 December. In view of its importance, I shall quote this passage relating to the question of self-determination. It was as follows:

"Her Majesty's Government have already affirmed their recognition of the principle of self-determination. When the international and strategic situation permits, and provided that self-government is working satisfactorily, Her Majesty's Government will be ready to review the question of the application of self-determination.

"When the time comes for this review, that is, when these conditions have been fulfilled, it will be the purpose of Her Majesty's Government to ensure that any exercise of self-determination should be effected in such a manner that the Turkish Cypriot community, no less than the Greek Cypriot community, shall, in the special circumstances of Cyprus, be given freedom to decide for themselves their future status."

That was what Mr. Lennox-Boyd said on 19 December and, when he was in Athens he explained to the Greek Government that this was my Government's position.

The second main complaint of the Greek Government in regard to the Radcliffe proposals was that they give the Governor almost unlimited powers. This seems to my Government a complete misunderstanding of the proposals. The Governor's powers are carefully defined. He has his own field, but outside that, in the field of self-government, his position is only that of a constitutional ruler.

My Government has had as great an experience as any of constitutional rule. We know that, basically, it depends on good faith between the different organs of government and a genuine will to make the constitution work. If that is not forthcoming, the most perfect provisions on paper cannot possibly take its place.

Unhappily, the Greek criticism of the Governor's powers seems to assume that this good faith and good will would be absent. However, if the Greek Government had doubts about points in Lord Radcliffe's report, it could have put them forward before rejecting our proposals. Indeed, we told them that we were willing to consider any suggestions and to pay the greatest possible attention to them. Given the tragic nature of the dispute over Cyprus, the Greek Government should surely have availed itself of this offer. In contrast to the Greek attitude, most people who have followed the Cyprus question and have taken a sympathetic interest in our attempts to establish self-government, have thought our proposals were balanced and reasonable.

After his visit to Athens, the Colonial Secretary went on to Ankara and explained our proposals to the Turkish Government, who generally approved of them. The Turkish Prime Minister said on 20 December that our statement "considered as a whole, includes points of departure which could secure the final solution of the Cyprus problem", and they have since discussed our proposals with us.

Had the Greek Government shown the same readiness to consider our proposals on their merits, we should have been very glad to have held similar discussions with them.

I have spoken at some length of our proposals and the way in which they were received. I have thought it necessary to do so because they represent our latest attempt to move forward towards a solution of the problem of Cyprus. We shall, of course, go on searching for a solution. This will not be found so long as Greece

will not content herself with less than Enosis, or the prospect of Enosis. Nor will it be found until those who support Enosis are willing to allow the Cypriots to live in peace and to express their opinions free from intimidation. If Greece will face the realities of the situation, some solution can be found. Every day that the terrorist campaign continues imposes a dangerous strain on the relations between the communities in the island and further poisons relations between Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

We do not want this. I should be sorry to think that the Greek Government wants it either. But it is the inevitable result of its present course of action. And if my colleagues consider that I have substantiated my charge that there has been support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus, then they must join me in calling upon the Greek Government to ensure that this does not continue. We have the right to ask this and, finally, our position is simply this: first, that support for terrorism from Greece should cease; and that the terrorists should stop their campaign of murder and intimidation; also, that the Greeks should stop their campaign for Enosis. That is what is holding up progress at the moment.

If they do this, I am quite sure that some solution for the future of the island can be found which will be acceptable to Greece and Turkey, as well as to the two communities in the island itself. The first step towards this solution is self-government for the island. And we are most anxious to press on with this. We are determined to find a solution acceptable to all concerned but we really must ask that some co-operation be forthcoming from Greece.

Mr. SAREER (Turkey): In a period when the attention of the world is focussed upon vital problems concerning the general area of the Middle East, in a period when goodwill, common sense and a determination to foster peaceful relations in that region should dominate the minds of statesmen all over the world, the First Committee of the General Assembly has been placed in the position of having to examine certain aspects of yet another problem which has been artificially created, sustained and brought into the political area -- the so-called Cyprus question.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Indeed, among the many acrimonious debates in this Assembly -- and unfortunately there have been too great a number of such debates -- there has hardly ever been one in which my delegation has felt so much reluctance and sorrow in being compelled to state the facts and expose the truth to the Members of the United Nations.

The forces which have been the architects of the present form of the "Cyprus question", the forces which seek to promote their own selfish interests by creating hatred, dissent and division among the peoples of the region, the provocateurs whose only fear is to see the establishment of peace, stability and friendly co-operation among Greek and Turk and Britisher, have won an easy -- if only partial -- victory. How happy they must feel today that the Greek Government has been put in the position of making a claim for the annexation of a distant territory and that Turkey and the United Kingdom cannot concur in this claim. The mere fact itself should be a cause of jubilation for them, as the interest of these forces lies not in adding another island to the territory of Greece, but in only fomenting hatred, dissent and division.

What is the essence of the Cyprus question? What are the premises on which it was built up to its present tragic state?

In a region which is the home of 26 million Turks and 8 million Greeks, there is an off-shore island of Turkey on which part of the population speaks Greek and the other Turkish. We are told that the Greek-speaking population outnumbered the Turks by 260,000. We are told that this handful of a majority on an island 700 miles away from Greece should be considered sufficient reason to hand over to Greece the control of the entire region, strategically, economically and from the point of view of communications. We are told that this handful of a majority, which Greece desires to annex, should decide upon the fate and destiny of 33 million Turks and Greeks, that all the political realities of the region should be made subservient to one ambition, that policies of friendship and co-operation of which the establishment has taken years of toil and loyal efforts by great statesmen in the three countries concerned should now be brushed aside for one goal, that international treaties freely negotiated and signed in order to bring to an end periods of futile bloodshed, tragedy and suffering for both Turkey and Greece should now be violated for one purpose -- the annexation of Cyprus to Greece.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

It is with such thoughts in our minds and with sorrow in our hearts that we feel compelled to make known to the Committee the Turkish point of view on the so-called "Cyprus question".

On 15 November 1956, while the item on Cyprus was being placed on the agenda, I made a statement at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly in order to explain the position of my delegation regarding the manner in which the General Committee had decided to recommend the amalgamation of the two sub-items concerning Cyprus: (a) the Greek demand for self-determination and (b) the United Kingdom complaint on the support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus. I pointed out the fact that the amalgamation of the two sub-items taken from the provisional agenda could not be construed in any way to imply the competence of the United Nations to intervene in such affairs concerning Cyprus which are essentially of internal jurisdiction or to modify or attempt to modify, directly or indirectly, the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne. I explained that this Treaty was freely negotiated, accepted and signed by all the parties concerned, that among its provisions there are articles concerning the sovereignty of Cyprus, and that these articles were conceived, written and agreed upon in a manner which excludes all possibility for the island to be placed under the sovereignty of Greece. The United Nations has a very vast domain of jurisdiction in international affairs. But the founders of the Charter, as well as the Members who have acceded to it, have made certain reservations of which the respect for international treaties is one.

This position of my delegation has not been altered and still forms the basis of our stand in face of the Greek demand from the United Nations for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece by direct or indirect means.

Having made our position on this point clear, I should like to remind the members of the Committee that this is the third year in succession that the Greek Government is attempting to obtain support within the United Nations for its annexationist ambitions in Cyprus. The first year, during the ninth session, the Assembly disposed of the matter with a procedural resolution of which the considerandum expressed the opinion that it was not appropriate for the time being to adopt a resolution on which question, and the only operative paragraph stated

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

the decision of the Assembly not to consider further the item of self-determination for Cyprus. Last year, at the tenth session, both the General Committee and the General Assembly decided not to include the Greek demand on the agenda.

When it might have been hoped that this attitude of the General Assembly might induce the proponents of Enosis to stop, think and ponder upon the validity of their claim and the implication of their actions, the result has been, on the contrary, the increase of assistance to terrorism, the intensification of hate campaigns against my country and against other countries, through official radio stations and the press, the redoubling of agitation and propaganda, the innovation of new tactics to spread misrepresentation and confusion in world opinion and among the Members of the United Nations.

Such are the circumstances in which the Greek demand for the annexation of Cyprus has been presented to the United Nations for the third time. I deem it necessary to dispel to the best of my ability the confusion which has been created around this claim for annexation, since I believe that the abuse from this table of lofty principles, such as the principle of self-determination, to cloak selfish designs, would do harm to the principles themselves as well as to the work of the United Nations.

Leaving aside for the moment the organized agitation and propaganda for the territorial aggrandizement of Greece, leaving aside the campaign of hate inaugurated and sustained by the official Government radio in Athens and by the newspapers in Greece, some of which are owned by Ministers in the Greek Cabinet, leaving aside the thousand and one ways in which the Greek claim on Cyprus has been cloaked and presented to different audiences in different countries, I propose to examine, with the Chairman's permission, the official Greek document which stands before the Committee. I am referring to document A/3120/Add.1, circulated on 13 June 1956, and containing a letter to the Secretary-General signed by Ambassador Christian Palamas, to which is attached what the letter calls the "explanatory memorandum" to the Greek demand.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The first thing which is striking in this document is the fact that the word "colonial" in various forms--such as "colonial oppression", "colonial injustice" etc. -- appears eleven times in this relatively short memorandum, and the term "self-determination" at least an equal number of times. The memorandum has been prepared in an attempt to show that the interest of the Greek Government in Cyprus lies in its eagerness to fight colonialism and to seek the further application of the principle of self-determination.

The agitation organized in Greece over Cyprus has nothing to do with "anti-colonialism" or "the principle of self-determination". The only aim of those who first created this artificial issue and thrust it upon public opinion in Greece was to agitate in favour of the territorial aggrandizement of Greece through the annexation of this distant island. During the past few years, when this question was artificially inflated, the only aim of the agitation carried on -- both in Greece and elsewhere -- has been and continues to be the annexation of Cyprus to Greece. The attempt to present this claim as though it were in conformity with the principle of self-determination is only a very recent strategem in this unfortunate question, which itself was created only a few years ago.

In order to illustrate this statement of facts, with your permission I wish to remind the Committee, first, of the present juridical status of Cyprus, and, secondly, of the attitude taken by the Greek Government itself in connexion with this juridical status from the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne up to the present time.

The Treaty of Lausanne was signed in 1923 for the purpose of bringing to an end a period of futile bloodshed and tragedy which had caused great suffering both to the Turkish and Greek nations. The period which had preceded the Conference of Lausanne was one in which the Greek Government of that time -- taking advantage of the demobilization of the Turkish Army under the terms of the Armistice signed at the end of the First World War -- had sent the Greek Army to invade Turkey and placed under its control an area up to a point near Ankara, the capital. Turkey, whose very existence was thus placed in danger, asked that the principle of self-determination be applied. Greece refused, thus causing a tragic war between the two neighbouring countries. These events belong to history. I am referring to them without bitterness or recrimination. After the signing of the Treaty of Friendship between Turkey and Greece in 1931,

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

there was a mutual understanding to relegate such happenings to history -- where they belong. I am acting in the same spirit, and am only mentioning them objectively to remind the Committee of the background of the Lausanne Conference.

After the end of the military operations which restored to Turkey its sovereignty, the Turkish delegation at the Lausanne Peace Conference made great concessions and sacrifices for the sole purpose of establishing once and for all harmonious, peaceful and friendly relations in the region. Western Thrace, a Turkish province inhabited by a great majority of Turks, was ceded to Greece, as were the island provinces of the Aegean Sea bordering on Turkey. An exchange of population was agreed upon and carried out between Turkey and Greece. Almost all the Greek population on territories under Turkish sovereignty were sent to Greece, and, in exchange, almost all the Turkish population remaining under Greek sovereignty were taken into Turkey.

Cyprus was under Turkish sovereignty for 352 years, up to the signing of the Lausanne Treaty. It was excluded from this exchange of population because, under the same Treaty, its sovereignty was transferred to the United Kingdom. This made it possible for the Greek Cypriots to remain in a territory forming a great geographic and strategic part of the Turkish mainland when both Turkish and Greek populations in the two countries had been exchanged to enhance the ethnic homogeneity within the geographic and political boundaries of both Turkey and Greece.

The two articles of the Treaty concerning the fate of Cyprus are articles 20 and 21. Article 20 makes a specific cession of sovereignty from Turkey to the United Kingdom. Article 21 stipulates the conditions under which the inhabitants of Cyprus who were Turkish nationals up to the transfer of Turkish sovereignty over the island could use their option for either Turkish or British citizenship. No other possibilities, no other eventualities, were envisaged or admitted in either of these articles. On the contrary, the last paragraph of article 21 stipulates that the Government of Cyprus will be entitled to exclude from British citizenship those Cypriots who, while being under Turkish sovereignty, might have acquired another nationality without the consent of the Turkish Government. This paragraph was inserted to exclude from citizenship a number of Greek Cypriots who had acquired Greek citizenship.



Such was the cession of sovereignty which was made by Turkey -- a cession which was specifically in favour of one country, made under specific conditions -- a cession which was recognized, accepted and agreed upon by all the signatories of the Lausanne Treaty, including Greece.

Nor is this all. There is yet a further particularity of this specific cession of sovereignty made by Turkey and agreed upon by all the signatories. The wording of article 20 on the status of Cyprus has distinct peculiarities in comparison with the other articles of the Treaty concerning the cession of sovereignty in other parts of the region. Not only is the Turkish cession of sovereignty made specifically in favour of one country, but it is also made in a specific manner: in the form of the recognition of a proclamation made by the United Kingdom nine years before the Conference -- the proclamation of 5 November 1914.

In fact, according to the article, "Turkey recognizes the annexation of Cyprus proclaimed by the British Government on the 5th November, 1914". In other words, the cession of sovereignty was made in a form requiring conformity with a certain official act, a proclamation.

What does the proclamation of 5 November 1914 say? In its operative part it says: "From and after the date hereof" -- I repeat, "from and after the date hereof the said island shall be annexed to and form part of His Majesty's dominions and the said island is annexed accordingly."

Clearly, the retransmission of sovereignty through any means is completely out of the question in these texts. Turkey has made the sacrifice of accepting a cession of sovereignty to a specific country on the basis of a proclamation made by that country.

What has been the recent attitude of the partisans of Greek annexation on the juridical and contractual position which I have outlined above?

When I first reminded the First Committee of this situation on 14 December 1954, Ambassador Kyrrou of the Greek delegation replied that the cession of the sovereignty of Cyprus from Turkey to the United Kingdom made by virtue of article 20 of the Lausanne Treaty was a matter between Turkey and the United Kingdom and that it did not imply Greek acceptance.

mrm/6

A/C.1/PV.848  
29-30

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I answered by reminding him of the Preamble and the Final Act of the Lausanne Peace Treaty, which leave absolutely no doubt of the fact that all the articles and every one of the stipulations were agreed upon and accepted by all the signatories, including Greece. I went further and reminded the distinguished representative of Greece that, in any case, this opinion expressed by him could have no bearing on the subject under discussion. Either -- from the point of view of the Greek Government -- article 20 of the Lausanne Treaty is valid and therefore Cyprus is legally part of the British Commonwealth, or article 20 is not valid for the Greek Government, and in that case -- from the point of view of the same Greek Government -- Cyprus is still under Turkish sovereignty. In either case, Greece has no right to make a claim for the annexation of Cyprus.

To my knowledge, the opinion of my distinguished friend, Ambassador Kyrou -- which I have just mentioned -- has now been abandoned by the Greek delegation.

Very recently, in the Greek Press, and in paid advertisements in sections of foreign newspapers usually reserved for the promotion of commerce, a new point of view has been raised. It is claimed -- not seriously, of course, but only maliciously -- that the Treaty of 1878, whereby, as part of a defensive alliance, Turkey had ceded to Britain the administration of the island while retaining sovereignty over Cyprus, was a conditional treaty; and that, those conditions not having been fulfilled either by Britain or by Turkey, the Treaty of 1878 was not valid.

Now, I am leaving aside the real reasons for attempting to build up such an argument, and the circumstances under which it is publicized. They have nothing to do with the Cyprus question and are only based on a desire to slander and vilify Turkey. But, taking up the argument objectively, on its face value, what could it prove even if it were true -- which is not the case? If the argument were true, if the cession by Turkey to Britain of the administration of this island, which at that time formed, not only geographically and historically, but also juridically and politically, an integral part of Turkey -- if this cession made in 1878 were not valid, then, by the same Greek argument, the island would be still an integral part of Turkey, and Greece again could raise no claims over it whatever.

It so happens that the extremist partisans of the Greek annexation of Cyprus can go back 2,500 years denouncing all the international treaties signed during that period, and still they would not have one bit of evidence to justify juridically a claim for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece.

But let us, for a moment, go back again to the Treaty of Lausanne. I have explained to the Committee that the juridical status of Cyprus is covered by articles 20 and 21. There is no other article which can be appropriately referred to, in the same Treaty, in connexion with Cyprus. Despite this fact, reference has been made to article 16 in attempt to prove two things: first, that Turkey had renounced all rights over Cyprus and therefore cannot be considered to be a "concerned party" in the sense of the Treaty; and, secondly, that Greece was a "concerned party" by the stipulations of the same article.

Now, let us see; I shall read the text of article 16:

"Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present Treaty and the islands other than those over which her sovereignty is recognised by the said Treaty, the future of these territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned."

In the first place, may I point out that the original draft of the article -- that is, article 16 -- proposed to Turkey by the Allies was different from the present text. It contained an additional paragraph, which read as follows:

"Turkey recognises and agrees to dispositions which have been or shall be made concerning the attribution, independence or any other regime of these territories or islands."

The territories or islands to which reference is made in this article are those whose fate, although they had been detached from the Ottoman Empire one or two years before the Lausanne Conference, was not specifically settled in the Lausanne Treaty. Cyprus was not among these territories, as its status was specifically settled in articles 20 and 21 of the same Treaty. In any case, this draft proposal was rejected by Turkey, the Turkish delegation having stated that "Turkey cannot commit herself to accept dispositions the nature and scope of which were not known to her". This draft was finally eliminated, and the present wording adopted.

In the second place, the present wording of the article distinguishes between territories whose status was "being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned". There is no doubt that Cyprus falls within the first category as its status was settled specifically by articles 20 and 21 in the form of a cession from Turkey to Britain within the conditions of those two articles.

In the third place, article 16 stipulates that settlements were made, or remained to be made, between "parties concerned". There is no doubt that, in the sense of the Lausanne Treaty, the parties concerned in the settlement of the status of Cyprus were Turkey and Britain. Just as in the case of articles 2 and 12 concerning the cession of Turkish territory to Greece, the parties concerned were Turkey and Greece. And in article 15 concerning the Dodecanese, the parties concerned were Turkey and Italy, even though Greece had made a certain reservation on this particular article. So far as articles 20 and 21, which are the only articles on Cyprus, are concerned, the cession of sovereignty was made by Turkey

to Britain; the inhabitants of the island could opt for either Turkish or British citizenship. In fact, the meaning of the term "parties concerned", as it is utilized in the Treaty of Lausanne, is such that not only is Turkey undeniably a concerned party in the settlement of the status of Cyprus, but also the articles relating to this particular settlement exclude all other countries except Turkey and Britain.

Such is the legal status of Cyprus according to the Treaty of Lausanne, which is still a valid international instrument.

Now, what was the attitude of the Greek Government regarding the sovereignty of Cyprus during the Lausanne Conference?

During the Conference, Greece made reservations on the provisions of article 15 of the Treaty concerning the sovereignty of the Dodecanese Islands. It made no objections, no reservations whatsoever, on the status of Cyprus which it accepted unconditionally.

Some year later, in 1931, the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. Venizelos, publicly reiterated the position of the Greek Government in the sense that it had no claims on Cyprus and recognized the present juridical status. The year 1931 was the year in which the Treaty of Friendship between Turkey and Greece was signed.

There was no change in this attitude of the Greek Government regarding Cyprus until well after the Second World War. In proof of this fact I wish to quote verbatim only one from among the many pertinent paragraphs to be found in Keesing's Contemporary Archives regarding this matter. It is from volume 1946-1948, page 7930, and it reads as follows:

"The Greek Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Dragoumis, stated in London on May 23 (1946), during a visit to Britain, that Greek territorial claims were as follows: (1) a rectification of the Greco-Bulgarian frontier on security grounds, so as to secure a strategic readjustment of the frontier in the Rhodope Mts. to cover Thrace and Eastern Macedonia; (2) the return of the Dodecanese Islands; (3) the incorporation of Northern Epirus (Southern Albania), which it was claimed had a predominantly Greek population; (4) the cession of Sasena Island in the Gulf of Valona, which was ceded to Albania under pressure from Italy in 1913."

As the Committee will note, the annexation of Cyprus did not figure among Greek territorial claims in 1946. This is a fact.

It is true that in this region there have been from time to time minor groups of individuals who have theorized, mostly in a platonic way, that such and such a territory should be detached from such and such a country and annexed to another. During the past century, such unorganized, minor groups of theoreticians have, unfortunately, existed not only in Cyprus and Greece but in all the countries and territories of the region. Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and even my own country, Turkey, have seen during the past century minor

groups of individuals trying to stir up trouble with unjustifiable claims. Most often such individuals did not represent their ethnic group, and as long as they had no official backing, as long as minorities did not impose upon majorities, their platonic dissertations dwindled away into oblivion. Peace and friendly relations triumphed in the end.

Cyprus was no exception to this general pattern. There had been Greek-speaking individuals, especially members of the Cyprus Orthodox Church, who had expressed the ambition to see Greece annex Cyprus. There had been Cypriot Turks who had expressed the desire to see Cyprus returned to Turkey, but the greatest majority of the Cypriots ploughed their fields and lived their daily lives in harmony and peace. The Greek annexationists on Cyprus had not yet been organized from the outside and an unprecedented propaganda and agitation, as well as ruthless terrorism, had not yet paralysed the will of the Cypriots to live in peace.

The turning point came between the years 1948-1951. The period coincides with the victory of the Greek people over the communist insurrection in their country and with the adhesion of Greece to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A manoeuvre designed as a counter-offensive in face of these events came promptly. The extreme left espoused for the first time the cause of Enosis and thus came about the co-operation between extreme right and extreme left. During this period an unprecedented campaign of agitation was inaugurated both by the extreme left and the extreme right, represented by the Church, in favour of Enosis, which means "union" or "annexation" of Cyprus to Greece. All attempts at constitutional reforms in the island were turned down by the two extremist political forces. For different reasons, neither the extreme right nor the extreme left found any advantage to themselves in constitutional reforms, in the advance of democracy, in the respect of equal rights to the two communities on the island -- their own particular interests could only profit from the continuance of agitation for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece. Accordingly, pamphlets were distributed, speeches were delivered, a Press campaign was started in which no other word was used for the Greek claim on Cyprus except Enosis, or annexation. A vast number of societies and organizations were created, none of which had any other appellation or other advertized aim except Enosis or annexation. Most of these societies and

organizations -- although not all of them -- have recently replaced in their titles the word Enosis, or annexation, by the words "self-determination". In this manner, for reasons which must be clear to anyone, the name of the "Pan-Hellenic Commission for the Annexation of Cyprus" was changed to the "Pan-Hellenic Commission for Self-Determination in Cyprus". The President of this Commission was and still is the Archbishop of Athens, Spyridon.

The idea of linking up the demand for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece with the principle of self-determination is a recent one which was adopted for reasons of expediency in the United Nations and only after a minority in Cyprus was so organized as to convince the extremist annexationists that they could now swing a part of the Cypriots to co-operate with them.

In 1951, a second turning point was reached in the Cyprus question when the Greek Government for the first time took officially upon itself the claim for the annexation of Cyprus. On 15 February 1951, in the Greek Chamber of Deputies, the Prime Minister, Mr. Venizelos, first brought forward this claim by declaring that he desired officially -- and I am quoting his exact words -- to "proclaim the Greek Government's demand for the union of Cyprus with Greece the Motherland".

The official position taken after this date and up to the decision of the Greek Government to seek the support of Members of the United Nations continued to be openly based on a claim for annexation. The veil of self-determination was introduced, for the reasons I have stated before, as a tactical expedient in the United Nations. Archbishop Makarios has openly admitted this fact on many occasions. Kennett Love, correspondent of The New York Times, reporting an interview with Archbishop Makarios which appeared in that paper on 13 September 1955, said:

"Self-determination has become the battle cry of Cypriote Greeks in recent months, instead of Enosis, by which is meant unity with Greece. But this is a change in tactics not in ultimate aims."

In another report from Cyprus, published on 29 January 1956 by The New York Times, it is stated that Archbishop Makarios "has kept the movement flaring, first as Enosis -- pure and simple -- the adherence of the island to mainland Greece -- and then as self-determination." The reporter goes on to explain that this tactical change had first occurred to Archbishop Makarios during a conversation



On the subject of the term self-determination being used by the partisans of Enosis to mean "annexation", here is what the Greek Orthodox Bishop of Kyrenia, one of the leaders of the annexationist movement, told another reporter of The New York Times, Homer Bigart. I am quoting from the 4 February 1956 issue:

"The real danger in accepting Britain's self-government offer, he said, is that this would dampen Cypriote ardor for union with Greece. We should stick to self-determination at once and without any intermediate stage. Self-government takes us further away from that goal."

In other words, any kind of application of the principle of self-determination that might allow the Cypriots to express their opinion freely in opposition to annexation is discarded as dangerous. For self-determination, in the eyes of the Bishop of Kyrenia, is only good as a tactical weapon in the agitation and propaganda for the annexation of Cyprus.

This tactical change was so rapid that it took some time for the Greek Government itself to adopt fully the new terminology.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

When the former Greek Government first asked the United Nations to intervene in the Cyprus question, it presented its claim in 1954 under the title "application under the auspices of the United Nations of the principle of equal rights and of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus". But in the explanatory memorandum the words "union with Greece" and "self-determination" were used interchangeably. On 14 December 1954, I drew the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that in the explanatory memorandum of the Greek Government, dated 16 August 1954 and distributed by the Secretariat as document A/2703, the apparent interest in self-determination was inextricably mixed up with statements and allegations claiming that Cyprus belongs to Greece -- in fact, that "Cyprus is Greece itself".

This was the manner in which the Cyprus question was first introduced to the United Nations.

May we now look a little closer to this island which allegedly is "Greece itself". What are the facts, the figures, the geographic, historical and juridical data?

Geographically, Cyprus is an off-shore island of the Turkish mainland. It forms a part of Asia Minor. It lies forty-three miles off the shores of Turkey, and 683 miles away from Greece.

Historically, from the earliest period of recorded history, up to thirty-four years ago the island has always belonged to the Powers that ruled over Asia Minor. In all history, Cyprus has never belonged to Greece -- it has never belonged to modern Greece or to ancient Greece. In remote history, there have been minor Greek colonies established in Sicily, in Marseilles, on the Spanish coast, on the Egyptian coast, and in other parts of the Mediterranean. In the same way, in remote history, there were minor Greek colonies established in a few corners of Cyprus. According to historians, these were small colonies of which the population had retained for the greater part their local languages. But the island itself has never been part of Greece. Its fate has always been linked to the fate of Asia Minor which today constitutes the mainland of Turkey. In this manner, it has belonged to the Assyrian, Persian and Arab Empires, and to the Eastern Roman Empire, only as long as these Empires ruled over Asia Minor. Even Alexander, the Macedonian, when he annexed Cyprus to his Empire for the brief period of twelve years, some 2,400 years ago, did so not because he had subjected Greece to his rule, but as the temporary conqueror of Asia Minor.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Even the Crusaders, when they had established kingdoms in Asia Minor and aspired to rule over it, had seen the necessity of holding Cyprus and, accordingly, occupied and held it for centuries.

It has been claimed by the partisans of Enosis that Cyprus, during its history, had for some time in the Middle Ages belonged to the Eastern Roman Empire, that this Empire, also called the Byzantine Empire, was Greek and that, therefore, Cyprus should belong to Greece.

To call the Eastern Roman Empire a "Greek Empire" is, to say the least, a very singular idea, and to bring in this argument as a proof that Cyprus should belong to Greece, seems to me, all the more peculiar. In fact, the Greeks were one of the hundreds of subjected peoples in the Roman Empire, and the Eastern Roman Empire was no more Greek than the Western Empire was Spanish or French. Although Cyprus was included in the boundaries of the Eastern Empire, the territories of the following modern States were also included: Yugoslavia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Egypt and, at some intermittent periods, even Libya. Surely the fact that they shared a common destiny one thousand years ago under the same Roman rule cannot make any one of these countries today the sole heir of the Eastern Roman Empire.

Furthermore, may I point out this fact: in the administrative subdivision of the Eastern Roman Empire, Cyprus was never placed in the same administration as the provinces of Greece. It was always placed under the administration of the provinces of Asia Minor. Indeed, the Eastern Roman Empire retained Cyprus only as long as it ruled over Asia Minor. And so, history has repeated itself.

For such is the strategic significance of Cyprus that the defence of Asia Minor in any period of history has never been conceived and cannot be conceived without taking into consideration this off-shore island.

Coming to more recent history, from 1571 to 1923, a period of 352 years, Cyprus was an integral part of Turkey. In 1878, in a defensive alliance against the Tsarist Russian Empire's expansion in Asia Minor, Turkey ceded to England the administration of the island and the right to have military bases, while retaining sovereignty itself up to 1923. In this manner, even the sacrifice made by Turkey to transfer to another Power the administration of the island was linked with the exigencies of the defence of Asia Minor.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Today, too, Cyprus is of primary importance to the defence of Turkey. I do not want to take the time of the Committee with lengthy dissertations on a matter which is self-evident. Let me, however, point out only this fact: Turkey has only two open areas of communication with the rest of the world. If the country which holds all the islands on the Western approaches of Turkey -- as in the case of Greece today -- were also, at the same time, to hold Cyprus which controls all the remaining routes of communication, which are those of the south, then it will have encircled Turkey. As we have already said before on this subject, "No country can allow itself to be so completely encircled and to leave its entire security at the mercy of one country, no matter how great a friend and ally the latter may be".

Now, taking up the question of the population of Cyprus, the first point on which all specialists agree is that it has been extremely variable in history, both as to its ethnic components and as to their relative numbers. Today, the population of Cyprus is estimated to be around 500,000. Of this number, over 100,000 are Turkish in origin, language and culture; 11,000 are Catholics, Maronites, and of other religions; about 386,000 are of the Greek Orthodox Church and speak a Greek dialect peculiar to Cyprus which incorporates a great number of non-Greek words and has other particularities of its own. Although there have been minor waves of Greek immigration to the island, the Greek Orthodox population of the island is essentially a mixture of all the ancient peoples of the Mediterranean who have, at various times in history, inhabited the island. The Greek-speaking group has essentially no racial connexion with Greece. Sir George Hill, author of the most complete history of Cyprus, Professor Arne Furumark of the University of Upsala in Sweden, who has conducted archeological researches on Cyprus, as well as all objective and scientific specialists on the subject, confirm this fact.

Professor Furumark said in a lecture at Radio Sweden, Upsala, on 25 January 1956, that in Cyprus "Greek means Christian -- more precisely and very emphatically, of the Greek Orthodox Church".

It is a historical fact that the predominance of the Greek Orthodox faith and of the Greek dialect among the Christian inhabitants of Cyprus is a result of the Turkish administration of the island for over three centuries. This fact is even accepted by the most extreme Enosists. Before it became part of Turkey in 1571, Cyprus had been under Latin rule for nearly four centuries.

During the rule of the descendants of the Crusaders over the island, the official religion of Cyprus was Roman Catholic. The Greek Orthodox religion was suppressed. The Orthodox Archbishop was removed from office. Instruction was in Latin, and later in Italian. This was the situation found by Selim II of Turkey when he occupied Cyprus. It was the Turkish administration that restored the Greek Orthodox Archbishop, established freedom for the Greek Orthodox clergy, reopened Greek Orthodox Churches, which had been closed for four centuries. Thus the religion and the language of the Greek-speaking Cypriots were preserved, not because of efforts made by Greece, which never ruled over the island, but because of the liberal Turkish administration.

I have already said that both the number and the ethnic composition of the population of Cyprus has varied in history. Today the Greek-speaking Cypriots are a majority on the island. But this has not always been the case. At least three estimates made by three different persons in the latter part of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, have recorded Turks as forming a majority. These are: the Greek Cypriot historian, Kyprianos, the British Consul, De Vezin, and the British Consul, Drummond. Later on, in 1814, Kipplier estimated the two communities as equal in number. Up to the beginning of the present century, the differences in number between the two communities have been very slight, despite the fact of considerable emigration from Cyprus to Turkey after the cession of the administration, and later of the sovereignty of the island. Today, the Turks of Cypriot origin and their descendants number about 300,000 in Turkey.

Over 100,000 Turks live on Cyprus. They are mostly farmers, whereas the Greek-speaking population is mostly occupied with commerce and trade. Because the need for land in the agricultural occupation is not the same as in the commercial occupation, over 42 per cent of the land in Cyprus is owned in rightful property by the Turkish population. Apart from this property, the religious "vakif" foundations, which belong to the Turkish community and are under its administration, have been evaluated by the official authorities of Cyprus as at over \$28 million. This is certainly a very important sum considering the size of the island and the low price of property on it.

I have explained that Cyprus lies forty-three miles from Turkey, and about 700 miles from Greece. I have recalled the history of the island to show that it has never belonged to Greece, but has always been linked to the Anatolian mainland, and that in this manner it was part of Turkey for 352 years, up to thirty-four years ago. I have explained how the ratio and composition of the population of Cyprus has been extremely variable in history, and I have given data on its present composition as well as on the property on the island, which is over 42 per cent Turkish. At the beginning of my statement, I also explained that the present juridical status of Cyprus was decided by free negotiations and the mutual consent of all interested parties in the Lausanne Treaty, which was signed by Turkey, Greece, the United Kingdom and other Powers. I pointed out the fact that Greece had accepted unconditionally the present international status of Cyprus, and that it had later reiterated its approval.

These are the facts and figures about the island of Cyprus, which we are now told "is Greece itself".

I should now like to examine the Cyprus question from another angle: the applicability of the principle of self-determination.

I have already furnished sufficient evidence to show that the Greek claim, in reality, is one for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece, in contradiction to the provisions of the Lausanne Treaty. I have quoted leaders of the annexationist movement to show that they admit having devised the formula of self-determination only as a tactical weapon to be used for a single purpose: the annexation of Cyprus to Greece, in violation of contractual commitments.

I have pointed out the fact that Cyprus does not fall within the category of territories whose fate has not been settled, and that, on the contrary, a series of international treaties have been signed concerning Cyprus, none of which recognize any right to a Greek claim, the latest being the Treaty of Lausanne. This Treaty is still valid for all its signatories, including Greece, I hope.

Even so, I wish to say a few words about the principle of self-determination.

In the first place, I do not think it necessary for me to reiterate here the high value which my Government and my countrymen place upon the principle of self-determination. The people of Turkey have sealed their allegiance to this high principle with the sacrifice of their own blood. They consider it as a lofty

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

This limitation was requested of the Austrian people and accepted by them as a further contribution of the peace and freedom-loving people of Austria to the peace and security of Central Europe. It is now part of international law. It is not true, as the representative of Greece said this morning, that Anschluss was imposed by force from outside. The Austrian people freely accepted it.

And yet, we are told that the Greek claim for "Enosis", or the incorporation of Cyprus, which, in any case, has a mixed population, and lies 700 miles away from Greece, is based on such an overriding principle that nothing can stand in its way -- including the peace of the region and the stipulations of the international treaties signed by Greece.

I have spoken about geographic separation. There is yet another aspect of this problem. In the New World, for example, there may be some places in which immigration or other causes have resulted in the formation of pockets of majorities of various ethnic or racial groups. If, under foreign pressure and provocation, or in any other way, such "pockets of majority" should demand their territorial incorporation into other countries, which they may claim to be their real motherland, would such demands and claims be admissible in international law?

In the case of Cyprus, which is an integral part of the Turkish mainland, the 380,000 Greek-speaking Cypriots should not be cast against the more than 100,000 Turkish Cypriots but should be taken into account in conjunction with the 25,000,000 Turks who compose the over-all Turkish nation on the mainland.

We are told that the Greek claim for the annexation of Cyprus, in contradiction with the Lausanne Treaty, is based on the principle of self-determination. Well, what was the attitude of the Greek Government on this matter during the negotiations and the signing of this Treaty, the Treaty of Lausanne?

Among the many sacrifices and concessions which Turkey was asked to make in the Lausanne Treaty, I wish to remind the Committee of the circumstances under which Western Thrace was incorporated into Greece. This province had been Turkish for 600 years, ever since the 14th century. It had a predominantly Turkish population in which the Turks outnumbered the Greeks 4 to 1. When Greece made a claim on Western Thrace, Turkey asked for a plebiscite under international control and the application of the principle of self-determination. Greece refused. Mr. Venizelos, the head of the Greek delegation, expressed his

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

opposition to the application of self-determination on two grounds: first, on the ground that the principle of self-determination could not be applied to territories whose fate had been settled by international treaties; and, later, when he was reminded by the Turkish delegation that his statement did not reflect the case of Western Thrace, he set forth another argument, which I quote from the official minutes of the Conference:

"It is true that his democratic principles incline him to accept the recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination: but it must be admitted that this right does not constitute the only relevant factor in the solution of questions relating to the disposal of territories inhabited by mixed populations."

May I now ask the Greek delegation which of these two arguments sustained by Greece in the Lausanne Conference to obtain a territorial annexation could now provide an exception in the case of Cyprus -- an open door for the modification of the status of Cyprus, which was decided by the same Treaty? Is it that the sovereignty over Cyprus was not decided by an international treaty? Or is it that the population of that Island is not mixed? Or, is it, rather, that all the arguments put forward by Greece to justify its claim for Western Thrace in 1923 now stand to condemn the latest annexationist claim of Greece for Cyprus.

Such is the contradiction involved in the Greek claim for Cyprus. We are told that the Treaty of Lausanne, in which the principle of self-determination was denied to Turkey by Greece, in one of its provisions, should now be modified in favour of Greece in another provision on the basis of the very same principle, the application of which was refused to Turkey.

We are told that the United Nations is a proper organ for such modification. We are told that the General Assembly can be seized of one single provision from among the great number which, together, have formed an international settlement, that a single item of a treaty can be taken up separately, out of context, out of the general considerations which formed the basis of the entire settlement, out of the equilibrium which was sought and which was decisive for the approval of this Treaty. We are told that the General Assembly can examine such an item separately and then give instructions for the modification of an international treaty.



(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I have dwelt on the various political, juridical, contractual and other reasons why the principle of self-determination is not applicable to the Greek claim on Cyprus. There is one more aspect of this question which I should like to point out to this Committee. It is an important one and it resides in the fact that self-determination, as it is conceived in theory and practice by the partisans of the "Enosis" movement, has nothing to do with the concept of self-determination as it is accepted in the free and democratic countries.

The first signs of political violence and intimidation over the Cypriot people to obtain their co-operation -- or, rather, submission -- in favour of Greek annexation, go back to 1947, although terror had not yet been organized in the same able manner in which it is conducted today from the outside. As for the Cypriot Church, the pressure exercised by this institution over the Greek-speaking Cypriots, including the practice of ex-communication on political grounds, goes back far before that date. When, in early 1948, an effort was made by the Governor of Cyprus to discuss new constitutional reforms, Archbishop Makarios, too, before even having seen the proposals, called upon his religious followers to reject their discussion and demand the union of Cyprus with Greece.

It was under such circumstances that the Consultative Assembly of Cyprus met in early May 1948. Despite this situation, the Assembly decided, on 21 May, by 11 votes in favour and 7 votes against, to accept the proposals on constitutional reforms. I repeat: They decided, by 11 votes in favour and 7 votes against, to accept the proposals on constitutional reforms. The 11 vote majority included all of the Turkish votes and four of the eleven Greek votes. The 7 negative Greek votes were given en bloc by the representatives of the leftist party. Further events prevented the pursuance of this decision.

I do not know if the Greek representatives, who voted in the same way in which their Turkish colleagues voted on that occasion, are still alive. In any case, that was the last occasion on which the Greek-speaking Cypriots could have the courage to stand up and express, at least to some extent, a free opinion on this matter.

Today, the "Enosis" movement in Cyprus is the monopoly of a small but militant minority, sustained from the outside, whose only purpose is to make it impossible for any Cypriot to express his free opinion and, thus, to establish the very opposite of self-determination.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

It is a conspiracy maintained by threat, intimidation, terror and cold-blooded murder, including the slaughter of women and children. Nothing has been neglected in spreading terror and intimidation over all those who oppose Greek annexation and most over Greek Cypriots themselves. Nothing has been considered too immoral, or too shameful or too cowardly.

The Cypriot Orthodox Church, headed by a group of fanatic extremists, has for years used the threat and the actual practice of excommunication, the refusal of marriage rites, of the baptism of children and of Christian burial as a powerful weapon in its struggle for eliminating opposition to Greek annexation.

In its Explanatory Memorandum of 12 June 1956, the Greek delegation also mentions the deportation of Archbishop Makarios, which it calls "a heavy blow and damaging offence to the religious heritage of the world".

There is a great deal to be said about this statement of the Greek delegation. However, I will refrain from making any comments myself. I shall merely quote a passage from the newspaper Christian World which, as its name denotes, embraces Christian opinions all over the world. In its issue of 30 August 1956, this newspaper had this to say on Archbishop Makarios:

"There was always hope of a peaceful and agreed settlement of the whole question of Cyprus. Yet while discussing these matters over the conference table, the Archbishop was secretly planning acts of violence and murder against the nationals of the Power which was treating him with respect and courtesy as a recognized plenipotentiary."

The Christian World goes on to say:

"No excuse is possible for this utterly uncivilized and wicked behaviour. Archbishop Makarios can no longer be regarded as a possible negotiator on the Cypriot side. The question has been raised as to whether the Archbishop should be brought to trial for his active participation in the activities of EOKA. This is a comparatively small matter. It is enough for the present that this misguided ecclesiastic is under lock and key. But the Cypriot people have a duty -- a duty to themselves -- to find a negotiator who is not, like the Archbishop, unrepentantly guilty of treacherous bloodshed." Those are the words of the newspaper Christian World on Archbishop Makarios.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

As for the terrorists, under the leadership of the Greek Army Colonel Grivas, who was smuggled to Cyprus from Greece, they have murdered up to now a greater number of Greek Cypriots than they have murdered Turks and Britishers combined. I shall come to the case of the Turkish Cypriots later on. May I point out now that some of the Greek Cypriots, murdered because they opposed Greek annexation, were eminent personalities of whom any community could be proud. One such murder was carried out in a monastery, another in a church while a religious service was going on. There were no protestations from the officiating priest or from Archbishop Makarios.

What kind of national movement is this that exterminates its own children? What kind of a liberal, ideological aspiration for self-determination is this that asserts itself by terrorizing and murdering those who are supposed to express their free will?

Not only is the terrorist action in itself contemptible and disgusting, but the very conception of self-determination in the minds of the annexationists has been thriving on false grounds from the very beginning. Whether partisans of the present kind of terrorism or not, all extremist supporters of the Greek annexation of Cyprus have always conceived the expediency of self-determination concurrently with the use of force and intimidation towards their own compatriots who oppose Enosis.

I am going to read the textual translation of a passage from a speech delivered in the Greek Chamber of Deputies on 25 April 1956. The speech was delivered by Mr. Loizides, who, I understand, is one of the distinguished members of the Greek delegation to this Assembly. The debate was on whether or not there should be a fixed period for self-determination. Mr. Loizides, having explained that "the political leader of Cyprus, Makarios, as well as the fighting organization have taken a concrete position with their statements", he went on to explain this concrete position as follows:

"So long as we do not have their proposition for a fixed period of up to five years, we Cypriots prefer that they give us self-government, as we require it, without a fixed period. The reason is quite simple. I am not revealing any secret because the English have common sense.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Should they consent to give us a form of self-government, full and complete, with all the powers and the police in our hands, the customs and the courts, and the prisons, then the fixed period does not interest us, for we could within one, two or three years grasp self-determination with our own hands."

Though I agree with Mr. Ioizides that he did not reveal any secret, I still would like to know how one can grasp self-determination with one's own hands. How can one use the courts, the police and the prisons, and, of course, the customs which control the importation of ammunition, to bring about the annexation of Cyprus to Greece and still call it self-determination?

I think the only relevant point in the statement of Mr. Ioizides is the sincerity of his assertion of what indeed might happen if proper safeguards are not included in any constitutional reform.

Another example of this same conception was furnished by the so-called plebiscite of Greek Cypriots on 15 January 1950. I am sure that if the general theme of our subject were not so burdened with tragedy, the members of this Committee would have found the circumstances of this plebiscite particularly amusing, if not hilarious.

The Orthodox Church of Cyprus, under the leadership of Archbishop Makarios, who at that time was Bishop of Kitium, had made its preparations for many months in advance of the so-called plebiscite. All parishioners were told by village priests and others of what they were expected to do. The day of the so-called plebiscite, two books were placed in the churches. The voters were told that if they wanted union with Greece they had to sign one book, if they were opposed, the other book. The whole ceremony of explanation, decision and signing took place in the open, in front of everybody. Special messengers were sent to call in those who had not presented themselves and who, upon their arrival, were asked again which book they wanted to sign. Those books were carried by the Archbishop of Kyrenia to the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies in Greece, and it was thus proclaimed to all the world that 95 per cent of the Greek Cypriots had voted in favour of annexation to Greece. I marvel at the courage of the other 5 per cent. I have known other lands where, under similar circumstances, the voting was 99.99 per cent.

Leaving aside this rather amusing interlude, I wish to go back again to the deplorable subject of terrorism.

Much has been said on the subject of terrorism in Cyprus. Much evidence has been furnished to show its ruthlessness and to prove that it has been organized, encouraged and sustained by Greece.

For my part, I shall make an effort to reduce the irrefutable, undeniable evidence to the very minimum accepted by all neutral observers in all parts of the world. I shall try to furnish only a minimum number of facts which either cannot be denied or have already been accepted by the Greek Government itself.

The first irrefutable fact is that the Greek terrorists in Cyprus have killed more Greek Cypriots than Turks and British combined. This is a matter of facts and figures. It is undeniable evidence which goes to show that the aim of the Greek terrorists is not so much to harm the alleged "oppressor" as to terrorize the Cypriots themselves.

In the second place, it is undeniable that the head of the terrorist action in Cyprus, Colonel George Grivas, is a regular officer of the Greek Army who was smuggled into Cyprus from Greece, having been specially detached from the Greek Army by the previous Government of Greece. The names of other specialists of terrorism who have come to Cyprus from Greece have been mentioned in the international Press.

In the third place, among the many Greek ships which have secretly smuggled ammunition and explosives to Cyprus, at least one, the St. George -- as the United Kingdom representative said this morning -- has been acknowledged by the Greek Government, which called this smuggling "unofficial action". Twenty-six cases of ammunition and thousands of sticks of dynamite were captured on the St. George. The international Press followed the court proceedings and reported them.

In the fourth place, the official Government radio stations of Greece are continually instigating, encouraging and glorifying acts of terrorism.

In the fifth place, in the city of Athens and in other Greek towns, streets have been named after terrorists who have been proved to have committed murder.

In the sixth place, Greek statesmen and Government officials have made official statements in praise of violence, inciting, encouraging and glorifying terrorism in Cyprus.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I wonder if all the members of this Committee have carefully examined the Greek explanatory memorandum (A/3120/Add.1) addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and circulated by him on 13 June 1956 to Members of the United Nations. Nearly half of this official memorandum which has been presented to the United Nations is devoted, not to an apology, but to a complete philosophy in justification and praise of Greek terrorism in Cyprus.

Indeed, the document contains more than that on the subject of terrorism. After analysing in a lyrical style the moral and philosophical foundations of terrorism and violence, it has this to say in justification of Greek terrorism:

"Actually, material force, that is to say, violence, is the main source of British law and order as well as the main foundation of British government and administration in Cyprus". (A/3120/Add.1, paragraph 7)

The logic in this sentence is considered sufficient to prove that violence was started by the other side. Then, this passage of the memorandum concludes with the following words: "the only possible answer to violence is violence" (Ibid.). Such is the logical conclusion of this philosophy. But, among other things, what is carefully avoided in the philosophy is an explanation of the fate met by the Cypriot Greeks and Turks who were murdered simply because their opinions were not in accordance with those of the Greek annexationists.

Nor is this all. After further dissertations on the merits of terrorism, the memorandum carries the question of terrorism to a climax with the following words:

"Greece is against the use of violence. As long as lawful action is left open to the contesting parties, Greece is in favour of such a peaceful approach. And this way of lawful action is the United Nations". (Ibid., paragraph 9)

The memorandum continues:

"Had the General Assembly from the outset carried out its responsibilities according to the letter and the spirit of the Charter, the world would not have to be faced with such a critical situation as the one which has now developed in Cyprus.

"It is high time for the United Nations to show wisdom and determination in playing its part properly and in using its political and moral strength to bring about reasonable and constructive solutions". (Ibid.)

What is the meaning of such a statement? Greece is against violence, under certain conditions. Greece will stop its support of terrorism only if the Members of the United Nations vote the way Greece wants them to vote; otherwise, there will be more victims in Cyprus. Is that what it means? I hope it does not. I hope that this statement is not meant to be a threat or an attempt to exert pressure on Members of the United Nations. I hope that the passages which I have quoted textually from the Greek memorandum, as well as the interpretations of them which could very easily be made, do not reflect the opinion of the Greek Government. I shall welcome and accept any other interpretation which might be furnished by the delegation of Greece.

I have stated to the Committee my delegation's views on the question of the applicability of the principle of self-determination to the Greek claim on Cyprus, and have also indicated the reasons and circumstances which make it clear that the meaning attached by the partisans of Enosis to the term "self-determination" has little, if anything, in common with the general understanding of this term.

I should now like to take up a question which has been very carefully and methodically avoided in all Greek propaganda for the annexation of Cyprus. The question is the following: What about the Turkish Cypriots, of whom only those living on Cyprus today number more than 100,000?

We are told that the Greek-speaking Cypriots do not want to be under British rule. Have any partisans of the Greek annexation stopped and pondered the fact that Turkish Cypriots do not want to be under Greek rule? Is there any doubt in anyone's mind that, ever since the creation of the movement for union with Greece -- and I do not mean only the present form of the so-called movement, which has been further complicated by organized violence and agitation from the outside -- and ever since the design for union with Greece was first introduced in the form of platonic wishes pronounced by a few individuals, the Turks of Cyprus have used all legally- and morally-permissible means to proclaim that they will never agree to be ruled by Greece? Is it denied that the violent campaign of hate and vilification inaugurated against the Turkish nation in Greece, the threats against and intimidation and murder of Turkish Cypriots by the terrorists, under the orders of the Cypriot Orthodox Church and of Colonel Grivas of the Greek Army, have only further strengthened the determination of the Turkish Cypriots to oppose being placed under Greek rule?

As I have already explained, the composition of the population of Cyprus has varied throughout history -- including recent history. There have been times when the Turks have been in the majority, and other times when the opposite has been true. Basing themselves on the coincidence that, today, the number of Greeks on Cyprus is larger by a handful -- there are 260,000 more to be exact -- they tell us that the fate of this island, which is geographically part of the Turkish mainland, should be sealed for ever and ever by its annexation to a country 700 miles away. This, we are told, is self-determination. But what about the self-determination of the Turkish Cypriots? What about the more than 100,000 Turkish Cypriots living on the island today and the 300,000 living in Turkey? Or is self-determination a right which is inherent only in those who speak Greek?

There is no doubt, no possibility of denial, as regards the sentiments and determination of the Turkish population of Cyprus on this point. These are the sentiments of a proud people, who are accustomed to live in freedom and in dignity. This determination has been crystallized and strengthened by the words and the deeds of the Greek annexationists themselves.



Indeed no one will deny that for the Turkish Cypriots it has not been necessary to murder each other in order to arouse their unanimous will not to be part of Greece. In all the history of bloodshed and terror in Cyprus, there is not a single case of a Turk murdering another Turk for his political beliefs or of the Turkish religious officials threatening their followers with excommunication or the fires of hell for political ends. I defy and challenge anybody to state the contrary. And yet, the undeniable fact remains that 100,000 Turks, like many Greeks on the island, are opposed to being placed under Greek rule.

The Greek Government recently stated that if Cyprus were annexed to Greece, it would be willing to give guarantees to the Turkish Cypriots. What is the implication of this declaration? What is the meaning of this statement by a Government which has up to now refused any kind of internal self-government that does not include a loophole for the eventual annexation of the island? Does it imply that any kind of guarantees given by any other government are unacceptable to Greek Cypriots, while Greek guarantees should be considered satisfactory to the Turkish Cypriots.

On what grounds is based this self-assurance of the Greek Government? Certainly, the words and the actions of Greek extremists, both in Cyprus and Greece, are not of a nature to build confidence, to give assurance and to dispel doubts in the minds of the Cypriot Turks.

First, the Turkish Cypriots are asked to have confidence in Greek guarantees at a time when a campaign of hatred and vilification is being conducted in that country against the Turkish Cypriots in particular and the Turkish nation in general. The intensity and the tone of this regrettable campaign have never been equalled in any part of the world at any time between countries which are not in a state of war.

The campaign of vilification against Turkey, conducted by the use of the Government Radio Stations, the Press, textbooks printed for use in schools and by other means, has nothing to do with the analysis or criticism of the Turkish point of view on Cyprus. Not at all. It has nothing to do with trying to furnish proof in justification of the Greek claim on Cyprus. The only aim of this

campaign is to create and to sustain in Greek public opinion hatred for everything that is Turkish, and to pour slanderous vilification on the Turkish nation in the hope of turning world opinion against Turkey.

And yet the same persons who are making such an effort to poison both their own public opinion and that of the world by creating and sustaining hatred against the Turks also sustain the claim that another 100,000 Turks should be placed under their custody.

I do not want to burden the Committee with hundreds of examples of this campaign which was started in 1953-54 and is now continuing with an ever-increasing intensity. I do, however, wish to furnish just a few of the more typical examples in order to give some idea of the anxiety felt by the Turkish Cypriots, why they are afraid.

The list of Greek newspapers co-operating in the campaign against the Turkish nation is very long: it includes Acropolis, Kathimerini, To Vima, Athinaiki, Elefteria, Ethnikos Kiriks and many others. Special mention should be made of the newspaper Ellenikos Vorras which is owned by Mr. Levantis who, when he first started his anti-Turkish campaign, occupied the post of Minister of Agriculture in the Greek Cabinet. He has now been promoted to Minister of Education. In the same belligerent and violent anti-Turkish endeavours, a further mention must also be made of the newspaper Rodiaki which is owned by Mr. Kotiyadis, Minister of the Merchant Marine in the Greek Cabinet.

Here are just a few examples of this press campaign:

1. On 26 October 1954, the Athenian newspaper Ethnikos Kiriks, after calling the Turkish population of Cyprus "arrogant" and "cowardly", likened them to "herds of beasts sold by their Sultan" and said that nothing could be expected of them but slavery.

2. In July, August and September of 1954, the newspapers Acropolis, Elefteria, Ellenikos Vorras, Kathimerini and others brought the anti-Turkish campaign to a new high pitch. The language used by Ellinikos Vorras, especially in an article published on 1 September 1954, surpassed all the others in its gross vulgarity, while Elefteria on 17 October 1954, wrote about the "shamelessness" and "dishonesty" of Turkey.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

3. On 7 August 1955, the newspaper Ethnikos Kiriks invited the Greek people to invade Turkey for the purpose of annexing Turkish territory, stating:

"We should remember that the Greek people lack the land necessary for living and demand Eastern Thrace" -- that is European Turkey -- "which was Greek for centuries and now has been turned into ruin by the Turks".

The campaign of this newspaper, trying to convince Greek public opinion of the advantage of an armed attack on Turkey and of the annexation of Turkish territory, was intensified and reached the point of hysterics in articles published by the newspaper on 13 and 19 August 1955.

Early in 1956, this same newspaper, having partially succeeded in deteriorating the atmosphere of Turkish-Greek relations, started a new campaign in a senseless and vain attempt to poison, as well, the atmosphere of friendship and alliance between Turkey and other countries. Here is an example of this manoeuvre from the newspaper Ethnikos Kiriks of 28 February 1956. This is a textual translation:

"... But we shall not commit the errors of the past. Turkey must know that she cannot continue to hold the most fertile extensions of the Eastern Mediterranean, that she is not capable of giving them value. Because these lands are too much for her and two steps further there are two intelligent, progressive, capable and active peoples who have an unbearable lack of land. These are Italy and Greece. This theme must be put forward, either sweetly or by force. In any case, it must be resolved."

Leaving aside all other considerations, I have this to ask: Are these words of a nature to make Greek annexation desirable for the Turkish Cypriot farmers who own nearly half of the land in Cyprus and whose labour brings fertility to its fields?

During the period which I have covered very briefly, many Greek newspapers joined in the belligerent appeals against Turkey. Ellenikos Vorras, the newspaper of the Minister of Education of the Greek Cabinet, was second to none.

After talking about the barbarism, the stupidity, the incapacity of the Turks and on 3 November 1955, likening them to "oxen" and "buffaloes" -- I am sorry, but this is a translation and I am just reading it from the newspaper -- Ellenikos Vorras wrote on 27 May 1956:

"The State must take all necessary measures to finish up with the Turks and throw the British out of Cyprus ... Therefore, we must prepare for war. Cyprus and the stupidity of the Turks give to Greece a divine occasion to start again our case against Turkey. Such occasions present themselves rarely. Therefore, do not let us miss this occasion without profit. The nation and the Greek youth are full of enthusiasm which reanimates once again the 'Megali Idea'" -- by the way, the Megali Idea or Grand Idea is the name given to the Greek movement for building a great Empire at the expense of her neighbours -- "Without hurry and without mistakes we must prepare ourselves to be ready at the appropriate moment which will not take a long time to come. We shall accomplish our national desires."

Are these words meant to bring comfort and assurances to the Turkish Cypriots who rightly consider themselves as part of the Turkish nation?

On 8 July 1956, Ellenikos Vorras, the newspaper of the Greek Minister of Education, wrote:

"The people of Greece have been ready for a long time for the hour and the moment of attack which will permit them to enter into possession of the vast and rich Turkish territory."

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

On 22 July 1956, the same newspaper, referring to an article in the New York Times in which, allegedly, it was said that the United States did not desire to intervene in order to change the attitude of the Turkish Government, went on to say the following:

"The American newspaper by revealing the lack of enthusiasm on the part of America and England for convincing Turkey to abandon her intransigence concerning the Cyprus question, has rendered a great service to Greece which has found a formidable way for inducing the Turks to accept the Cypriot solution. This way is: the solution of the Cypriot question shall be accomplished by the use of arms."

Another newspaper, the Rodiaki, owned by yet another Greek Cabinet Minister, Mr. Kotiadis, Minister for the Merchant Marine, has been doing all in its power not to remain behind its colleagues. After inviting the Greeks to annex Turkish territory, in an article published on 22 May 1956, it continued to make contributions to the hate campaign and wrote on 15 July 1956:

"If the worthless and low creatures in Ankara threaten us, let us threaten them. If they refuse to give liberty to Cyprus by claiming that their strategic position will be endangered, let us remind them that we can threaten their belly which is empty and which has no safe communications from the island of Meis to the island of Lemnos." -- that is to say the coast of Western Turkey.

The Newspaper Messageur d'Athènes, published in Athens in the French language, has taken upon itself an attempt to spread to all the world slander, vilification and lies about the Turkish nation. It is almost a daily occurrence for this newspaper to publish articles distorting the facts and aiming only at poisoning Turkey's friendly relations with other countries and damaging Turkish prestige in the world. I wonder if the managers of this newspaper are conscious of the degree to which their campaign has directly contributed to the strained relations between the two communities in Cyprus.

Concurrently with the campaign aiming at the vilification of the Turkish nation, and aside from the main topics which I have briefly summarized, there is also, in all the newspapers published in Greece, a campaign of lies, distortions

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

and misrepresentations on matters which might be minor in appearance but which, when added up, are meant to help in building up hatred against Turkey. Thus, for example, when the Turkish Government took a regular census of the Turkish population in November 1955, as it has been doing every five years for the last thirty years, this routine procedure was represented by the Greek press as a sinister manoeuvre on the part of the Turkish Government to proclaim a greater population than really exists in order to obtain more international economic assistance. When the Turkish factories made a commercial deal to manufacture and export certain types of arms to Western Germany, whose own factories are busy producing other types of industrial commodities, the Greek press reported that Turkey was selling the weapons which it had received from NATO. When Greek fishing boats were intercepted fishing illegally in Turkish territorial waters, with the use of dynamite, the Turkish Customs and Coast Guard officials were depicted as bloodthirsty pirates.

These are a few examples of the manner in which the Greek Press is attempting to create hatred against the Turkish nation in the minds and hearts of the Greek people.

To what extent they may succeed, I do not know. Personally, I believe that the great mass of public opinion in Greece will reject this campaign. But the question which I want to ask is the following: can 100,000 Turkish Cypriots accept incorporation into a State of which some of the leaders and most of the Press willfully and in a calculated manner are doing all they can to stir up hatred and prejudice against the Turkish nation in the minds of the people who, it is claimed, should govern these 100,000 Turks?

Nor is the Press the only weapon used to encourage hatred. The official Government radio station has played an ominous part in this campaign by distorting the news, creating false rumours, encouraging and glorifying terrorism and bloodshed and by other means.

As even a brief summary of the role played by this official radio station in fomenting dissent between the two communities in Cyprus and in vilifying the Turkish nation would take too much of the precious time of the Committee, I shall give just one example selected, not from the news services, but from the so-called

artistic and theatrical service of the Greek Government radio. I am referring to the radio theatrical entitled Kolokotronis broadcast by all Greek Government radio stations on 25 March 1955 and on other dates.

Kolokotronis is the name of one of the heroes of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. The Turkish Republic, like many of its neighbours, is also an heir to the Ottoman Empire. It occupies a territory which is the homeland of Turks, as its neighbours occupy territories which are their own homelands. It has no feeling but one of respect for the independence and freedom of all the heirs to the same Empire. We believe that all these countries should glorify their national heroes and pay tribute to them. Indeed, Turkish diplomatic officials never miss the opportunity to participate in the national celebrations of their neighbours, bringing to them the congratulations, the sympathy and the good will of the Turkish people.

But what should we say when the theme of national heroes is utilized not for their glorification but only as a pretext for encouraging hatred and prejudice today? What should our reaction be if the theme of incidents which allegedly happened six generations ago, is used as an excuse for insults, smears and incitement to bloodshed in the present period?

I shall read only a few lines of the textual translation of the play Kolokotronis as produced by the Government radio station of Greece:

Line 52: "The Turks, these low creatures, these dogs of Ali Bey" -- whatever this means I do not know.

Line 56: "I shall bring in my bag seven Turkish heads."

Lines 65 to 69: "I shall bring to the village 100 Turkish heads, I shall light a fire and throw them in it.

We shall all dance over the fire as though it were the night of St. John."

Lines 74 to 81: "These dogs, these degenerate Albanians and Turks. We shall cut them to pieces.

We shall throw their dirty corpses, their dirty heads as food for wild beasts and birds."

I could go on quoting other passages of this so-called artistic theatrical production. I do not think it is necessary. The point which I want to make is

MW/gd

A/C.1/PV.848

74-75

the following: these passages were not written in the Middle Ages. They were broadcast over a Government radio station in the year 1955. I have quoted them only as examples of the kind of propaganda which is still going on.

Every country represented in the United Nations has a glorious history of which it is proud. Most of them have made great sacrifices for their national independence and sovereignty. Most of them have national heroes who are a source of pride not only to them but also to the whole world, as they have all contributed to the universal cause of freedom and independence. But I can say one thing without fear of being contradicted: sacred themes of freedom and independence, as well as incidents which happened six generations ago, have never been abused to such an extent or shrouded in a language calculated to foster hatred and prejudice in such a manner, in any other part of the world.



Yet the same radio which indulges in this propaganda of hate also proclaims to the world that the Island of Cyprus, of which nearly 50 per cent of the land belongs to Turks and which is inhabited by over 100,000 Turks, should be given to Greece.

There is another aspect of the campaign against the Turkish nation which undoubtedly will be considered most tragic. I am referring to the efforts made to poison the minds of the youth and of innocent school children by bringing them up in a manner designed to create and sustain national hatred as well as to breed a desire for the annexation of territories of neighbouring countries.

School books in Greece are chosen by the Ministry of Education and published by the Administration, the initials of which are "O.E.S.V.", which in Greek stand for "the Administration for the Publication and Difusion of School Books". The entire operation is under the responsibility of the Minister of Education, from whose newspaper I have already given the Committee some quotations. Passages designed to create hatred against the Turkish nation in the minds of children are to be found in the books of the fifth and sixth grades of the primary schools and are also contained in the books used by the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth grades of the Gymnasium; in other words, all through secondary education.

This campaign designed to poison the minds of innocent children is based on all the scientific principles of indoctrination and inculcation. Thus, in the books for smaller children, the campaign is conducted through tales and simple anecdotes pretending to glorify heroic acts. In the more advanced classes, all forms of literature, stories, poems, theatrical pieces, like the one I mentioned above, speeches, memoires, etc. as well as pictures are utilized. Special care is given to the principle of repetition of certain slogans, such as the necessity for Greeks to conquer parts of Turkey, since it is known that repetition penetrates children's minds and may leave traces in adult life.

After the Treaty of Friendship between Turkey and Greece had been signed in 1931, and after the signature of the Balkan Pact, it was mutually agreed to eliminate from the school books of both countries such passages which were designed to create and encourage hatred between the Turkish and the Greek nations.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Turkey has fully complied with this agreement. Not only has Greece not complied, but the tone of the propaganda in school books has been further intensified during the campaign for the annexation of Cyprus.

I have in my files eighty-two examples of such passages from Greek school books. If the Greek delegation desires to take the initiative in this matter, I shall be ready to distribute translations of these passages to the Committee members.

Yet, when such conscious efforts are being made to poison the minds of innocent children with sentiments of hatred, revenge and territorial aggrandizement, when schools are used in an attempt to perpetuate hatred in future generations, the Greek Government tells us that the United Nations should present them with an island which strategically dominates Turkey, an island on which nearly 50 per cent of the land belongs to Turks, an island which is today the home of 100,000 Turks who started tilling the land in 1571, before the first American settlers had even stepped on the shores of New England. This is what we are told. And what is more, we are told that the Turkish Cypriots should accept the Greek claim and place themselves at the mercy of Greece.

The anxiety of the Cypriot Turks is not only based on words, rumours and verbal threats. The incitation to hatred and bloodshed has unfortunately already produced tragic results in Cyprus itself. A great many innocent Turkish Cypriots have been murdered up to now by the gangs of Colonel Grivas. Villages have been attacked; Turkish Cypriot women and children have been beaten and stabbed by those who claim that since they are in the majority, they have the right to rule over the Turkish Cypriots. Colonel Grivas has ordered an economic and social boycott of all the Turkish population of Cyprus and on 15 May 1956, he sent a proclamation to the Greek Cypriots threatening them with death if his boycott was not obeyed by them. Incidentally, this proclamation of the head of the Greek terrorists contained the following poetic passage:

"When water and fire become intimate friends and when hell and paradise unite -- then and only then shall we be the sincere friends of the Turks."

And yet we are told that the Turkish Cypriots should place their land, their belongings, their freedom and their very lives in the hands of Colonel Grivas and his band.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I can imagine that some members of the Committee will feel that communal strife and even bloodshed, unfortunate and tragic as they may be, should not be taken as examples of what the future has in store, that they are not continual as long as the legal Governments and institutions do not encourage or uphold them. That may be so. But it will certainly be very difficult to convince the Turkish Cypriots especially since the Greek Governmental institutions officially participated in these village quarrels and communal disturbances in the following manner.

I wish to remind the Committee of two incidents to this effect. I have refrained, up to now, from dwelling on what are called "atrocities stories" and I am not going to relate any events of this nature now. I shall quote only the headlines of news reports in neutral American newspapers in connexion with a period of only a few weeks in order to provide the background for an action undertaken by the Greek Chamber of Deputies:

Headlines from The New York Times of 20 March 1956: "Greek Mob Raids Turks on Cyprus -- Men, Women and Children in villages of Vasilias are stoned and Clubbed".

Headlines from the Daily News, 25 March 1956: "Violence Reigns Despite Curfew, Cypriot extremists murdered a Turkish Cypriot".

Headlines from The New York Times, 23 April 1956: "Cypriot Rebels Slay two Turks".

Headlines from the New York Herald Tribune of 25 May 1956: "Turkish Cypriots Riot in Reprisal on Greeks". I shall read part of the beginning of the news telegram printed under this caption as the headlines might be misinterpreted:

"Turkish Cypriots armed with stones and clubs rioted here and in Larnaca today, seeking revenge against Greek Cypriots for the fatal shooting of a Turkish Cypriot."

Headlines from The New York Times of 27 May 1956: "Cyprus Keeps up Factional Riots". And now I shall read a sentence from the telegram under this headline:

"According to witnesses, the fighting started about 10.45 p.m. in the Greek section of the village. Greek villagers rang church bells and a crowd, joined by several truck loads of men from two neighbouring villages, attacked the Turkish section of Aphanias."

AW/tc

A/C.1/PV.848  
79-80

(Mr. Sarter, Turkey)

I shall not read the rest, which is on what happened to the Turkish men, women and children on this occasion. As I said before, my aim is not to make a point of so-called "atrocities stories" but to draw the attention of the Committee to the action taken by the Greek Chamber of Deputies on the subject of these incidents, as reported by neutral international Press.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

On 27 May 1956, The New York Times reported the murder of another Turkish Cypriot, and of three more on the 3rd, 4th and 5th of June.

Now this was the background of the so-called "rioting of Turkish Cypriots for revenge and reprisal" on 29 May 1956. Incidentally, there was not a single loss of life among the Greek Cypriots during these unfortunate incidents, and the material damage to Greek property was valued at \$12,000. The local administration immediately took drastic measures to curb further incidents and imposed a curfew.

How has the Greek Chamber of Deputies reacted to these unfortunate incidents? On 6 June 1956, it sent a telegram to all the Parliaments of the world and to scores of newspapers and news agencies, in which it stated in most solemn words that the Turkish minority in Cyprus was killing the Greeks of the island in an attempt "to completely exterminate the Greek population of the island".

I shall read the full text of an English translation of this message of the Greek Chamber of Deputies of which we were provided with the French text:

"The members of the infinitesimal minority of the population of Cyprus, profiting from the tolerance of the English Administration, kill and wound Greek Cypriots which constitute, as it is known, the majority of five-sixths of the population. They also smash, burn and destroy Greek property at Nicosia, Larnaca, Ammochostos and other points of Cyprus.

"The British Administration takes no measures for punishing the delinquents and for curbing the renewal in the future of these crimes which aim at the complete extermination of the Greek population of the island. This behaviour of the British authorities encourages the Turkish hordes to commit new crimes and causes immediate danger to peace.

"The Greek Chamber of Deputies expresses its profound indignation for these barbarian acts and for the tolerance of the British Administration. It raises an energetic protest and denounces these actions which are perpetrated to the detriment of the Cypriot people fighting for freedom. And, finally, it invites the Parliaments of free nations to extend their assistance so that freedom and peace may be established again on the great island."

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

These are the words with which the Greek Chamber of Deputies informed the world of the incidents of that period in Cyprus in which a great number of Turks were murdered or wounded and not one single Greek was seriously injured. And they call that "complete extermination of the Greek population of the island". There was not one single Greek seriously injured. That was reported by the international and neutral press.

This was an attempt to smear the Turkish Cypriots in connexion with incidents which all impartial news reports established to have been started by the Greek Cypriots. Leaving aside the moral and ethical implications of such action, leaving aside all sentiments of justice, decency, fairness and equity, I have this to ask:

How do these gentlemen, who have committed such an act of injustice against the Turkish Cypriots, propose to convince these same Turkish Cypriots that they should have confidence in their ruling? Has it not occurred to these gentlemen that while they were trying to vilify and degrade the Turkish Cypriots in the eyes of the world, they were sealing forever and ever the determination of the Turkish Cypriots not to be ruled by them?

This is not an isolated case. The same tactics have been used very recently, here in the United Nations on the occasion of similar incidents on Cyprus. A letter was addressed to you, Mr. Chairman, by the Chairman of the Greek delegation on 21 January 1957. The contents of this letter, as well as the reply of my delegation dated 28 January 1957, are known to the members of this Committee. I have been informed that on this occasion too the Greek Chamber of Deputies has repeated its tactics of attempting to smear the Turkish Cypriots for the action initiated and sustained by the Greek terrorists in Cyprus.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece had made an effort this morning to explain the campaign of hatred and vilification which is carried on in Greece in connexion with the question of Cyprus, by saying that Greece practised freedom of the press, and that they did not want to suppress this freedom.

Here is a very significant example of that freedom of the press:

One magazine in Greece called "Astinomika Nea" had the courage, for one, not to follow the official instigations. On 20 October 1954, under the signature of Hadjinikolau, this paper published a criticism of the Greek Government's policy.

This writer, Hadjinikolau, said: "We are following the worst course in our effort for Cyprus. While seeking Enosis, we accomplish acts of such a nature that the hope of obtaining the island is definitely discarded... Taking the question to the United Nations will be the tomb of the Cypriot question as well as of the foreign policy of Elefterios Venizelos. That is the name given in Greece to the policy of Turkish-Greek friendship inaugurated by Kemal Ataturk and the Greek statesman, Venizelos.

This Greek citizen as well as the owners of the paper "Astinomika Nea" were both condemned to four months imprisonment for publishing the article, which I have quoted, in which they asked for the continuation of the policy of friendship with Turkey. It was alleged by the former Government of Greece that these men were foreign agents.

This is the manner in which liberty of the press is being practised in Greece.

This is a small addition to my statement in answer to what the distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece spoke about this morning.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

I have taken up much of the precious time of this Committee. Unfortunately there was no other course for me to follow. As the question has been brought to the attention of the United Nations we have been compelled to dwell at some length on various aspects of this problem and to lay before the Committee certain relevant facts.

Now, with your permission, I shall attempt to summarize these facts in order to bring before the Committee the main points of the Turkish case.

First, Greece has no justification whatsoever in making an issue out of the Cyprus question which was artificially created by that country. There are no justifiable grounds for a Greek claim for the annexation of Cyprus.

Secondly, the concern of Turkey over the status of Cyprus is natural and self-evident.

This concern stems mainly from the two following considerations:

- (a) There are today over 100,000 Turks living on this island, and Turkey is deeply concerned with their fate.
- (b) There are geographical, historical, political and contractual reasons which make the status of the island of vital interest to Turkey. The position of this off-shore island of Anatolia affects the defence and security of the Turkish mainland.

Thirdly, in spite of these facts, our Greek allies have attempted to reverse the roles and in order to obtain sympathy for their annexationist ambitions they have endeavoured on the one hand to present themselves as the only interested party in this question, and, on the other hand as the disinterested defenders of the principle of self-determination.

Furthermore, they have attempted to exert pressure for the solution of this question in the direction which they desire by organizing and overtly instigating terrorism in Cyprus, by trying to vilify Turkey in the eyes of world opinion through a malicious propaganda campaign conducted with an unparalleled violence and by availing themselves of every opportunity to turn this question into a grave and dangerous issue.

These activities are not only incompatible with the established practices of friendly relations among nations, but they are also in flagrant contradiction with the obligations assumed by Greece under the Charter of the United Nations.



Fourthly, in spite of these activities undertaken by various Governments in Greece, Turkey has done its utmost to display restraint and moderation and to prevent this question from deteriorating to its present tragic state.

Unfortunately in matters of this nature unilateral efforts are not sufficient to produce the desired end.

It is amazing and distressing to see Greece, which has openly strained and aggravated the question of Cyprus, come before the United Nations as a claimant and as the defender of justice. It is appropriate that the United Nations put an end to this situation.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Fifth, we are the complaining party. We have complaints against terrorist action. We have complaints against the campaign of hatred and vilification inaugurated against Turkey by Greece in connexion with its claim on Cyprus which it has unjustifiably created and sustained without any legitimate grounds. We have complaints against this attitude which Greece has chosen to take in contradiction with its moral and contractual obligations, in a period when the world is in need of peace and tranquillity more than ever.

We are faced with an attempt to abuse the principle of self-determination, which is sacred to us as it is to all countries. This is intolerable. Although presented under the guise of self-determination, the claim of the Greek Government on this island which is geographically part of the Turkish mainland and lies 700 miles away from Greece and on which there are two communities with divergent aspirations is, in reality, directed towards bringing about the domination of the Greek-speaking community over the Turkish community and in this manner effectuating the annexation of Cyprus to Greece.

This is not self-determination but merely an attempt to impose a Greek diktat. To ask the United Nations to conceive the principle of self-determination in such a way and to proceed to its implementation in this manner would be contrary to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

When the question of Cyprus was first thrust upon the political scene by Greece, Turkey for a considerable period of time made efforts for the maintenance of the juridical status quo to avoid a possible deterioration of relations among three friendly and allied countries, in the hope that an amicable solution could be achieved directly among the three countries concerned. At that time, unfounded and unjustified allegations were brought forward by certain quarters, some of whom lacked sufficient information for penetrating the essence of this question and others had an interest in trying to weaken the position taken by Turkey.

Allow me to mention some of these allegations. It was alleged that Turkey's attitude on the Cyprus question was a negative one; that Turkey merely raised obstacles in the path of Greece as Turkey itself had no rightful claim and no proposal for a constructive solution. And yet, what could be more constructive than an attitude aimed at the preservation of an international equilibrium which was established by the Treaty of Lausanne and which forms the solid foundation of very important and valuable alliances?

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

Another such allegation against Turkey has been the following. Efforts have been made to insinuate that Turkey viewed colonialism with favour and supported colonial policies. It has been pretended that Turkey was interested in the Cyprus question at the instigation of the United Kingdom and that it had come forward in this question for the sole purpose of rendering assistance to that country.

The history and the deeds of Turkey stand as an irrefutable proof of the fact that Turkey is not and cannot be a supporter of colonialism. Yet the promoters of this propaganda should know that in a case which has nothing to do with colonialism such efforts, aimed at exerting pressure on Turkey with the threat of being labelled as pro-colonialist, cannot intimidate this country into making concessions incompatible with its rights and legitimate interests. At a time when contradictions between words and deeds have unfortunately been witnessed in abundance, this determined attitude of Turkey should be considered an important contribution to the authority and prestige of this world Organization.

As for the second part of the contention, it is indeed a fact that Turkey and the United Kingdom are friends and allies. But the contention that Turkey has been acting solely to render assistance to the United Kingdom in the Cyprus question can be disproved by a mere glance at the map. Cyprus is attached to Anatolia not by virtue of any friendship or alliance but as the result of geological and geographical phenomena.

Another unfounded allegation has been to depict Turkey as though it were opposed to the constitutional progress of the people of Cyprus as well as to their aspirations for freedom. In other words, it was alleged that Turkey was against self-government. In order to demonstrate the unfounded character of this contention, may I remind the members of this Committee of the official declarations made by the Turkish Government on this matter. In principle, Turkey has never been opposed and is not opposed to self-government in Cyprus. This is all the more obvious in view of the fact that it would equally constitute a progressive development of the 100,000 Turks on the island. But -- and this is very important -- we have been opposed to self-government being used as a stepping-stone for Enosis and as a manoeuvre to subjugate the Turkish population of the island. In accordance with what we have been saying up to the present, we wish to reiterate that self-government cannot be put into effect as long as terrorism continues and

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

certain elements on the island attempt to realize Enosis at all costs. When self-government is put into operation it should eliminate all possibilities for one community to dominate the other and it should provide the necessary safeguards for the defence of equal rights between them.

During the period to which I have referred, it was argued in certain quarters that a point of no return had been reached, making it impossible to revert to the situation which existed at the outset of the present contingency. It was claimed that the efforts of all the parties concerned should now be directed to finding the most reasonable and equitable means for coming out of the present situation. We were told that we too should make such proposals so that the Turkish thesis might be directed to the future and not to the past. In fact, our attitude has never been inconsistent with the essence of these arguments. As I have explained in my statement, Turkey has always had definite ideas on the kind of self-government applicable in Cyprus as well as on the rights of the Turkish population of the island. We have always followed closely all developments and studied carefully any positive proposals regarding the situation in Cyprus. We have adopted our future course of action with a clear conscience.

In this connexion, we have accepted as a reasonable basis for negotiation the statement made in the House of Commons on 19 December 1956 by Mr. Lennox-Boyd, Secretary of State for the Colonies of the United Kingdom Government, as well as the report of the constitutional expert Lord Radcliffe to which that statement referred. This acceptance was made public by the Turkish Government immediately following Mr. Lennox-Boyd's statement and has been reiterated on several occasions since.

The statement of the United Kingdom Government to which I have referred and which has been considered by my Government as forming a unit, contains two parts. The first of these deals with the Radcliffe report. The second part concerns the ultimate future of the island. The following views were included in this statement:

"When the international and strategic situation permits, and provided that self-government is working satisfactorily, they (the United Kingdom Government) will be ready to review the question of the application of self-determination.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

"When the time comes for this review, that is, when these conditions have been fulfilled, it will be the purpose of Her Majesty's Government to ensure that any exercise of self-determination should be effected in such a manner that the Turkish Cypriot community no less than the Greek Cypriot community shall, in the special circumstances of Cyprus, be given freedom to decide for themselves their future status. In other words, Her Majesty's Government recognize that the exercise of self-determination in such a mixed population must include partition among the eventual options."

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The Radcliffe report, which was rejected by Greece in a summary manner, has been carefully studied by the Turkish authorities who are in contact with the United Kingdom authorities in this matter. In our view, the statement of the United Kingdom Government on the conditions under which self-determination shall be applied at the proper time, is in complete conformity with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, with the general rules of justice and equity as well as with the undeniable particularities of Cyprus.

In fact, in an island such as Cyprus where the population is far from being homogeneous, divided as it is in two distinct communities whose relations with each other have unfortunately and regrettably been strained to a degree causing deep resentment and even animosity, it is inconceivable that one community should be allowed to exert influence in determining the fate and destiny of the other. Therefore, it is clearly evident that the only conceivable solution resides in making it possible for the Turkish community to determine freely and independently its future status when the appropriate time arrives.

I will not dwell any further on the Radcliffe proposals and the right of the Turkish community to determine their own future independently, for it is the opinion of my Government that these questions must be settled among the interested parties in accordance with the peaceful means prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations.

My intention has been to provide some information to the Committee on the manner in which Turkey, as a further proof of her goodwill and of her constant desire to keep pace with the realities, has seized these new possibilities and has immediately supported them with active contributions.

In these circumstances, we are of the opinion that the General Assembly within the limits of its competence as defined in the Charter and in conformity with the principles of justice and equity could bring its invaluable contribution in this matter by proceeding in the following manner:

1. To call upon Greece to put an end to its support of terrorism in Cyprus.
2. To encourage the renewal of negotiations among the parties directly concerned with a view to arriving at a rapid and peaceful solution of the Cyprus question and to refrain from endeavouring to formulate within the Assembly the concrete solutions which can only come about through such negotiations between the three countries concerned.

(Mr. Sarper, Turkey)

The Cyprus question has come to constitute an important test for the prestige and the authority of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Indeed, the Assembly is faced with a question which has been confused by attempts to conceal and distort its true nature. We are witnessing an attempt to abuse lofty principles with high sounding words and expressions aiming to appeal to the sentiments in order to cover annexationist imperialistic designs.

In view of all these maneuvers of camouflage, distortion and incitement the General Assembly of the United Nations is faced with the solemn duty of stripping the question of all these elements in order to reach the root of the matter rationally and with insight.

I am confident that the General Assembly will not fail in discharging this important duty, for the terrorism instigated, supported and sustained by Greece in Cyprus has created a situation on the island, such, that co-existence and co-operation between the two communities has been made totally impossible.

Before concluding I should like to comment briefly on the speech made this morning by the Foreign Minister of Greece. In this speech, there are quite a few points which must be corrected, clarified, rectified and also partly denied. I will do that at the appropriate stage of our debate. I wish to reserve the right of my delegation to intervene in the debate whenever it deems necessary.

Mr. HAYMERLE (Austria): I would like to make a very short remark on a point raised by the representative of Turkey in his speech, which we have just had the privilege of hearing.

Ambassador Sarper mentioned Austria in connexion with the principle of self-determination. He stated:

"...in accordance with the terms of the Austrian Peace Treaty, the Austrians cannot exercise the right to form union with Germany.

(Mr. Haymerle, Austria)

"This limitation was requested of the Austrian people and accepted by them as a further contribution of the peace and freedom-loving people of Austria to the peace and security of Central Europe." (Supra, pp. 49-51)

Although I would like to express my deep appreciation for the friendly words the representative of Turkey has found in this connexion vis-á-vis my country and people, I feel that I have to point out that the Austrian case can in no way serve as an example to illustrate the question before us. If, perhaps, after the First World War, under the impression of a political and economic breakdown in Central Europe, some doubts might have been raised about the viability of the newly established Republic of Austria, the situation changed completely after the Second World War. Today, the problem cited by Ambassador Sarper does not exist. The right which the representative of Turkey has mentioned as having been limited by our people as a contribution to the peace and security of Central Europe has in reality not been claimed. For all of us, the independence and sovereignty of Austria, for which we had to struggle so hard, is a fact which -- and we firmly believe this -- will never be questioned again.

I do hope that my colleague and friend from Turkey does not mind that I had to clarify this point.

Mr. SARPER (Turkey): The intention of the example I cited was to prove that the right of self-determination or self-determination as such is not an absolute right on a pattern which is applicable everywhere and to all cases in international relations. This is a matter of interpretation. The representative of Austria interpreted my words in one way. Others may interpret them in a different way, of course. But every international situation, problem and dispute should be judged on its own merits. There is no rule which can be applied indiscriminately to every case. That was all I wanted to say in that example.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have just been informed that the plenary meeting of the General Assembly which was scheduled for tomorrow will not take place. Therefore, the Political Committee can meet tomorrow morning and afternoon. At the same time, I would like to invite the speakers who wish to address the Committee to give their names to the Secretary so that we can make as much progress as possible in our work.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.