



*Friday, 23 September 1955,  
 at 3.30 p.m.*

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 7:	
Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter.....	53
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda.....	53
First report of the General Committee	

**President:** Mr. José MAZA (Chile).

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter (A/2972)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The first agenda item for consideration this afternoon is the notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Charter.
2. On 20 September 1955, the Secretary-General circulated document A/2972, notifying the General Assembly of matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council. This notification was made in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Charter and rule 49 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

*The General Assembly took note of the notification.*

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**Adoption of the agenda**

**FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/2980)**

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now submit to the consideration of the Assembly the first report [A/2980] of the General Committee on the adoption of the agenda, the allocation of items to committees and the organization of the session.
4. Before we deal with part I, entitled "Adoption of the agenda", we must go through the matters referred to in paragraphs 2 to 8.
5. Paragraph 1 is purely descriptive and does not require any decision by the Assembly.
6. In paragraph 2, the General Committee recommends that item 18 of the provisional agenda [A/2915] and item 6 of the supplementary list [A/2942] should be included in the agenda as parts (a) and (b) of an item with the general heading "Peaceful uses of atomic energy".
7. Similarly, in paragraph 3, the General Committee recommends that item 4 of the supplementary list [A/2942] and the additional item proposed by India [A/2949] should appear on the agenda as parts (a) and (b) of an item entitled "Effects of atomic radiation".

8. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the General Assembly accepts the grouping of these items in the form proposed by the General Committee.

*It was so decided.*

9. THE PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We go on now to paragraph 4. The General Committee decided to recommend that item 1 of the supplementary list. "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus", should not be included in the agenda.

10. The General Committee's recommendation is now before the Assembly, and the floor is open to speakers.

11. Mr. STEPHANOPOULOS (Greece) (*translated from French*): In its report to the Assembly, the General Committee recommends that item 1 of the supplementary list, entitled: "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus", should not be placed on the agenda of the present session. This recommendation was submitted for approval and adopted by 7 votes, including that of the Chairman of the General Committee, to 4, with 4 abstentions. I do not wish to deny that there was a majority in the formal sense but I would point out that only 7 of the 15 delegations on the General Committee were against placing the item on the agenda, and it is pertinent to add that these 7 votes include that of the party directly concerned.

12. Furthermore, the Thai delegation's abstention was in the nature of a vote to place the item on the agenda of the next session. On a question so important in the international field and in the United Nations it is significant that the formal majority, or what I might call the majority of consciences, was not against including the item. I sincerely hope that at the end of this discussion, the General Assembly, which is the only representative organ of the United Nations, will transform this majority of consciences into a formal majority.

13. The Cyprus question raises the principle of freedom and the implementation of the right of a people to self-determination and is therefore unquestionably within the competence of the United Nations, which itself is founded on human rights. As the General Assembly has solemnly stated on many occasions, the right of peoples to self-determination is the keystone of the whole structure of human rights. This elementary right is denied to the people of Cyprus and the system of colonial domination imposed on this people against as will not only constitutes a violation of the Charter, but compromises the peace of the eastern Mediterranean with the threat of a severe crisis.

14. What further justification could be needed for United Nations action? It was for this reason that the General Assembly, at its last session [477th meeting], firmly set aside the objections of non-competence raised by the United Kingdom and the delegation of certain

other colonial Powers and their sympathizers, and affirmed its competence by 30 votes to 19.

15. I think it would therefore be a waste of time to try to refute once again the arguments based on a more or less tendentious interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7; even the United Kingdom representative himself put forward those arguments without conviction and merely in order to still what I might call his colonial conscience.

16. Once the Assembly has decided its competence, it has a duty to focus its attention on the Cyprus question and to endeavour to ward off the threat to peace and freedom represented by the establishment of a system of violence in a particularly sensitive part of the world.

17. That is what the Assembly did last year. Unfortunately, after two days' discussion it adopted resolution 814 (IX) stating, for reasons which we all know, that it did not appear appropriate "for the time being", that is, in December 1954, to continue the study of the question further.

18. Consideration of the matter was therefore suspended "for the time being". To deny in good faith that this was a provisional adjournment of a question which thereby remained pending before the United Nations is to deny the obvious.

19. The initial proposal was admittedly conceived by its sponsors as an adjournment *sine die*, but the Assembly decided otherwise and adopted an amendment changing the adjournment *sine die* into a provisional adjournment, in fact to more than provisional, an adjournment "for the time being".

20. I would quote in evidence what the representative of El Salvador, one of the sponsors of the amendment, said during the discussion in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 17 December 1954. He said: [514th meeting, paras. 265 to 267]

"I therefore decided to submit an amendment forming a preamble to the draft resolution and in fact did so jointly with the delegation of Colombia . . .

"I want to make it quite clear that it was not my delegation's intention that this amendment should be interpreted as expressing any doubt with regard to competence; quite the contrary. As we see it, under this draft resolution, the General Assembly does not renounce its competence but rather reaffirms it, since the statement that for the time being it does not appear appropriate to adopt a draft resolution implies that if at any future time it considered it necessary and opportune to do so it could adopt a resolution on the substance of the question of Cyprus.

"It was in that spirit that my delegation proposed the amendment. It voted for the draft resolution in the First Committee and will vote for it again here in the plenary meeting."

21. When a national or international organ decides to adjourn provisionally consideration of a case before it, the case remains pending before the body in question. That is true however one-sided the interpretation put on it and whether our British friends like it or not.

22. But, says the United Kingdom representative, why do you wish Cyprus to be discussed now? What has happened since December last to justify such a request? Her Britannic Majesty's representative sees absolutely no change which could induce the United Nations to continue to deal with the problem. Decidedly, events take on a different aspect and meaning when seen from the banks of the Thames.

23. But is the situation, both in Cyprus and in the eastern Mediterranean, the same today as it was in December 1954? This is how the Colonial Office, in its publication *The Colonial Territories, 1954-1955*, page 2, describes the development of the situation in Cyprus following the adoption by the United Nations of its resolution of adjournment for the time being:

"Unrest in Cyprus began when the United Nations decided to defer the Greek resolution on self-determination, and culminated in a number of dynamite outrages at the beginning of April 1955."

24. Since then, events have taken an increasingly violent and particularly disturbing course; the spontaneous demonstrations of a nation for its freedom, and its increasingly violent action, have been countered by the severest colonial repression. The record is very black and certainly does not redound to the United Kingdom's credit.

25. Blood began to flow, Cypriot blood, naturally, on the day when troops were called out to open fire on unarmed demonstrators. Since then, over 700 people have been sentenced to imprisonment or fines; hundreds have been arrested, several of them without warrant, in violation of the principles of *habeas corpus* which is the keystone of any democratic system. The prisons are choked with Cypriots thrown into them on the mere order of the British governor.

26. The representative of the United Kingdom ventured to assert, during the discussion in the General Committee of the request for the inclusion of this item on the agenda, that the mainspring of an entire people's struggle for its freedom was the broadcasts from Athens radio. I state categorically that Athens radio has done no more than is done by broadcasting services in all the free countries of the world. It has always confined itself to a faithful account of events in Cyprus and commentaries from the Greek and international Press.

27. I have several times stated, and I repeat now, that we are against violence. But violence occurs whenever power flows not from the popular will but from arbitrary rule. The existence in Cyprus of the arbitrary rule of the colonial system, against the manifest will of the people, is responsible for initiating this chain reaction of violence.

28. But besides the situation in Cyprus, important international developments have occurred during this summer. The British governor took the initiative of calling a Tripartite Conference in London between Greece, the United Kingdom and Turkey in order to discuss the Cyprus question and other matters. The only party really concerned, namely, the people of Cyprus, was absent.

29. The Greek Government went to London with the best intentions, in a spirit of co-operation and moderation. Its mission was to speak on behalf of the elementary right of the people of Cyprus to freedom and to discharge its responsibilities as a Member of the United Nations.

30. But the views disclosed in London were radically different, completely opposite. The Greek argument was based on the United Nations Charter. The arguments put forward by the other parties practically amounted to a denial of the Charter and of the principles of freedom and justice which it contains, in favour of alleged grounds of military security and the ambition of a minority to usurp the rights of the majority. We heard in London, from the United Kingdom Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Macmillan, a new version, a final refusal

of any prospect of self-determination for Cyprus, such as had been foreshadowed last year by the Under-Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs, Mr. Hopkinson.

31. So-called internal self-government might, in default of anything better, form a basis for agreement as a step towards self-determination. Unfortunately, the United Kingdom Government's proposal was not inspired by a sincere wish to grant self-determination to the people of the island. In the eyes of any impartial judge it is the colonial system in disguise and, by setting up a so-called Tripartite Commission of Co-operation, with powers of control, offers the population of Cyprus not one master but three, a Briton, a Greek and a Turk. Greece could not stoop to such huckstering. Moreover, the Turkish representative was quick to declare that Turkey could not agree to the people of the island being given anything other than the existing colonial system. Thus, the people of Cyprus, one of the noblest and most civilized in the world, would be condemned to live forever under colonial domination.

32. The Greek Government was thus obliged to reject such fundamentally unacceptable proposals and that brought the London Conference to an end.

33. How can it still be imagined, after the total failure of this Conference, that all possibilities of negotiation in present circumstances have not been exhausted? Yet even if we concede the contrary, how could discussion of the question in the United Nations injure those possibilities?

34. Normal diplomatic channels are always available to men of goodwill where these exist. But if goodwill is absent, only two ways are open to people demanding their freedom: the first is the way of violence, the second is the way of the United Nations. Greece has chosen the latter. It puts its entire trust in the peaceful procedure laid down by the Charter. It is inconceivable that the United Nations should by its own action close all access to that procedure and leave open to subjugated people only the way of violence.

35. The United Nations cannot refuse a hearing to peoples which ask it. It may sometimes find it difficult to act, but it can always listen. Just to be heard smoothes out difficulties and hatreds and lends counsel to the parties to a dispute. It is the only way available to the international community to turn peoples aside from the path of violence and bring them gradually back into the path of legality.

36. We are asked to believe that discussion in the Assembly would compromise the possibility of understanding by exacerbating feelings and stiffening antagonism. The mere presence of the United Nations itself constitutes a guarantee that any exchange of views will be conducted only within the framework and in the spirit of the Charter. Without the United Nations, what happens? The London Conference, with its deplorable consequences, is a striking example. There could be no better example to guide the Assembly's action not only in the present case but where the Assembly is called on to take action in similar cases in the future. The London Conference not only made a solution of the Cyprus question still more difficult, but caused irreparable damage and harm.

37. The policy which for some time past Turkey has been incited to follow has borne fruit. Events in Turkey, the destruction of monuments and churches and the fact that tens of thousands of Greeks have lost every-

thing and been reduced to poverty, have seriously undermined the work of Kemal Ataturk and Venizelos.

38. As recently as the day before yesterday, Mr. Sarper made statements in the General Committee [102nd meeting] for which emotion is the only possible explanation. He spoke of the alleged damage to Ataturk's birthplace in Salonika as justifying the veritable "pogroms" organized in his country. The truth is that Ataturk's birthplace is intact and that the Greek quarters of Istanbul are in ruins. Mr. Sarper also said—I did not quite understand why—that Greece is a mosaic of heterogeneous minorities. Here again, he seems to be ill-informed, because Greece is probably one of the most homogenous countries in the world. I have no intention of prolonging this pointless and distasteful argument. The Tripartite Conference in London has raised discordant echoes even within these walls.

39. The colonial Powers and those which support their policies in the United Nations endeavoured last year—I must confess, unfortunately, not without success—to implant in the minds of certain representatives some confusion regarding the nature of my Government's application. They tried to make our application appear as a territorial claim by Greece against the United Kingdom. This was attributing to us intentions which we do not possess. The Greek Government has never considered that the fate of a colonial territory could be the subject of a deal between Governments. In the case of Cyprus, only the inhabitants of the island have the right to determine their fate. Greece has never had any thought of annexing Cyprus; she has never asked for that, and never will. We ask only that the right of the people of Cyprus to choose freely its future régime, its government and its way of living be recognized. Greece will respect the wishes of the Cypriot people, whatever they may be and whatever shape they make take.

40. Let us not forget that we are dealing with the fate of a people under colonial domination and that if by sophistry and subterfuge we impede the march of colonial peoples to liberty, we shall have failed in one of the most important of the purposes of the United Nations.

41. To incite a minority against the majority of the colonial population and to range one nation against another by breaking alliances and fomenting hatred, are applications of the principle of *divide ut imperes* with which we are all familiar.

42. What, after all, is Greece asking, as the spokesmen for the Cypriot people, when it calls for the inclusion of this item on the agenda? Simply that the Assembly should take cognizance of the events which have occurred since the end of the ninth session up to the present time and of their repercussions in the eastern Mediterranean. The word "events" is a neutral term but really covers suffering, imprisonment, wounding and killing. Does the General Assembly refuse even to grant a hearing to the victims? Do mere considerations of expediency perhaps keep the door closed? But how can anyone invoke considerations which cannot, objectively speaking, emerge except from a discussion?

43. We only ask to be heard. The Assembly is free to take the decisions which the situation requires. To refuse us this right would be a violation of the right of freedom of discussion, a complete denial of hearing and justice. The small States in particular must ponder well the implications for them of an over-hasty decision, taken after bad counsel. Their representatives perhaps one day too

may wish to be heard by the United Nations. It is extremely dangerous to establish such precedents. The fact that the question which we wish included is controversial should be an argument for, rather than against, its inclusion.

44. I must point out that whilst our application was before the Assembly for several months last year, peace and quiet prevailed in Cyprus, and good understanding among the allies. But from the day when the Assembly decided to adjourn the question, disappointment and bitterness immediately led to disorder and acts of violence. Denial of justice opens the way to violence.

45. I venture to stress the great responsibility which the Assembly will take upon itself today if it rejects our request for inclusion. None can foresee how far frustration may drive a people denied access to peaceful means for the realization of its hopes and aspirations.

46. Mr. NUTTING (*United Kingdom*): The Greek Foreign Minister has just asked that the Assembly should reject the recommendation of the General Committee against the inclusion of an item on Cyprus in the agenda of the tenth session. I was sorry to hear him challenge that recommendation, because I am convinced that the course of wisdom is to accept it. But I believe we should all be wise to accept what is, I am sure, the general opinion in the Assembly that it is not appropriate for the Assembly to go into this matter.

47. I know that some delegations have held the view that as a matter of principle any item should be included in the agenda at the request of any Member State. They may feel that they do not want to oppose inclusion, but at the same time they are anxious to avoid discussion. I would point out that you cannot in practice draw a distinction between inclusion and discussion. Once an item is included, it is down for discussion and it stays down for discussion until it has been disposed of by discussion. Therefore, I do suggest that, in wisdom and in prudence, we should consider each item proposed for our agenda, and therefore for discussion, on its merits. I do suggest that before we include any item we should ask ourselves whether the inevitable discussion of that item will help or hinder.

48. I listened with great attention to all that the Greek representative Mr. Melas, said on 21 September in the General Committee [102nd meeting]. But I could not fail to notice that he did not attempt to answer the basic argument upon which I presented the case against inclusion and discussion of the Cyprus issue. Indeed, he said that I rested the burden of my argument on Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter, that is, on whether the Assembly is competent to discuss this issue or not. I would ask Mr. Melas to look at my speech. If he does so, he will see that whilst I reserved my Government's position on the issue of competence, my whole argument was addressed to the two practical and all-important questions: first, whether inclusion and discussion of this issue in a public forum would help to find a solution or whether a settlement could not better be found by quiet diplomacy conducted in private? Secondly, whether inclusion and debate here would help to promote that period of calm which is so urgently needed by the Administration and by the people of Cyprus?

49. I also listened to Mr. Stephanopoulos today. He, too, failed to reply to my simple contention that private negotiation and not public debate is the way to try to settle this problem. Mr. Stephanopoulos repeated the

claim that the General Assembly, by its resolution of 17 December 1954, 814 (IX) prejudged its decision on inclusion and discussion for this tenth session. But last year's resolution decided that it was not appropriate to go into the matter further.

50. I must therefore repeat, what I said in the General Committee on 21 September, that what last year's resolution does is to place the onus on the representative of Greece to show that it is now appropriate for the United Nations to debate and to pass judgment on this issue. But he has not done so. Neither in the General Committee was it done, nor was the case proved, or attempted to be proved, here in the General Assembly.

51. Mr. Stephanopoulos talked about the London Tripartite Conference which he attended. I shall not repeat the very full account which I gave on 21 September of that Conference; this is on record and is within the knowledge of the whole Assembly. But I must say that I was astounded to hear the assessment, given by Mr. Stephanopoulos today and by Mr. Melas yesterday, of that Conference. Mr. Stephanopoulos, if I heard him correctly, said today that the possibilities of negotiation were exhausted. Mr. Melas, speaking for the Greek Government in the General Committee on 21 September, described the London Conference as a tragic intermezzo bound to fail even before it began.

52. I must say that I am not so pessimistic. I refuse to believe that a solution of this difficult problem could never have been found, and cannot still be found by diplomacy. With goodwill, these problems can be solved. I did not claim, at the meeting of the General Committee on 21 September, as Mr. Melas said, that the London Conference was an "achievement"; that was the word which he used. On the contrary, I made it clear that the Conference stood suspended in disagreement. The whole purpose of what I said about the Conference was to show that it could have been a good beginning, and I am still convinced that, following on the proposals that my Government made at that Conference, we can still make a start on the path to settlement. This can be done if our two friends, Greece and Turkey, not only share our aims but are prepared to work out with us the means to translate them into practice. These two aims, I repeat, are, first, to foster the well-being of the population of Cyprus and to promote as rapidly as possible their constitutional development towards self-government and, secondly, to maintain and cement their friendship and alliance with Greece and Turkey.

53. Mr. Melas described the proposals which we made as unconstructive and unhelpful. That was the statement of the Greek representative in the General Committee. But let us look for a brief moment at what these proposals were.

54. Mr. Macmillan, to whom Mr. Stephanopoulos referred a moment ago, put forward proposals which made the most of a considerable area of common ground. He proposed that we should agree to agree on as much as we could, and agree, for the moment, to differ where we could not agree. Leaving on one side, therefore, the future international status of Cyprus, he put forward a set of proposals designed to set Cyprus on the road to self-government. He proposed the introduction of a liberal constitution designed to lead to the fullest measure of self-government compatible with the strategic requirements of the present international situation. There would be, from the outset, an assembly with an elected majority, a proportionate quota of seats



being reserved for the Turkish community. All departments of the Cyprus Government would be progressively transferred to Cypriot Ministers responsible to the assembly, with the sole exception of foreign affairs, defence and public security. As part of the safeguards to be provided for the Turkish community, a proportion of the ministerial portfolios would be reserved for that community. A Cypriot chief Minister would lead the new Cypriot administration. These are described by the representative of Greece as unconstructive proposals.

55. Mr. Macmillan also proposed a Tripartite Committee of the three Powers which would, among other things, act as a standing body for consultation and co-operation between the three Governments on Cypriot problems.

56. I was amazed to hear Mr. Melas describe this proposal as the negation of democracy. He even used, though he said that he did not wish to use it, the word "mockery". He depicted the Tripartite Committee as a group of overlords who would dominate the whole self-governing administration of Cyprus. Mr. Stephanopoulos a moment ago described, if I heard his words correctly, this Tripartite Committee as the three masters of the people of Cyprus.

57. But what, in fact, is the truth? What is this Tripartite Committee to do? This body would be a consultative body, not a governing body. In the first place, it is designed to enable my Government to have the benefit of the views of our Greek and Turkish allies on the actual form of the constitution. It is also designed to provide the means by which the three Governments could keep in continuous touch with one another about the affairs of Cyprus, to associate with the affairs of Cyprus the Governments of Turkey and Greece. And it was hoped to provide the means to reconvene the Tripartite Conference with the association of elected Cypriot representatives when the constitution was in full and working effect.

58. I was sorry, and indeed astonished, to hear two representatives of the Greek Government, including the Greek Foreign Minister himself, complaining in such bitter terms of a proposal intended to help his country to maintain contact with, and interest in, the future and the affairs of Cyprus. Such objections, springing from the representatives of Greece in this Assembly and accompanied by such a misleading picture of the true facts and real intentions of these British proposals, can only go to prove once more that the real aim of Greece — and I say this with a heavy heart about a friend — is the acquisition of Cyprus and not the development of constitutional self-government in the island.

59. This is the root of the matter. What we are here confronted with is not a colonial issue. This is a straight, if disguised, bid for *enosis* — that is, for the union of Cyprus with Greece.

60. On 21 September I said, and I repeat here today, that my Government is most anxious to press forward with the development of self-government in Cyprus. I said that my Government was ready to resume discussion of the Cyprus question with the Greek and Turkish Governments at any time. I repeat — at any time we are ready to resume discussion. Our proposals stand, but we are ready to consider amendments or counter-proposals. I do not honestly see what more can be expected of us. I am only sorry that I heard no answering echo in the speeches either on 21 September or of today of representatives of Greece. Nor have I

heard of any response to my offer to resume discussion. On the contrary, the representatives of Greece have both ignored my offer and insisted upon pressing this item for debate in public in the United Nations.

61. The General Committee took the course of wisdom in deciding against inclusion, but today our Greek friends and colleagues seek to challenge that recommendation. I will not weary the Assembly with a repetition of all that I said two days ago about the dangerous precedents which the inclusion of this item would set. I will say only that the Assembly must not admit that Member States can use the United Nations to promote claims on a neighbour's territory or to set aside treaties to which they are parties. But what would be the consequences in this particular case of debating these inflammable issues in the United Nations? None of us can be in any doubt that tempers would run high. None of us can doubt that there would be a bitter debate. None of us can doubt that the debate would solidify existing differences, crystallize present positions and heighten existing tensions. Could this possibly help to produce a settlement? That is the problem. That is the sole and simple issue. That is the all-important question we must all decide.

62. The last thing which my Government wishes to do is to quarrel with an old friend and ally. Nothing is more painful. We want to settle this problem. We want to remove the only barrier between us — for I know of no other. We do not want to stifle freedom of discussion. All that we ask, in the name of statesmanship and wisdom, is a chance to settle this problem in peace, in calm, in quiet, to give time for reflection, to allow patient diplomacy and negotiation to play their essential parts.

63. For my part, I pledge solemnly, on behalf of my Government, an unremitting endeavour to work out a solution to this tangled, difficult and delicate issue. I appeal, therefore, to this Assembly to uphold the judgment and recommendation of its General Committee. I trust that I shall not appeal in vain.

64. Mr. SARPÉR (Turkey): Before I make my brief statement, I should like to mention just one point. During the course of his speech the Foreign Minister of Greece made a number of insinuations which are irrelevant to the subject under consideration. The subject is whether the item on Cyprus should or should not be included in the agenda — whether the General Assembly will accept the recommendation of the General Committee or not. That is the point. I do not propose to answer the Foreign Minister of Greece and thus turn this procedural debate into one of useless and harmful mutual recrimination.

65. The report of the General Committee which is now before this Assembly recommends the rejection of the item proposed by Greece on Cyprus. Last year when this item was proposed, my delegation, together with other delegations which held similar views, explained in detail the reasons for which it did not consider possible and advisable the inclusion of this item in the agenda. We stressed the fact that, according to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, the United Nations cannot intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. We expressed our concern over the dangerous precedent which might be created by the Assembly if it attempted to intervene in a matter which falls so clearly and indubitably outside its jurisdiction.

66. These two principles provide sufficient cause for not including this question in the agenda. But we also

submitted a number of other reasons based on the principles of international law and equity, as well as on political expediency, to clarify our stand further. The Greek claim is aimed at the transfer of sovereignty over the island of Cyprus from the United Kingdom to Greece. The boundaries between Turkey and Greece and the United Kingdom which this Greek claim would have revised, were freely negotiated and settled by mutual consent in the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. The revision of international treaties and of boundaries between States is not a matter which falls within the competence of the United Nations. On the contrary, respect for international treaties is one of the basic principles embodied in the Preamble of the United Nations Charter.

67. Despite this evidence, it has been claimed that the matter was one of a demand for the application of the principle of self-determination and that, therefore, the United Nations could be considered competent. In this procedural debate I do not propose to analyse either the general application of the principle of self-determination, or the validity of invoking the principle as a sufficient reason in itself for asking the intervention of the United Nations. Whatever position one may take on this issue, one thing is clear: the argument cannot be invoked in the case of Cyprus.

68. During the negotiations which led to the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne, discussions arose over the future status of Western Thrace, a province which had belonged to Turkey for many centuries and which had a predominantly Turkish population. Turkey asked at that time for the application of the principle of self-determination and for an internationally controlled plebiscite. Greece opposed this Turkish demand for self-determination, stating that the principle could not be applied to questions settled by international treaties. And now we are told that this same Treaty, in which the principle of self-determination was denied to Turkey by Greece in one of its provisions, should be modified in favour of Greece in another provision on the basis of the same principle, and that the United Nations is competent to effect such modification.

69. Apart from these considerations based on the principles of international law, my delegation also explained why, in its view, discussions on this matter would be contrary to the purposes of the United Nations, which must seek to foster friendly relations between nations. The setting up of boundaries in the region concerned has caused tragic bloodshed and bitterness in the past. It has taken several decades and the constant efforts of great statesmen, to create ties of friendship and co-operation between the interested parties. The repercussions of a needless debate within the United Nations could serve no other purpose but to disturb and jeopardize the maintenance of friendly relations in that region.

70. These were some of the points advanced by my delegation last year on the question of whether the item proposed by the Greek Government should or should not be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations — and this year there are additional factors against the opening of a debate on the Cyprus question.

71. First, a great number of representatives who last year voted in favour of the inclusion of the item in the agenda explained that, whatever might be their attitude on the substance of the case, they favoured allowing

any Member at least to present for a hearing any problem which it claimed to be of general interest, and thus to inform the General Assembly. May I submit to the representatives who so explained their attitude, that the Assembly has now been sufficiently informed, as the views of all the parties concerned have been brought to its attention during the last session and this one.

72. In the second place, we have before us this year a resolution (814 (IX)) adopted by an overwhelming majority, including Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, during the ninth session, which reads as follows:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Considering that, for the time being" — that famous phrase, "time being" — "it does not appear appropriate to adopt a resolution on the question of Cyprus," —*

and the following is the one and only operative paragraph of the resolution —

*"Decides not to consider further the item entitled 'Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus'."*

73. This is as clear and definite a text as ever was adopted by the United Nations. In our view, it stands for no qualification whatever or misinterpretation whatever in good faith.

74. It is true that all 50 representatives who voted in favour of this resolution did not give the same reasons in explanation of their attitude. But it is equally true that, among all such reasons invoked by various delegations last year in support of this resolution, there is not one which could validly be cited as a basis for favouring the reopening of the discussion on this matter this year.

75. Some delegations explained their vote on the basis that the decision was a procedural one, and that the United Nations was not competent in the matter in view of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

76. Other delegations explained their vote by stating that the matter was not one of self-determination, but that it consisted of a demand by one Member for the annexation of a territory belonging to another Member.

77. Still other delegations mentioned the fact that the consideration of this question would be tantamount to an intervention by the United Nations in the modification and revision of existing international treaties.

78. Yet another group of delegations sympathized with the general principles of the Greek demand, but for the time being conceded, for reasons of expediency, that the General Assembly should not consider further the so-called question of Cyprus.

79. It is the firm conviction of my delegation that, no matter what might have been the reasons invoked by different delegations for voting in favour of the resolution against consideration of the item last year, the same reasons should, to say the least, now equally impel those delegations to vote against the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

80. Moreover, the clarity and precision of the text of the resolution leaves no grounds for further discussions on this matter.

81. First, the resolution contains no indication that can be interpreted to admit the competence of the United Nations to deal with this question. On the contrary, the

explanations given at various stages of the debate by the delegation of New Zealand, which sponsored the original text of the resolution, as well as the statements made by a number of representatives, show clearly that the decision voted upon was a procedural decision, and that therefore it cannot be invoked to prove the competence of the United Nations in this matter.

82. It is interesting to note that this indisputable fact found its confirmation even in the Greek Parliament, in statements made by various representatives of the Greek people, during the debates which took place in that body after the United Nations decision last year.

83. The leader of one Greek party in the Parliament expressed particular concern over the fact that the Greek delegation had voted in favour of this resolution in which, according to him, the existence of the words "for the time being" cannot be interpreted to mean a recognition of United Nations competence.

84. Another very distinguished Greek statesman went further and explained that, if Greece desired to bring the question again to the attention of the United Nations, it would have to start its efforts from the very beginning, and that in addition Greece had now assumed a new obligation which it did not have last year, namely, the obligation to prove that the time and circumstances are at present favourable for a discussion of this matter. This, according to the Greek statesman, is a new burden of proof which now rests upon the Greek Government.

85. A second characteristic of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year is that, apart from not recognizing the competence of the United Nations in this matter, it precludes, both in letter and spirit, the interpretation advanced by Greece in its letter of 23 July 1955 [A/2920] that the question remains pending in the United Nations. There is certainly no part in this resolution to justify such an interpretation, and there exist no precedents in the United Nations which would permit the Greek delegation to substantiate this contention.

86. Now it has been claimed that the words "for the time being", which have been incorporated into the considerandum of the resolution, might allow the re-opening of discussions on this question if and when the Assembly is convinced that the present time is, in effect, appropriate for the adoption of a resolution.

87. My delegation cannot accept this argument, which was strongly refuted last year by many other delegations. But even if, for a moment, we were to admit that a change in circumstances would warrant a reversal of the decision taken after such careful consideration by the Assembly, it is the obligation of the Greek delegation to prove that the present time and circumstances are more appropriate for a resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly.

88. Can such proof be given to the Assembly this year? Are the present circumstances more appropriate than they were nine months ago when the Assembly made its decision?

89. The only elements of change which have been suggested to the consideration of the Assembly consist solely of changes in the Greek attitude itself. There are no changes in the positions of the United Kingdom or of Turkey in regard to the essence of the question. The Treaty obligations which bind all the parties concerned are still the same. The region of the eastern Mediterranean is still equally in need of stability, tranquillity and security. In fact, all the major elements which might

have prompted the Assembly not to consider this question nine months ago continue to exist today, except for those which are dependent on the attitude of Greece itself. These changes in the Greek attitude can be characterized by a hardening of the Greek position and by the use of certain methods, upon the details of which I do not propose to dwell at this stage.

90. In any case, can the change in the attitude of the demanding party be used as an argument by the same party to reopen discussions on a matter which the Assembly decided not to consider further?

91. I have briefly outlined our views on the situation which confronted us at the opening of this session of the General Assembly as regards the inclusion of the "Cyprus question" on the agenda.

92. And now may I submit to the Assembly's attention the importance and significance of the recommendation of the General Committee which stands before us?

93. Having carefully examined the Greek demand and having heard the parties concerned, the General Committee decided on 21 September with a clear majority of 7 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, to recommend the rejection of the request for inclusion of this item in the agenda. The General Committee is composed of high officers in whom the Assembly has shown great confidence by entrusting to them the responsibilities which they hold. Furthermore, the General Committee has always followed the tradition of not opposing the inclusion of an item in the agenda unless there are very strong and valid reasons which weigh against such inclusion. I am sure that the General Assembly will give its full consideration to the recommendation of the General Committee and to the reasons which motivated this course of action.

94. Indeed, both the resolution adopted last year by the General Assembly and the recommendation made this year by the General Committee are well in accordance with the provisions of the Charter as well as with the high purposes of the United Nations. One of the basic purposes of this Organization, embodied in the Preamble of the Charter, is to foster friendly relations among nations.

95. The Assembly is well aware of its responsibility in avoiding any course of action which, far from bringing any positive contribution, may add only discord and bitterness to this situation, which, unfortunately, has not been improved by the discussions at last year's session.

96. As I have already stated earlier, it has taken several decades and the efforts of many great statesmen to build up friendly ties among the parties concerned in this matter. Turkey, for its part, attaches great value to the continuation of these ties of friendship.

97. This fact was very recently stressed by the Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Adnan Menderes, in a speech delivered to the Grand National Assembly on 12 September 1955. Pointing out that Turkey has always considered and acted in recognition of the fact that an alliance between Turkey and Greece was a guarantee of their mutual existence, he declared that today too, in this dark and perilous phase of world history, he would like to proclaim to the world that Turkey's view in this respect remains unchanged.

98. Several speakers during last year's debate on whether or not this question should be included in the agenda, expressed their concern over possible harmful

effects of such discussions on the already aroused public opinion of the countries concerned.

99. My delegation is therefore confident that, having in view the high principles of equity and justice, bearing in mind the letter and spirit of the provisions of the Charter, conscious of its duty not to imperil peace and tranquillity in the region involved, fully aware of the true interests of the United Nations as well as of all the parties concerned, the General Assembly will pronounce itself against the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

100. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand): As the representative of Greece made a reference to the attitude of my delegation in the General Committee, I feel that I should give an explanation to the General Assembly of the position of my delegation in this matter.

101. As it is a purpose of the United Nations to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, my delegation considers that the General Assembly should be a forum to which the Member States, particularly the small Powers, should be able to submit for discussion any matter of international concern coming within the scope of the Charter.

102. As a result of a discussion of the question, what can the General Assembly do by way of recommendation, or what should the Assembly do? I indicated that the General Assembly should be careful not to contravene Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and that the function of the General Assembly was to bring about peaceful solutions to international problems and peaceful adjustments of situations submitted for its consideration. I indicated that in the first instance the concrete result that we could expect and desire, would be to bring the parties together into direct negotiation.

103. In this matter of the question of Cyprus, my delegation considered, in view of the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, to the effect that it is a purpose of the United Nations to "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," the item proposed by the delegation of Greece, when it was proposed for the first time last year, should be included in the agenda. My delegation then supported inclusion of the item in the agenda, both in the General Committee and in the General Assembly. Last year we considered that the Assembly was competent to discuss this matter, and we still consider that the Assembly is competent.

104. However, on the question of whether or not this item should be included in the agenda of the present session, my delegation submitted the view that a hearing was given last year to the delegation of Greece. What should we seek now? We should seek to bring the parties together into direct diplomatic negotiations. I do not know what else or what more the General Assembly could do at the present session, and as the representative of the United Kingdom has again declared the readiness of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to undertake these diplomatic negotiations, in the General Committee my delegation submitted that the appropriate course of action at the present stage would be to allow time for direct negotiations. This is our sincere belief, and, lest there should be any misunderstanding that the non-inclusion of this item on the agenda would mean its total or absolute rejection, we want to say further that that is not at all our implication. We stated explicitly in the General Committee that the United Na-

tions should continue to take an interest in this question. Certainly the delegation of Thailand will continue to be interested in the question.

105. In the General Committee, I read out a passage from rule 40 of the rules of procedure, and I said that the item should be included in the provisional agenda of a later session. I did not say the next session, I said at a later session, because we do not know how long a period should be allowed. Probably it may be the next session, but time should be allowed for direct negotiation.

106. I ask the delegation of Greece to believe that my delegation has considered this question in a friendly and sympathetic spirit. Thailand is not directly interested in the question, but as a member of the United Nations we came forward last year to support the delegation of Greece. Because my delegation agrees with the report of the General Committee that this item should not be included — I give my own interpretation — in the agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly, I think that the report of the General Committee should be adopted.

107. Mr. PUTRAMENT (Poland) (*translated from French*): My delegation has already had an opportunity at the 102nd meeting of the General Committee of stating its position on the inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly.

108. My delegation returns to this matter because it regards the General Committee's decision to exclude the item from our agenda as unjustified and in conflict with the just aspirations of the people of Cyprus to national freedom.

109. It has been maintained that the Cyprus question is one of domestic jurisdiction and reference has been made to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter to justify opposition to inclusion of this item in the agenda of the tenth session. There is no doubt, however, that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter is not applicable to the question which we are now discussing.

110. No one can deny that the Cyprus question is an international problem. For Cyprus, as for any other Non-Self-Governing Territory, the administering Power is required to fulfil the obligations laid down in Article 73 of the Charter; paragraph b of Article 73 imposes on administering Powers the obligation of administering territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government so as to "develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples" — I emphasize this passage particularly — "and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;"

111. In view of the political aspirations of the people — of which the results of the plebiscite held in Cyprus in January 1950 are a particularly eloquent expression — and in view of subsequent developments in Cyprus, it can be affirmed that the question of the fulfilment of the international obligations contained in the provisions of the Charter to which I have just referred is completely relevant at this time. The issue is the fulfilment of an obligation under the United Nations Charter and the General Assembly's competence cannot be denied. What is more, the Assembly is in duty bound to consider questions connected with the fulfilment of the provisions of the Charter.



112. Moreover, it is not only Article 73 b of the Charter that applies to this case; it also involves the observance of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which enjoins "respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples". I would also like to draw attention to resolution 637 (VII) of 16 December 1952, entitled "The right of peoples and nations to self-determination".

113. It is precisely for these reasons of principle that the Polish delegation once again urges on the Assembly the need to place the Cyprus question on the agenda of its tenth session. The Polish nation has the deepest sympathy for peoples who are fighting for their freedom and their right to self-determination. It has the deepest sympathy for the people of Cyprus, fighting courageously for the right to decide their own destiny. There can no longer be any foundation for the claim that the Cyprus question is a domestic affair, seeing that during the past year it has been discussed at two international conferences — the ninth session of the General Assembly and the London Conference, in which three sovereign States Members of the United Nations took part. By taking the initiative for, and participating in, a tripartite conference, the United Kingdom Government has itself acknowledged the international nature of the Cyprus question.

114. Not only is it an international question, but it also has all the characteristics of an international dispute, as is clearly shown by the differences which were a feature of the London Conference. We all know that the participants in the London Conference failed to reach agreement on the question; so in accordance with the spirit and letter of Chapter VI of the Charter, particularly Article 35, the question has now been brought to the attention of the General Assembly after the procedure laid down in Article 33, paragraph 1, had been followed without result. The General Assembly would be failing in its obligations if it refused to consider a question relating to the performance of international obligations under the Charter, a question which, to quote Article 34 of the Charter, "might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute".

115. For all these reasons, my delegation considers that the Cyprus question should be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, and that all Members should support such action.

116. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States will not address itself to the arguments on the substance of this question which have been made here today either by the representative of Greece or the representative of Turkey or the representative of the United Kingdom. The United States generally believes that matters of international concern should go on to the agenda of the General Assembly whenever there is reason to think that discussion will promote the purposes of the Charter. But debate in the United Nations of course is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end. Public debate is curative in many cases, but it cannot cure all problems any more than a certain medicine will cure all diseases.

117. The General Assembly should not allow itself to be used to defeat its own purposes. It is to be observed that Article 33, paragraph 1, of the Charter itself provides that in certain cases the parties to an international dispute should "first of all, seek a solution by negotiation . . . or other peaceful means".

118. The United States has given very careful consideration to the proposed inclusion again of the question of Cyprus in the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly at this time. Last year the United States was dubious about inclusion because we doubted that, as a practical matter, positive results could be achieved here. Therefore, we abstained on the question of inclusion. However, the General Assembly decided to proceed with the matter. But after the debate had taken place, the General Assembly last December concluded that it was not appropriate to adopt any resolution on the matter of Cyprus, and that it should not consider the item further.

119. The debate at that time was conducted in a spirit of relative moderation. Since then, the situation has become more inflamed. It seems to us that the considerations which actuated the General Assembly last December apply even more strongly now.

120. Let me say that a decision at this time not to accept the question of Cyprus for General Assembly debate would not mean that nothing will happen. It means rather that the matter can and will be dealt with under different and more auspicious conditions. There are occasions when quiet diplomacy is far more effective than public debate, and this seems to be one of those occasions.

121. The representatives of the United Kingdom have given assurances that they will actively pursue a programme which will afford the Cypriots a greater opportunity to attain their legitimate aspirations. Let me say, speaking for the United States, particularly to my Greek friends, that the United States pledges itself to continue an active interest in the Cyprus situation. We believe that developments in the general interest are more likely to occur if the General Assembly does not now take jurisdiction of the matter. We have come to this decision only after grave thought because the matter is one of great importance. It particularly concerns, in varying ways, three nations: the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, with each of which we have the closest ties. To make a decision which may be contrary to the desires of our Greek friends, to whom we feel so close, is particularly painful for us, following the tragic events which have recently occurred in Turkey. We feel, however, that we are taking the course of true friendship in seeking to avoid what we believe would in reality be a disservice to our Charter goals, both those relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories and those relating to the development of friendly relations among nations. For this reason, we shall now vote against inclusion of the question of Cyprus.

122. This is, of course, without prejudice to our right to support inclusion later if we think it would advance the purposes and principles of the Charter. However, as matters are, we believe it best now to follow the decision of the General Assembly itself of last December, namely that the General Assembly should not now consider the item further.

123. The primary purpose of the United Nations is to encourage in every possible way the peaceful settlement of international disputes. We do not believe that the inclusion of the Cyprus item in the agenda of the General Assembly at this time will contribute toward that end.

124. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has before it the Greek delegation's request for

the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of a question entitled "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus". I do not intend to discuss the substance of this question and shall confine my remarks to the procedural aspect of the matter relating to the inclusion of this question in the agenda.

125. This question was included in the agenda of the last session of the General Assembly. However we know that it was not settled. The new Greek request is based on the fact that the situation on the island of Cyprus as compared with last year has not only failed to improve but, on the contrary, continues to deteriorate, and relations between the States concerned are becoming increasingly strained. The United Nations therefore cannot disregard the situation.

126. For these reasons the USSR delegation supports the proposal that the item, submitted the Greek delegation, should be included in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly and examined carefully.

127. Mr. MENON (India): I should like to state the position of my delegation in regard to the report that has come to the General Assembly recommending that this item be not inscribed.

128. I wish to state at the outset that our Government does not consider that the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter are applicable to this item. We believe that the General Assembly is competent to discuss this. It is not a matter to which this provision applies and, even if it were, that would not be a bar to its discussion. As I have stated on a number of occasions in the General Committee, there are two considerations in the placing of an item on the agenda: first of all, whether the Assembly has competence and, secondly, if it has competence, whether it is desirable and in the interests of the purposes of the Charter and the immediate settlement of an issue to discuss it.

129. So far as we are concerned, the first question is not in doubt, that the Assembly has total competence. In regard to all issues of this kind — such as Algeria or Morocco — the position that has been taken by our delegation is that in bringing these matters before the General Assembly we are not asking for intervention in the sense of enforcement action, but calling upon the parties to enter into negotiations in order to bring about a settlement.

130. We have today heard the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom. It takes this matter much further than it has ever been taken before. That is to say, it is an undertaking before this Assembly that the Government of the United Kingdom will use its best endeavours to pursue negotiations and unremittingly strive to bring about a settlement.

131. It is also necessary to state our view about the parties involved in this. We heard from this rostrum just a while ago that there were three principal parties involved: the British, the Greeks, and the Turks. We respectfully disagree. The main party involved is the Cypriot nation. The Cypriots are not Greeks or Turks; they are Cypriots. So far as we are concerned, they are a nation — a nation entitled to full self-government and independence. We would therefore regard as a solution of this problem the establishment of independence in these islands, and the end of colonial rule. That is not assisted at the present moment by making this an issue

between two or three rival parties, none of whom has spoken about the independence of these people, but who have spoken mainly in terms of their rival claims and of the strategic importance or otherwise of these islands.

132. We support the demands of the Cypriot people for their right to full independence and for the establishment of an independent nation. But we do not think in the present circumstances, when negotiations have been proceeding, and when there is violence in the area, and when this undertaking has been given to carry on negotiations and bring about a settlement in a peaceful manner, that the purposes of the Charter and the prospects of a settlement would be advanced by public debate in this Assembly. We shall not, therefore, in the circumstances, vote against the recommendation of the General Committee.

133. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on the issue of the inclusion of an item on Cyprus on the agenda, and to make our position quite clear. To do so, I make the following observations.

134. First, my country maintains the friendliest relations with our neighbour and ally, Turkey, and with our ally, the United Kingdom, as well as with our old friend, the Kingdom of Greece. Thus the decision which we make will be based entirely on our conviction of what is in the best interests of Cyprus and of the area as a whole.

135. Second, we do not share the view of those who claim that this item should not be dealt with by the General Assembly of the United Nations, it being an interference in the internal jurisdiction of the United Kingdom. We believe that the General Assembly can deal with the issue, if it is necessary, in accordance with Article 10 and Article 35, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

136. Third, my delegation believes that the principle of self-determination is one of the paramount principles of the Charter to which we wholeheartedly adhere and to which all people are entitled. We do not debate the right of any people to self-determination. Leaving these observations aside, I wish to make some additional observations.

137. In the first place, the harmony and security of the Middle East requires that the question of Cyprus should be dealt with and settled in a friendly diplomatic way between the parties concerned. Secondly, the United Kingdom has already taken the initiative of calling for a meeting of the States concerned and it is still ready to do so again. We have just heard that assurance from the representative of the United Kingdom. Thus, the diplomatic channel is fortunately open and it could very well be used. Thirdly, supposing this item was inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly this year, what could the General Assembly advise or recommend other than to have the parties concerned meet in a friendly manner and find a peaceful solution? If that meeting is already possible and if all parties concerned can come together and handle the matter with cool nerves, goodwill, patience and a friendly spirit, we do not see any reason why the Assembly should deal with the issue at this session. That is why we cannot support the inclusion of the item at this session, and we will support the recommendation of the General Committee.

138. Mr. STEPHANOPOULOS (Greece) (*translated from French*): I should like to reply very briefly to certain arguments put forward by the United Kingdom and Turkish representatives, in order to remove any possible confusion and explain the situation better

to representatives, so that they can decide in full knowledge of the facts on our application to have this item placed on the agenda.

139. The United Kingdom representative has explained what the Tripartite Conference in London was, and has referred to what he described as the offer of a liberal government; at the same time, he has expressed surprise that my colleague Mr. Melas, the day before yesterday, and myself today, should have felt that that offer did not meet our wishes. There is no cause for surprise. What is the position? What does this offer of a liberal government amount to? When we speak of a liberal government we mean a government in which administrative and government matters are managed by the representatives of the people. But what do we find in the United Kingdom Government's plan? We find a Tripartite Commission set up in London representing Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom and this Commission, in London, can intervene in the management of affairs by the representatives of the Cypriot people. I ask you: does a Tripartite Commission of this kind, a Commission made up of members of other Governments, intervening in the administration of affairs by Cypriot representatives, really constitute a liberal government? Is that a democratic constitution?

140. We have asked, even to our detriment — because, I repeat, we are members of this Commission — that the democratic principle should be respected fully, that is, that as soon as you give Cypriots the right to have elected representatives, through whom they manage their governmental and administrative affairs, you should leave them full responsibility, without intervening, without raising obstacles, and without bringing in other Governments, because unless you do so every democratic principle goes by the board.

141. This is what we ask. When a democratic solution is mentioned be sure that the democratic principle of free election is safeguarded and do not try to abolish it by other means. That is precisely what I wish to explain to this Assembly. That is why we said, and repeat, that this so-called liberal government of Cyprus is merely a diluted and completely undemocratic substitute. As my colleague Mr. Melas said on 21 September, at the 102nd meeting of the General Committee, it is not a constructive solution.

142. The United Kingdom representative says that the solution of questions such as the one we wish to bring before this Assembly is not to be sought here, but through diplomatic consultations and conferences, as in the past, and that a solution will be found by such means, in peace and quiet. But what is the position? What are we asking here and what did we find in London? Here, we have come to ask what only the Assembly can grant, the Cypriot people's right to self-determination. And in London, what were we offered? Only a free government. But on the main question which concerns us, and the Members of this Assembly, that is, the question of self-determination, the representatives of the British Government only said they were not prepared to consider it. That is why we have turned to the Members of this Assembly, because, in view of the negative attitude of the United Kingdom Government, only they have the power, and even the duty under the terms of the Charter which they have signed, to grant this right to the Cypriot people.

143. Since we have been placed in this dilemma I might ask the representative of the United Kingdom,

since he insists, why does he not arrange a Conference to settle the question amicably? I should like to place this question squarely before the United Kingdom representative: Is he prepared, in London, at a conference, to discuss and to grant this right of self-determination to the Cypriot people? If so, I am prepared on behalf of my Government immediately to withdraw our request for the Cyprus question to be placed on the agenda; but I am certain that this assurance will never be given.

144. That is the reason why the duty of this Assembly becomes immediately apparent, the duty of ensuring the right of self-determination to all peoples, great and small. We have said, and I repeat, that we are asking nothing for ourselves. We have explained the request of the Cypriot people because they could not come here themselves to ask for a right which the Assembly have already recognized to other peoples. We ask nothing, I repeat. We do not ask annexation, but we state that we shall respect the results, whatever they may be, whether against Greece, against annexation, if the right is exercised in a democratic and liberal manner.

145. That is why I am in full agreement with the Indian representative who took exactly the same line, that it is the Cypriot people who should be given the right to decide in the first place. Alone the Assembly can see that they are given that right. After that, their fate and future will be decided by themselves.

146. That is the Greek Government's contention, and I repeat, will never be recognized by any diplomatic conference. On the contrary, it will be denied to us, as it was in London. That is why we have turned to the United Nations.

147. The Turkish representative, Mr. Sarper, has again referred to the Treaty of Lausanne. But I should like to ask him: Was the Cypriot people a contracting party to the Treaty of Lausanne? For it is the Cypriot people's right of self-determination which is at stake here. Can the signatures of the high contracting parties to the Treaty of Lausanne bind the Cypriot people and, at the same time, deliver them up to perpetual colonial domination?

148. I do not think we have the right to decide this question; we have no right to talk of undertakings when the Cypriot people itself has given no undertaking. The Treaty was signed by all the other interested parties, but not by the Cypriot people; this people now wishes to decide its own fate; it is claiming its rights. I repeat, that since the Cypriot people did not sign the Treaty, it is not bound by it.

149. I said I would be brief and I should now like to conclude by examining this appeal to wisdom. The General Committee's decision was a wise one. We always impute the quality of prudence to all its compromise solutions and say that what our Assembly needs is prudence, restraint and moderation. We know something about moderation for it was in the Acropolis that moderation was born. Naturally we try, as far as possible, to practice moderation in all things, in all fields of our public, social and private life.

150. But quite outside those fields, outside all such principles, lies the field of freedom. If the Greeks had thought of moderation in 1940, in the face of fascism and nazi aggression, they could have found a way to compound with the fascist enemy. But the Greeks did not do so because freedom was at stake and because prudence should never apply in such cases.



151. In the problem before us it is that very principle of liberty which is at issue. We must reject any solution of prudence and go straight to the generous solution which is to grant the Cypriot people the right of self-determination, the right to which the Member States put their signature in the United Nations Charter. If the Members of this Assembly do not do that, if they yield to counsels of moderation and prudence, it will be very difficult subsequently to explain their decision to this little nation and very difficult to impose respect for this organization on the conscience of nations.

152. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): The subject of our debate at the moment is the application of one of the fundamental principles on which our Charter is based, one which is passing from a mere written precept of the Charter into a reality in the life of nations, namely, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. A request is being made for the application of this principle, which has meant so much to the prestige of the United Nations, to a practical case, the case of Cyprus. Unfortunately, I represent a very small and very weak country, as far as political, military and economic strength is concerned, but I represent a social and human group of enough strength of heart and mind to uphold principles above all the political and strategic expedients of the moment.

153. It has been argued here that it is not advisable for the time being, to allow Cyprus to exercise this right, the basic reason being the strategic position in the world of today. I know full well that the United Kingdom is a great country, a country which has spread its culture to the four corners of the earth. I know that we owe to the United Kingdom many of the rights enjoyed in modern times, and that without its resistance and the heroic part it played in the last war, we would not enjoy the benefits of this World Organization. I also know that we of the Latin American countries especially, owe the greatness in our lives to the immense, glorious and generous part played by the United States of America. Our group of small nations really owes the maintenance of its freedom and independence to this great nation, because with all its power it has never in recent times tried to domineer over these small countries but has always treated them as equals.

154. Yet, despite all this, in the case in point, we must also recognize that at this time the course that is being followed betrays an indescribable strategic blindness, and that just as the great and powerful countries are entitled to uphold their interests and advantages here, the small countries are entitled to uphold the great interest and the great advantage of maintaining the principles of universal law.

155. It is the voice of one of the small countries which is raised now in opposition to the will of all the powerful ones, to say that it is essential that justice should be done to the claim of these people, and that Cyprus should be told that the United Nations was not prevaricating when it said that there would be self-determination, and that it will be put into practice. As we have just heard the Greek representative say, what would be the effect in the world of a refusal by this great body where all disputes should have a hearing and where all countries should be able to bring their problems without fear of anyone, as true, simple and unequivocal democracy requires? What would these countries say if at this time, when a plea is made for the application of the principle of self-determination,

the reply was no, that for strategic reasons, for reasons of expedience and tranquillity, to give opportunity for further study, the subject should be postponed, from last year to this and from this year to next and from the next to eternity?

156. No, if the Latin American countries had sought their freedom not through arms, but through the principle of self-determination, they too would have been told: it is impossible at this point in world strategy, when the Holy Alliance is passing through such difficult times, you must wait. We could have waited a hundred years and not be free yet, if it had not been for rebellion and force of arms.

157. This is precisely what we want to avoid here, and as the Greek representative has said, of these two methods, force and the United Nations, recourse is being made to the noble, the great, the civilized method of law, of discussion, of understanding, and yet the reply is made: no, this would cause bitterness. Instead of something truly useful emerging from this discussion, something evil and confusing will come out. Why is this same concept not applied to all the problems of the cold war? Have we not heard here in the United Nations tremendous debates between the United States of America and the Soviet Union? Have we not heard other tremendous discussions? And what has come out of them? Ideas have been clarified. These debates like storms have helped to clear the air, to calm passions and to open the hearts of men.

158. We of democratic convictions are not afraid of public discussion and I find it extraordinary that it should be the very teachers of democracy, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and other similarly illustrious countries, which are now saying that it is impossible to debate this matter here, so that we can all understand it, so that the whole world can understand it, so that it can be discussed clearly and openly in this forum to which this type of problem should come, but that it should be dealt with through — they say — diplomatic channels, which are the most opportune and the most appropriate. These diplomatic channels serve precisely to postpone, to delay, to cast into the limbo of time and memory great problems which require immediate solutions.

159. We have already seen what a failure these diplomatic channels have been at the London Conference. What came out of the London Conference? In the end, a complete breakdown, with violence in Cyprus, in Turkey and in parts of Greece. What was the final conclusion? Nothing at all, so far. So the problem comes here, to the United Nations and my reply to the United Kingdom representative who asked, "Is this the proper time to deal with this matter in the United Nations?" is "Yes, this is the proper time to deal with it, and to deal with it calmly, to deal with it nobly, without Greece insulting Turkey or Turkey insulting Greece, or the United Kingdom taking advantage of its great military, economic, and intellectual might and its influence throughout the world, to treat those two Powers with contumely. No. It is time for us to agree, as we did in so many other problems which seemed insoluble but in the end were settled. The Korean armistice, for example, the most tremendous, the most difficult, the most bloody of all problems. And after it had been debated with extraordinary vehemence, in the end minds became clear, men spoke and the guns were silent, an armistice was concluded which, whether good or ill, still holds good and a great many lives have been saved.



160. My answer to the great British nation's first question is that this is the proper time to deal with this problem; but to deal with it with calm, integrity and courage, eschewing insults and references to the historic past which serve merely to inflame passions.

161. His second question was: whether diplomatic channels might not be more advisable than open debate in the United Nations. I think I have already answered this. What is the United Nations to become? Is it to become, as one representative said, just a group of close friends, a club? No, this is a gathering of nations, an opposition of interests, a violent clash of interests and positions, and it is essential that problems should be brought here, should be studied and discussed and a way found to solve them, or to let time and circumstances solve them gradually. So to the second question I say that these are the most proper channels, and that the reason why the United Nations was born was the need for a universal forum in which the claims of all countries, just or unjust, opportune or inopportune, should be heard, studied and settled, so that the stony path of mankind could be made a little smoother.

162. Further, I must remind this Assembly of what the Secretary-General has constantly maintained in his reports and in his requests. Gentlemen: make real use of the United Nations; don't hold these conferences and make these treaties outside the United Nations, because in so doing you will weaken the content, the meaning and the value of the United Nations. The Secretary-General was very right to call our attention to this; every effort should be made to hold these conferences, whether of the Big Four or the Little Four, within the United Nations, and whether it be a major or a minor problem that is brought here for consideration in the light of the interests and ideas of all the 60 countries here which represent, though incompletely, the will of all nations.

163. The Secretary-General was quite right to ask us, to urge us to bring all these problems to the United Nations. He is here now and he should say: It is true, this problem too should be brought here, it too should be discussed. The question is to find a formula, to reach a proper and adequate solution.

164. Why evade discussion? It might well happen that in the end, when it came to a debate, I should be against whatever resolution was proposed. But the problem has been discussed and stated. Why close the door to debate? Why reject an honest, an honourable, proposal from a people which longs to enjoy liberty?

165. Gentlemen, I address myself to your hearts even more than to your minds, to ask you if we can close the door to a little country which brings us the United Nations Charter, and says to us: "Is it true or is it false, what you have written here?" For these reasons the delegation of Ecuador will vote in favour of the inclusion of the item, and against the recommendation of the General Committee.

166. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Representatives are entitled to explain their votes after the voting. If the Assembly agrees, we shall now proceed to the vote. The United Kingdom representative has asked for a roll-call vote.

167. The vote is being taken on the General Committee's recommendation [A/2980, para. 4] that item I of the supplementary list [A/2942] entitled "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of

peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus" should not be included in the agenda.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*New Zealand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, France, Honduras, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

*Against:* Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Lebanon, Mexico.

*Abstaining:* Philippines, Burma, China, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel.

*The recommendation of the General Committee was adopted by 28 votes to 22, with 10 abstentions.*

168. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala): Article 34 of the Charter of the United Nations refers to: "Any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute". It also contains the words "to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security".

169. Article 35, paragraph 1, says "Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council, or of the General Assembly".

170. The Guatemalan delegation considers that in accordance with these precepts, any member of the United Nations is entitled to propose the inclusion of an item in the agenda of the General Assembly, and that if the proposed item relates to an international dispute or a situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, the General Assembly should approve its inclusion.

171. In the view of my delegation, the question raised by Greece is a typical case of an international dispute and also of a situation which not only may lead to international friction, but has already done so.

172. According to Article 1 of the Charter, 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, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

173. The Guatemalan delegation further considers that if, in order to settle an international dispute by peaceful means, one of the parties to it should see fit to refer it to the General Assembly for consideration, this right should not be restrained by the Assembly or by any of its organs. Any restriction of that right would imply a contradiction of the very purposes which inspired the inclusion in the Charter of the principle of the peaceful settlement of conflicts or disputes of this kind.

174. Moreover, these standards and arguments based on legal interpretation merely reflect the spirit of the Charter, to the effect that any country irrespective of

its size or strength, may, in certain circumstances, as the wisest course, refer its problems to the United Nations, on an equal footing and with a view to safeguarding peace and seeking a fair solution.

175. For these reasons, and without prejudice to the substance of the question or to the attitude which my delegation might have taken if the substantive problem had been discussed, the Guatemalan delegation voted against the General Committee's recommendation and in favour of the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

176. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): The Philippine delegation voted last year for the inclusion of this item in the agenda. I do not need to repeat here the stand which my delegation took on the substance of the question and to which my delegation still adheres.

177. After exhaustive debate, in which the Philippines made its modest contribution, the General Assembly adopted resolution 814 (IX) dated 17 December 1954 by a vote of 55 votes to none, with 4 abstentions. The Philippines joined with Greece and Turkey in voting for the resolution, which considered "that, for the time being, it does not appear appropriate to adopt a resolution on the question of Cyprus".

178. In the view of my delegation, the question posed by the recommendation of the General Committee for the non-inscription of the Cyprus question on the agenda of the present session is whether or not the appropriate time has arrived for the General Assembly to be seized of the problem.

179. Recently, there have been outbreaks of violence not only in Cyprus but outside the Island. It is not for my delegation to fix responsibility for these regrettable incidents which have exacted their toll of human life, but in common with the great majority, if not all, of the delegations represented here, my delegation fervently hopes that serenity and calm will be restored, not only for the sake of the noble people of Cyprus, but in order to maintain harmony and friendship between the parties and contribute to the peace of an important area of the world. Perhaps this is an indication that the appropriate time has not yet arrived for another full-dress debate by the General Assembly on the issues involved.

180. In voting last year for the General Assembly resolution which postponed consideration of the Cyprus question, my delegation believed, and it still believes, in the virtue of negotiations between the parties directly concerned. Fortunately, the door to further negotiations has not been closed. While the London Conference did not succeed, it cannot be said that the exploratory talks which took place did not serve a useful purpose. My delegation dare not abandon the hope that a further attempt between the parties to compose their differences will be more fruitful.

181. If my delegation abstained on the inclusion of the item in the agenda at this time, it is, let me assure the Assembly, in order to encourage an atmosphere which would lend itself to amicable settlement which is recommended by the Charter and which is a goal to which we all aspire.

182. At the same time, my delegation does not concede that the Cyprus problem is outside the competence of the United Nations or that the principle of self-determination enshrined in the Charter has no validity in any particular area of the world. My delegation reserves its position pending the result of further negotiations between the parties.

183. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation has just voted against the General Committee's recommendation and in favour of the inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda of the tenth session. The vote we have just cast means that the Bolivian delegation is adhering to the principle it has always upheld, that our Organization cannot refrain from hearing, analysing and discussing subjects affecting the aspirations and desires of nations when these aspirations and desires are brought before the United Nations in accordance with the purposes laid down in the Charter concerning respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

184. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): Before giving a brief explanation of my vote, I should begin by saying how painful it is for me to take a decision which requires me to choose between things which I love very dearly and spiritual ties deeply rooted in my being. I am a most ardent admirer of the Greek people. If it were possible for me to sum up their history in two words, I should say that Greece is the light of the past and the symbol of heroism in the present. I wish to express my deep affection for the people of Cyprus; and also for the Turkish minority of Cyprus, because it too is endowed with human rights which we must respect. I cannot forget the historic bonds between Latin America and Great Britain which stood at our side during the epic struggle for our independence; and I should also avail myself of this opportunity to express, as other Latin American representatives have done with an eloquence that I do not command, my profound attachment to the principle of self-determination, adding this further thought: the principle of self-determination is an integral part of us; it is flesh of our flesh, blood of our blood and soul of our soul. America's independence grew out of a movement for self-determination. Furthermore, the principle of self-determination is part of international law because it was formulated, defined, proclaimed and applied in Latin American independence.

185. Now you will understand, since this is my position, how painful it is for me to have to cast a vote when that vote will apparently be in contradiction of the principle of self-determination. Fortunately, this contradiction is only apparent. At this stage my delegation would have preferred a clear-cut proposal to postpone the question on the two grounds mentioned, that the moment was inopportune and that caution was advisable. You know well, as I have stated repeatedly and as I say again now, that justice demands prudence, that often a just intention carried out imprudently becomes an injustice. Prudence regulates every virtue, and particularly the good results of every just intention.

186. Two considerations have been mentioned. The first consideration is that it would not be wise to aggravate the situation and the second that negotiations might be instituted and, therefore, as this has been the trend of the debate, I must interpret the General Committee's recommendation clearly to mean, first, that the Committee has not taken a decision upon the General Assembly's competence, which is not affected or compromised in the slightest. In voting upon the Committee's recommendation, the Assembly is not prejudging its competence in respect of the principles of self-determination in any way. Secondly, in view of the trend of the discussion, to which I have already referred, reasons have been adduced to justify the necessity of bringing about a calm atmosphere in order to prevent

the problem from being aggravated by any increase in emotional tension, and, there is a final reason which carries much weight. To be specific, why are we endeavouring to create a calm atmosphere? For purposes of negotiation, and negotiation, according to the Charter, is the most effective method — even more effective than a moral decision of the General Assembly, notwithstanding its great moral force — of solving the problem.

187. We are confronted with a fact that has impressed me profoundly. The United Kingdom representative, with all his authority, has offered to renew negotiations and he has done so reaffirming his proposal, communicating it to the representative of Greece and announcing it from this rostrum as a firm moral commitment of the most solemn kind.

188. For these reasons, considering that the Committee's recommendation merely signifies a postponement which in no way prejudices the question of competence, for the purpose and in the hope of creating a calm atmosphere, expressing the fervent wish that the negotiations will be held in accordance with the principles of the Charter and that the ties of friendship will be strengthened between these nations which fought side by side in the great struggle for freedom; for these reasons, my delegation cast its vote as it did.

189. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma): At the ninth session, the Burmese delegation voted in favour of the inclusion of this item, both in the General Committee and in the General Assembly. In so doing, we were adhering to the principle that the General Assembly should not arbitrarily shut out discussion of an item

relating to a matter of international concern proposed by a Member State, unless its consideration is clearly and unmistakably barred by the Charter.

190. We still stand by this general principle. But principles, however valid in themselves, cannot be applied blindly and indiscriminately and without reference to surrounding factors. Last year, we were not convinced, in spite of all that was said on the subject, that the discussion of the item might be harmful. Indeed, we thought that the airing of the problem might be beneficial and perhaps even fruitful. But the situation has changed this year. Having heard the speeches in the General Committee and in this Assembly, and taking into account recent developments elsewhere, we feel that a discussion of the item during this session would serve no useful purpose.

191. On this ground, and on this ground alone, and without in any way compromising the general principle to which I have referred, my delegation abstained in the vote. This vote should therefore in no way be regarded as limiting or restricting our freedom of action in the future. If and when this matter should be raised at a future session, my delegation considers itself free to take such action as it may deem appropriate in the circumstances obtaining at that time.

192. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): No other representative has asked to explain his vote, we have therefore finished the discussion of paragraph 4 of the report.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*