

1516
0012950
UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

1953rd MEETING: 25 AUGUST 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1953)	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.

1953rd MEETING

Held in New York, on Wednesday, 25 August 1976, at 10.30 a.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/1953)

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 11.15 a.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 shall now, invite the representatives of Greece and Turkey to participate in the Council's discussion 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 the draft resolution sponsored by France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States in document S/12187.

3. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): My Government has followed with grave concern the recent developments in relation to the Aegean Sea which have led to an atmosphere of tension in the eastern Mediterranean. Our concern is deepened by the fact

that both the parties concerned are bound by close ties of friendship and alliance to the United Kingdom.

4. It is perhaps the duty of friends and allies in a situation such as this to exercise their every effort to ensure that differences are settled peacefully and, at the same time, that they are resolved in the best interests of both the parties. My Government, together with its partners in the European Community, has therefore pursued efforts with the Governments of Greece and Turkey to try to ensure that the present dispute is settled fairly and amicably. These attempts have naturally been reflected here at the United Nations, where, together with the United States, the delegations of France, Italy and the United Kingdom have tried to reconcile the differences between the two sides in their approach to this debate.

5. The fact that two weeks have elapsed since the Council heard the statements by the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey [1949th and 1950th meetings] shows that this has not been an easy task. Members of the Council will be aware that our efforts to this end are now reflected in a draft resolution contained in document S/12187. We recognized that it would not be wholly acceptable to either side. In our view, it is however a carefully balanced document, and was designed to be so. It takes account of the needs of both sides and protects their essential interests, without prejudging any of the issues in dispute.

6. I am sure that it is totally accepted by everyone at this table that whatever the United Nations does must be designed to assist a settlement of the dispute and must in no way contribute to any increase in tension. For this reason my delegation does not believe that it is appropriate for the Council to enter into the substance of the dispute. Not only are the legal aspects of the problem highly complicated, but it also appears to us that any such attempt would almost inevitably be construed by one or other of the parties as being prejudicial to their side of the case. If so, it would hinder, rather than encourage, settlement of the dispute. In these circumstances, my delegation believes that the task of the Council is, first, to express its concern over the tensions which have arisen between Greece and Turkey in relation to the Aegean Sea, and then to give its considered view of the general direction in which efforts to achieve a solution should be aimed.

7. There is also general recognition that the situation arising from the disagreement between Greece and Turkey is a dangerous one, and that it threatens the stability and harmony of the Aegean. Council members are only too well aware that the maintenance of peace in the eastern Mediterranean requires of the Governments concerned that they exercise the most restrained and responsible statesmanship in the pursuit of their respective interests. For this reason my delegation believes that the Council must call for restraint on both sides and must then go on to urge them to do everything in their power to reduce the present tensions. Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution reflect this conviction. I believe that the two Governments will respect and heed this appeal, which carries with it the wishes and hopes of the Council that this situation should not be prolonged.

8. It goes without saying that a solution to the differences between Greece and Turkey can only be lasting and tension between them can only be finally removed if the eventual settlement of the dispute is acceptable to both sides. It follows from this that the solution to the dispute has to be worked out primarily in direct and meaningful negotiations between those concerned. I may appear to be stating the obvious in dwelling on the value of such negotiations. Yet misunderstandings and misconceptions of the policies of others can arise only too easily in the absence of direct contact and frank and thoroughgoing discussion. Moreover, the circle is a vicious one. Once misunderstandings begin, communication may thereafter rapidly be limited to formal exchanges through diplomatic channels. I do not think that such complicated and wide-ranging problems as those to which our attention has been drawn by the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey can satisfactorily be resolved in such a manner.

9. My Government believes therefore that the resolution we adopt must include a call on the Governments of Greece and Turkey to resume the negotiations with a view to arriving at a satisfactory settlement, and that they should also do everything in their power to ensure that these result in mutually acceptable solutions. Such a call to the parties is contained in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. In the view of my delegation negotiations should be resumed on the wider dispute over the continental shelf. I would go further and express the hope that Greece and Turkey will hold direct talks on other topics of dispute concerning the Aegean to which there have been allusions by the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey in their statements.

10. At the same time, while not wishing to enter into the substance of the dispute between Greece and Turkey, it seems clear to my Government that the questions which divide them contain both legal and political aspects. In such circumstances it seems to us necessary that the draft resolution which we adopt should invite the Governments of Greece and Turkey

to continue to take into account the contribution that appropriate judicial means—and in particular the International Court of Justice—are qualified to make to the settlement of any remaining legal differences which they may identify in the course of their negotiations. Members of the Council will observe that this point is covered in the operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

11. I have spoken briefly because, as I have already said, I do not believe that the cause of peace in the eastern Mediterranean will be served if the Council goes deeply into the substance of the problem. I would hope therefore that the Council can now adopt the draft resolution which has been submitted, by consensus, and thus provide a framework in which the dispute between Greece and Turkey can be resolved.

12. May I conclude by appealing again to the parties to settle their differences amicably. I am encouraged by the continued presence in New York of such distinguished and busy statesmen as Mr. Bitsios and Mr. Çağlayangil to hope that the wishes of the Council in this regard will be heeded. I go further and say that I would hope that they could meet together soon, possibly before they leave New York, to consider the modalities of how negotiations between their Governments are to be resumed. The general feeling of the Council is, I am sure, that direct talks should now be resumed. If they are, then this meeting of the Council will have more than served its purpose.

13. Mr. VINCI (Italy): We listened with great interest and attention to the statements which were delivered here by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Greece and Turkey. Both spoke in forceful and eloquent terms, giving us a very lucid picture of the positions of their respective Governments on the item under consideration. Their statements and the useful documentation with which the Council was provided have made clear how sensitive both parties are to the questions relating to the Aegean Sea, since they rightly feel that interests of great importance to their own countries are involved. In acknowledging their earnest efforts to clarify their respective positions on a complex issue which has arisen between two neighbouring countries, I wish to pay a personal tribute to these two speakers. In fact, the climate of the debate and of our work has immeasurably benefited from the restraint and gentlemanly dignity with which they have spoken and acted throughout all these days.

14. The result of nearly two weeks of intensive consultations is the draft resolution before the Council in document S/12187, of which my delegation is a co-sponsor. I do not think that for my part I need add any further considerations to those so eloquently set forth by the representative of the United Kingdom, with whose clear presentation I wish cordially to associate myself. My remarks will therefore be of a more general nature and will aim at stressing the impact and the political implications of this issue.

15. To begin with, I should like to say that my Government is obviously deeply concerned about and interested in what is taking place in the Aegean Sea, owing, first of all, to the very close ties between Italy and both Greece and Turkey. These long-standing relations of friendship and co-operation have been strengthened in particular by formal treaties and association between these two countries and the European Community, adding a new link to the already well established common partnership in the North Atlantic alliance. May I also recall here that the proximity to our shores of the area which is the object of the dispute is obviously a further reason for my Government to follow this matter very closely. The situation which seems to prevail at this point in the relations between Greece and Turkey is for my Government and the Italian people a cause for concern and distress.

16. Having said that, I should like to add that my Government is however perfectly aware of the many aspects of the difficult issue has been brought before the Council. These aspects of a legal, political and an economic nature make the whole dispute all the more complex. All these elements seem to have become progressively enmeshed in such a way as to raise emotions on both sides and exacerbate the controversy, and it appeared as if the crisis was reaching a point where it could have got out of control. Since this danger had not completely vanished, and since the Council has been seized of the dispute, my Government feels it has a duty, at this stage, to express its most heartfelt wishes to the Governments concerned and appeal to them not to lose sight of their real long-range interests, which call for a solution of the present dispute in a spirit of conciliation and understanding for each other's positions and views. It further seems to us that the two Governments should not lose sight of the many political, economic and social values they share.

17. I should like the Council to know that the nine members of the European Community have long been well aware of the seriousness of the situation in the Aegean Sea and have been concerned about the growing feud building up between Greece and Turkey. May I therefore recall that the Nine have neither relented nor ceased to offer to both Ankara and Athens their contribution of ideas and initiatives. I do not think that I am divulging a State secret by letting the Council know that the Nine have not failed to undertake proper initiatives in these very days in relation to the present course of events. In so doing, they have fulfilled what they feel is their duty, for they are linked to both Greece and Turkey by treaties of association, as I have already mentioned, and, furthermore, they share with these countries basic political philosophies and systems of government.

18. Needless to say, Italy's interest in peace and security in the Mediterranean is self-evident. I should like to add that in the Mediterranean we are currently

witnessing too much trouble and turmoil. We cannot afford further crises. They would make things worse than they are. May I say that, while we are aware of the great importance of what is at stake, we feel that the burden of finding the right and lawful solution for sharing the wealth of the Mediterranean lies with the responsible leadership of all the coastal countries. I have in mind the tremendous benefits which could accrue to all the inhabitants of the shores of the Mediterranean as a result of the combined efforts of the States concerned.

19. Having given the matter our most careful consideration, we have come to the conclusion that it would be difficult indeed for the Council to rule on the substance of such a highly complicated issue, which by its very nature requires that it should be settled by the parties primarily concerned through an effort of conciliation and goodwill, using every available means. I refer in particular to Articles 33 and 36 of the Charter, which specifically mention procedures suited to the present circumstances. We understand, moreover, that this view is by and large shared by the two parties concerned.

20. However, the approach which my Government would naturally endorse whole-heartedly would be a sincere effort by the two parties to come to terms with their problems in an atmosphere of good-neighbourliness and without recourse to outside bodies. In this connexion I would fully and whole-heartedly support the appeal made by our British colleague, Ambassador Ivor Richard.

21. I should like to conclude this statement by expressing the fervent wish of my Government that this approach may once again be explored and that it will ultimately prevail, and by reaffirming that my Government and our partners in the European Community will certainly be more than willing to do whatever they can do to promote this development.

22. Finally, I can only recommend the present draft resolution as an effort in this direction, in other words, towards conciliation and the resumption of a friendly dialogue. I sincerely trust that they will support it and give it unanimous approval.

23. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): My delegation has followed the course of this discussion in the Council with great interest and special concern, for the United States has the closest of ties with both Greece and Turkey. They are our friends and allies. We share with them common purposes based upon common interests. Accordingly, differences between them are of special concern to us. A problem such as this—which has led both Governments to send their Foreign Ministers to address the Council—requires not only our most careful attention but has led to my Government exerting its best efforts to encourage progress towards a resolution of the issues.

24. We do not underestimate the depth of feeling on both sides or the complexity of the legal issues involved. The historical roots of some aspects of the problem go back to classical times. The legal issues related to the continental shelf are among the most sensitive in the entire field of the law of the sea. I do not believe, however, that this is the place to analyse such complex issues of international law. The Council, should instead, rather do all it can to encourage the two parties to engage in contacts and discussions that will ensure that the problem between them does not now or at any time in the future lead to a threat to the peace of the area. To achieve this objective, this Council must exercise its responsibilities under the Charter in a way that will contribute to the settlement of the dispute.

25. In working with other delegations to develop the draft resolution before the Council, my delegation held the strong view that nothing was to be gained by settling on language which would simply provide temporary satisfaction to one or the other of the parties, because inevitably the result would be that the underlying problem would remain unaffected. What was needed was a text which both parties could accept and under which they both could work to strengthen the peace. My Government believes that objective has been achieved. We hope the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus.

26. During recent weeks and days my Government has been in close touch with both the Greek and the Turkish Governments to encourage restraint on both sides and a renewed effort to achieve a basis for discussion. We are gratified that the leaders of both countries have sought to approach their differences with statesmanship and moderation.

27. On 9 August Prime Minister Caramanlis stated that Greece is avoiding any resort to force and is hoping instead that the dispute will be resolved by peaceful procedures. At the same time Turkish leaders have expressed their desire to resolve the dispute through negotiation and they have affirmed that their research activities are not intended to prejudice the legal rights of either Greece or Turkey in the Aegean.

28. In the course of our current debate the Foreign Minister of Greece has stated that there are many opportunities offered by Greece to Turkey for the peaceful settlement of the dispute and that these were not confined only to the proposal that the matter be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Foreign Minister of Turkey has reaffirmed that Turkey stands ready to resolve all outstanding differences with Greece by peaceful means and that it does not exclude recourse to the Court. Therefore, both sides have reaffirmed to this Council their willingness to resolve their dispute regarding the continental shelf of the Aegean. We now believe that a fundamental basis exists for the kind of discussion and adjudication which must be undertaken if a settlement is to be achieved.

29. In such a situation, I believe that there are two cardinal elements to any advice which this Council might give to Greece and Turkey.

30. First, it is essential that the Council urge Greece and Turkey to continue to exercise the utmost restraint and to avoid falling into a pattern of action and reaction, the result of which would be an increasing rigidity of position the raising of the stakes each party considers to be involved in the conflict, and a consequent heightening of tensions between the two countries.

31. Second, both Governments should be encouraged to pursue the way of procedures which are available to them for the peaceful settlement of this dispute. From what we have heard here from the spokesmen of Greece and Turkey, I think it is clear that both countries recognize that it is only through the resumption of direct and meaningful discussions between them that such a settlement can be achieved or indeed must be achieved. For its part, the United States strongly favours and urge the earliest resumption by the parties of such discussions. I believe it is also clear that both parties recognize the potentially valuable role of the International Court of Justice to consider matters which remain unresolved after negotiation. The important thing is that the parties find a basis through direct contacts between them for whatever combination of direct talks and supporting adjudication may be necessary to achieve the peaceful settlement that my Government is confident both Governments seek.

32. Finally, I have no doubt that all of us are also agreed that the conditions for progress in solving the problems between Greece and Turkey can only further improve if both sides avoid any military measures that could in any way be interpreted as threatening and thus detracting from an atmosphere of peace, which is now so essential.

33. My delegation sought to bear these criteria in mind in our participation in the efforts that led to the preparation of the draft resolution we have joined in proposing. We believe that text is fair and reasonable. It is intended to assist in creating a context in which the parties can solve their differences. We urge the parties to accept the Council's advice.

34. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Having on 10 August considered a request from the representative of Greece for a meeting, the Council is today, 25 August, going to take a decision on the matter before it. It has had very few official meetings in the intervening 14 days because it has been faced with a situation which generally requires a great deal of patience, imagination and work on the part of its members. Three European countries, including France, with the support and participation of the United States, did their best to find language most likely to meet with general acceptance. I should now

like to comment upon the outcome of those efforts by emphasizing—as my colleagues, whom I am tempted to call my team-mates, have done—the common interests that have motivated us throughout.

35. May I first say that France was extremely distressed and greatly concerned by the deterioration of relations between Greece and Turkey. Those countries are our friends by virtue of history, geography and mutual agreement. They are our allies; they are our associates; their ties with Europe are essential in all respects.

36. Our hearts and minds left us no alternative but to consider the Greek request for the convening of the Council, to listen to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece and Turkey and to decide how those two countries could be helped. What was to be done first? It is well known—and this is an obligation under the Charter—that in the case of a dispute the Council must attempt through its recommendations to promote the resumption of direct dialogue between the parties. The four delegations that have sponsored our draft resolution have tried to serve as the instruments of such a resumption. They have attempted to initiate an indirect dialogue between Greece and Turkey in the hope that a direct dialogue could then proceed. To that end, our text indicates the two preconditions for such a resumption: first, non-aggravation of the situation and, secondly, reduction of existing tensions. Since fever does not make for a clear head, it must first be reduced.

37. That being so, the events which led the Council to meet should not be ignored. The immediate cause of the Greek action was the research voyage undertaken by a Turkish naval vessel in a contested area of the continental shelf. This is an objective fact which no one can deny even if it is differently construed by the two parties. The circumstances surrounding this fact will play a role in the reduction of tension which the Council is urging both parties to promote between themselves.

38. It is true that the root causes are difficult. As true followers of Aristotle we know there are immediate causes and ultimate causes. In other words, we should be prompted to broaden our consideration of the reasons for our meeting and also to take due note of certain less immediate aspects of the Greek-Turkish dispute. My delegation listened attentively to those portions of the Turkish statement which dealt with these aspects. We have taken note of them and we feel that if both parties can discuss their problems from various angles without increasing the tension between them, it would be a good thing for them to do so. The recommendations contained in the operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of our draft resolution should be interpreted, both in letter and spirit, as a desire on the part of the Council to see no increase but rather a reduction in the number of points of difference existing between Turkey and Greece.

39. Following the order of the paragraphs, I come to the very heart of the recommendation. Operative paragraph 3 calls upon the parties to resume their negotiations and to do everything within their power to find, in the more relaxed atmosphere advocated in operative paragraph 2, mutually acceptable solutions. As we know, States are ultimately responsible for their own destiny; they are the architects of their own fortune and misfortune. They can only be assisted indirectly. The main brunt of the task is borne by them. In addition to this general conclusion, there is another one which is inspired by the friendship which, as I have said, France feels for both the Greek and the Turkish peoples. Given the part of Europe in which they are situated, both Greece and Turkey must agree and come to an understanding with each other. They are and will be increasingly motivated not only to seek but also to find mutually acceptable solutions, on the basis of law and with respect for the legitimate interests of both parties.

40. Operative paragraph 4 is well known to members of the Council. It is even better known to its authors, who had a great deal of trouble with the two parties regarding it. Since this is a paragraph which is just as necessary as the others, I shall in this connexion make the following comment: Chapter VI of the Charter lists the various peaceful ways of settling disputes. Article 36 (3) specifically singles out the specific role to be played by the International Court of Justice in dealing with a legal dispute, which is clearly what the limitation of the continental shelf is. What we have tried to recall in this paragraph of our draft resolution, which is the logical outcome of the preceding paragraph, is that when the parties, in their negotiations, encounter problems which they are unable to resolve, they have available to them the judicial channels laid down in the Charter—and, in the case of the Court, those enunciated in its Statute. This reminder seems reasonable to us and in accordance with the position previously taken by both Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, there are a number of recent examples of this kind of recourse, particularly among European and Mediterranean countries.

41. These are the comments which I think were called for in connexion with this draft resolution, whose main purpose is to unsnarl the machinery for a peaceful settlement. Our delegation co-operated in the efforts of our four countries with the desire to find a proper balance between the positions of the two parties involved, which were very distant at the outset. Like any compromise text, ours will undoubtedly prompt comments on certain points. We are not unaware of the fact that neither of the parties regards this as a faithful reflection of all its claims. But it appears to us that the essential elements are there and that the goal proposed is in keeping with the Council's responsibilities in a situation which is likely to threaten international peace and security. At this stage of tension, which, through compromise, we hope can be made to evolve towards a resumption of the dialogue

between Greece and Turkey, there can be no doubt that it is the duty of both countries to be particularly careful about what they do and what they say in order not to hamper the trend towards negotiation, which we hope will come about. My delegation also hopes that, as a result of the efforts which have been made, the parties will seriously consider either parallel or simultaneous measures in order to promote a settlement of the problems between them and to create the sort of understanding between them to which they aspire.

42. Finally, my delegation would like to welcome the presence among us for the past two weeks of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Greece and Turkey. Their presence is a sign of the importance which both those countries attach to the functions of the Security Council and to the assistance which it can try to give. As I have already said, the responsibility for substantive conversations lies with the States themselves and with their authorized representatives. Naturally, I echo the hope expressed by our British colleague regarding the forthcoming meeting between the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Greece and Turkey, who are present in New York today—a meeting which we hope will be likely to promote the better atmosphere we think so desirable.

43. Mr. RÍOS (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to begin its brief statement by greeting the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, who is back with us again after having performed very delicate tasks at the Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that was recently held in Colombo.

44. On 12 August the Security Council met to consider the complaint by Greece against Turkey. The Greek Government stated that Turkey had committed flagrant violations of the sovereign rights of Greece on its continental shelf in the Aegean. When the debate on this extremely delicate question began, my delegation paid special attention to the statements made by the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey. The arguments put forth by both sides are, we believe, worthy of the greatest attention. This is a classical case of past frictions becoming more dangerous as the years elapse, and thereby creating an urgent need to seek permanent solutions that will do away with the sources of tensions which endanger the peace not only of the region but of the world. As my delegation has repeatedly stated, in the world of today, regional conflicts may very easily become extended, with unforeseeable consequences.

45. The dispute which we are now considering is centred on the Aegean Sea. That sea, the theatre of heroic feats of the past, which served as the pathway and the channel for the first developments of Western civilization, which served as a link between the East and the West, will continue to serve that historic purpose.

46. In view of the situation that has been created, and weighing the arguments adduced by the parties, my delegation believes that only bilateral negotiation can possibly lead to an understanding that will remove the causes of conflict. Only an understanding between the parties directly concerned will ensure that the time and the efforts that are today expended in dispute can be better expended for co-operation.

47. We support the draft resolution submitted by the representatives of France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States in its entirety. We believe that it is an adequate answer to the question before us. The reasons for that draft resolution are clearly spelled out in Article 33 (2) of the Charter. The Council, aware of its responsibility to the international community and basing itself on the irrefutable principle of the pacific settlement of disputes, urges the Governments of Greece and of Turkey to preserve the greatest moderation possible and to exhaust all means for reaching an understanding as spelt out in Article 33 (1).

48. We know that at times it is difficult to find formulas for conciliation. Agreements sought through peaceful means often require much time, patience and even a great deal of tolerance. We Panamanians know this very well. For many years we have been the victims of injustice on the part of a great Power but, aware of our commitments to the Panamanian people and to the world community, we have continually called for bilateral negotiations. Despite the frustrations suffered in more than 11 years of progress and retrogression without anything truly positive to show, we will continue to exhaust the peaceful means of negotiation until the end. We trust that, without having to resort to destructive violence, we will ultimately achieve agreement, that for the good of both Panama and the other party, we will be able to remove the causes of tension and pave the way for co-operation based on the sovereign equality of States.

49. Finally, my delegation would like to express its appreciation to those colleagues who, with great dedication and awareness of their responsibilities, have managed to place before us the draft resolution in document S/12187. We know that the text is the result of very difficult and laborious negotiation. We support it, for in so doing we are consistent with our policy of supporting all constructive efforts to preserve international peace and security and co-operation between all peoples.

50. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Romania, as a country that is situated in the Balkans, is deeply concerned with the maintenance of peace and security in the area as well as in the neighbouring regions. It is a well-known fact that my country has always acted consistently with these views, including the taking of initiatives for the establishment of a zone of peace and good-neighbourliness in the Balkans. It should also be noted that, pursuant to the terms of declarations and agreements signed by

Romania with the countries of the region, including Greece and Turkey, the parties assumed a commitment to act to avoid conflicts and to solve any that arose by peaceful means in order not to endanger the peace and security of their peoples or of the other countries of the region.

51. In the light of the tensions which have recently developed in the relations between Greece and Turkey, two countries with which Romania enjoys close relations of friendship and co-operation, we feel impelled to express our deep concern regarding the existence of conflict in the area which could affect the peace and security of the peoples, including the Romanian people. It is precisely for this reason that my country could not remain unaffected by the situation. We feel that other States of the region have a duty to act positively and constructively by all the means at their disposal to promote and encourage the settlement of the dispute by peaceful means in accordance with the terms of the Charter of the United Nations. The appeals to moderation addressed to the parties to the dispute and the offers of good offices should be interpreted as so many modalities through which the other States are performing these duties. Furthermore, it is extremely important that the parties to the dispute, like the States of the area and other States, should refrain from any action that might aggravate the conflict, increase tension in the area or even provoke military acts. All States must act calmly, in a lofty spirit of responsibility towards the peace and security of peoples.

52. We believe that the dispute between Greece and Turkey can be settled if the two parties act in accordance with the commitment which they undertook under the Charter of the United Nations and solemnly renewed at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. As signatories of the Final Act of that Conference, it is up to Greece and Turkey to carry out their obligations in good faith and to co-operate effectively in the solution of their dispute by peaceful means.

53. We also believe that the two countries bear a grave responsibility for the building of security and peace in the Balkans and in the Mediterranean as part of peace and security in Europe and in the rest of the world. The peaceful settlement of the dispute regarding the Aegean Sea will doubtless be the best proof of the determination of the two Governments to contribute effectively towards achieving that goal.

54. The Romanian delegation feels that all problems concerning the rights and interests of States over a given sea area, including the problems of the territorial delimitation of those rights and interests, must be solved on the basis of agreement between the countries directly concerned, bearing in mind the special circumstances of the area and the principles of international justice and equity. The States must accordingly act with moderation in adopting unilateral mea-

asures, particularly when such measures might affect the rights and interests of coastal and other States. We also feel that, while the settlement of this legal problem is pending, the States involved should abstain from any measure that might increase tension and affect the freedom and security of navigation in the area.

55. Since the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States—whom we should like to thank for their efforts—meets the concern which we have voiced, the Romanian delegation will vote in favour of it. My delegation hopes that that draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

56. We remain convinced that both Greece and Turkey will make every effort to resolve their dispute by peaceful means in the interest of their peoples and of the peace and security of all States of the region and of the world in general. The presence here, at the Council table, of the Foreign Ministers of Greece and of Turkey and the constructive tone and moderate tenor of their statements strengthen our conviction.

57. We appeal to the States of the area and to all other States to encourage and to support a friendly and peaceful settlement of the dispute between Greece and Turkey in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the rules of international law, bearing in mind the interests of international peace and security.

58. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council is now considering the question of the situation that has arisen in the Aegean Sea in connexion with the problem of the continental shelf. Two States Members—Greece and Turkey—are affected by this problem and they have presented to the Council their positions on the matter. On 12 August [1949th meeting], the members of the Council had the opportunity to hear the arguments and positions of the Greek Government, on whose initiative the Council was convened, as these were set forth by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece; and on 13 August [1950th meeting], the Council heard the views and arguments of the Turkish Government as reflected in a statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey. From the information thus available to the members of the Council, it is clear that the positions of the two parties on the substance of the issues do not coincide. A dispute thus exists between the two States and there has been a deterioration of relations between them.

59. Inasmuch as the Security Council has taken up this problem, it may be useful to recall the criteria which, according to the Charter, should guide all Members of the Organization in dealing with such cases. The first of these criteria is to be found in Article 2 (3) of the Charter, which states that all Members of the United Nations should settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered; the second is

to be found in Article I, which states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, the adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

60. The Soviet delegation feels that these provisions of the Charter are fully applicable in the present case. In the opinion of the Soviet Union, such problems should be resolved through negotiation and without the use, or the threat of the use, of force. Of course, this is not merely a theoretical precept. Such an approach, in the view of the Soviet Union, should serve as a code of action for all States. Furthermore, the inadmissibility of the use of force in international relations is now becoming one of the paramount issues of the day. I wish to emphasize that. It is a principle which is of fundamental international significance. That is why, in the matter being considered by the Security Council today, we can see reflected, as in a pool of water, one of the fundamental principles of present-day international relations. The position of the Soviet Union in this connexion is clear and unambiguous. The fundamental position of the Soviet Union is that disputes between States must be resolved by peaceful means, through negotiation and without resort to force. As long ago as the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was held in 1971, the following goal was set: "Renunciation of the use of force and the threat of the use of force in the settlement of disputes should become a law of international life"

61. We citizens of the Soviet Union are proud of the fact that it was precisely the Soviet State, the first socialist country of the world, that took the initiative and played the leading role in this important international area. The Soviet Union suggested that those countries that agreed to this approach should conclude the appropriate bilateral and regional treaties. Since then, a great deal has been done in this connexion on both a bilateral and a regional basis. Renunciation of the use of force and the threat of the use of force became one of the key provisions in an extremely important document, namely, the statement of principles governing co-operation between the Soviet Union itself and France, signed in Paris on 30 October 1971 by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, and the President of the French Republic, Mr. Pompidou. The Soviet-American document which was signed in May 1972 in Moscow, at the highest level, entitled "Basic principles of mutual relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America" [S/10674] provides that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. Accordingly, the Soviet Union and the United States undertook to do their utmost to avoid military confrontations and to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war; and with that end in view

negotiate and settle differences by peaceful means. Furthermore, the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Prevention of Nuclear War¹, signed in Washington in June 1973, expressly states that each party will refrain from the threat or use of force against the other party, against the allies of the other party and against other countries. Similar principles guided the Soviet Union and another permanent member of the Security Council, the United Kingdom, when, in February of 1975, at the highest level, they signed the joint United Kingdom-Soviet Statement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; those principles are reflected in other documents as well.

62. It is particularly noteworthy that the principle of the non-use of force has in recent years served as the basis for the normalization of relations between a number of socialist countries—the Soviet Union, Poland, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia—and the Federal Republic of Germany. Furthermore, a new stage, qualitatively speaking, was reached with the approval of the principle of the non-use of force in relations among States on a regional basis, namely, in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to which, on 1 August 1975, 35 States affixed their signatures.

63. In order to become genuinely universal, the principle of the non-use of force in relations among States must of course embrace all countries and all continents of the world. That is why it is a matter of particular gratification to be able to note the substantial role that is being played by the non-aligned movement in consolidating and further propagating this principle. As we know, at the Conference held in the capital of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Guyana, Georgetown, in August 1972, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries declared themselves in favour of devising "rules of behaviour which would eliminate force from international relations". The ministers particularly emphasized that "States must refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations".

64. The United Nations also made an important contribution to the affirmation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations. This principle was enshrined in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)*], which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, and also in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)*]. In 1972, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly adopted an important resolution—resolution 2936 (XXVII)—on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

65. All that bears ample testimony to the fact that, in order further to consolidate and make irreversible the favourable trends which are observable in international relations, it is important, necessary and feasible to banish once and for all the use of force—that law of the jungle—from international relations. The necessary conditions for this exist. That is why the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, as another step in its efforts to remove force from relations between States, set the following task: "... to work for a world-wide treaty on the non-use of force in international relations." The attainment of that noble goal would be a turning-point in the history of mankind. The Soviet Union calls upon all States and all peoples to concert their efforts in order to achieve this lofty goal.

66. In its reply dated 13 August 1976 to the questionnaire circulated by the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Soviet Union stated the following:

"In an effort to reduce still further the threat of war and to strengthen international peace and security, the Soviet Union has put forward a proposal for the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The aim of this proposal is to make the renunciation of the use of force for the purpose of settling disputes in relations between States an immutable law of international life. The parties to the treaty, including, of course, the nuclear Powers, would undertake to refrain from the use of any type of weapons, including nuclear weapons, to settle disputes between themselves. The Soviet Union has declared its readiness to consider, together with other States, practical steps to bring about the implementation of this proposal."²

67. That, then, is the essential position of the Soviet Union in this extremely important area of international relations. Those are the noble initiatives that have been made by the land of the Soviets in this connexion. In our opinion, that should be the attitude of all States regarding the need to consolidate in everyday practice the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and the settlement of disputes between States by peaceful means and through negotiation.

68. In the opinion of the Soviet Union, in the particular case which is today being considered by the Council, the parties, in seeking a solution to the differences existing between them, should also exercise restraint, adopt a serious and constructive approach and refrain from the use or threat force. May I remind representatives in this connexion that both parties are countries which have signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Therefore, it is appropriate and timely to express the hope that they will act in strict compliance with the provisions of that document, which makes im-

poses on States the obligation to resolve problems arising between them by peaceful means, without threatening international peace and security.

69. This, then, is the approach of the Soviet delegation with regard to the draft resolution which has been presented to the Council. We believe that, on the whole, this draft answers the main purpose, that is to say, in this particular instance to bring about a situation whereby the differences that have arisen between the two parties can be resolved by peaceful means and by negotiation. Its adoption will be an important contribution by the Council to reaffirming the principle of the non-use of force in international relations. For that reason the Soviet delegation will support this draft resolution.

70. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan listened with great attention to the statements made in meetings of 12 and 13 August by the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey on the matter now under consideration by the Council. I should like to take this opportunity to extend my delegation's welcome to Mr. Çağlayangil and Mr. Bitsios and to say how pleased and honoured we are to have them in our midst and how impressed and inspired my delegation has been with the good will they have shown towards each other and the great respect they have shown for the principles of the United Nations Charter. We were much impressed by the dignity and moderation with which both sides presented their views on the question under discussion, in particular, the issues pertaining to the law of the sea, which point to the existence of a situation which is unsatisfactory not only for Greece and Turkey but also for the international community as a whole.

71. The fact that almost the whole of the customary and conventional law of the sea has been under review for a number of years and is now being debated in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is evidence of the fact that most of the law of the sea was formulated in the past in different circumstances and therefore requires reformulation in accordance with the principles of justice and equity among nations large and small.

72. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, in his statement of 12 August, said that it was not his intention to ask the Council to take a decision on the legal dispute; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, in his statement of 13 August, similarly expressed his country's determination to resolve the issue before us and other related matters through bilateral negotiations in a spirit of good-neighbourliness. My delegation will therefore not offer any comments on the legal aspects of the matter.

73. We do appreciate the fact that the question of the Aegean Sea is a complicated one, in the consideration of which not only the legal but also the equally important political, economic and security aspects

must be given due and proper weight. Any search for a solution of the issue will prove elusive unless the matter is considered in its entirety and in its historical perspective.

74. Furthermore, the nature of the situation is such that it is the parties themselves that bear the responsibility for seeking a reasonable and mutually satisfactory accommodation. It is a source of satisfaction and encouragement that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of both Greece and Turkey expressed their countries' resolve to solve the issue peacefully and in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece said in his statement of 12 August:

"Greece took the view that it owed it to itself and to the general welfare and peace to leave no avenue unexplored that could lead to the elimination of a dispute in an area that was already rife with danger and tension." [1949th meeting, para. 24.]

Further, in his statement of 13 August he read the following passage from a declaration by the Prime Minister of Greece:

"Greece has never claimed... 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." [1950th meeting, para. 37.]

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, for his part, expressed his Government's resolve to settle the question of the Aegan continental shelf and other related issues through bilateral negotiations.

75. We share the general view that the Security Council should, in response to the wishes of the parties themselves, encourage them to resolve their differences in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Charter and as good neighbours on the basis of equity and justice.

76. We should like to commend the sponsors of the draft resolution which is before the Council for the patience and sincere efforts which they put into its preparation. We are in full accord with the importance it attaches to the resumption and continuation of direct negotiations between Greece and Turkey to resolve their differences. We endorse its appeal to the two Governments "to exercise the utmost restraint in the present situation" and "to do everything in their power to reduce the present tensions in the area so that the negotiating process may be facilitated".

77. My country has consistently held the view in matters in which its own interests have been involved that, if a dispute cannot be settled through negotiations between the parties concerned, the other means mentioned in Article 33 of the Charter should be utilized. In our view, the draft resolution, in its preamble, does the appropriate thing in reminding the parties of

these means of settlement, namely, conciliation, arbitration, mediation, judicial settlement or any other peaceful means of their choice.

78. In this context we have noted what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece said here in his statement of 12 August, namely:

"Many are the opportunities offered by Greece to Turkey for the peaceful settlement of our dispute. They are not confined to our proposal that the matter be referred to the International Court of Justice." [1949th meeting, para. 28.]

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey said, in his statement on the following day:

"If it becomes necessary, Turkey does not exclude to the International Court of Justice to settle certain relevant aspects of the problem, but maintains that the dispute should first be negotiated between the two countries." [1950th meeting, para. 12.]

79. In the light of this, we feel that the reference to the International Court of Justice, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, does not reflect the minimum common position implicit in the statements I have just quoted. We feel in particular that in light of the fact that the Greek Government has proceeded unilaterally to make reference to the Court—a course of action which we hope it will now find it possible to reconsider—the Council should have been unambiguous in urging upon the parties that direct and bilateral negotiations offer, in its view, the best way of reaching a mutually acceptable solution. To invite them, as operative paragraph 4 does, to contemplate even at this stage a partial failure of these negotiations is not, in my delegation's view, the appropriate course of action. We note, on the other hand, that this paragraph calls upon the parties to identify any remaining unsettled issues of a legal nature, an action which by definition has to be undertaken jointly, before they have recourse to the Court, if such recourse becomes necessary.

80. My delegation regrets that the sponsors were unable to accept the suggestions for changes in the draft resolution which would have enabled the Council to adopt the draft resolution unanimously. However, our primary concern is to make it possible for the process of direct negotiations to be resumed, and we shall not therefore stand in the way of its adoption. With the reservations concerning paragraph 4, which I have made, my delegation is prepared to go along with the consensus on the draft resolution.

81. As I said earlier, we have been heartened by the resolve the two sides have shown in their statements and in discussions held outside for settling these issues peacefully. We hope that the process of bilateral negotiations will commence soon and that the two

sides will settle their differences in all their aspects in a spirit of give and take and good-neighbourliness.

82. My country, which has close and friendly relations with both Greece and Turkey, desires peace and prosperity for their people, and it will be a source of particular satisfaction to the Government and the people of Pakistan when this dispute and other outstanding differences between these two countries are resolved peacefully in accordance with the precepts of equity and justice.

83. Mr. HUANG HUA (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened carefully to the statements made of the Ministers for foreign Affairs and Greece and Turkey.

84. Both Greece and Turkey are friends of China. With regard to the dispute between those two countries over the question of the Aegean Sea, we sincerely hope that, taking to heart the over-all interests of unity against hegemonism, Greece and Turkey will adopt an attitude of restraint, seek a fair and reasonable settlement of the issue through patient negotiations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence and thus avoid giving openings for exploitation by the super-Powers.

85. The Chinese delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document S/12187. It does so because the main thrust of the draft lies in calling on Greece and Turkey to resume direct negotiations. As to what appropriate means both sides are likely to adopt for the settlement of the dispute in the course of the negotiations, they can be determined only through consultation between the two parties themselves.

86. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): The Libyan Arab Republic, which maintains both historical and friendly relations with Greece and Turkey, is deeply distressed by the present discord between the two friendly neighbouring countries regarding the situation in the Aegean Sea. During the present period of tension in that area, the Government of the Libyan Arab Republic, motivated by good will and the friendly relations it maintains with both nations, has made sincere efforts with the two Governments to avoid any actions that would lead to an armed confrontation and has recommended that the two countries endeavour to resolve their differences through negotiations and by peaceful means. I should like to take this opportunity to thank both Governments for their understanding and appreciation of our efforts.

87. On this occasion I should also like to express the appreciation of the Libyan delegation to the sponsors of draft resolution S/12187 for their consistent efforts during the last two weeks to arrive at a workable solution. My delegation feels that this text does not fully meet the hopes of the interested parties. However, the Libyan Arab Republic is confident that both

Turkey and Greece will do their utmost to reduce the present tensions in the Aegean Sea and will settle their differences by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore the Libyan delegation expresses its hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus. If the draft resolution is put to the vote, the delegation of the Libyan Arab Republic will abstain.

88. The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to proceed to the next step. In this respect, may I propose that, instead of proceeding to a vote, the Council adopt draft resolution S/12187 by consensus?

The draft resolution was adopted by consensus [resolution 395 (1976)].

89. The PRESIDENT: Several members of the Council have expressed a desire to speak at this stage. I shall now call upon them.

90. Mr. ACAKPO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation wishes to thank the sponsors of the resolution we have just adopted for their work. It is an even-handed and balanced text. We know that the situation prevailing in the Aegean Sea which gave rise to these meetings of the Council is a complex and delicate one and, as such, it should be dealt with most prudently. That is what the sponsors have done, and their efforts have borne fruit. The text the Council has just adopted by consensus, reaffirms one of the guiding principles of the Charter—namely, the peaceful settlement of disputes. This is a principle which the Military Revolutionary Government of the People's Republic of Benin holds very dear.

91. It goes without saying that the Council's appeal to Turkey and Greece for restraint and for maximum efforts to reduce tension in the region in order to facilitate the process of direct negotiations on all disputes or pending problems is wise and conducive to a negotiated settlement of the present dispute. Furthermore—and the sponsors of the draft resolution have stressed this—if direct negotiations should fail to achieve tangible results the Council invites the parties to use appropriate judicial means to solve any remaining legal differences connected with the present dispute.

92. These are all different aspects of the peaceful settlement of disputes to which the parties can resort if necessary. My delegation would also like to express the hope that Greece and Turkey will heed the appeal of the Council and do every thing in their power to achieve a negotiated solution to their dispute and thus safeguard peace and security in the region.

93. Mr. CHALE (United Republic of Tanzania). My delegation supports the resolution the Council has just adopted. In supporting it, we are mindful of the very delicate nature of the question involved. It is our sincere hope, therefore, that the resolution will con-

tribute towards the peaceful settlement of the issue of delimitation of the continental shelf and, by achieving this, the Council will happily have successfully completed its task.

94. My delegation believes that disputes of this nature should be settled amicably in accordance with Article 33 of the Charter. This is precisely what the resolution calls on the parties to do. The resolution urges both parties to facilitate the negotiating process so as not to increase the present tensions. And as an extension of this negotiating process, the parties may resort to judicial means to settle their differences in accordance with international law. In this way, the dispute can be resolved in a manner that is satisfactory to both parties. For this reason, my delegation strongly appeals to both parties to heed this call of the Council. They should proceed in good faith to resolve this matter speedily and efficiently so that they may continue to live in harmony and good-neighbourliness.

95. In the mean time, we hope that the current negotiations of the Conference on the Law of the Sea will contribute towards the settlement of the Aegean Sea question by establishing a clear delimitation mechanism for the continental shelf. We for our part will do all we can to make a meaningful contribution in this regard, because we believe that good fences make good neighbours.

96. Mr. HAMMARSKJÖLD (Sweden): The Swedish delegation only wishes briefly to join those who have expressed their great appreciation to the four members of the Council who have made such great efforts to arrive at a text commanding the widest possible acceptance. During these two weeks the members of the Council have formed a clear picture of how extremely complex the problems involved are. In supporting the resolution we have just adopted, it is our hope that the two parties will find it possible to resume their no doubt difficult negotiations with a view to finding a solution which, in spite of all difficulties, is mutually acceptable.

97. The PRESIDENT: According to traditional practice in the Council, I shall make the following short statement as representative of JAPAN.

98. My delegation is deeply concerned over the situation in the eastern Mediterranean, which has recently deteriorated because of the differences between two countries friendly to us, Greece and Turkey, on questions relating to the Aegean Sea, and in particular their conflicting claims to the continental shelf of that sea.

99. Indeed, the positions of the Governments of Greece and Turkey regarding the continental shelf in the area remain far apart. My delegation, however, highly appreciates the conviction expressed here by both parties to the dispute that the problem at issue should be solved through peaceful means. My Government strongly hopes that Greece and Turkey will avoid any armed conflict and will follow a course

leading to an amicable settlement of the dispute. All of us can recall that Article 33 of the Charter provides that:

“The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by... peaceful means of their own choice.”

100. My delegation recognizes the usefulness of direct negotiations between Greece and Turkey to determine the method by which a solution should be sought. In this respect, my delegation welcomes the fact that Greece and Turkey have begun negotiations seeking a solution of the dispute through peaceful means.

101. We earnestly hope that both Governments will heed our strong appeal and refrain from any action which might aggravate the present situation and impair the effectiveness of the efforts towards a mutually acceptable solution.

102. Inasmuch as the resolution, which was the product of the arduous efforts of the four sponsoring delegations, well reflects this point of view of ours, we supported it. We wish to urge the two parties to the dispute to heed the resolution and strengthen their efforts to attain an amicable settlement of the dispute.

103. Speaking again as PRESIDENT, I call upon the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, who wishes to make a statement.

104. Mr. ÇAĞLAYANGİL (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): I should like briefly to set forth the views of my Government on the resolution which has just been adopted by the Council.

105. As I emphasized in my statement on 13 August [1950th meeting], the request made by Greece for a meeting of the Council was completely pointless, because there had been no action on the part of Turkey which could lend credence or plausibility to the allegations of Greece that Turkey has been responsible for creating a threat to peace and security in the Aegean area. That being so, my delegation from the very outset took the position that Greece's request did not necessitate any resolution.

106. However, we should like to express our appreciation to the four Western members who drew up the text of this resolution for all they have done in attempting to reconcile the positions of the two parties.

107. This resolution has been adopted 13 days after the first meeting of the Council was held, at Greece's request. The very length of the time which has intervened suffices in itself to show that the Council did not share Greece's view regarding the urgency of the so-called threat to peace and security in the region.

The members of the Council wisely made efforts to obtain a constructive result by laying emphasis on the resumption of negotiations. In its wisdom, the Council did not accept the contention that the Turkish research vessel, *Sismik-I*, in its activities, had infringed on the sovereign rights of any country. It correctly diagnosed the various sources of tension and conflict in the Aegean Sea, for which, we are convinced, we are not responsible.

108. The Council stressed the urgent need to respect international obligations, and now, more than ever before, Turkey is entitled to require that Greece comply with its contractual obligations, which are of vital importance for the security of Turkey.

109. Furthermore, the Council, in the manner in which it dealt with the concept of negotiation and other peaceful means for resolving conflicts, clearly gave priority and pride of place to the process of negotiation. It referred to the possibility, should the need arise, of resorting to the appropriate judicial bodies in connexion with any remaining legal differences that might be outstanding after substantial and meaningful negotiations.

110. The Council, therefore, recognizes the scope of the problems relating to politics, economics and security. There can be no doubt that the unilateral application by Greece to the International Court of Justice is in complete contradiction with both the letter and the spirit of this resolution, quite apart from the question of whether it was a valid request.

111. Having clarified that point, I should like to reiterate that my Government continues to be firmly convinced that there has been no action on the part of Turkey that could be described as necessitating or justifying the adoption of a resolution by the Council. Turkey has violated no international treaty nor has it infringed on the rights of other countries. No one, I think, in the Council could claim otherwise.

112. I should also like to repeat that Turkey has always advocated negotiations with Greece not only in connexion with disputes concerning the continental shelf in the Aegean but also to settle all outstanding problems between the two countries. Turkey has made this point on a number of occasions, and it was always Turkey which took the initiative in the field of negotiations. Since our attitude remains unchanged, we feel that paragraph 3 of the resolution is fully in accord with the policy that has been consistently pursued by Turkey.

113. I do not believe that I need to expatiate on the other paragraphs of the resolution since our position has been made abundantly clear by what I have already said. The core of the resolution can be found in paragraph 3. While we feel that this paragraph is in

accord with our policy, we do not consider that we are bound by any other provision that could be construed as constituting a precondition or a constraint.

114. Nor could we accept any provision that would be likely to prejudice the process of negotiation or its outcome or that might involve any unilateral recourse to a judicial body. It should also be borne in mind that Turkey has not recognized the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as binding.

115. Furthermore, it is undeniable that the resumption of negotiations implies that no unilateral action should be undertaken that would be in flagrant contradiction with the concept of negotiation as I have just defined it.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece.

117. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): I wish just to say two words to thank the Council. I wish to thank it, first of all, for having granted our request, secondly, for having listened to our expression of concern regarding the maintenance of peace and security in the region and at the same time our desire to settle our dispute with Turkey peacefully; and, finally, for having adopted a resolution which, despite the statement that we just heard, will, I trust, clear away the obstacles to a resumption of the dialogue and lead to the solution of the problem of the continental shelf of the Aegean Sea by peaceful means.

118. More particularly, I should like to thank the members of the Council who, during these long days of waiting, have worked unremittingly to produce a draft resolution, with the constant concern for reducing tension and for suggesting to the parties the means for resolving their dispute.

119. The PRESIDENT: I should like to express my sincere appreciation to all members of the Council and to the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey and their delegations for the spirit of co-operation and great patience with which they have participated in the present deliberations, thus enabling the Council to achieve the adoption of a resolution by consensus today.

120. I now declare that the consideration of this item in the Council has been concluded.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

Notes

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 917, p. 85.

² A/31/177, p. 2.

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.
