



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Item 9 of the provisional agenda:</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded)</i>	
Statement by the representative of India . . .	1
Statement by the representative of Algeria .	2
Statement by the representative of Morocco	3
Statement by the representative of Cyprus .	5
Statement by the representative of Pakistan	8
Statement by the representative of India . . .	8
Statement by the President	8

President: Mr. Alex QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana).

ITEM 9 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA
General debate (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: This afternoon I shall call on a number of representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply arising from statements made in the general debate. After that we shall have concluded the general debate.
2. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): My delegation was shocked to learn of the sad and sudden passing away of Prime Minister Hassan Ali Mansour of Iran. A dynamic, youthful and forward-looking Asian statesman has been so tragically removed from our midst in the prime of his life, at the hands of an assassin. Ambassador Vakil has not only lost his Prime Minister, he has lost a brother-in-law. Iran and India have had age-old ties of friendship, going back to the dawn of civilization. Ambassador Vakil is a dear personal friend of mine. We want him and his family to know that their grief is shared by us and that we mourn the loss along with them. May I respectfully extend to His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah, the Government, the people of Iran, and to Ambassador and Mrs. Vakil my delegation's and Government's deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences.
3. The Minister for External Affairs of Pakistan, in his address on 22 January 1965 [1319th meeting], made wild and absurd allegations against India. In my rebuttal yesterday [1322nd meeting] I showed that Pakistan was trying to drive a wedge between India and African-Asian countries; that it was Pakistan, not India, which started the arms race in the sub-continent and created tension in our region; that it was Pakistan, not India, which had followed aggressive policies; and, finally, that Pakistan was trying to whitewash the implications of the Chinese nuclear explosion by justifying it.
4. The Foreign Minister has given no answer to these rebuttals in exercising his right of reply. Obviously,

- he has no answer for them. It is clear that he made all these charges against India only to mislead this Assembly. I leave it to the good sense of the Assembly to decide what credence it should give to his statements.
5. Not having been able to meet the facts and arguments cited by me, he has started beating the old drum once again. There is nothing new on Kashmir that he has said. We have already replied to his wild allegations in the past, and I have also given references to the documents containing those replies. I do not, therefore, feel justified in repeating them once again, except to say that he has quoted the late Prime Minister Nehru entirely out of context.
 6. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan asks how a smaller neighbour can try to provoke a larger neighbour. The answer to that query has perhaps been furnished in an article published in the January 1965 issue of Foreign Affairs. I quote from that article:

"Pakistan has been able to acquire a disproportionately strong power position relative to that of India through alignment with the United States. . . . Pakistan has commanded from the United States an economic and military aid subsidy much larger than her size would otherwise warrant. Rawalpindi has been emboldened by this to think big and to press for Indian concessions from a position of artificially induced strength."
 7. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan says that Pakistan has never used its "armed forces for aggression" [1323rd meeting, para. 35]. Is this true? Pakistan undoubtedly committed aggression at least in Kashmir and still illegally occupies 32,000 square miles of Indian territory. I need give but one quotation from the voluminous records of the Security Council to refresh his memory. Sir Owen Dixon, United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan, had this to say:

"...without going into the causes or reasons why it happened, which presumably formed part of the history of the sub-continent, I was prepared to adopt the view that when the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed, on I believe 20 October 1947, by hostile elements, it was contrary to international law, and that when, in May 1948, as I believe, units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State, that too was inconsistent with international law".^{1/}
 8. The Foreign Minister also says that a no-war declaration is not necessary in view of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. How dear he holds the principles of the Charter should be clear from the irrefutable fact that within twenty days—I repeat,

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, Supplement for September through December 1950, document S/1791, para. 21.

within twenty days—of becoming a Member of the United Nations Pakistan invaded Kashmir. When we brought the complaint to the Security Council, Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, categorically denied that Pakistan had ever invaded Kashmir or that any armed forces of Pakistan were in Kashmir; but when the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan came to the Indian sub-continent and facts could no longer be suppressed, the same Foreign Minister informed the members of the Commission, to their dismay, that: "... the Pakistan Army had at the time three brigades of regular troops in Kashmir".^{2/} Is that not a complete refutation of Mr. Bhutto's claim that Pakistan has "never deployed a single Pakistani soldier in the use of aggression"? [1323rd meeting, para. 35] The Foreign Minister talks of duplicity and fraud, and I leave it to the Assembly to judge who is guilty of fraud and duplicity.

9. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has complained that India has committed aggression on Pakistan. He has the temerity to say that "it is Pakistan territory that India occupies" [*ibid.*, para. 32]. If, as it seems, he is insinuating that Kashmir is Pakistan's territory, I have two questions to ask him. First, since when and under what constitutional process has Kashmir become part of Pakistan? There can be no greater travesty of truth, and that is the type of statement with which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan tries to mislead this Assembly. Secondly, if he says that Kashmir is Pakistan's territory, how does he reconcile that with his own statement that the future status of Kashmir should be decided by the people and that there should be self-determination in Kashmir? The cat is out of the bag. Unable to rebut my arguments, he has now revealed his mind. The plain fact is that Pakistan wants to annex Kashmir. The demand for self-determination of the Sudetenland was followed by an attack on Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. Pakistan chose to reverse the procedure. Only when aggression in Kashmir was halted did Pakistan become a champion of self-determination for the Kashmiris.

10. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has urged that there should be no double standards and that the principle of self-determination must not be diluted in regard to Kashmir. Example is better than precept. Why does he not practise what he preaches? I repeat my question: why does he not grant self-determination to East Pakistan, Baluchistan or the disputed territory of Pakhtunistan?

11. Mr. BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria) (translated from French): I should like to say how embarrassed and sorry I feel at having to return so soon to this rostrum to speak on a problem which I did not raise in the first place and which I do not wish to tackle from the substantive point of view here. The sincere feeling of brotherhood which binds the Algerian and Moroccan peoples and the mutual respect which characterizes relations between the rulers of the two countries make it absolutely out of the question for me to allow myself to be tempted into a controversy which in any case would not accord with my personal feelings and still less with my Government's policy.

12. I am taking the floor once more, then, not so much to exercise my right of reply as to join in the surprise expressed by many delegations here and to remove the impression that my statement was made in bad faith.

13. The very remarkable statement made by my colleague and friend, the Moroccan Minister for Foreign Affairs, might give the impression that there had been a distortion of certain facts, that there had been deliberate omissions and false references by the Algerian delegation.

14. It is my duty, first of all, to explain that, contrary to what has been said here, it was the Head of the Moroccan delegation who first raised a problem which my delegation, for its part, would have avoided even touching on here. I shall spare you a full quotation of the Moroccan text and shall take the liberty, with your permission, of referring you to the verbatim record of the 1318th meeting (para. 114 to 119).

15. Far from seeking to reply to the Moroccan argument, the Algerian delegation, adhering to the logic of the ideas developed in its statement, wished to raise the problem of borders because it is still, unfortunately, a cause of dissension among African States. Considering the efforts made very sincerely by the Moroccan and Algerian partners to establish normal relations with each other, I should in no way have felt entitled to refer explicitly to a brother country, to make allusions and still less to engage in polemics with its Minister for Foreign Affairs, for whom I have both liking and respect. The Algerian delegation, moreover, said quite clearly in its statement yesterday [1322nd meeting] that it would not be appropriate here to go over the arguments put forward by one side and the other in support of completely opposing positions with regard to the conditions to be fulfilled in order to build a genuine African unity and genuine peaceful coexistence.

16. We advocated a number of measures, particularly measures which would transcend local differences, whatever their particular nature and however acute they may be. The references to texts of the Organization of African Unity and the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries^{3/} were placed in this eminently political context. Co-operation among African States, co-operation among non-aligned States, in a word, international co-operation, cannot, according to the texts we have quoted, be based on factitious premises.

17. It was to this African philosophy, this wisdom of our continent, that we sought to pay a tribute, strong in the knowledge that a more ringing tribute had been paid by the non-aligned countries with regard to the measures advocated by the African States in order to overcome their differences. In the particular case of the misunderstandings that may have arisen between our two brother countries, the inevitable normalization of relations can only be achieved through a common desire for co-operation.

18. The substantive problem is in the hands of the Organization of African Unity, in which both parties have never ceased to have full confidence. In any case,

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Third Year, Supplement for November 1948, document S/1100, para. 40.

^{3/} Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964.

the Algerian delegation takes this opportunity to reiterate before the Assembly its Government's full and unlimited confidence in the Organization of African Unity and to reaffirm the necessity of finding solutions to African problems within the African family alone.

19. The non-aligned countries, realizing that territorial disputes constitute a cause of misunderstanding between States, deemed it necessary to recognize respect for established frontiers as a principle of peaceful coexistence.

20. I have never claimed that Morocco did not make the most express reservations to the Cairo resolutions. The fact remains, however, that these resolutions exist and that they were adopted, as far as the African summit is concerned, unanimously except for two votes, if I am not mistaken.

21. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read out this resolution, which is an application of article III, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, concerning the principles relating to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State. I take the liberty of doing so because I have the impression that it was asserted yesterday that this resolution had never existed. I quote:

"The Assembly of Heads of State and Government meeting in its First Ordinary Session in Cairo, United Arab Republic from 17 to 21 July 1964,

"Considering that border problems constitute a grave and permanent factor of dissension,

"Conscious of the existence of extra-African manoeuvres aimed at dividing African States,

"Considering further that the borders of African States, on the day of their independence, constitute a tangible reality,

"Recalling the establishment in the course of the Second Ordinary Session of the Council of the Committee of Eleven charged with studying further measures for strengthening African Unity,

"Recognizing the imperious necessity of settling, by peaceful means and within a strictly African framework, all disputes between African States,

"Recalling further that all Member States have pledged under article VI of the Charter of African Unity, to respect scrupulously all principles laid down in paragraph 3 of article III of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity,

"1. Solemnly reaffirms the strict respect by all Member States of the Organization for the principles laid down in paragraph 3 of article III of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity;

"2. Solemnly declares that all member States pledge themselves to respect the borders existing on their achievement of national independence."^{4/}

22. The non-aligned countries, for their part, took up these ideas in resolution IV, paragraph 5, which reads:

"States must abstain from all use or threat of force directed against the territorial integrity and

political independence of other States; a solution brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognized, and in particular the established frontiers of States shall be inviolable." [See A/5763.]

23. To make this idea still more explicit, the non-aligned countries reaffirmed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution V on respect for the sovereignty of States and their territorial integrity:

"1. The Conference of Heads of State or Government proclaims its full adherence to the fundamental principle of international relations, in accordance with which the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, great and small, are inviolable and must be respected.

"2. The countries participating in the Conference, having for the most part achieved their national independence after years of struggle, reaffirm their determination to oppose by every means in their power any attempt to compromise their sovereignty or violate their territorial integrity. They pledge themselves to respect frontiers as they existed when the States gained independence;" [Ibid.]

24. My country, a member of both the Organization of African Unity and the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, placed me under a moral obligation to re-establish certain facts. These facts having been re-established, allow me, while expressing the hope that this statement will be the last on this problem, to end on the note of incorrigible optimism which has always characterized our relations with all our partners, including the Moroccans. I want no other proof of this optimism than the conclusion of my statement on this particular problem:

"The patience and generosity of our peoples, who set no conditions to their unity, are matched only by our trust in our partners and our sincere desire for real, far-reaching, honest and unselfish co-operation, reflecting the mutually complementary nature of the different parts of Africa. The building of a united Maghreb, within the framework of respect for the charters which we have signed, is becoming an increasingly inevitable and inspiring reality. In striving to attain this goal we are but heeding an imperative demand of our peoples, who, today as yesterday, have unanimous faith in their common destiny." [1322nd meeting, para. 38.]

25. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): I would have liked very much to respond to the appeal of my friend, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Algeria, that his statement on this problem should be the last one during this debate. He is well aware that such an appeal would have been heeded if there had not been some passages in his latest statement which I consider to be of positive importance in relation to previous statements, and which I should like to bring to the notice of this Assembly.

26. I fully endorse the sentiments expressed at the conclusion of the statement made here by the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Algeria [1322nd meeting]. He voiced the feelings shared by the Algerian and Moroccan peoples. The assurance and the confidence with which he expressed those feelings lead us to

^{4/} Resolution adopted at the first session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964.

believe that their reality is a matter of absolute necessity for our two countries.

27. The reason I denied myself the pleasure of expressing the same feelings, after hearing him speak here, is that I consider that when one of us—Morocco or Algeria—expresses certain feelings it is tantamount to a commitment on the part of both of us. Nevertheless, you will remember that yesterday [1323rd meeting] I did not wish to speak about the problem, which I do not call a dispute but still regard as a serious misunderstanding between Algeria and Morocco.

28. In the first place, we feel that there is one aspect that is particularly favourable to the settlement of this problem, namely, the fund of confidence provided by the brotherly link between our two peoples. Certain circumstances have perhaps moved us rather rapidly out of that context. We did not refuse to discuss the matter within a wider family circle, and we have placed equal confidence in the Organization of African Unity.

29. By a unanimous choice we have also shown our confidence in the seven countries which form its Arbitration and Conciliation Commission, and this means that we have reinforced the fund of Algerian-Moroccan relations with still greater assets in the form of the mutual confidence that exists among African States.

30. I therefore feel that to deal with the problem within this framework will not be to the disadvantage of the two parties, since to our own friendship we are adding the friendship of others to help us to solve the problem.

31. Yesterday, however, I wanted to make some corrections, which I take the liberty of not calling a deliberate omission, and I made this quite clear; but my friend, the Foreign Minister of Algeria, will allow me to digress so far as to say that the Arab culture in which we were both brought up and the use by both of us of the French language in international organizations enable us to avoid all misunderstandings when we communicate, directly or indirectly, with each other.

32. I stated that it had been asserted that the frontier problem was immutable and that this problem had been resolved at the African level through the unanimous recognition of the principle of immutability.

33. First of all, I must explain that the problem has not yet been solved and that this principle has not been finally accepted. One proof of this is that the Ad Hoc Commission dealing with it in the context of the Algerian-Moroccan dispute is still studying the problem. If the principle had been definitively accepted, one of the first consequences would have been the termination of that Commission's mandate.

34. Another proof is that, in connexion with other problems in Africa, the task of the Committee dealing with the dispute between Kenya and Somalia, and between Ethiopia and Somalia, has been continued and that the good-will mission between Upper Volta and Ghana has been maintained. Let no one tell us that the resolution is as valid as the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

35. The Charter speaks of the territorial integrity of countries; we have subscribed to this principle unreservedly and it has been unanimously accepted by the Organization of African Unity, for when we speak of integrity, it is in connexion with territories whose frontiers have been definitely established. On the other hand, in situations which are clearly defined as not having ceased to be sub judice in this connexion, we still consider that territorial integrity has not been formally established. We agree to the immutability of frontiers within the framework of territorial integrity, and that is how we have understood the problem.

36. With respect to the Conference of non-aligned countries—and here I should like to pay a sincere tribute to the skill with which the problem was examined and to the method used in dealing with it this afternoon—there are forms of rhetoric which do not amount to a suppression of the truth or to the formulation of falsehood. Nevertheless, while I cast no doubt whatever on the intellectual integrity of my distinguished friend, the Foreign Minister of Algeria, and do not even suggest that he would resort to any rhetorical device, I should like to say that I would have been glad if he had not refrained from giving a certain quotation in the General Assembly. If he had supplied that quotation, it would have been made quite plain that the Moroccan delegation had not been the first to raise the matter. He is gifted, perhaps, with a more perspicacious intelligence, since he tried to attribute to me—and certainly not in the most favourable light—a particular method of initiating a discussion on the basis of a passage in which, quite frankly, I made no allusion whatever to the problem. I asked to speak in exercise of my right of reply, when I might have taken the initiative in speaking of it. The Minister will forgive me if I say that Morocco did not take the initiative in raising this matter here.

37. There is another point which I must explain, and not for the sake of my friend, the Foreign Minister of Algeria. Indeed, it goes beyond the framework of our relations and beyond the value which we all—not only Algeria or Morocco, but all the countries which took part in the Cairo Conference—attach to the text on which a vote is taken, to the context in which we discuss related problems and to the verbatim records which constitute the most valuable political guide for the interpretation of a text and for placing it in its true perspective. The Conference of non-aligned countries did indeed pay a tribute to the wisdom of the African States and to their desire to settle this problem by peaceful means. I formally reaffirm here the solemn undertaking of Morocco, which subscribes fully to this principle, and at the same time I stress the fact that my country has for the last eight years shown its ability to settle all its problems by that means, an attribute which is not shared by all its partners. It has been pointed out, however, that this principle was not accepted by a large majority, still less unanimously. It was for that reason that, in order to give legal form to the difference in the acceptance of that principle and to present it in such a way as to express that shade of difference, we decided that the problems on which unanimous agreement was reached would appear in a document which would be called a general declaration, and that the other problems, which were clearly recognized as being difficult

or impossible to solve, would appear in an annex, which would have the value attached to any statement of that kind. I am sure that the Foreign Minister of Algeria, like me, wished to clarify this point today, in a manner to which I must pay a tribute, and this ends the controversy between us on this matter.

38. There is one final point to which I should not want to omit a brief reference. It is true that at Cairo a resolution was submitted by three or four African countries, within the framework of an item of the agenda entitled "Search for means to settle border disputes". The wording of this agenda item was the subject of considerable negotiation. The Foreign Minister of Algeria and myself made our contribution to those negotiations, both by giving the problem the most brotherly interpretation and by helping the linguistic aspect of the wording. We agreed on that wording and its meaning was very plain. The resolution that was submitted gave a clear definition of the problem. It did not define the ways and means of arriving at a solution; it stated that henceforth a certain principle would prevail for the solution of the problem, but it did not state that the paragraph in question nullified or removed the problem itself. The resolution concerns the method of settling the problem; it does not get rid of the problem. It recommends the African States to use a certain procedure to settle it. We gave our support to that procedure, the Ad Hoc Commission is proceeding with its work, and in my opinion the excellent relations between Algeria and Morocco certainly provide an added element of confidence which will also lead our African partners to appreciate that the intentions of the two countries directly concerned are peaceful and that this desire for a peaceful settlement will be reflected in the suggestions and recommendations to be made by the Commission.

39. Bearing this in mind, I am sure that our negotiations will prove more useful if they take place in the privacy which is the diplomatic tradition between Algeria and Morocco. My distinguished friend and myself, although nurtured in the tradition of public diplomacy, retain our confidence in the more stable settlement of these problems which can be solved through mutual understanding, setting aside considerations of prestige and self-esteem.

40. The Foreign Minister of Algeria has seen fit, in both his first statement [1322nd meeting] and the statement he has just made, to repeat what is perhaps the key word in all such disputes, not only with regard to Algeria and Morocco but with regard to all countries whose maturity enables them to appreciate the true value of that word. We believe in the virtue of the word "co-operation". Co-operation, however, presupposes working together on the basis of assets which not only constitute an investment designed to produce profits in the economic and cultural fields and in the way of friendship, but imply a pre-existing fund of confidence which is the foundation on which lasting co-operation can be built but which, given a bad beginning, might later lead to far more serious misunderstandings, for in politics, as in biology, a relapse may be more serious than the illness.

41. When we speak from this rostrum, prudence and optimism make it imperative for us to remain

confident in our use of the word "co-operation", but we must also be careful to give it a content which takes account of the concrete reality of the problem without overlooking the need to clarify situations which cannot be disregarded and which will prevent the progress of both parties towards co-operation so long as there remains any poison of misunderstanding which might at any moment infect the healthiest and most sincere co-operation.

42. In concluding on this note, I should like to thank my colleague, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, for having from this rostrum made a profession of faith in the future of our relations and for having renewed the confidence he has in the Moroccan people, for it is the counterpart of the confidence which the Moroccan people have in the people of Algeria.

43. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, it is indeed with deep regret that I have asked you to allow me to speak again because I did not have the intention of doing so. But after the statement which was made last night by the representative of Turkey in exercising his right of reply, I feel compelled to make a few remarks. The representative of Turkey said yesterday:

"Every single distortion and misrepresentation concerning the question of Cyprus which adorned his statements"—that is, my statements—"has already been refuted in anticipation by the speech delivered by the Foreign Minister of Turkey yesterday." [1323rd meeting, para. 187.]

If that were the case, I do not think that a long statement would have been necessary on the part of the representative of Turkey. But he felt it necessary to make a long statement, and he repeated various new and old accusations against Cyprus and its cause.

44. The representative of Turkey said that the Turkish Government had never refused to negotiate with President Makarios. Indeed, the President of Cyprus and the Government of Cyprus, when they asked for negotiations, did not ask the Turkish Government to negotiate with them, but they asked the then leaders of the Turkish minority in Cyprus to negotiate and, out of courtesy, the President of Cyprus gave copies of his proposals to the Government of Turkey, and he also gave copies to the Government of Greece and the Government of the United Kingdom.

45. But what was the result? The result was that the proposals of President Makarios, which were made and addressed to the then leaders of the Turkish minority in Cyprus, were rejected by the Turkish Government before the leaders of that minority, to whom the proposals were addressed, had even replied or commented upon them.

46. The representative of Turkey then made a reference to the joint communiqué which was issued in Ankara on the occasion of the State visit of the President of Cyprus in November 1962, and he read a passage from that communiqué. However, he did not read another passage from that communiqué which I have to say took us about twelve hours to agree upon with the Foreign Minister of Turkey. That paragraph, which he avoided mentioning yesterday, reads as follows, and I quote from the communiqué:

"The two Presidents reviewed questions of mutual interest and have observed that identity of views

existed among them on the importance of maintaining close relations and co-operation between their two countries not only in their countries' interests, but also as a contribution to international peace and security, and reiterated their resolution to deploy all efforts to have these relations further developed on the basis of equality and mutual respect."

It was this particular phrase which took us twelve hours to agree upon. The Foreign Minister of Turkey was insistent—and I do not think that anybody will be able to deny that—that we should insert in the communiqué that the relations between Cyprus and Turkey should be based upon the Agreements of London and Zurich. We, on our part, refused that and we argued that the relations between Cyprus and Turkey, if they were to be fruitful, had to be on a basis of equality and mutual respect.

47. I feel that I should also make reference to the idea which was introduced by the representative of Turkey in reiteration of what his Foreign Minister had said in this Assembly as regards the idea of "enosis". The representative of Turkey argued yesterday that we are afraid to mention the word "enosis" in this Assembly. We are not, but "enosis" is not a matter for this Assembly. Why does the Turkish Government bring the question of "enosis" before this Assembly? It is to try and find a way to eliminate the right of the people of Cyprus to decide for themselves what they want—not to prevent "enosis" but to negotiate "enosis" on the conditions that the Turkish Government wants, to negotiate "enosis", as they have been doing in the past few months, and I hope that nobody will be able to deny that.

48. The problem of Cyprus is not a problem of "enosis" or of anything else. It is a problem as to whether Cyprus, an equal Member of the United Nations, is entitled to its sovereignty, to its independence, to its territorial integrity, and whether the destiny of Cyprus is or is not in the hands of the people of Cyprus themselves.

49. I am not going to refer to various references of the Turkish representative to me personally. He, however, said that one day he hoped to read my own memoirs. If I ever produce or publish my memoirs, I can assure him that I shall not include his speeches because I shall be dealing only with the true facts of history.

50. The representative of Turkey again spoke of massacres. I was not the first one who raised this question of massacres and, as I said, I wanted to avoid it. I was forced the other day to refer to the Armenian massacres, which the representative of Turkey yesterday called "alleged" massacres.

51. He himself, in order to strengthen his own position, made a reference to a book by Arnold Toynbee. I would advise him to read all the works of Arnold Toynbee, and he would read there about the massacres of the Armenians and many other things indeed that I am sure he would not like.

52. He then referred to the Treaty of Lausanne.^{5/} He took exception to the fact that I dared mention the Treaty of Lausanne under which, to remind the repre-

sentatives, Turkey abandoned all rights and interests over the former Ottoman Empire territories; that is, including Cyprus. He did not deny that yesterday, but he then went on to show how his Government proposes not to allow the people of Cyprus to have the solution which they want. Is that not a violation of the Treaty?

53. The representative of Turkey said that Archbishop Makarios made a statement in his village, in September 1962, in which he called, among other things, for the expulsion of the Turks in Cyprus. Reference to this statement, allegedly made by the President, was first made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey the other day in the Assembly [1321st meeting]. I denied it then. But the representative of Turkey insisted on it. I deny it again. I deny it with all the emphasis I possess.

54. But was that statement meant in anticipation of safeguarding against a possibility of accusation against Turkey for the expulsion of Greeks and others from Turkey? I do not wish to comment on that. What is relevant and what is essential is what I said yesterday, that we do not want the Turks to leave Cyprus. We want them to stay as part of the population of Cyprus, with equal rights, without any discrimination. We have offered to agree to United Nations observation in respect of the application of human rights. And let the team of United Nations observers have the right to report to the Assembly or the Security Council or any other special body of the United Nations. As I said yesterday, and I say it again, I wonder very much if all countries would be prepared to do the same.

55. The Turkish representative has accused us of trying to deceive the Assembly. I will leave it to the General Assembly and to yourself, Mr. President, to judge, and we hope that you will be allowed, until the end of this tragic story, to be the judges and to give the final verdict.

56. In the meantime may I be permitted to make two or three remarks. The representative of Turkey said yesterday: "Turkey has never threatened to invade Cyprus nor does it have any territorial aspirations on that unfortunate island." [1323rd meeting, para. 190.]

The next thing we are perhaps going to be told in this Assembly by the representative of Turkey is that Turkey never bombed Cyprus. I do not think I need reply to that. Then the representative of Turkey tried to make it quite certain by saying: "Partition is not our aim, and to keep harping on it is no more than shadow-boxing with a non-existent adversary." [*Ibid.*, para. 209.]

57. As I said yesterday, we know the whole plan quite well. We know why subversion was started. We know for what purpose; we have enough evidence. The Turkish representative said yesterday that he would like to see it. I assure him that he is going to see it, all of it, in due course. But I think it will be useful in this connexion to quote a statement of the Turkish Prime Minister. Let us see now whom we are going to believe: the Turkish representative or the Turkish Prime Minister. I quote now the statement of the Turkish Prime Minister:

"One day Greece will agree to a peaceful partition of Cyprus with the help of NATO. As long as the

^{5/} Signed on 24 July 1923.

Greeks refuse, the battle will go on. Turkey will not recede. In any hopeless situation in Cyprus, Turkey will use her right of intervention in the island."

This statement was made by the Turkish Prime Minister on 17 May 1964. Because this statement contains another important element, I think I had better repeat it:

"One day Greece will agree to a peaceful partition of Cyprus with the help of NATO. As long as the Greeks refuse, the battle will go on. Turkey will not recede. In any hopeless situation in Cyprus, Turkey will use her right of intervention in the island."

58. Now this is the approach of Turkey to the problem of Cyprus. We are told that Turkey is worried about union of Cyprus with Greece. They are worried that union of Cyprus with Greece may take place not on the conditions of Turkey and on the conditions of NATO. This is the problem. But as I said earlier, in the United Nations we are not dealing with what the future of Cyprus should be, because the future of Cyprus should be in the hands of the people of Cyprus as a whole. The United Nations is interested, in regard to Cyprus, in whether another country has the right to intervene militarily, in whether countries shall be allowed to interfere in the domestic affairs of Cyprus, in whether other countries can be allowed to impose solutions upon Cyprus in the way, as I have just quoted, the Turkish Prime Minister envisages.

59. Here is another statement by the Foreign Minister of Turkey who, I am sorry, is not present in the Assembly. He said:

"The radical solution that would end once and for all the Greek-Turkish dispute and re-establish the friendship of the two countries on a solid and unshakable basis would be the ceding of a part of Cyprus to Greece and of the other part, which is closest to Turkey's Adriatic Coast, to Turkey."

60. Turkey does not object to Greek expansionism as long as Turkey itself also takes a part of Cyprus; in other words, if Turkey is to get a piece of Cyprus, then Greece may have the rest—it is all right; the claim might be valid in that case.

61. The Turkish representative in his argument yesterday tried also to put across the idea that federation does not lead to partition. He said, if I may quote him:

"At one point Foreign Minister Kyprianou used words to the effect that a federation on ethnic lines would be merely 'the last step to partition'. This I find difficult to understand." [1323rd meeting, para. 209.]

If he finds it difficult to understand, let me allow one of his Ministers to make it easier for him to do so. The Minister of Information of the Turkish Government, Mr. Coşuz, is quoted as follows: "The only long-term solution was the separation of the two communities in a federate state." Answering questions afterward, the Turkish Minister of Information said:

"It was probably true that such a federation would grow into separate, independent states which would

eventually opt for union with Greece and Turkey. He said Turkey would not oppose this since it would mean that the division would become the Greek-Turkish border, and Greece and Turkey have no desire to fight each other."

62. We were told last night—and again I am at a loss, I do not know what to believe among all these things—that Turkey has no territorial ambitions in any way whatsoever with regard to Cyprus. We were told in the most emphatic way, and I quote the Turkish representative:

"Where Cyprus is concerned, Turkey has but one purpose in mind, namely, the safeguarding of the rights and the security of its kinsmen in Cyprus. Where Cyprus is concerned, its duties arise from that unique consideration." [*Ibid.*, para. 190.]

63. If that is the position of Turkey, we can have a solution to the problem of Cyprus in half an hour. It is the easiest of problems. Is Turkey interested in the well-being of the Turkish minority in Cyprus? I am sorry to say it is not. The Turkish minority in Cyprus is simply a pawn in a much wider game that I trust we shall have the opportunity to expose in detail in this Assembly.

64. If Turkey had no territorial or other ambitions in respect of Cyprus and if its interest and concern stemmed only from the fact of the existence in Cyprus of a minority of Turkish ethnic origin, Turkey would have two solutions from which to choose—I cannot see a third one. Turkey could choose either to invite those Turks to go back to Turkey—and they have, by the way, themselves refused to go back to Turkey when they were invited to do so—or Turkey could allow those people to live in peace and harmony together with the rest of the population of Cyprus and on an equal footing.

65. As far as the second alternative is concerned, this is our choice, this is what we want. May I again repeat, to make it quite clear and beyond any possibility of doubt, because it is a commitment of the Government of Cyprus, a commitment made before you—that we are ready to accept a United Nations international guarantee for the human rights and liberties of all the people of Cyprus, and we are ready to accept a permanent United Nations presence in Cyprus, a body of observers in Cyprus which would have the right to report to the Assembly, to the Security Council, to the Secretary-General, to anyone that the Assembly wishes them to report to.

66. This is the case of Cyprus. We do no service by trying to beat about the bush. This is a clear-cut case. To try to say that whatever Turkey is doing with regard to Cyprus it is doing simply to protect the security of its kinsmen in Cyprus, is a gross misrepresentation of facts—not only the facts of today but the facts of history. You are going to be the judges of that.

67. These are the few remarks I wished to make on the comments made yesterday by the representative of Turkey. I am sorry that I had to take the floor again. I did not wish to engage in any debate on the specific subject of Cyprus, but I felt that it was necessary and it was my duty to say these things.

68. The problem before you is nothing else but what I described yesterday in a few words: Is Cyprus entitled to the rights deriving from the Charter, and is Cyprus and its people—one people, not a divided people; one people—entitled to the rights that we all so strongly uphold and wholeheartedly support in the case of all territories still under foreign domination?

69. Mr. Amjad ALI (Pakistan): I have no desire to tax the patience of the members of the Assembly by prolonging this debate with reply, counter-reply and counter-counter-reply. I shall therefore be very brief.

70. The representative of India, when about an hour ago he came to the rostrum, said that my Foreign Minister had done nothing else but beat the old drum, and he said that the arguments of that drum had been heard over and over again. But if that was the case, then why did my colleague from India take the trouble of coming to the rostrum and using such harsh and strong words, if not any arguments?

71. Yes, my Foreign Minister did beat a drum, but it was not an old drum. He beat a big drum, and a big drum whose tone at that time rang true because the episode was recent, and he was quoting the voice of none other than that great Prime Minister of India, the late Jawaharlal Nehru. As I said, the tone rang true because the episode was recent, but with the taste of the occupation of the beautiful valley of Kashmir, which the poets have called paradise on earth, of course the stance of India changed. Therefore, that drum today is out of tune.

72. The representative of India said that my Foreign Minister was quoting out of context, but he was doing nothing of the kind. He was quoting in context, and if there is any doubt entertained by the representative of India, he can look at the entire record of the statements of his own Prime Minister and the statements made in the Security Council, and he will then see that what my Foreign Minister said and quoted was absolutely correct.

73. This was one matter which was mentioned by the representative of India. The second matter was that he quoted Sir Owen Dixon on this question of aggression, and quoted him as saying that Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan had admitted this. The matter is very simple. Which people or which country likes to be invaded by an aggressor? If Pakistan committed an aggression against Kashmir, surely the people of Kashmir would hate the Pakistanis for taking away their liberty when they were independent and when we invaded them. If that were so, then surely that aggression would still be in their minds and they would hate the Pakistanis. The easiest way, then, for India would be to go through the process of a plebiscite. If this argument is true, then India should not fight shy of having a plebiscite.

74. I can give many arguments in rebuttal of the arguments of my colleague from India on Kashmir. I will not do so. I would simply say this, as was said by my Foreign Minister in quoting the late Prime Minister. The matter is very simple. These were the assurances given to the people of Kashmir, to Pakistan and to the United Nations, that the people of Kashmir will have the right to decide whether they

want to accede to India or Pakistan. Why should they not be given this opportunity, not in a closed plebiscite, but in an open plebiscite, so that the people would have the true right of expressing their wish, not under the shadow of Indian bayonets but under the open eyes of the observers of the United Nations?

75. Then the representative of India referred to East Pakistan, the Frontier Province and Baluchistan. I do not want to go into the internal affairs of India, but I would like to refresh the memory of the representative of India, who comes from the Presidency of Bengal, that it was the Bengali Moslems who were in the vanguard of the fight of Pakistan. It was they who were leading the movement of Pakistan, and, therefore, how can he turn round and say you should give the same opportunity to the East Pakistanis, who should express their will by a plebiscite. The recent elections in Pakistan have shown what they desire.

76. As I have said, I do not wish to mention the internal affairs of India, but all who have read this morning's edition of The New York Times must have read what has happened in Madras. Does that mean that there should be a plebiscite in Madras for the Madrasis to remain in India? No, we have never made any such claims or suggested anything so stupid as that. Madras is an integral part of India.

77. We only mentioned a plebiscite in Kashmir because Kashmir is not an integral part of India. I repeat that Kashmir is not an integral part of India.

78. Lastly, I wish to repeat here what is already on record. In his statement on 22 January 1965 [1319th meeting], my Foreign Minister referred to Mr. Senanayake of Ceylon. Our inquiries have revealed that this gentleman is an independent member of the House of Representatives in Ceylon and, of course, does not represent the views of his Government.

79. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): The Foreign Minister of Pakistan and the Permanent Representative of Pakistan have evaded meeting our arguments and have refused to answer the questions we put to them. An allegation is made, but when it is refuted the representative of Pakistan repeats the allegation. He goes on saying that Kashmir is not an integral part of India. I can only repeat that Kashmir is an integral part of India. In these circumstances, I see no point in carrying on the useless dialogue any further.

Statement by the President

80. The PRESIDENT: The general debate is now concluded.

81. As representatives are aware, I have accepted the invitation of the Government of the United Kingdom to represent the United Nations at the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill on Saturday, 30 January 1965. Both the Secretary-General and I feel that we need a little more time for consultation with the interested delegations and parties before we meet again. I would therefore propose that, if the Assembly agrees, we might meet again on Monday, 1 February, at 3 p.m. In the meantime, I would urge the various delegations to resolve their difficulties in regard to the constitution of the General Committee so that the Assembly may be able to set it up on Monday.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.