

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE 1010th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 4 December 1958,  
at 8.30 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Agenda item 68:   |             |
| Question of Cyprus ( <u>concluded</u> )                       |             |
| Consideration of draft resolutions ( <u>concluded</u> ) . . . | 315         |

**Chairman: Mr. Miguel Rafael URQUIA (El Salvador).**

**AGENDA ITEM 68**

**Question of Cyprus (A/3874 and Add.1, A/C.1/811, A/C.1/814, A/C.1/L.221-223, A/C.1/L.225, A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.228/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.229) (concluded)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
(concluded)**

1. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey), explaining the first of his delegation's sub-amendments (A/C.1/L.231) to the Greek amendments (A/C.1/L.230) to the revised Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2), asked why the Greek representative wished the words "between the three Governments concerned and representatives of the Cypriots" to be omitted from the Iranian draft; if the Committee adopted a resolution urging that a conference should be held on the Cyprus question, it should make clear who the participants in such a conference were to be.

2. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) replied that the party primarily concerned in the future of Cyprus was the people of that island; in submitting the second Greek amendment, he had sought to avoid creating the impression that the three Governments were to play the primary role in any projected negotiations.

3. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) said that, in order to meet the Greek representative's objection, the reference to the three Governments might be made to follow the reference to the representatives of the Cypriots, although it would be more correct form to put it the other way round.

4. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) explained that he wished any reference to the three Governments to be omitted lest the impression should be created that the Committee was proposing the replacement of one-Power colonialism on Cyprus by three-Power colonialism; it would surely be clear, despite the omission, just who the parties to the proposed conference were to be.

5. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) said that he supported the first Turkish sub-amendment; since it was clear to everyone that the parties directly concerned in the Cyprus question were the United Kingdom, Greek and Turkish Governments and the representatives of the two Cypriot communities, there was no reason to leave the language of the draft resolution obscure by deliberately refraining from specifying them.

6. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) reminded the Committee that a vague text had been adopted at the eleventh session and that, as a result, no conference among the parties had been held.

7. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that the United Kingdom representative had been expressing a colonialist point of view in stating that the three Governments referred to were among the parties directly concerned in the Cyprus question. The people of Cyprus constituted the only party directly concerned; the Greek Government, for its part, was merely acting as spokesman for the Cypriots.

8. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey), explaining his delegation's second sub-amendment to the Greek amendments to the revised Iranian draft resolution, said that the words "d'établir l'autonomie de Chypre" in the original French text of the third Greek amendment did not correspond to the original English text of the Iranian draft resolution and had departed from the wording of the United Nations Charter; his delegation proposed the substitution of the words "de développer la capacité des Chypriotes de s'administrer eux-mêmes", which were based on the language of the Charter, and were in line with the original English text.

9. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that his delegation could not accept the second Turkish sub-amendment. The third Greek amendment had merely borrowed the word "autonomie" from the French text of the revised Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2), which had been submitted in English. He wished to point out, however, that the French text of the Charter translated "Non-Self-Governing Territories" as "territoires non autonomes". He wondered why the Turkish representative preferred a French wording which meant "to develop the capacity of the Cypriots to administer themselves"; he trusted that the Turkish representative wished to see the Cypriot people ultimately attain complete freedom and sovereignty.

10. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) said that, at his request, a corrigendum had been issued (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2/Corr.1) in which the words "self-government . . . should be developed" in the Iranian draft resolution were translated by the French words "il convient . . . de développer leur capacité de s'administrer eux-mêmes". He suggested that the Greek delegation should redraft its third amendment to substitute those words for "il convient d'établir l'autonomie de Chypre".

11. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that, in order to avoid creating the impression that the Cypriot people was never to be granted complete freedom, an expression such as "when fully attained in due time" should complement the term "self-government" in the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the revised Iranian draft resolution.

12. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) said that the third Greek amendment represented an attempt to introduce



language different from that used in the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation supported the second Turkish sub-amendment, which provided greater clarity and was in conformity with the language of the Charter.

13. As far as he was concerned, self-government meant self-government, not autonomy or anything else.

14. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey), commenting on the Greek representative's insistence on the word "autonomie", which was in any case an inadequate translation, pointed out that the Committee was not being asked to vote on independence or any other question of substance relating to Cyprus, but on a draft resolution recommending the convening of a conference. He asked Mr. Averoff-Tossizza whether the authors of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter, concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories, had intended that those Territories should be condemned to permanent colonial status. He had objected to the use of the French word "autonomie" in the third Greek amendment only because he had felt that the Committee should not adopt a resolution which constituted a decision on the substance of the question and specifically recommended independence for Cyprus as the Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.222) sought to do.

15. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that he accepted the clarification offered by the Turkish representative. He wished to know, however, what the United Kingdom representative had had in mind when he had said that self-government meant self-government and nothing else. If the United Kingdom representative was prepared to offer the assurance that he had not meant that Cyprus should remain permanently under United Kingdom sovereignty, the Greek delegation would be willing to agree to the use of the word "self-government" in its amendment to the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the revised Iranian draft resolution.

16. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) recalled that in his statement of 25 November (996th meeting) he had said "there is no need to expect that the United Kingdom will make the retention of its present sovereignty in Cyprus an obstacle to an eventual settlement". In that connexion, he referred the Greek representative to the United Kingdom's past record in developing self-government in other territories. It should be pointed out, however, that it was impossible to foresee the course that Cyprus' future development towards self-government would take.

17. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) said that his delegation was prepared to withdraw its third sub-amendment to the Greek amendments to the revised Iranian draft resolution.

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the various draft resolutions, amendments and sub-amendments before it.

19. In accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.1/L.221), having been submitted first, should be voted on first.

20. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) said that he would not press his draft resolution (A/C.1/L.223) to a vote if the Iranian draft (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2) obtained a majority.

21. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) stated that he would be prepared to withdraw his draft resolution (A/C.1/

L.221) if the Turkish and Greek representatives did the same.

22. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that he would have no objection if priority were given to other draft resolutions. He wished, however, to be able to revive his draft resolution (A/C.1/L.222) if other proposals were withdrawn or did not obtain a sufficient majority.

23. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) asked the Colombian representative not to insist on priority for his draft resolution (A/C.1/L.225), in order to allow the Committee to vote immediately on the Iranian draft and the amendments and sub-amendments to it.

24. Mr. ARAUJO (Colombia) agreed to waive his right of priority.

25. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) requested a separate vote on each of the Turkish sub-amendments (A/C.1/L.231) to the Greek amendments (A/C.1/L.230) to the Iranian text.

26. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) reminded the Committee that he had withdrawn his third sub-amendment.

27. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that, although he was prepared, in the light of the explanations that had been given, to accept the word "self government", he considered that the Turkish sub-amendments should not be adopted.

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Turkish sub-amendments (A/C.1/L.231) to the Greek amendments (A/C.1/L.230) to the revised Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2).

The first sub-amendment was adopted by 34 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions.

The second sub-amendment was adopted by 26 votes to 22, with 31 abstentions.

29. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) stated that, in view of the adoption of the Turkish sub-amendments, he would vote against his amendments (A/C.1/L.230) as so modified and against the Iranian draft resolution.

30. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Greek amendments (A/C.1/L.230) to the revised draft resolution submitted by Iran (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2). He would put to the vote first those amendments which had been modified by the adoption of the Turkish sub-amendments.

The second amendment, as amended, was adopted by 27 votes to 15, with 33 abstentions.

The third amendment, as amended, was rejected by 22 votes to 21, with 34 abstentions.

The first amendment was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put the Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2), as amended, to the vote.

At the request of the representative of Greece, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iran, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of



Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Federation of Malaya, France.

Against: Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Ghana.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 31 votes to 22, with 28 abstentions.

32. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) announced that he would not press his draft resolution (A/C.1/L.222) to a vote.

33. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) indicated that he would not press his delegation's draft resolution (A/C.1/L.221) to a vote.

34. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) said that he would not ask for a vote on his draft resolution (A/C.1/L.223).

35. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Colombian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.225).

36. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that his delegation accepted the Colombian draft resolution.

37. Mr. RAMOS (Argentina) asked whether the representatives of the United Kingdom and Turkey also supported the Colombian draft resolution.

38. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) moved, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, that the Committee should decide not to vote on the Colombian draft resolution.

39. The CHAIRMAN ruled the Argentine representative's question and the United Kingdom representative's motion out of order.

40. He put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Colombia (A/C.1/L.225).

At the request of the representative of Mexico, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Paraguay, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Paraguay, Peru, Spain, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Mexico, Nepal, Panama.

Against: Romania, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Argentina,

Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan.

The result of the vote was 17 in favour, 17 against, and 47 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted.

41. Mr. THORS (Iceland) announced that the sponsors of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.228/Rev.1) would not press it to a vote. The Committee had already voted in favour of one draft resolution, although it was doubtful that it could be adopted in the General Assembly. The ten-Power draft resolution had been submitted in an attempt to find a text acceptable to all concerned which would open the way to a sensible solution. Its sponsors would use the time until the matter came before the General Assembly to work for such a solution.

42. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said that, since a two-thirds majority had not been obtained, it was clear that none of the drafts before the Committee would be adopted by the General Assembly. His delegation had reserved its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.229), which was couched in general terms, for such an eventuality. The Committee must now decide whether it preferred that the General Assembly should again display its impotence to take any action on the issue or would adopt his delegation's draft resolution. He therefore requested that it be put to the vote.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Belgian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.229).

At the request of the representative of Belgium, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Sweden, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jordan, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Tunisia, Union of Soviet Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan.

The draft resolution was rejected by 22 votes to 11, with 48 abstentions.

44. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) said that his country had in the past made it clear that it could not admit the right of the United Nations to discuss the



domestic affairs of any Member State. However, the United Kingdom delegation, representing the sovereign authority in respect of Cyprus, had accepted the Iranian draft resolution and had not invoked the provision in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter against discussion of such matters in the United Nations. Moreover, the United Kingdom had itself suggested negotiations with Greece and Turkey for the solution of the problem. In the circumstances, his delegation, being desirous of assisting in achieving a solution, had not opposed the Iranian draft resolution but, in view of certain elements it contained, had been unable to vote for it and had therefore abstained.

45. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) said that his delegation had been sympathetic towards the Colombian and Belgian draft resolutions and had at one point been prepared to support them. It had voted against them, not because it disagreed with the ideas they contained, but because the Committee had already adopted the Iranian draft resolution, which, as revised by its sponsor, had taken on much more of the character of a compromise solution.

46. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said he had voted in favour of the first Turkish sub-amendment because he considered it necessary to recognize the political nature of the problem and to state clearly and frankly that the participants in a conference should be the three Governments concerned and representatives of the people of Cyprus. He had voted against the second Turkish sub-amendment because he considered that the General Assembly should make specific reference to the development of self-government and free institutions in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, thus leaving room for the application of Articles 1 and 55 as well as Article 73 of the Charter. For the same reason, he had voted in favour of the Iranian draft resolution.

47. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) said that the votes taken in the Committee showed clearly that further negotiation was necessary in order to achieve a single draft resolution. The affirmative votes his delegation

had cast, and the support it would have given to the ten-Power draft resolution (had that been put to a vote), should be interpreted only as the expression of its desire to contribute to the adoption of a number of draft resolutions which could be combined into one compromise text before the plenary meeting. His abstention in the vote on the Belgian draft resolution had been due simply to the emphasis placed in that text on the question of terrorism.

48. He appealed to the parties concerned to make another effort to reach agreement before the plenary meeting of the Assembly.

49. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) expressed regret that the parties concerned had been unable to reach agreement after a debate which had revealed that their views were in agreement on many points. The United Kingdom representative had stated that his country was prepared to give up Cyprus, the fear of enosis (union with Greece) had been eliminated, and the principle of respect for the rights of the Turkish minority had been accepted by all the parties. In his delegation's opinion, the points disputed by the Committee had been minor differences of interpretation: the people of Cyprus would naturally take a pre-eminent part in any conference since they were the party most directly concerned, and the difference between the terms "autonomy" and "self-government" could not affect the substance of the resolution.

50. His delegation had voted in favour of the Colombian draft resolution because it was sponsored by a sister country, laid down some salutary principles and pointed the way to concord and understanding. He had abstained on the other draft resolutions because they did not contain a sufficient number of points acceptable to his delegation or had failed to gain the full support of the three parties concerned. He appealed to those parties and to all representatives to make a further effort to reach the agreement which had seemed to be almost within the Committee's grasp.

The meeting rose at 11.25 p.m.