

006374

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

MAY 28 1985

LIBRARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1950th

 MEETING: 13 AUGUST 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1950)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Greece against Turkey: Letter dated 10 August 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12167)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1950th MEETING

Held in New York, on Friday, 13 August 1976, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Isao ABE (Japan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1950)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Greece against Turkey:
Letter dated 10 August 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12167)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Greece against Turkey:

Letter dated 10 August 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12167)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 1949th meeting, I propose to invite the representatives of Greece and Turkey to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bitsios (Greece) and Mr. Çağlayangil (Turkey) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to a new document which is relevant to the agenda item under consideration, namely, document S/12173 containing a letter from the representative of Greece addressed to the Secretary-General.

3. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Mr. Çağlayangil. On behalf of the Council I should like to welcome him, and I now call on him to make his statement.

4. Mr. ÇAĞLAYANGIL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the office of President of the Council. You are assuming your duties as President at a difficult time and your task will be heavy. However, we have confidence in your diplomatic skills and in your great experience. We are also convinced of your ability to guide this debate towards a conclusion that will be inspired by wisdom and justice. In addressing my congratulations to you, I should like also to pay tribute to your great country, Japan, with which Turkey enjoys excellent and constantly improving relations.

5. The request of the Greek Government for a meeting of the Council and the reasons adduced for that meeting are surprising. If there is currently tension in the Aegean and if a dangerous situation has been created in that region, the reason is that Greece has, without any legal right, resorted to military harassment of a Turkish civilian ship conducting research outside the territorial waters of Greece. This harassment took the form of flights at very low altitude over the vessel and attempts by Greek warships to intimidate and hamper the movements of the ship. The Greek Government, while resorting to military action, is also making the unbelievable allegation that Turkey is violating the sovereign rights of Greece on the continental shelf in the Aegean. This allegation is obviously based on the hypothesis that the continental shelf of the Aegean wholly and entirely belongs to Greece. In point of fact, since both countries have conflicting claims over the Aegean continental shelf, no unilateral assertion by Greece, no military intimidation and no attempt to confuse world public opinion will confer upon Greece the sovereignty over the regions that it claims. Until the continental shelf is defined and delimited, the respective claims of Turkey and Greece are equally valid, and this question can only be settled through negotiation.

6. On the other hand, it is unfortunate that Greece should have chosen to request a meeting of the Council at a time when the negotiating process between the two Governments is under way. The pretext adduced, that a Turkish ship is carrying out research, is far from convincing, since Greece took part in the negotiations in full awareness that Turkey intended to undertake such research. The true reason that impelled the Greek Government to call for a meeting of the Council, therefore, is nothing but a desire to

conduct propaganda, fanned by bellicose outcries from Athens.

7. Greece today argues that the research activities of the Turkish ship *Sismik-1* violate its sovereign rights over the continental shelf in the Aegean; but nowhere does the Greek request mention the fact that a Greek vessel named *Nautilus* is at this very moment conducting very similar activities in a neighbouring region. As far as the Greeks are concerned the activities of *Nautilus* are irreproachable, since according to them sovereignty over the entire Aegean continental shelf belongs to Greece. In fact Greece had begun to regard the Aegean as a Greek lake as far back as 1963, when, without any prior consultations or negotiations with Turkey, it undertook exploration in the Aegean Sea.

8. However, what Greece considers its sovereign rights are nothing but unilateral claims. Those claims, which are not based on international law, obviously cannot be accepted by Turkey, which, as one of the two coastal States of the Aegean, has equal rights in the continental shelf of that sea. In the absence of a delimitation in accordance with international law, the fact that Greece began explorations in the Aegean Sea at an earlier date still does not confer upon it any privilege or priorities or, in particular, any sovereign rights over the continental shelf of the Aegean. For these reasons, the declaration of Greece that its sovereign rights have been violated is contrary to law, to logic and to common sense. At the present time Greece possesses no delimited sovereign rights in the Aegean beyond its own territorial waters. It is impossible for anyone to imagine a violation of what are at present no more than unilateral claims.

9. The problem of the Aegean continental shelf and its delimitation goes beyond purely technical and legal considerations and involves important political, economic and security considerations. Turkey cannot relinquish any of its vital interests, which are closely tied to the maintenance of balance in the region.

10. To support its case, namely, the claim to exclusive sovereignty and monopoly of power in the Aegean, Greece has invoked the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf signed at Geneva in 1958.¹ Quite apart from the fact that Turkey is not a party to that Convention, the Greek interpretation of its provisions is arbitrary, selective and fallacious. As *The New York Times*, in an article published on 6 August last, stated: "No existing international law or convention provides a complete answer for the issues that divide Greece and Turkey in the Aegean." Furthermore, the legal concepts in this regard are in a State of evolution at present, and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea has not yet reached any final conclusions. One thing, however, is clear and certain, and that is that the continental shelf between two countries which either face each other or are adjacent to each other can be delimited

and defined only by mutual consent and taking into account all the relevant factors together with the principles of justice and equity. The question of the delimitation of the continental shelf is not one which concerns only Turkey and Greece; it is a process applicable to all countries facing similar problems.

11. The Turkish Government has for its part always been a firm advocate of bilateral negotiations with respect to the Aegean continental shelf, and it has taken the initiative in that direction. On the other hand, for a long time Greece maintained the startling view that there was nothing to negotiate and that Turkey's only alternative was to accept the unilateral Greek claims as recognized rights. However, Greece has finally come to understand the inevitability of negotiations, and thus a negotiating process was actually undertaken. The mission of *Sismik-1* should be considered in this context and viewed as part of the preparations of the Turkish Government for conducting negotiations with Greece in full possession of all relevant scientific data. Greece has already completed the research that enabled it to compile such data; it would therefore be impossible and unjust to require Turkey to refrain from doing likewise. The activities of *Sismik-1* cannot be considered as having impeded the negotiating process. In fact, for six months Greece has possessed all the facts and has been kept fully informed of the activities in which that ship would be engaged. The note of the Greek Government of 9 August 1976 [S/12173, annex, appendix I] addressed to the Turkish Government, recognizes that the Turkish authorities had already made public, on 14 March 1976, the programme of activities planned for *Sismik-1* in the Aegean. Thus, fully aware of this programme, Greece resumed bilateral negotiations with Turkey in June, and thus implicitly agreed that the activities of *Sismik-1* would not be construed as an obstacle to the continuation of the negotiating process.

12. Greece also alleges that Turkey has reneged on its previous acceptance of a judicial settlement of this question by the International Court of Justice, but this allegation distorts the facts. The position of the Turkish Government on this matter has always been clear and consistent. If it becomes necessary, Turkey does not exclude recourse to the Court to settle certain relevant aspects of the problem, but maintains that the dispute should first be negotiated between the two countries. Those aspects of the problem that cannot be resolved through negotiations conducted meaningfully and in good faith could then be referred to the Court or to some other judicial instance. It is obvious that such a referral can only be made jointly. This view of the Turkish Government has repeatedly been explained to the Greek Government.

13. The position of the Turkish Government is fully in accord with international law and is consistent with the general practice followed by countries that have been faced with similar issues in the past. In its deci-

sion concerning the continental shelf of the North Sea, the International Court of Justice itself clearly stated:

“the parties are under an obligation to enter into negotiations with a view to arriving at an agreement, and not merely to go through a formal process of negotiation as a sort of prior condition for the automatic application of a certain method of delimitation in the absence of agreement; they are under an obligation so to conduct themselves that the negotiations are meaningful, which will not be the case when either of them insists upon its own position without contemplating any modification of it.”¹²

In the same decision, the Court also stated:

“the judicial settlement of international disputes is simply an alternative to the direct and friendly settlement of such disputes between the parties... and that the obligation was not only to enter into negotiations but also to pursue them as far as possible with a view to concluding agreements.”¹³

In fact, negotiation has been the procedure resorted to by most countries faced with problems of delimitation.

14. The position of the Greek Government throughout the negotiations has been one of uncompromising negativism. Greece has categorically rejected all the Turkish proposals, ranging from a mere definition of the Aegean Sea to the joint exploitation of the resources of that sea. During the negotiations, Greece even refused to indicate the course of the line of delimitation of its own claims.

15. The Prime Minister of Greece has described the Turkish position as high-handed and arbitrary. Nothing could be further from the truth than such an accusation. The desire to negotiate, the desire to settle the dispute amicably, and all of the proposals for joint undertakings in the utilization of the resources of the Aegean Sea can hardly be termed high-handed and arbitrary. Such self-righteous rhetoric cannot hide the fact that Greece has so far barred the way to any chances of a peaceful settlement and has embarked upon a dangerous course of action in a frenzy or warlike activity. It has staked a claim to the high seas in the Aegean and in addition sets itself up to be both judge and party to the dispute. It is most unfortunate that the aspirations to aggrandizement and the chauvinistic megalomania which have brought Greece so much tragedy in the past have nevertheless been resurrected in the most irresponsible fashion.

16. This egocentric and self-righteously aggressive attitude of Greece is not reflected only in the recent situation. Since 1963 a grave situation has existed in the region because of the very dangerous path Greece has taken. Simultaneously with the effort to annex the independent island of Cyprus, in utter defiance of

international treaties governing the status of Greek islands along the coast of Turkey, Greece has armed and militarized those very islands, thus creating a serious threat to the security of Turkey. I think all members of the Council are fully aware of the fact that the Greek islands of the eastern Aegean are very close to the Turkish coast. Some of them are only a few kilometres from the Turkish coastline, and some are closer still, just a kilometre and a half away. Of the northern islands of the Aegean, Lesbos, Chios, Samos and Nikaria were demilitarized under the terms of article 13 of the Lausanne Peace Treaty of 1923.⁴ The Treaty of Peace with Italy signed in Paris in 1947⁵ stipulated, furthermore, that the islands of the Dodecanese were turned over to Greece on the specific condition that they were to be demilitarized and kept demilitarized. The islands of Lemnos and Samothrace were given the same demilitarized status. Greece assumed the solemn obligation to respect the status of all these islands; and yet at the present time practically all of them are heavily militarized. The islands have been fortified with guns, missiles, tanks and military installations and tens of thousands of troops.

17. Since 1964 Turkey has repeatedly drawn the attention of the Greek Government to these flagrant violations and to the grim consequences that could follow. For a long time the Greek Government denied that it was guilty of any treaty violations and repeatedly claimed that the measures taken in the islands were only for touristic and economic purposes. It was only very recently that the Greek Prime Minister himself finally admitted the truth. The Turkish Government believes that the unlawful militarization of the islands constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the region. Therefore it is now incumbent upon the Security Council, which is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, to consider what steps it deems appropriate to remedy the situation.

18. This arbitrary, provocative attitude of Greece, which is contrary to the principles and rules of international law, has been shown in its activities in the air space, over the Aegean. The illegal acts of the Greek Government, which abuse the technical responsibility entrusted to Greece flight information for the Aegean region, are aimed at transforming the international air space of the Aegean into national Greek air space, thus depriving Turkey and other countries of their inherent and traditionally established rights to use the international air space over the Aegean.

19. The Foreign Minister of Greece said nothing new in his statement of yesterday [1949th meeting]; he confined himself to repeating the unfounded Greek allegations. Such a statement should not call for an elaborate reply. However, I should like briefly to reiterate the views of my Government in connexion with some of the specific points he raised.

20. Mr. Bitsios referred to the question of Cyprus, which is not now on the Council's agenda. I am sure that the members of the Council are fully aware of all the aspects of that problem. Responsibility for the 1974 crisis lies entirely with Greece. Thanks to the Turkish intervention it was possible to preserve the independence of Cyprus and repel the invasion of Greece.

21. As to Prime Minister Caramanlis' proposal for an agreement on the renunciation of force, it will be useful to recall how that proposal was made. It was not, in fact, made through diplomatic channels. It was announced by the Prime Minister, Mr. Caramanlis, in the course of a heated debate in the Greek Parliament. The choice of that method inevitably cast serious doubts on the true intentions of the authors of the proposal. In his reply to Prime Minister Caramanlis, the Turkish Prime Minister, Mr. Demirel, expressed his doubts regarding the conclusion of a treaty on the renunciation of force between two countries which were members of the same alliance, but said that Turkey was ready to explore all peaceful ways of finding solutions to the questions pending between the two countries.

22. Greece called for the present meeting of the Council, alleging that there was a threat to peace in the Eastern Mediterranean. Greece had no qualms about describing Turkish policy as a threat to peace, but what justification was there for such allegations? Was it a question of the scientific research carried on by an unarmed civilian ship in the Aegean beyond Greek territorial waters? If so, how can we overlook the same kind of activities carried out by Greece in the Aegean for years? If peace is threatened in the region, it would be purely and simply because of the military activities of Greece in attacking an unarmed Turkish vessel in a region in which Greece has no sovereign rights.

23. A basic and fundamental contradiction is inherent in the Greek position, and it becomes evident when the Greek letter of 10 August 1976 [S/12167] addressed to the President of the Council and the Greek application to the International Court of Justice are studied. In its application to the International Court of Justice, Greece asks "what is the course of the boundary... between the portions of the continental shelf appertaining to Greece and Turkey in the Aegean Sea". On the other hand, in its letter to the President of the Council, Greece speaks of "violations... of the sovereign rights of Greece on its continental shelf in the Aegean". In other words, Greece, while asking the Court to determine which parts of the continental shelf belong to it, accuses Turkey of having violated Greece's rights on a continental shelf, without knowing whether or not that continental shelf belongs to it. And it is on that contradictory basis that Greece has requested a meeting of the Council.

24. Turkey has always been a proponent of bilateral negotiations to settle all its difference with Greece.

It did so in connexion with the question of the delimitation of the continental shelf. My Government naturally does not expect the Council to settle that complex question. Such an outcome can be achieved only by negotiations. It is with that conviction that Turkey hopes that the Council will invite Greece to enter into meaningful negotiations, in a constructive spirit. Turkey hopes, on the other hand, that the Council will examine Greece's flagrant violations of its international obligations regarding the demilitarization of the islands in the eastern Aegean and will take the steps required to put an end to a threat to peace and security in that region.

25. The problems between Turkey and Greece are complex, and all those problems have been unilaterally created by Greece, which has made a habit of deliberately violating international agreements and has for many years been attempting to upset even the equilibrium established by the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923. In fact, after a tragic war resulting from the aggressive and imperialist aims of Greece, the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 established a delicate balance between the two countries. There can be no solution that entails upsetting that balance. Greece's policy, its attempt to annex Cyprus, to close the Aegean air space, to monopolize the Aegean continental shelf and to militarize the islands, are dangerous actions designed to destroy a very carefully established balance. But all those efforts are doomed to fail. Turkey is not bent on domination, but neither is it a nation that will retreat when its vital rights and interests are threatened.

26. Turkey stands ready, as it has always done, to resolve all its outstanding differences with Greece through negotiations. It sincerely wishes to restore mutually beneficial co-operation between the two countries. I hope that in its deliberations the Council will keep that imperative in mind and will find a way to contribute to the achievement of that objective.

27. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Greece, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

28. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece): The Turkish argumentation—and I am referring not only to what has just been said by the Foreign Minister of Turkey, but also to what we heard yesterday from the representative of Turkey and to what appears in the Turkish reply to our protest—contains certain leading points to which I shall now reply.

29. The Turks say:

"Greece... does not distinguish allegations from rights... the continental shelf... has not yet been delimited. ... the Greek position [is] based on mere allegations... Violation of allegations is... impossible." [S/12172, annex II.]

The fact that there is no bilateral agreement between Greece and Turkey on the delimitation of the continental shelf does not mean that the coastal States have no rights. In the absence of a special agreement, the applicable law determines the rights of the parties—for instance, in the case of States facing each other, the median line rule, or the line of equidistance. To say that because there is no bilateral agreement each party is free to grab for itself whatever it can is tantamount to denying the existence of a legal order established by long and consistent State practice. Is that the position of the Turkish delegation? Greece does not base its rights on mere allegations, but on positive international law, both conventional and customary. Does Turkey really contend that no such law exists or that it does not confer exclusive rights on the coastal State?

30. The Turks say:

“... it should be recalled that, in the past, Greece had carried out similar activities in the Aegean.”
(*Ibid.*)

Greece did carry out in the early 1960s exploration on the part of the continental shelf appertaining to Greece. As I stated yesterday, there was no problem at that time. That Greek exploration of the continental shelf did not violate Turkish rights is attested to by the fact that such exploration did not give rise to any Turkish protest; while, when Turkey laid its claim to the Greek continental shelf, Greece protested immediately. The two situations are simply not comparable.

31. They also say:

“The activities of... *Sismik-I* are in no way incompatible with the rules of international law. Furthermore, [they] cannot be considered as an impediment to the success of bilateral negotiations...” (*Ibid.*)

International law is specific on this point. It says, first, that the coastal State has exclusive and sovereign rights as regards exploration of the continental shelf and exploitation of its natural resources; second, that even though the coastal State may not be exercising these rights, no other State or qualified institution is entitled to do so except with the express consent of the coastal State; and, third, that even “purely scientific research” is subject to the approval of the coastal State, which, however, shall not normally be withheld in certain circumstances. Turkey must really decide which way it wants it. Is *Sismik-I* exploring the shelf? If so, Turkey should have asked for the consent of Greece under article 2, paragraph 2, of the Geneva Convention of 1958, which, according to the International Court of Justice, reflects customary law and therefore is binding even on non-signatories of the Convention. Is *Sismik-I* conducting “purely scientific research”? Turkey, again, should have asked for the consent of Greece, under article 5, paragraph 8, of the Convention, which must also be accepted as

reflecting customary law. Indeed, the trends emerging at the Conference on the Law of the Sea are much more stringent in this respect than the provisions of the Convention. But Turkey did not request the consent of Greece. It even refused to give Greece advance notice of the full itinerary of the ship. It did not disclose the nature and extent of the research, and, when requested, it refused to commit itself to the publication of the results—which is the only proof of scientific intent.

32. As to the contention that such behaviour is not an obstacle to the success of bilateral negotiations, it also depends on how one interprets the word “success”. Success for whom? For Turkey, certainly, since it would have succeeded in imposing a factual situation furthering its—shall we say—acquisitive aims. But for Greece, most certainly not, since by tolerating these violations without protest it would in fact have thrown its case out the window. This argument is really fatuous, and I submit that the circumstances do not call for frivolity.

33. The Turks say that by taking part in the Bern meeting of June 1976, Greece had accepted the activities of *Sismik-I*, which had been made public in March 1976. When the projected activities of *Sismik-I* were first disclosed in March 1976, the Greek Ambassador in Ankara immediately sought clarification of the intentions of the Turkish Government. He met with evasiveness and equivocation. He came back in writing, with no greater success. At the Bern meeting itself, the head of the Greek delegation warned the Turkish delegation in plenary session, and then in private, that “No action should be taken that could aggravate the situation in the Aegean.” The sortie of *Sismik-I* was specifically mentioned in the private talk between the two heads of delegation as a particularly aggravating action. I should like to ask the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey two questions. But I must warn him that the validity of the negotiations past and future will depend on his answers: is he or is he not aware of these exchanges and, if so, can he really contend that Greece had “accepted” the activities of *Sismik-I* beforehand?

34. Since the Turkish side has mentioned the question of air space, I shall read out to the Council an extract from the letter of 20 May 1976 of the Greek Prime Minister to the Prime Minister of Turkey:

“With regard to the air space, you are no doubt aware that the International Civil Aviation Organization offered in October 1974 to mediate, and that it formulated official proposals whereby the measures imposed by both sides would be lifted and the previous legality would be restored. Greece accepted; Turkey did not.”

May I now ask who is ignoring the proper international procedures and international rules, as provided by the Convention of the International Civil Aviation

Organization, in order to solve this question? Who is staking claims in this case?

35. It was alleged that Greece is militarizing and arming the Greek islands in flagrant violation of international treaties. Apart from the fact that Turkey ought, after all, to feel some restraint when speaking of islands—at least before the Security Council, which has adopted a series of resolutions against the continued military occupation by Turkey of the non-aligned and defenceless island of Cyprus—one gets an uneasy feeling as to the ulterior motives of the Turks, who do not find it objectionable to concentrate massive land, air and naval forces on the Anatolian coast opposite the Greek islands. These forces include—certainly by no coincidence—a very large number of landing craft—I repeat, “landing craft”. Incidentally, this army is called the “Army of the Aegean”. Let me say to my Turkish colleague that he is wrong if he thinks that the treaties were made not in order to maintain peace and security, which is their avowed purpose, but rather to facilitate Turkish expansionism.

36. Like any other country, Greece has never surrendered its natural right of self-defence. Only elementary security measures have been taken on the islands, measures which constitute no threat whatsoever to the mighty Fourth Turkish Army of the Aegean. It is the islands which are threatened, and I shall now quote certain statements from Government sources of the highest level:

—Mr. Günes, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, on 3 June 1974: “The continental shelf of the Aegean Sea is a continuation of Asia Minor as well as of the islands in question”.*

—Mr. Demirel, Prime Minister, on 8 June 1974: “Disagreement resulted from the fact that the islands situated very close to Turkey belong to Greece and not to Turkey. At the end of the Second World War these islands did not belong to Greece. The islands are part of Asia Minor, and for centuries have belonged to the State which dominated Asia Minor”.*

—Mr. Irmac, Prime Minister, on 18 January 1975: “Turkey is making no concession in the Aegean Sea. Half of it belongs to us”.*

—Mr. Sancer, Minister of Defence, on 20 January 1975: “In the Aegean Sea the balance is obviously in Turkey’s favour. This is true to such an extent that the eyes and thoughts of the Turks, the former inhabitants of the islands, remain focused on lands a few miles from the Turkish coasts, in the hope of being able to re-establish themselves there one day”.*

—Mr. Aktoulga, Commander General of the Second Army, on 25 January 1975: “The Greeks will never

be able to become the friends of Turkey if they do not renounce their “great idea”. Therefore, the question of the Dodecanese and of eastern Thrace will have to be raised”.*

Instead of commenting, I shall read out the comments made by the Turkish newspaper, *Tercüman*, on the statement of General Aktoulga:

“The Dodecanese issue is of the greatest urgency. The least we can do is to take from the Greeks those of the Dodecanese islands which are situated within our territorial sea. The first step to this end is the demilitarization of these islands.”

Nothing could be more revealing of the Turkish intentions when they speak of the “demilitarization” of the islands.

—Mr. Demirel, Prime Minister, in an interview in *Paris March* of 5 July 1975: “Look at the map. Does the Aegean Sea look like a Greek lake? Furthermore, history bears out what geography tells us. Up to recent times, the islands of the Aegean Sea have always belonged to those who possessed Anatolia”.*

—Finally, Mr. Turkes, Vice-President of the Turkish Government, on 30 March 1976: “The group of islands situated close to the Turkish coasts, including the Dodecanese, must belong to Turkey. Among them are Samothrace, Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Kos, Rhodes and all the other small and large islands situated at a distance of 50 kilometres”.*

37. The Greek Government has been accused of pursuing the impossible dream of making the Aegean an exclusively Greek lake. Let me read out from a declaration by Prime Minister Caramanlis. This text, reiterating previous statements, solemnly declares:

“Greece has never claimed, as the Turkish Government is charging, that the Aegean is a closed Greek sea. Neither is she denying that Turkey, as a coastal country, also has certain rights in this sea. But Turkey, exaggerating these rights and denying their delineation through legitimate procedures, has created the dispute between the two countries regarding the continental shelf.”

This declaration by the Greek Prime Minister is quoted in the letter dated 10 August 1976 [S/12/68] from the representative of Greece to the Secretary-General, and I am sure that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey must have had an opportunity to read it before he made his statement this afternoon.

38. It is highly suspicious that the Turks persist in attributing to us intentions which are so blatantly untrue. I trust that the Council grasps full well the significance of these Turkish tactics. And since Turkey is invoking “dreams”, are we not entitled to ask if Turkey, made “giddy”—as it has been ob-

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

served—by the Cyprus invasion, is not nurturing the dream of restoring the Ottoman Empire?

39. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Turkey, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

40. Mr. ÇAĞLAYANGİL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): I have listened carefully to the second statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece. I shall be brief. I do not wish to tax the patience of the Council; I always endeavour to respect its agenda. However, there are some points that I should like to stress.

41. A map has just been circulated to the members, of the Council. This map shows which zones will be Greek and which Turkish, according to Greece, of the continental shelf. Those shown by the dotted portion of the map are for Turkey. On the Turkish coasts, there are 10 million inhabitants. In the sea area off those coasts there are approximately 200,000 inhabitants. The rest of the Aegean Sea, according to the view of the Greek Government, belongs entirely to Greece. Here is the map. And our colleague speaks of justice and equity.

42. In his first statement [1949th meeting], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece said that he would not present the legal aspect of the problem, that that was a matter for the International Court of Justice and that we should speak here only of the threat to peace. That is why I spoke of that threat. If he has changed

his mind now, and wishes to discuss the legal aspect of the problem, I am more than ready to do so. We can bring our experts to the Council, if the members so desire, to go into the substance of the legal question and we can explain our point of view.

43. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece spoke of the organization of a new army in Turkey. Turkey is under no contractual obligation to limit the size of its army. We have made no commitment not to increase or to decrease our military forces. All States are free to decrease or increase the strength of their armed forces. But Greece has signed treaties solemnly undertaking to respect the demilitarized status of the islands. Turkey can organize its armies as it wishes. That is for Turkey to decide.

44. Having said that, I shall carefully study the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece and I should like to reserve my right to reply at a future meeting if I deem it necessary.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

Notes

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 499, p. 311.

² *North Sea Continental Shelf, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1969*, p.47.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 47 and 48.

⁴ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XXVIII, p. 11.

⁵ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 49, p. 3.

⁶ *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, I.C.J. Reports 1976*, p. 4.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
