

a complete and effective cease-fire and a prompt withdrawal of armed personnel to the positions held by them before 5 August 1965, as called for in its resolutions 209 (1965) of 4 September, 210 (1965) of 6 September, 211 (1965) of 20 September and 214 (1965) of 27 September 1965,

"1. *Reaffirms* its resolution 211 (1965) in all its parts;

"2. *Requests* the Governments of India and Pakistan to co-operate towards a full implementation of paragraph 1 of resolution 211 (1965); calls upon them to instruct their armed personnel to co-operate with the United Nations and cease all military activity; and insists that there be an end to violations of the cease-fire;

"3. *Demands* the prompt and unconditional execution of the proposal already agreed to in principle by the Governments of India and Pakistan that their representatives meet with a suitable representative of the Secretary-General, to be appointed without delay after consultation with both parties, for the purpose of formulating an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties; urges that such a meeting shall take place as soon as possible and that such a plan contain a time-limit on its implementation; and requests the Secretary-General to report on the progress achieved in this respect within three weeks of the adoption of the present resolution;

"4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit for its consideration as soon as possible a report on compliance with the present resolution."

#### COMPLAINT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS

**Decision** of 4 March 1964 (1102nd meeting):

- (i) *Calling upon all Member States to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in Cyprus or to endanger international peace;*
- (ii) *Asking the Government of Cyprus, in accordance with its responsibilities to take all additional measures necessary to stop violence and bloodshed in Cyprus, and call upon the communities in Cyprus and their leaders to act with the utmost restraint;*
- (iii) *Recommending the creation of a United Nations force, to preserve international peace and security, to prevent a recurrence of fighting and to contribute to the restoration of law and order; the Commander of the force shall be appointed by the Secretary-General who should keep the contributing Governments fully informed and who should report periodically to the Security Council of its operation;*
- (iv) *Recommending that the stationing of the force shall be for a period of three months, all costs pertaining to it being met in a manner to be agreed upon by the Governments providing the contingents and by the Government of Cyprus;*
- (v) *Recommending further, that the Secretary-General designate in agreement with the Government of Cyprus and the Governments of Turkey and the United Kingdom, a mediator who should use his best endeavours with the representatives of the communities and the above-mentioned Governments for the pur-*

*pose of promoting a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting Cyprus; and further to provide funds for the remuneration and expenses of the mediator and his staff*

By letter<sup>64</sup> dated 15 February 1964, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Council that internal security in Cyprus had seriously deteriorated and that tension between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities had risen sharply, culminating in a serious act of violence in the town of Limassol on 12 February 1964. An early meeting of the Council was therefore requested to consider the matter and to take appropriate steps to ensure that the dangerous situation which then prevailed could be resolved with a full regard to the rights and responsibilities of both of the Cypriot communities, of the Government of Cyprus and of the Governments party to the Treaty of Guarantee.

It was recalled that in a letter<sup>65</sup> dated 8 January 1964, the Government of the United Kingdom had informed the Council on the steps it had taken within the spirit of the Charter and in close co-operation with the Governments of Turkey and Greece to avoid bloodshed and to promote a solution of the problems arising from the outbreak of intercommunal disturbances in Cyprus. It was further recalled that in that letter, reference was also made to the holding of a conference to resolve the difficulties which had arisen and to the joint request on the part of the Governments of the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to appoint a representative to act as a United Nations observer in Cyprus, whose role would be to observe the progress of the peace-making operation and to report to the Secretary-General. Noting that the Agreements leading to the establishment of Cyprus as an independent Republic provided *inter alia* for a special relationship between Cyprus and the Governments of the United Kingdom, of Greece and of Turkey and for a Treaty of Alliance between Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, the letter then called attention to the fact that after a request by the Government of Cyprus that the troops stationed there be used to assist in the preservation of the cease-fire, and the restoration of peace "had been met", it became clear that an augmented force would be required if conditions of internal security were to be restored. Although the United Kingdom Government had consulted with the Government of Cyprus and the Governments of Greece and Turkey and a number of other Governments "about the need to associate the forces of other nations in an international peace-keeping arrangement on the island", it could not be effected owing to the inability of the Government of Cyprus to agree to the proposed arrangement.

In a letter<sup>66</sup> dated 15 February 1964, the Government of Cyprus referred to its complaint against the Government of Turkey<sup>67</sup> of which the Council had been seized, and called attention to "the increasing threat from war preparations on the coast of Turkey opposite Cyprus coupled with the declared intentions of the Turkish Government to interfere by force in

<sup>64</sup> S/5543, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 66-67.

<sup>65</sup> S/5508, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 16-18.

<sup>66</sup> S/5545, *ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

<sup>67</sup> S/5488, O.R., 18th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1963, pp. 112-114.

Cyprus" which had made the danger of the invasion of the island both obvious and imminent. It further called attention to the continuing deployment of the Turkish unit within Cyprus in violation of the Treaty of Alliance and the sovereignty of that country as well as to the new dangers posed by the collapse of the London Conference. In the light of those developments and in the vital interest of the people of Cyprus as a whole, an urgent meeting of the Security Council was requested under rule 3 of the provisional rules of procedure in order to consider the matter and to take appropriate measures under the relevant articles of the Charter.

At the 1094th meeting on 17 February 1964, the Council decided<sup>68</sup> without vote to include as sub-items<sup>69</sup> (a) and (b) respectively in its agenda.

"(a) Letter dated 15 February 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5543);

"(b) Letter dated 15 February 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5545).

The question was considered by the Council at the 1094th to 1103rd meetings from 17 February to 4 March 1964.

At the 1094th meeting on 17 February 1964, after the Council decided<sup>70</sup> to invite the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece to participate in the discussion, the representative of Norway proposed under rule 33 of the rules of procedure that the meeting be adjourned until three o'clock the following afternoon in order to allow an opportunity for contact between the parties directly concerned and other members of the Council.<sup>71</sup>

At the 1095th meeting on 18 February 1964, the representative of the USSR, noting that the President (Brazil) had called upon the representative of the United Kingdom as the first speaker on his list, drew attention to the formulation of the item on the agenda and to the fact that the Council had simply "resumed consideration of a matter which it had already discussed at its 1085th meeting in December 1963", and suggested that the "right to speak first should naturally be given to the country which appealed to the Security Council" to protect it from threats to its independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty.<sup>72</sup>

After an extended procedural discussion on the criterion for determination of the order in which representatives might address the Council, the President, in accordance with rule 27<sup>73</sup> of the provisional rules of procedure called upon the representative of the United Kingdom as the first speaker.<sup>74</sup>

In his statement before the Council, the representative of the United Kingdom explained the circumstances through which his Government had come to be so closely involved in the recent developments in

Cyprus and why it had undertaken such a major role in a matter "which, on the surface appears to lie solely between the two Cypriot communities". Continuing, he gave the historical and legal background to the United Kingdom's intervention described as the events and incidents leading up to the present deterioration of the situation. He further outlined the position of his Government regarding a solution of the situation and suggested that, while it might be somewhat premature to introduce a draft resolution at that stage, any draft resolution that eventually might be submitted "should contain endorsement by the Council of the appeal which the Secretary-General has already made; it should call on the parties concerned, including the guarantor Powers and in consultation with the Secretary-General, to secure the establishment of an effective peace-keeping force as soon as possible;<sup>75</sup> it should also provide in appropriate form for agreement to be reached on the designation of an impartial mediator who may assist the parties in achieving an agreed settlement".<sup>76</sup>

In his opening remarks, the representative of Cyprus\* suggested that the sudden intercommunal fighting and other recent events in which the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Cyprus had been violated were but "symptoms of other causes". Before appealing to the Council, however, his Government, in accordance with its Charter obligations, had explored other possibilities for a solution of the problem and had even agreed to participate in the London Conference in an effort to negotiate a new political settlement. But even while the Conference was in progress the threat of aggression continued and, on more than one occasion, Cyprus was made to understand that if it did not give way on particular points, the talks might break down with a Turkish invasion of Cyprus as the result. That Conference had failed, however, either to bring about a political settlement or to secure agreements on the question of an international force which Cyprus felt should be under the control of the Security Council, as "the only appropriate international organ for the purpose". Moreover, Cyprus had even offered to agree with the other parties both on the composition as well as on the other terms of reference of the force prior to putting the question before the Security Council, in order to facilitate the task of the Council and to expedite the procedure. The representative further stated that his Government's position on the matter was that the terms of reference of the force should include not only internal peace-keeping and the restoration of law and order, but also the protection of the independence and territorial integrity of the State from any outside aggression. With the breakdown of the London Conference on this issue, Cyprus then decided to request the Council to proceed with the examination of its complaint, particularly in the light of the renewed threats of aggression. Having submitted the matter to the Council, his Government stood ready for discussions both on the political solution of the problem and its peace-keeping aspects within the framework of the United Nations. He emphasized, however, that the sovereignty and complete independence of Cyprus was not negotiable: "These are the very things we call upon the Security Council to safeguard and to protect."<sup>77</sup>

<sup>75</sup> For discussion concerning the establishment of a United Nations Peace-keeping force in Cyprus, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>76</sup> 1095th meeting, paras. 33-94. See also chapter V, Case 2, and chapter X, Case 8.

<sup>77</sup> 1095th meeting: paras. 97-145.

<sup>68</sup> 1094th meeting: p. 1.

<sup>69</sup> These fell under the item:

"Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5488):

<sup>70</sup> 1094th meeting, para. 1.

<sup>71</sup> 1094th meeting: paras. 4-5.

<sup>72</sup> 1095th meeting: paras. 4-12.

<sup>73</sup> For discussion concerning this rule see chapter 1, Case 37. See also chapter II, part III, Case 1.

<sup>74</sup> 1095th meeting: para. 32.

At the same meeting, the representative of Turkey \* drew the attention of the members of the Council to the views of Dr. Fazil Küçük, Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus,<sup>78</sup> concerning the constitutionality of the request by the Government of Cyprus for a meeting of the Council, and the composition of the delegation which was claiming to represent Cyprus and requesting "that a representative of the Turkish community of Cyprus should equally be given the right to present its case to this Council at an appropriate time during the debate".<sup>79</sup> The representative then reminded the Council of previous allegations made by Cyprus concerning the threat of imminent attack from Turkey which never materialized and were never substantiated. He recalled also that the Council on previous occasions "did not even discuss the allegations of the Cypriot delegation because there was nothing to discuss; no proposals were made and no decisions were taken". He then contended that the principal reason why an urgent meeting of the Council was requested by Cyprus in December 1963 was to divert world attention from the atrocities committed by "Greek Cypriot terrorist bands" against Turkish Cypriots. After drawing attention to recent activities against the Turkish community, he suggested that the root of the problem lay in the fact that the Government of Cyprus not only sought to repudiate international treaties by which it was bound, but also refused to implement fundamental provisions of the Constitution and even implied in a number of statements that Archbishop Makarios "was looking for the first opportunity . . . to do away with the basic articles". When a memorandum putting forward thirteen proposals to this effect had been rejected by the Turkish Cypriot community and by Turkey, a campaign to terrorize the Turkish community and subjugate it by violent means was mounted by the Greek Cypriot press and radio broadcasts. This culminated in the clashes of 21 December 1963. From the outset, the Turkish Government did all in its power to put an end to the intercommunal fighting but that did not prevent the continued campaign against the Turkish Cypriots. Turkey had therefore come to the Council with full confidence in its sense of equity and responsibility. It felt that the Council could be most useful if members would avoid injecting into the debate inflammatory or extraneous matter or making a "cold-war issue" of the situation. At the same time since the Council was bound by the principles of the Charter which demanded respect for obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law, it should show scrupulous care in respecting treaty rights and obligations.<sup>80</sup>

The representative of Greece \* asserted that his Government had from the beginning taken a firm stand in favour of moderation and peaceful action and had deplored all acts of violence and excesses that gave rise to further violence. While his Government had favoured the establishment of an international force and had entered into negotiations to that effect, nevertheless, it had maintained that such a force should be placed under the auspices of the United Nations. Turning to the right of intervention claimed by certain powers he expressed the view that the exercise of such

a right did not serve the interest it professed to defend or the wider interest of the international community. It was therefore understandable that Cyprus "having thus been threatened and disappointed" should turn to the United Nations and the Security Council in search of assistance.<sup>81</sup>

At the same meeting the representative of Cyprus \* drew the attention of the Council to a statement made by a member of the Turkish Government that the only long term solution to the problem was the separation of the two communities in a federal state and that if the Council was unable to find a solution the result would " 'almost certainly' be a full-scale intercommunal war in which Turkey would be 'forced to intervene' ".<sup>82</sup>

At the 1096th meeting on 19 February 1964, the representative of the USSR observed that the tension which had arisen in Cyprus had been fostered from the outside and was being used for interference in its internal affairs by certain Powers. Such interference had in turn created a threat to the freedom, integrity and independence of Cyprus. He asserted that the events relating to Cyprus did not concern Cyprus alone, but impinged upon the interest of all peace-loving peoples and the basic principles of international relations. That meant that it was therefore the responsibility of the Council to take urgent measures to protect the Republic of Cyprus from aggression, prohibit any foreign intervention in its internal affairs and assure respect for its sovereignty, freedom and independence in accordance with the purpose and basic provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>83</sup>

At the same meeting the representative of the United States reminded the Council that its most urgent business was the restoration of order and communal tranquillity in Cyprus before new violence broke out. He reiterated his Government's willingness to participate in a peace-keeping force, but only on the request of all interested parties and urged the Council to come to an agreement on the establishment of such a force. "This may require that we introduce into these consultations an expert in the peace-keeping field of recognized impartiality and stature. No one better fills such a requirement than the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We therefore recommend that the Council appeal to the parties concerned, in consultation with the Secretary-General, to move ahead quickly in working out such arrangements."<sup>84</sup>

At the 1097th meeting of 25 February 1964 the Secretary-General made a statement in which he offered certain points of clarification particularly with regard to his own role in the situation under consideration.<sup>85</sup> After the Secretary-General had spoken the President called attention to a letter<sup>86</sup> dated 19 February 1964 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Turkey and suggested that since there were already a number of speakers on the list, consideration of that letter be deferred until a later stage.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>81</sup> 1095th meeting: paras. 236-242.

<sup>82</sup> 1095th meeting: para. 259.

<sup>83</sup> 1096th meeting: paras. 12-20, 44-56. For discussion of this question in terms of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, see chapter XII, Case 2.

<sup>84</sup> 1096th meeting, paras. 66-81. See also chapter X, Case 8.

<sup>85</sup> 1097th meeting: paras. 3-9. For the statement of the Secretary-General see chapter I, Case 22.

<sup>86</sup> S/5556, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 76-77.

<sup>87</sup> 1097th meeting: para. 8.

<sup>78</sup> S/5491, O.R., 18th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1963, pp. 114-115. S/5551, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 72-73.

<sup>79</sup> 1095th meeting: para. 157. See discussion at 1099th meeting, p. 111 below.

<sup>80</sup> 1095th meeting: paras. 157-221.

The representative of Norway observed that it was not for the Council to pronounce upon the Constitution of a Member State nor pass judgement on a set of treaties which were negotiated as an integral part of the whole process of granting independence to that State. At the same time he maintained that the immediate objective of the Council should be to prevent the situation in Cyprus from deteriorating and to restore peaceful conditions in that country and he felt that a peace force would have a very important effect in that connexion. His delegation also favoured the appointment of an impartial mediator and endorsed the proposal that the parties avail themselves of the assistance of the Secretary-General to work out the necessary arrangements.<sup>88</sup>

At the same meeting the representative of the Ivory Coast commented that the situation in Cyprus was not without analogy to the problems of "the Congo" where decisions taken in a certain state of confusion had led to a complication internally and internationally of a situation of strife and mutiny, which doubtless would otherwise have been less disastrous and tragic. He urged that the Council immediately put an end to the "massacre" and supported the appeal for peace launched by the Secretary-General, and the establishment of a peace force as requested by certain members. He felt, however, that that force, once constituted "should be under the effective direction of the Secretary-General."<sup>89</sup>

The representative of Cyprus \* expressed his Government's deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for agreeing to send to Cyprus his personal representative, General Gyani, as well as for the mission undertaken by Mr. Rolz-Bennett.<sup>90</sup>

At the 1098th meeting on 27 February 1964, the President called attention to the communication<sup>91</sup> mentioned earlier from the representative of Turkey requesting an opportunity for Mr. Denktas to address the Security Council as the representative of the Turkish Cypriot community, one of the interested parties in the question. The representative of the USSR observed that there was no need for the Council to grant a hearing to anyone else from Cyprus.<sup>92</sup>

After a procedural discussion<sup>93</sup> on the applicability of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to the request under consideration, the Council adopted<sup>94</sup> a proposal by the representative of Morocco that, under rule 39, Mr. Rauf Denktas be invited to make a statement before it.

At the 1099th meeting on 28 February 1964, after the representative of the USSR<sup>95</sup> had queried the terminology used by the representative of Turkey in referring to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus as "the representative of the Greek Cypriots",<sup>96</sup> the President called upon Mr. Denktas to make a statement before the Council.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>88</sup> 1097th meeting: paras. 39-45.

<sup>89</sup> 1097th meeting: paras. 62-81.

<sup>90</sup> 1097th meeting: para. 135.

<sup>91</sup> S/5556, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 76-77.

<sup>92</sup> 1098th meeting: paras. 3-6.

<sup>93</sup> For discussion on rule 39, see chapter III, Case 6.

<sup>94</sup> 1098th meeting: para. 61.

<sup>95</sup> 1099th meeting: paras. 15-22.

<sup>96</sup> See chapter III, Case 6.

<sup>97</sup> 1099th meeting: paras. 42-90. After recounting a number of Greek Cypriot atrocities against the Turkish community Mr. Denktas asked whether the Council would "adopt a resolution which will leave us completely at the mercy of

At the 1100th meeting on 2 March 1964, the President (China) called attention to a draft resolution<sup>98</sup> jointly submitted by the representatives of Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway. In introducing the draft resolution, the representative of Brazil, after explaining the objectives of the various provisions, expressed his confidence that the draft resolution once approved could contribute substantially to bringing about the conditions required for a thorough review of all the issues involved in the Cyprus situation.<sup>99</sup>

At the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964, the representative of the USSR outlined his position on the draft resolution in general, and called attention to operative paragraph 4 concerning the procedure "for settling matters relating to the composition, size and command of the United Nations Force" which would in practice lead to bypassing the Security Council. Thereupon he requested that a separate vote be taken on that paragraph on which he intended to abstain. He further reserved the right of his Government to request a meeting of the Security Council for a review of its decision to send a force to Cyprus even before the three months expired "if those forces are used, not for the strengthening of the security and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, but for some other purpose conflicting with that aim".<sup>100</sup>

Before the vote was taken on the paragraph in question, the Secretary-General, noting that the draft resolution would call upon the Secretary-General to undertake certain responsibilities, expressed his views on the nature and exercise of these responsibilities as he saw them.<sup>101</sup>

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by eight in favour, none against, with three abstentions.<sup>102</sup> The draft resolution was adopted<sup>103</sup> unanimously. It read as follows:<sup>104</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting that the present situation with regard to Cyprus is likely to threaten international peace and security and may further deteriorate unless additional measures are promptly taken to maintain peace and to seek out a durable solution,*

*"Considering the positions taken by the parties in relation to the treaties signed at Nicosia on 16 August 1960,*

*"Having in mind the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and in particular its Article 2, paragraph 4, which reads:*

*"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations,"*

these people". He expressed the fear that should the Council adopt a resolution to send a United Nations force to Cyprus for three months, that decision would be interpreted as rendering invalid the Treaty of Guarantee and after the force had departed the Cyprus Government would defy the guarantor Powers in the name of that resolution.

<sup>98</sup> 1100th meeting: para. 4.

<sup>99</sup> 1100th meeting: paras. 5-19.

<sup>100</sup> 1102nd meeting: paras. 6-15. For discussion of this question, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>101</sup> 1102nd meeting: paras. 20-25. For the statement of the Secretary-General, see chapter I, Case 23.

<sup>102</sup> 1102nd meeting: para. 27.

<sup>103</sup> 1102nd meeting: para. 28.

<sup>104</sup> S/RES/186 (1964), O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, pp. 2-4.

"1. *Calls upon* all Member States, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in the sovereign Republic of Cyprus, or to endanger international peace;

"2. *Asks* the Government of Cyprus, which has the responsibility for the maintenance and restoration of law and order, to take all additional measures necessary to stop violence and bloodshed in Cyprus;

"3. *Calls upon* the communities in Cyprus and their leaders to act with the utmost restraint;

"4. *Recommends* the creation, with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, of a United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus. The composition and size of the Force shall be established by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The commander of the Force shall be appointed by the Secretary-General and report to him. The Secretary-General, who shall keep the Governments providing the Force fully informed, shall report periodically to the Security Council on its operation;

"5. *Recommends* that the function of the Force should be, in the interest of preserving international peace and security, to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions;

"6. *Recommends* that the stationing of the Force shall be for a period of three months, all costs pertaining to it being met, in a manner to be agreed upon by them, by the Governments providing the contingents and by the Government of Cyprus. The Secretary-General may also accept voluntary contributions for that purpose;

"7. *Recommends further* that the Secretary-General designate, in agreement with the Government of Cyprus and the Governments of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, a mediator, who shall use his best endeavours with the representatives of the communities and also with the aforesaid four Governments, for the purpose of promoting a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting Cyprus, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, having in mind the well-being of the people of Cyprus as a whole and the preservation of international peace and security. The mediator shall report periodically to the Secretary-General on his efforts;

"8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide, from funds of the United Nations, as appropriate, for the remuneration and expenses of the mediator and his staff."

**Decision of 13 March 1964 (1103rd meeting):**

- (i) *Reaffirming its call upon all Member States in conformity with their obligations under the Charter, to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in Cyprus, or to endanger international peace;*
- (ii) *Requesting the Secretary-General to press on with his efforts to implement the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 and re-*

*quests Member States to co-operate with the Security Council to that end*

In a letter<sup>105</sup> dated 13 March 1964, the representative of Cyprus "in accordance with Articles 34, 35 and 39, and also Article 1, paragraph 1, Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, and Article 24, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Charter, and further to the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 4 March 1964 (S/5575)", requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the threat of an imminent invasion of Cyprus by Turkish forces and to take appropriate measures under the relevant provisions of the Charter for the purpose of averting this danger and safeguarding the political independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus.<sup>106</sup>

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the Council decided without objection to include the question in its agenda,<sup>107</sup> and in accordance with previous decisions invited the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece to participate in the discussion.<sup>108</sup>

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964 the Secretary-General, after referring to his recent report<sup>109</sup> to the Council on developments concerning the establishment of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, stated that "the Force will be established without further delay and that elements of it will soon be deployed in Cyprus". The Secretary-General then called attention to a communication<sup>110</sup> from the Government of Turkey describing "the massacre perpetrated by the Greek Cypriot terrorist organization against the Turkish community in violation of human rights and in the proportions of genocide", and expressing Turkey's intention by virtue of the right conferred upon it under article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee "to take appropriate action", if the Greek Cypriot leaders did not put an end to the atrocities, and establish law and order in the island. Turkey intended to dispatch to Cyprus forces which would strengthen the existing three-Power peace-keeping force in the island, and while the force would be entrusted with the "exclusive task" of putting an end to the massacres, it would operate until the United Nations Peace-keeping Force envisaged in the Security Council resolution of 4 March could effectively perform the functions entrusted to it, and would refrain from violating the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus. In reply<sup>111</sup> to that letter, the Secretary-General appealed to the Government of Turkey "to reconsider most urgently the decision announced in your message to me", and to refrain from any action which might worsen the situation in Cyprus and in addition pose "the gravest risks", to international peace and security.<sup>112</sup>

At the same meeting after the representatives of Cyprus,<sup>113</sup> Turkey<sup>114</sup> and Greece<sup>115</sup> had given an

<sup>105</sup> S/5598. *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, p. 140.

<sup>106</sup> For discussion of this question see chapter XII, Case 2.

<sup>107</sup> 1103rd meeting: para. 1.

<sup>108</sup> 1103rd meeting: para. 1.

<sup>109</sup> S 5593, and Add. 1-3, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 125-133.

<sup>110</sup> S/5596, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 135-139.

<sup>111</sup> S/5600, *ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

<sup>112</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 4-6. For the statement of the Secretary-General, see chapter I, Case 24.

<sup>113</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 7-51.

<sup>114</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 53-70.

<sup>115</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 153-155.

account of the latest developments in the area and the positions of their respective Governments with regard to the situation, the representative of Brazil introduced a draft resolution jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway,<sup>116</sup> whereby the Council would reaffirm its call upon all Member States to refrain from any action likely to worsen the situation, and would request the Secretary-General to press on with his efforts to implement the Council's resolution of 4 March.<sup>117</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was unanimously adopted.<sup>118</sup> It read as follows:<sup>119</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having heard the statements of the representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey,*

*"Reaffirming its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964,*

*"Being deeply concerned over developments in the area,*

*"Noting the progress reported by the Secretary-General in regard to the establishment of a United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus,*

*"Noting the assurance from the Secretary-General that the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus envisaged in resolution 186 (1964) is about to be established and that advance elements of that Force are already en route to Cyprus,*

*"1. Reaffirms its call upon all Member States, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to refrain from any action or threat of action likely to worsen the situation in the sovereign Republic of Cyprus, or to endanger international peace;*

*"2. Requests the Secretary-General to press on with his efforts to implement Security Council resolution 186 (1964), and requests Member States to co-operate with the Secretary-General to that end."*

**Decision of 20 June 1964 (1139th meeting):**

(i) *Reaffirming its resolutions 186 (1964) and 187 (1964);*

(ii) *Extending the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for an additional period of three months ending 26 September 1964*

On 15 June 1964, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council his first report<sup>120</sup> on the United Nations operations in Cyprus for the period 26 April to 8 June 1964, which was considered by the Council at the 1136th to 1139th meetings between 18 and 20 June 1964. The representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece were invited<sup>121</sup> to participate in the discussion.

At the 1136th meeting on 18 June 1964 after a procedural discussion of the order in which invited representatives should be called upon to speak,<sup>122</sup> the representative of Turkey\* observed that if as his Government had understood it, the United Nations Force was to use its "best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting", one of the first things it had to do

was to see to it that the warring communities do not arm themselves in order to resume fighting. However, there had been some question as to whether the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus had, under existing resolutions of the Security Council, the authority to prevent the importation of arms into the island. His Government had always maintained that the United Nations Force was not only fully authorized to stop such deliveries, but was duty bound to do so. It was therefore to be hoped that during the discussion attention would be directed to the interpretation of the existing resolutions to empower the United Nations organs to act energetically in dealing with that matter which carried the seeds of an explosive situation. Furthermore, while his delegation hoped "that the present session of the Council will throw light on the true intentions of this body and will thus empower the Secretary-General to carry out his difficult task with more effectiveness", the report of the Secretary-General was bound to cause "disappointment and misgivings" both in his country and in all circles interested in arriving at a peaceful solution. The whole tenor of the report was discouraging inasmuch as it failed to give any indication as to what was understood by the term "law and order" mentioned in resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March which in his view could only emanate from the Constitution of Cyprus. The first duty of the United Nations Force should therefore be to establish as far as possible the rule of law under the Constitution. However, the report made no mention of the Constitution whatsoever.<sup>123</sup>

The representative of Cyprus\* recalled that the report had concluded that "The recurrent threats of a landing by Turkish military forces in Cyprus impede the efforts of the United Nations to restore normal conditions and to prevent fighting on the island of Cyprus" and that "such threats serve as well to make the Turkish Cypriot leadership less amenable to the acceptance of arrangements designed to contribute to a return to normality in the island". He then asserted that the sole purpose for which the Security Council adopted its resolution of 13 March was to deter the projected invasion by Turkey, who was bent on pursuing its plan of partition and of destroying the State itself. He suggested further that the main obstacle to the return to normality was a lack of freedom of movement in certain parts of the island where "Turkish terrorists" were in control of certain roads, in accordance with their plans for division and partition. Cyprus, however, was one and indivisible and the effective authority of the Government should be established over the whole territory. He further stated that "it is in this direction that the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus can, and should, render a more active assistance".<sup>124</sup>

At the 1137th meeting on 19 June 1964, before calling on the first speaker on his list, the President (Ivory Coast) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution<sup>125</sup> submitted jointly by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway.<sup>126</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Greece,\* after commenting on certain developments in Cyprus, noted that while requesting the Security Council to prolong the mandate of the United Nations Force in Cyprus, it should be recognized that the Force could

<sup>116</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 95-96.

<sup>117</sup> 1103rd meeting: para. 95.

<sup>118</sup> 1103rd meeting: para. 156.

<sup>119</sup> S/RES/187 (1964). O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, p. 4.

<sup>120</sup> S/5764 and Corr.1, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1964, pp. 211-244.

<sup>121</sup> 1136th meeting: para. 1.

<sup>122</sup> For a discussion of the issues raised on this point, see chapter I, Case 35.

<sup>123</sup> 1136th meeting: paras. 77, 98-100.

<sup>124</sup> 1136th meeting: paras. 127, 130, 137, 225-228.

<sup>125</sup> S/5776, 1137th meeting: para. 2.

<sup>126</sup> 1137th meeting: para. 2.

not remain there indefinitely and that a political solution could not be deferred until it had left. He stated further that his Government deplored the fact that no progress had so far been made toward a political solution.<sup>127</sup>

Speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, the representative of Brazil stated that the basic consideration behind the submission of the draft resolution was the request by the Secretary-General that the United Nations Peace Force be maintained for an additional period of three months with the same terms of reference.<sup>128</sup> He then recalled that the Secretary-General had clearly indicated that the presence of the United Nations Force in Cyprus was advisable and useful in order to prevent the recurrence of fighting, to permit the maintenance and restoration of law and order and to promote the return to normal conditions in the area, and reminded the Council that its resolution of 4 March 1964 under which the United Nations Force was created and a Mediator appointed, was the result of a very lengthy process of negotiations and reflected a "delicate balance". It was for that reason that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution considered it advisable simply to reaffirm the previous resolutions of the Council without trying to single out any specific issue in the complex question under consideration.<sup>129</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom drew attention to the urgency of the matter under consideration and suggested that if the Council decided to accept the advice of the Secretary-General and to approve the five-Power draft resolution, it would be highly desirable for the Council to act quickly, thereby enabling the Secretary-General and others concerned with the provision of contingents and the arrangements for financing, to take the necessary practical and legal steps to carry out the resolution.<sup>130</sup>

At the 1138th meeting on 19 June 1964, the representative of Brazil, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution submitted a revised text<sup>131</sup> which included a new operative paragraph calling upon all Member States to comply with "the above-mentioned resolutions". He explained that the objective of that revision was to emphasize the responsibilities and the commitments which fell upon all Member States under the resolutions already approved by the Council.<sup>132</sup>

After a procedural discussion concerning the inscription of the list of speakers,<sup>133</sup> the representative of the USSR called attention to the functions of the United Nations Force in Cyprus outlined in the Council's resolution of 4 March and reiterated his Government's objection to any enlargement of those functions.<sup>134</sup> Similar reservations were expressed by the representative of Czechoslovakia.<sup>135</sup>

At the 1139th meeting on 20 June 1964 the draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>136</sup> It read as follows:<sup>137</sup>

<sup>127</sup> 1137th meeting: paras. 41 and 45.

<sup>128</sup> For decisions concerning the prolongation of the mandate of the Force, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>129</sup> 1137th meeting: paras. 58-60.

<sup>130</sup> 1137th meeting: para. 77.

<sup>131</sup> S/5776/Rev.2. Same text as S/5778, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1964, pp. 254-255.

<sup>132</sup> 1138th meeting: paras. 3 and 4.

<sup>133</sup> For a discussion of this question, see chapter I, Case 36.

<sup>134</sup> 1138th meeting: paras. 45-46, 48-51. See also chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>135</sup> 1139th meeting: para. 13.

<sup>136</sup> 1139th meeting: para. 21.

<sup>137</sup> S/RES/192 (1964). O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, p. 5.

"The Security Council,

"Noting that the report of the Secretary-General considers the maintenance in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, created by Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, for an additional period of three months to be useful and advisable,

"Expressing its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964,

"Expressing its deep appreciation to the States that have contributed troops, police, supplies and financial support for the implementation of resolution 186 (1964),

"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 186 (1964) and 187 (1964);

"2. Calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions;

"3. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;

"4. Extends the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for an additional period of three months, ending 26 September 1964."

**Decision of 9 August 1964 (1143rd meeting):**

*Appeal by the President to the Government of Turkey to cease instantly the bombardment and the use of military force of any kind against Cyprus and to the Government of Cyprus to order armed forces under its control to cease firing immediately*

**Decision of 9 August 1964 (1143rd meeting):**

- (i) *Reaffirming the appeal by the President to the Governments of Turkey and Cyprus;*
- (ii) *Calling for an immediate cease-fire by all concerned;*
- (iii) *Calling upon all concerned to co-operate fully with the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in the restoration of peace and security, and upon all States to refrain from any action that might exacerbate the situation or contribute to the broadening of hostilities*

**Decision of 11 August 1964 (1143rd meeting) statement by the President:**

- (i) *Asking all Governments to stop all flights over the territory of Cyprus in violation of its sovereignty;*
- (ii) *Requesting the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus to supervise the cease-fire and to reinforce its units in the zones which were the sphere of recent military operations so as to ensure the safety of the inhabitants*

By letter<sup>138</sup> dated 8 August 1964, the representative of Turkey requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the serious situation created in Cyprus by the renewed and continuing attempts of the Greek Cypriots to subdue by force of arms the Turkish community in Cyprus in order to perpetuate the usurpation of government by the Greek community.

<sup>138</sup> S/5859, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. July-Sept. 1964, p. 144.

By letter<sup>139</sup> dated 8 August 1964, the representative of Cyprus requested "in accordance with Articles 34, 35 and 39 and also 1 (1), 2 (2), 2 (4), and 24 (1) of the United Nations Charter and further to resolutions S/5575,<sup>140</sup> S/5603<sup>141</sup> and S/5778<sup>142</sup> adopted by the Security Council on 4 and 13 March 1964 and 20 June 1964, respectively" an emergency meeting of the Security Council "in view of the deliberate and unprovoked armed air attacks against the unarmed civilian population of Cyprus, carried out by airplanes of the Turkish Air Force in the hours immediately preceding the submission of this request, and which are still continuing". It was stated further that the Security Council would be called upon to put an end to "the armed Turkish aggression against the Republic of Cyprus", thereby discharging its basic responsibility for the restoration of international peace and punishment of the aggressors.

At the 1142nd meeting on 8 August 1964 the Council adopted<sup>143</sup> the agenda after the representative of the USSR had waived his objection on the understanding that adoption of the agenda would not prejudice the order in which the questions raised in the subparagraphs of the provisional agenda were taken up nor any procedure which the Council might subsequently adopt in discussing them.<sup>144</sup>

The question was considered by the Council at its 1142nd to 1143rd meetings between 8 and 9/11 August 1964. At the 1142nd meeting after the President (Norway) had presented<sup>145</sup> to the Council information he had received from the Secretary-General on the latest developments in Cyprus, the representatives of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus were invited<sup>146</sup> to participate in the discussion.

At the same meeting after a procedural debate on the order of discussion of the items on the agenda<sup>147</sup> and the order in which invited representatives might be called upon to speak,<sup>148</sup> the Council rejected,<sup>149</sup> by a vote of 4 to 3 with 4 abstentions, a proposal by the representative of the USSR that the representative of Cyprus be heard as the first speaker.

Upon the suggestion by the representative of Bolivia,<sup>150</sup> however, the representative of Cyprus was permitted to make a brief statement on information which he had received from his Government on the latest developments in Cyprus.

The representative of Cyprus \* stated that according to a telephone message he had just received, six Turkish warships were heading for Cyprus for the purpose of invasion and were being followed by another twenty-six warships and troopships "for the purpose of aggression against Cyprus and invasion of the island, and within one hour they will be landed there". In the light of such developments he thought it fitting to inform the Security Council of the situation so that the Council could decide "whether it will not proceed with

the consideration of this imminent danger" which threatened Cyprus and which might bring about a world war.<sup>151</sup>

The representative of Turkey \* recounted certain atrocities which he said were being committed by the Government of Archbishop Makarios against the Turkish community for the purpose of destroying or subduing that community. He cited certain military preparations that were being undertaken by "Greek Cypriot bands" with the obvious objective of unleashing a major offensive in an area where the besieged Turkish community had its only access to the sea. Despite assurances given by "Makarios himself" that no such action would be undertaken, the Greek Cypriots unleashed offensives on various points of the island, and certain Turkish Cypriot positions were under fire from the sea where they faced the prospect of a landing by the Greek Cypriots. Under the threat of such imminent dangers and having nowhere to turn for protection but to Turkey, the Turkish Government could not "ignore such a humane and legitimate call". Moreover, his Government did not fail to approach the other guarantor Powers and the Commander of the United Nations Force in order to enlist their aid in stopping the onslaught. It was also in that connexion that a meeting of the Security Council had been requested. "Nevertheless, the criminal attacks have continued unabated, even in spite of the warning flights effected yesterday . . . In these circumstances the Turkish Government has been compelled to stop the flow of reinforcements by bombing from the air the road used for the purpose of bringing them in. This action undertaken by Turkish aircraft is directed exclusively at military targets and constitutes a limited police action taken in legitimate self defence." The Council was thus requested to consider what urgent measures could be taken to put a stop to the Greek Cypriot aggression which was threatening the peace in the area. In that connexion, he suggested several measures that might be undertaken in order to reduce the existing supply of arms and personnel in Cyprus. These included the placing of entry points to Cyprus under effective control by a committee<sup>152</sup> composed of representatives of Turkey, Greece and the countries contributing troops to the United Nations Force, and the subjecting of both sides to a gradual and controlled disarmament.<sup>153</sup>

The representative of Cyprus \* denied that the Greek Government forces had started the attack or that his Government was responsible for the current situation. He recalled that while the representative of Turkey had disputed his statement about an imminent invasion he had not denied that warships were heading for Cyprus for that purpose and suggested that the Council should note that it was after Turkey had appealed to the Council that it had dispatched its aircraft into Cyprus. In that connexion, he wondered whether such conduct accorded with the obligations of Members under the Charter, which had ruled out warfare and had abolished the rule of force and suggested that if the Council did not take the decision it should on the question of the "airplane aggression" against Cyprus then "the Charter of the United Nations and the whole Organization would become meaningless".<sup>154</sup>

<sup>139</sup> S/5861, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964*, pp. 145-146.

<sup>140</sup> S/RES/186 (1964).

<sup>141</sup> S/RES/187 (1964).

<sup>142</sup> S/RES/192 (1964).

<sup>143</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 3.

<sup>144</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 2-3. See also chapter II, Case 1.

<sup>145</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 4-6.

<sup>146</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 7.

<sup>147</sup> See chapter II, Case 1.

<sup>148</sup> See chapter I, Case 37 and chapter III, part III, footnote 18 to introductory note.

<sup>149</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 46.

<sup>150</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 52. See also chapter III, Case 11.

<sup>151</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 54.

<sup>152</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 82.

<sup>153</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 59-63, 66-69, 80-83.

<sup>154</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 87, 90, 91, 113.



At the same meeting the representative of Greece \* noted that it was the fifth time that Cyprus had appealed to the Security Council requesting that an end be put to the aggression by Turkey. "This time we are not dealing with a threat. We are in the presence of an indisputable act of aggression." Moreover, so long as the threat of invasion persisted, there could be no hope for the restoration of peace in Cyprus. Besides, "hope of an invasion" led the Turkish Cypriots to arm themselves in order to facilitate invasion if it came and conversely the threat of invasion caused the Greek Cypriots to arm themselves in order to avert the danger.<sup>155</sup>

The representative of France reminded the Council that in spite of "some restoration of calm", the situation in Cyprus remained explosive and urged that the Council add its authority to the efforts of the United Nations Force and its Commander to prevent a resumption of the fighting. He urged further that an appeal be made to the parties to co-operate with the steps taken by the United Nations to bring about a peaceful solution and to "stop jeopardizing" the efforts of the Mediator in that regard.<sup>156</sup>

At the proposal of the President, the meeting was adjourned for the purpose of consultation among the members and interested parties in regard to the procedure to be followed at the resumed meeting.<sup>157</sup>

At a resumed 1142nd meeting on 9 August 1964, the President (Norway) announced that it had not been possible to arrive at a consensus during the informal consultations which had taken place owing to certain difficulties in communications experienced by some parties. He then suggested that in the meantime the Secretary-General would prepare and present to the Council an urgent report on the latest development in Cyprus so that when it reconvened, the Council might deal more rapidly and effectively with the situation in the light of all available information. Members were requested to remain available for an early meeting to be determined by the availability of the Secretary-General's report and the termination of the communication difficulties complained of.

At the 1143rd meeting on 9 August 1964, the Secretary-General explained that a report consisting of information which the Commander of the United Nations Force had been able to verify was being urgently compiled and would be circulated among the members of the Council as soon as it was ready.<sup>158</sup>

The representative of the Ivory Coast while awaiting the report of the Secretary-General before taking a position in the debate, proposed that as in the cases of Panama and Cuba in which certain provisional measures were taken, the President should be authorized to appeal to Turkey "to put an end forthwith to the bombardment of Cyprus and suspend all military measures against Cyprus, and to call on the Government of Cyprus at once to order an immediate cease-fire pending the adoption by the Council of a final decision on the matter".<sup>159</sup>

The Council decided<sup>160</sup> without objection to adopt the proposal of the representative of the Ivory Coast, which was formulated by the President as follows:<sup>161</sup>

"To the Government of Turkey: to cease instantly the bombardment and use of military force of any kind against Cyprus; to the Government of Cyprus: to direct the armed forces under its control to cease fire immediately."

At the same meeting, the representative of Greece \* stated that "on the Greek Cypriot side all hostility came to an end last night at nine o'clock, Cyprus time, that is at 3 p.m. New York time . . . Despite this fact, Turkish aircraft . . . returned to Cyprus today and Greek Cypriots are being fired on from the Turkish Cypriot side". He warned that if the appeal just addressed to Turkey was not heeded and "if the action of the Turkish Air Force continues beyond three o'clock this afternoon, New York time, Greece will assist Cyprus with its air force and with every military means at its disposal".<sup>162</sup>

The representative of the United States asserted that the responsibility of the Council was to stop the hostilities "and until all are stopped none will stop". He suggested that an appeal for a cease-fire was the swiftest action the Council could take and introduced a draft resolution<sup>163</sup> jointly submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States under which the Council would endorse and reaffirm the President's appeal and call upon all concerned to co-operate fully with the United Nations Force and on all others to refrain from any action likely to exacerbate the existing situation.<sup>164</sup>

At the same meeting the representative of Cyprus, \* recalling that the President had appealed to the Government of Turkey to cease instantly the bombardment and the use of military force of any kind against Cyprus, expressed his astonishment that it had been left out and suggested that "the gist" of the President's appeal should be put into the draft resolution if its other provisions were to be effective.<sup>165</sup>

That suggestion was followed by other proposals for changes in the joint draft resolution. The representative of Czechoslovakia remarked that in his appeal the President "made a distinction between the external aggression on the part of Turkey and the operations carried out by the Government of Cyprus in the exercise of its right of self-defence". That distinction, he felt, should be reflected in the draft resolution under consideration.<sup>166</sup>

The representative of the United States declared that in view of the criticisms that the draft resolution was not identical with the language of the President's appeal his delegation was prepared to repeat that appeal in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. He explained, however, that the draft resolution was "not just a reaffirmation of that appeal". It was designed, *inter alia*, to make clear that the Council wanted a cease-fire by all concerned, including elements under the control of either Government.<sup>167</sup>

The representative of Bolivia, on the other hand, noting that the draft resolution might be interpreted as implying that the debate had been concluded since it made no reference to the report of the Secretary-General which was still awaited, proposed the addition of a preambular paragraph to wit: "Awaiting the publication of the Secretary-General's report which

<sup>155</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 129-131.

<sup>156</sup> 1142nd meeting: paras. 174-175.

<sup>157</sup> 1142nd meeting: para. 177.

<sup>158</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 3-4. For the statement of the Secretary-General see chapter I, Case 28.

<sup>159</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 7-12.

<sup>160</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 14.

<sup>161</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 13.

<sup>162</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 23-25.

<sup>163</sup> S/5866, 1143rd meeting: para. 44.

<sup>164</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 42-45.

<sup>165</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 58-62.

<sup>166</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 83-87.

<sup>167</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 89-90.

will enable the Security Council to adopt suitable measures." 168

The representative of the USSR noted that in the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution an attempt was made to treat "the attackers and the attacked in the same way" placing them on equal footing. Moreover, the attempt to make the Council do no more than include in the preamble simply the President's appeal "deprives that appeal of adequate force and significance". The result was that the Council was not demanding that the Turkish Government should respond to that appeal and thus instantly cease its military operations in Cyprus. 169

The representative of the United States accepted the suggestion made by the representative of Bolivia and further revised the draft resolution so that the reaffirmation of the President's appeal would become the first operative paragraph. 170

After a suspension of the meeting to allow representatives to consult with their Governments, the representative of Cyprus \* stated that his Government was not satisfied with the draft resolution under its present formulation and would ask as a minimum the introduction in the preambular part, of the phrase "Confirming the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964", so that the position taken in that resolution would not be affected by the present draft resolution". 171

The representative of the United States was agreeable to that suggestion and further revised the draft resolution to include the reaffirmation of previous Security Council resolutions. 172

At the 1143rd meeting on 9 August 1964, the revised draft resolution was adopted 173 by 9 votes to none with two abstentions. It read as follows: 174

"The Security Council,

"Concerned at the serious deterioration of the situation in Cyprus,

"Reaffirming its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964 and 192 (1964) of 20 June 1964,

"Anticipating the submission of the Secretary-General's report on the situation,

"1. Reaffirms the appeal just addressed by the President of the Security Council to the Governments of Turkey and Cyprus, worded as follows:

"The Security Council has authorized me to make an urgent appeal to the Government of Turkey to cease instantly the bombardment of and the use of military force of any kind against Cyprus, and to the Government of Cyprus to order the armed forces under its control to cease firing immediately";

"2. Calls for an immediate cease-fire by all concerned;

"3. Calls upon all concerned to co-operate fully with the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in the restoration of peace and security;

"4. Calls upon all States to refrain from any

action that might exacerbate the situation or contribute to the broadening of hostilities."

After the adoption of the resolution, the meeting was suspended at the suggestion of the President and with the understanding that the Council would "remain at the disposal of the President if any development in the area should warrant a call at short notice". 175

At a resumed 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964, the President (Norway) explained that the meeting had been "resumed" at the request 176 of the representative of Cyprus. 177

In his statement the representative of Cyprus \* complained of the same strafing attacks against the civilian population of Cyprus by Turkish aircraft and of the entry by Turkish vessels in the territorial waters of that country in violation of the cease-fire and the resolution of the Security Council adopted previously at the same meeting. He stated that his Government was particularly concerned by the flights of Turkish aircraft over Cyprus, the purpose of which was to terrorize the population. Noting that terror was accompanied by tension and tension by attack and counter-attack, he urged that there should be no such flights over Cyprus and that the Council adopt a resolution deploring the conduct of Turkey. Furthermore, Turkey should be called upon to respect fully the cease-fire and the Council's resolutions. 178

The representative of Turkey \* asserted that "the cease-fire had been observed by Turkey", but contended that its tenure would be uncertain unless the Greek Cypriots withdrew to the position they occupied before their last attack on 5 August. Citing the dangers facing certain Turkish Cypriots who were confined to a narrow strip of beach and completely surrounded, he defended the reconnaissance flights of Turkish aircraft over Cyprus as a precautionary measure necessitated by the gravity of the situation. With regard to the question of Turkish destroyers in the territorial waters of Cyprus, the representative of Turkey stated that he had no reports on the presence of such destroyers. However, he was "quite prepared to believe that they were there"; to make sure that the Greek Cypriot attack would not start. 179

The representative of Greece \* asserted that information available to his Government confirmed the account presented to the Council by the representative of Cyprus concerning the violation of Cyprus air space by Turkish aircraft following the acceptance by the Turkish Government of the President's appeal, and the adoption of the Security Council resolution. He added that there had also been a "provocative violation of Greek air space, committed this morning by a Turkish aircraft...". With regard to the question of establishing the validity of those allegations, he suggested that the Secretary-General be requested to put before the Council "all the information at his disposal". Should the facts be corroborated by the United Nations authorities present in Cyprus, then "Turkey should be called to order by an immediate resolution of the Security Council..." as requested by the representative of Cyprus". 180

In his statement before the Council the Secretary-

168 1143rd meeting: para. 94.

169 1143rd meeting: paras. 104-106.

170 1143rd meeting: paras. 110-113.

171 1143rd meeting: para. 159.

172 1143rd meeting: para. 171.

173 1143rd meeting: para. 178.

174 S/RES/193 (1964), O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, p. 6.

175 1143rd meeting: paras. 144-146, 180.

176 S/5872, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 154-155.

177 1143rd meeting: para. 183.

178 1143rd meeting: paras. 184, 187-198.

179 1143rd meeting: paras. 201-223.

180 1143rd meeting: paras. 226-233.

General recalled his report<sup>181</sup> to the Council in which it was stated that the cease-fire called for by the President on 9 August was in effect. There had been subsequently, however, instances involving Turkish aircraft and evidence that Turkish destroyers had unloaded supplies in Cyprus. With regard to the question of civilian casualties the Secretary-General noted that only an "estimate" of such casualties had been available at that time.<sup>182</sup>

The representative of the Ivory Coast expressed concern over the incidents reported to the Council, particularly with regard to "the flight over Cypriot territory". He maintained that under the circumstances every flight by a military aircraft could only "sow panic and inflame passions", and thus gave rise to reactions incalculable in their consequences. In that connexion he proposed that the President at the end of the debate make "a kind of summary expressing the Council's desire to see the parties comply fully with our resolution, on the understanding that the debate continues and that the final decision has not yet been taken". He emphasized that by compliance with the resolution of 9 August he meant in particular the suspension of all flights over the territory of Cyprus pending the Council's final decision.<sup>183</sup> Similar suggestions were made by the representatives of Bolivia<sup>184</sup> and Brazil.<sup>185</sup>

The representative of Czechoslovakia observed that the Security Council could not allow its decisions to be ignored by one of the parties. It was, therefore, necessary for the Council to reaffirm its own decisions and to demand their unconditional application. He further urged that the Council "state without any equivocation that military actions such as the violation of the air space of a sovereign State Member of our Organization by military aircraft, and all other actions of the same kind are wholly inconsistent with the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Council on 9 August".<sup>186</sup>

The representative of Greece \* saw the proposal by the representative of the Ivory Coast in placing the two parties on the same footing as a dangerous procedure.<sup>187</sup> In reply the representative of the Ivory Coast offered certain points of clarification.<sup>187a</sup>

The President (Norway) explained that as he understood it, the suggestion by the representative of the Ivory Coast, supported by the representative of Brazil, would consist of two parts: a summary of the views of the Council and the appropriate appeal to be issued as a consequence of that summary. The President then outlined the points that were likely to be included in that summary.<sup>188</sup>

The representative of the USSR objected to the President's formulation which he contended went beyond the limits of the question "placed before the Council at this meeting" and his responsibilities as President.<sup>189</sup> He further asserted that the only proposal before the Council was that of the Ivory

Coast. It would therefore be "inappropriate . . . for us to consider the various points contained in your earlier suggestion". If no other proposal was submitted, his delegation was prepared to support that of the Ivory Coast with certain reservations.<sup>190</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom felt that a long term solution of the problem would be facilitated if all Governments and all parties concerned avoided actions which could be in any way provocative. In that connexion, he urged that, while appealing for a cessation of the overflights, efforts should be made to ensure that there was no need for anxiety on the part of inhabitants in certain areas of Cyprus. To that end he proposed that a further point be added to the proposal by the representative of the Ivory Coast that the Commander of the United Nations Force take steps to reinforce its units in certain areas in order to ensure that all the inhabitants might be free from any anxiety about their future and safety.<sup>191</sup>

At the request of the representative of France, the meeting was suspended to allow those members of the Council who had "taken a particularly active part" in the debate to formulate more precisely the terms for the appeal that the President would be requested to make.<sup>192</sup>

At a resumed 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964 the proposal of the Ivory Coast authorizing the President to summarize the consensus of the Council was adopted<sup>193</sup> without objection. It read as follows:<sup>194</sup>

"After hearing the report of the Secretary-General and the statements of the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey and of the members of the Security Council, the Council notes with satisfaction that the cease-fire is being observed throughout Cyprus; requests the parties to comply with resolution S/5868 of 9 August 1964 in its entirety; asks all Governments to stop all flights over the territory of Cyprus in violation of its sovereignty; requests the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus to supervise the cease-fire and to reinforce its units in the zones which were the sphere of the recent military operations so as to ensure the safety of the inhabitants; and requests all concerned to co-operate with and to assist the Commander of the Force in achieving this purpose."

**Decision** of 25 September 1964 (1159th meeting):

- (i) *Reaffirming its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964, 192 (1964) of 20 June 1964 and 193 (1964) of 9 August 1964 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*
- (ii) *Extending the period in which the United Nations Peace-keeping Force shall be stationed in Cyprus for another three months, ending 26 December 1964, in conformity with the terms of resolution 186 (1964)*

On 10 September 1964, the Secretary-General submitted his second report<sup>195</sup> on the United Nations operations in Cyprus which the Security Council

<sup>181</sup> S/5879, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 162-163.

<sup>182</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 236-239. For the statement of the Secretary-General, see chapter I, Case 28.

<sup>183</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 267-269.

<sup>184</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 277.

<sup>185</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 280.

<sup>186</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 272-273.

<sup>187</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 282-283.

<sup>187a</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 288-291.

<sup>188</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 293-299.

<sup>189</sup> For discussion of the issues raised in terms of rule 19, see chapter I, Case 19.

<sup>190</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 314-319.

<sup>191</sup> 1143rd meeting: paras. 349-351.

<sup>192</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 346.

<sup>193</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 358.

<sup>194</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 358.

<sup>195</sup> S/5950 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 280-341.

considered at its 1151st and 1153rd to 1159th meetings held between 16 and 25 September 1964.

At the 1151st meeting on 16 September 1964, the representatives of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus were invited<sup>196</sup> to participate in the discussions.

At the same meeting the Secretary-General reported that as a result of the death of the former Mediator on Cyprus, the four Governments concerned had agreed to the appointment as Mediator of Mr. Galo Plaza.<sup>197</sup>

The representative of Cyprus, \* after explaining the position of his Government regarding certain questions raised in the report of the Secretary-General, reserved the right to make comments and observations at a later stage on other points. He then restated his Government's acceptance of the proposed extension of the mandate of UNFICYP for an additional three months "on the basis of the terms of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 4 March 1964", and reassured the Council of his Government's intention to co-operate fully with the United Nations Force in achieving the common goals laid down in that resolution. Turning to developments in Cyprus the representative, after describing recent action by his Government in consultation with UNFICYP and the Red Cross to permit the entry of essential goods into the "self-restricted areas", drew attention to certain other measures taken by his Government aimed at assisting the Turkish minority in Cyprus and furthering the cause of peace and normality. Then reviewing the actions of the Turkish Government and the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community, he expressed concern that such actions would not contribute to the consolidation of peace on the island. In conclusion he asserted that while his Government wanted peace it would not surrender to external force aiming at imposing upon Cyprus solutions unacceptable to its people and contrary to the principles of the Charter.<sup>198</sup>

The representative of Turkey,\* noting that the Secretary-General in his report had stated that the Turkish Government while indicating its desire to have the mandate of UNFICYP prolonged, had put forward certain observations concerning "the efficacy of the Force", reiterated the observations of his Government to the Council. He considered the Secretary-General's report a highly commendable document and "the fullest, frankest and fairest, and the most revealing" of all the reports. At the same time, it reflected the central weakness of the United Nations Force hampered by a lack of precision in its mandate and a "whole set of conflicting interpretations". Turning to the specific issues regarding the problem of Cyprus, he cited the question of the economic blockade and the arms build-up on the part of the Greek Cypriot Government. Those developments he considered to be incompatible with the resolutions of the Security Council, an incompatibility noted in the report of the Secretary-General. He contended that tranquillity would return to those areas under siege only after the Greek Cypriots had returned to their previous positions and the state of siege had been lifted. He was hopeful that the UNFICYP, given greater authority, would attend to the serious problem of bringing about genuine "cease-fire conditions" in those areas.<sup>199</sup>

The representative of Greece \* shared the opinion advanced in the Secretary-General's report that without the presence of UNFICYP the situation in Cyprus would have led to disaster. At the same time, he maintained that the situation was far from satisfactory. Nevertheless, his delegation was encouraged by certain decisions recently taken by the Government of Cyprus repealing all restrictions on the supply of food-stuffs to isolated Turkish communities and the offer of amnesty and material assistance to those wishing to return to their homes. Besides, the acceptance by that Government in advance of suggestions which the United Nations might make regarding security measures for the pacification of the island was another positive step. In that connexion, he requested that the Secretary-General keep the delegations most concerned advised of the progress achieved in the task he had entrusted to his personal representative and the Commander of the Force.<sup>200</sup>

At the 1153rd meeting on 17 September 1964, the representative of the United States, after deploring "any air attacks on the island" of Cyprus, supported "the recommendation now accepted in the Council by the main parties concerned: that the mandate of the Force be extended for an additional three months". He then called attention to the question of financing in connexion with the proposed extension, and urged that all members of the Council who had unanimously established the peace-keeping operation, set an example by contributing the financial means without which the operation could not be successful.<sup>201</sup>

The President, speaking as the representative of the USSR, recalled that his Government had on principle adopted a "negative attitude" towards the dispatch to Cyprus of any foreign forces, including the force of the United Nations, and asserted that while the USSR delegation had raised no objection to the proposed extension of the United Nations operation in Cyprus it would oppose any broadening of the functions of the Force as set out in the resolution of 4 March 1964.<sup>202</sup>

At the 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964, the representative of Brazil introduced a draft resolution jointly submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway whereby the Council, noting the report of the Secretary-General and recalling its previous decisions, would extend the period in which the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus would be stationed there for another three months ending 26 December 1964.<sup>203</sup> He observed that the sponsors were convinced that the presence of the Force by virtue of its stabilizing influence would be able to play a decisive role in facilitating a settlement of the problem.<sup>204</sup>

The representative of the Ivory Coast admitted that in some respects the draft resolution was inadequate and suggested that the Security Council "ought to have gone even further in defining principles admitting of new approaches to the affair". He noted that the Secretary-General's report had indicated that in order to make the Force's mission more effective the Council ought to define it more clearly and grant the Force

<sup>200</sup> 1151st meeting: paras. 140, 161-162.

<sup>201</sup> 1153rd meeting: paras. 40-48.

<sup>202</sup> 1153rd meeting, paras. 96-102, 106-108. See also chapter V, Case I.

<sup>203</sup> For decisions concerning prolongation of the mandate of the Force, see chapter V, Case I.

<sup>204</sup> 1159th meeting: paras. 3-8.

<sup>196</sup> 1151st meeting: para. 1.

<sup>197</sup> 1151st meeting: paras. 5 and 6.

<sup>198</sup> 1151st meeting, paras. 10-12, 14-15, 39, 40, 43-70, 101.

<sup>199</sup> 1151st meeting: paras. 104, 106, 115-118, 125-127.

new technical means indispensable to the maintenance of order, and suggested that the Council should adapt itself to the requirements of the situation.<sup>205</sup> Similar observations were made by the representatives of Morocco<sup>206</sup> and Bolivia.<sup>207</sup>

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>208</sup> It read as follows:<sup>209</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and noting, in particular, that the Secretary-General considers it necessary that the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force created by Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 should be extended beyond 26 September 1964,*

*"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has indicated its desire that the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus should be continued beyond 26 September 1964,*

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964 and 192 (1964) of 20 June 1964,*

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the States that have contributed troops, police, supplies and financial support for the implementation of resolution 186 (1964),*

*"Paying tribute to the memory of Sakari Tuomioja for the outstanding services that he rendered to the cause of the United Nations,*

*"Expressing satisfaction that a new Mediator has been appointed by the Secretary-General in conformity with resolution 186 (1964),*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964, 192 (1964) of 20 June 1964 and 193 (1964) of 9 August 1964 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*

*"2. Calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions;*

*"3. Extends the period in which the United Nations Peace-keeping Force shall be stationed in Cyprus for another three months, ending 26 December 1964, in conformity with the terms of resolution 186 (1964);*

*"4. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed regarding the compliance of the parties concerned with the provisions of the present resolution."*

After the resolution was adopted, the Secretary-General explained the procedure he hoped to follow in its implementation and made certain comments concerning the financing of the Force.<sup>210</sup>

**Decision** of 18 December 1964 (1180th meeting):

(i) *Reaffirming its resolutions 186 (1964), 187 (1964), 192 (1964) and 194 (1964) and the*

<sup>205</sup> 1159th meeting, paras. 12-14. See also chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>206</sup> 1159th meeting: paras. 17-19.

<sup>207</sup> 1159th meeting: paras. 20-23.

<sup>208</sup> 1159th meeting: para. 24.

<sup>209</sup> S/RES/194 (1964). *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>210</sup> 1159th meeting: paras. 26-44.

*consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*

(ii) *Extending the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for an additional period of three months, ending 26 March 1965*

On 12 December 1964, the Secretary-General submitted his third report<sup>211</sup> on the United Nations operation in Cyprus which the Security Council considered at its 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964. At the same meeting after the Council had invited<sup>212</sup> the representatives of Turkey, Cyprus and Greece to participate in the discussion, the President (Bolivia) informed the members that he had received a draft resolution<sup>213</sup> sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway.<sup>214</sup>

The representative of Cyprus\* noted that during the period under review there had been no major incidents in Cyprus. He emphasized, however, that the "rebels", acting under directives from the Turkish Government had made it clear that a return to law, order and normality would impede their plan for the partition of Cyprus. There could be no doubt, therefore, that the return to normal conditions as called for by the resolution of 4 March and reiterated by subsequent resolutions of the Security Council was being obstructed as a matter of policy by their leaders acting under instruction from "Ankara". His Government, however, by virtue of its sovereign rights recognized in the decisions of the Security Council and UNFICYP, had the responsibility to see that normal conditions were restored despite Turkish obstruction. In conclusion, he stated that his Government had accepted the extension for another period of three months of the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in the expectation that during that period it would be able to complete the task entrusted to it by the Security Council.<sup>215</sup>

The representative of Turkey\* observed that the Secretary-General's report was "eloquent in its account of the severe hardships to which the Turkish community is still being subjected". After noting the difficulties experienced by UNFICYP in its efforts to bring about freedom of movement on all roads of the island, and a gradual return to normal conditions in Cyprus, he commended the efforts of that body but asserted that the concept of normal conditions should be clearly defined since even if UNFICYP did not consider it part of its mandate to re-establish "constitutional law and order" in Cyprus, it could only contribute to a return to normal conditions by helping the two sides in the civil war to get together. He also observed that it would have been extremely useful if UNFICYP could have rallied support to the call issued by the Vice-President to bring about a meeting of the "true and lawful Government of the Republic comprising members of both communities". He stated further that his Government had consented to the continued presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, on the understanding that it would effectively carry out its avowed intention of avoiding

<sup>211</sup> S/6102, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964*, pp. 221-310.

<sup>212</sup> 1180th meeting: para. 1.

<sup>213</sup> S/6115, same text as S/6121, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964*, p. 322.

<sup>214</sup> 1180th meeting: para. 2.

<sup>215</sup> 1180th meeting: paras. 7-16, 67-69.

any action liable to affect a final political solution. At the same time, he recalled that the Council had demanded not just any solution, but that an "agreed" solution to the question should be sought.<sup>216</sup>

The representative of Greece \* called attention to the efforts made by the Government of Cyprus to facilitate a return to normal conditions and conversely to the efforts of the Turkish leadership to obstruct those efforts and to prevent the Turkish community from returning to normal life. He alleged that Turkish Cypriots were being kept in "conditions of segregated captivity" by Turkish "extremists" and denied the opportunity to return to their homes. UNFICYP in his view, should guarantee to those people, if they so desired, the right to return to their homes "and benefit from measures for their resettlement which the Government of Cyprus has pledged itself to take with United Nations assistance". His Government agreed to the prolongation of the mandate of the United Nations Forces in Cyprus as proposed by the Secretary-General, hoping that the suggestions he had made regarding the function of the Force, especially regarding the need to help the members of the minority to resume a normal life in their homes, would be taken into account.<sup>217</sup>

Speaking in favour of the draft resolution which he co-sponsored the representative of Brazil recalled that the Secretary-General had informed the Council that he considered it indispensable to maintain the United Nations Force in Cyprus for some time to come, and asserted that the draft resolution had as its objective the extension of the stationing of United Nations Forces in Cyprus, thus helping to create the conditions that would lead to an agreed solution of the Cyprus problem.<sup>218</sup>

The representative of the USSR, recalling his previous reservations concerning the functions of UNFICYP, stated that his delegation did not oppose the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the stationing of the Force be extended for another three months provided that it acted in conformity with the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964.<sup>219</sup>

The draft resolution resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>220</sup> It read as follows:<sup>221</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting that the report of the Secretary-General recommends the maintenance in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, created by Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, for an additional period of three months,*

*"Noting that the Government of Cyprus had indicated its desire that the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus should be continued beyond 26 December 1964,*

*"Noting with satisfaction that the report of the Secretary-General indicates that the situation in Cyprus has improved and that significant progress has been made,*

<sup>216</sup> 1180th meeting: paras. 81-93.

<sup>217</sup> 1180th meeting: paras. 99-113.

<sup>218</sup> 1180th meeting: paras. 117, 118. For decisions concerning the prolongation of the mandate of the force, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>219</sup> 1180th meeting: paras. 137, 138. See also chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>220</sup> 1180th meeting: para. 176.

<sup>221</sup> S/RES/198 (1964) O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, pp. 8, 9.

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, 187 (1964) of 13 March 1964, 192 (1964) of 20 June 1964 and 194 (1964) of 25 September 1964,*

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the States that have contributed troops, police, supplies, and financial support for the implementation of resolution 186 (1964),*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolutions 186 (1964), 187 (1964), 192 (1964) and 194 (1964) and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*

*"2. Calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions;*

*"3. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General;*

*"4. Extends the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for an additional period of three months ending 26 March 1965."*

**Decision of 19 March 1965 (1193rd meeting):**

(i) *Reaffirming its resolutions of 4 March, 13 March, 20 June, 9 August (S/5868), 25 September and 18 December 1964 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*

(ii) *Extending the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 for an additional period of three months, ending 26 June 1965*

On 11 March 1965, the Secretary-General submitted his fourth report<sup>222</sup> on the United Nations operations in Cyprus which was considered by the Council at its 1191st to 1193rd meetings held between 17 and 19 March 1965.

At the 1191st meeting on 17 March 1965, the Council decided<sup>223</sup> without vote, to invite the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate in the discussion.

At the same meeting the representative of Cyprus, \* recalling the previous recommendations for extension of the period of the United Nations Force in Cyprus, declared that however welcome the presence of the United Nations Force in Cyprus might be, his Government viewed the necessity for a new extension as proposed in the report under consideration, with disappointment, since it revealed that the task entrusted to the Force by the Council on 4 March 1964 had not yet been completely fulfilled. He stated further that in agreeing to a further extension, his Government did so in the hope that the Force would then be able to complete its task for the sake of peace and security in that area of the world. After reviewing developments in the area during the period covered by the report, he stated that the only obstacle to peace and the only reason for the anomaly which still persisted in a few parts of Cyprus was the policy of Turkey to promote strife and division, a policy which was not only contrary to the resolutions adopted by the Coun-

<sup>222</sup> S/6228 and Add.1, O.R., 20th yr., Jan.-Mar. 1965, pp. 106-174.

<sup>223</sup> 1191st meeting, para. 1.

cil and the terms of reference of the Force, but also contrary to the task entrusted by the Security Council to the Mediator whose mission was to find a solution in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Noting that if peace was to be secured and the recurrence of fighting avoided, all dividing lines on the island should be eliminated, he wondered whether the United Nations Force could allow the consolidation of the present stalemate.<sup>224</sup>

The representative of Turkey \* saw the report of the Secretary-General as "a tragic admission of the fact that a recurrence of fighting on a much larger scale is still a possibility and a return to normal conditions is still far from being achieved". He blamed that state of affairs on the Greek Cypriot Government and the Greek Government who were determined to impose a solution by force. In support of that allegation he recalled several instances in which the Government of Cyprus had disregarded or otherwise violated agreements entered into with the Turkish community. Noting that the resolution of 4 March called for a return to normal conditions in order that an agreed solution might be facilitated through negotiations, he contended that that recommendation had been ignored by Archbishop Makarios who had "pushed the Constitution into oblivion" and in the political vacuum thus created, launched his *de facto* administration. He recalled that his delegation had always maintained that UNFICYP could best carry out its mandate of restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions "by providing for the Turkish community the exercise of their constitutional rights". An important step in that direction would be to assure for the Turks of Cyprus full freedom of movement on all the roads of Cyprus. He concluded that while his Government welcomed the "Observations" of the Secretary-General that the parties make a determined effort by negotiations to find an agreed basis for long-term solutions, his Government could never accept any solution for the question of Cyprus which would involve the use of force in violation of the Charter and in disregard of the resolutions of the Security Council.<sup>225</sup>

The representative of Greece \* asserted that among the reasons for the present impasse was the fact that the Turkish leaders, encouraged by Turkey, opposed any negotiations or discussion likely to strengthen and uphold the independence of the sovereign Republic of Cyprus. He maintained that that was in keeping with Turkey's policy of "dismemberment of the island" which had been pursued by the Turkish Government in various forms. He contended that while possibilities for an arrangement which would guarantee the well-being of the population existed, those could be realized only when the minority leaders stopped pursuing plans which conflicted with the rights and interests of the majority. In its effort to promote a peaceful solution of the problem, the Government of Greece supported the proposed extension of the international Force's mandate for an additional period of three months.<sup>226</sup>

At the 1192nd meeting on 18 March 1965, the representative of the USSR, calling attention to the delay in convening the meeting observed that the members of the Security Council should have been in-

formed of the reason for such an irregular procedure.<sup>227</sup>

At the 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965, the representative of Bolivia recalling that the Secretary-General had informed the Council that he saw no alternative but to recommend the extension of UNFICYP for another three months, introduced on behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay, a draft resolution<sup>228</sup> under which the Council would authorize the extension for three months of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus.<sup>229</sup>

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>230</sup> It read as follows:<sup>231</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting that the report of the Secretary-General (S/6228 and Corr.1 and Add.1) recommends the maintenance in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force created by the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 (S/5575) for an additional period of three months,*

*"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has indicated its desire that the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus should be continued beyond 26 March 1965,*

*"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General that while the military situation has on the whole remained quiet during the period under review and while the presence of the United Nations Force has contributed significantly to this effect, nevertheless the position remains one of uneasiness in several points, with the consequent danger of a renewal of fighting with all of its disastrous consequences,*

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts in the implementation of the Security Council resolutions of 4 March, 13 March (S/5603), 20 June (S/5778), 25 September (S/5987) and 18 December 1964 (S/6121),*

*"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the States that have contributed troops, police, supplies and financial support for the implementation of the resolution of 4 March 1964,*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolutions of 4 March, 13 March, 20 June, 9 August (S/5868), 25 September and 18 December 1964 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964;*

*"2. Calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions;*

*"3. Calls upon the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to co-operate fully with the United Nations Force;*

*"4. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General (S/6228 and Corr.1 and Add.1);*

*"5. Extends the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established*

<sup>227</sup> 1192nd meeting: para. 2.

<sup>228</sup> S/6247, 1193rd meeting: para. 11, also para. 17.

<sup>229</sup> 1193rd meeting: paras. 9-11. For decisions concerning the prolongation of the mandate of the Force, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>230</sup> 1193rd meeting: para. 153.

<sup>231</sup> S/RES/201, (1965), O.R., 20th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, pp. 1-2.

<sup>224</sup> 1191st meeting: paras. 7-16, 23-29, 49-58.

<sup>225</sup> 1191st meeting: paras. 66-68, 80-92.

<sup>226</sup> 1191st meeting: paras. 101-105, 129-131.

under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 for an additional period of three months, ending 26 June 1965.”

**Decision of 15 June 1965 (1224th meeting):**

- (i) *Reaffirming its resolutions of 4 March, 13 March, 20 June, 9 August, 25 September and 18 December 1964 and 19 March 1965 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964;*
- (ii) *Extending the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 for an additional period of six months, ending 26 December 1965*

On 10 June 1965 the Secretary-General submitted his fifth report<sup>232</sup> on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, which was considered by the Council at its 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965.

At the 1224th meeting on 15 June, 1965 the Council decided<sup>233</sup> without objection to invite the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece to participate in the discussion.

The representative of Cyprus \* before commenting on the latest developments in Cyprus, and the Secretary-General's report, asserted that his Government had accepted the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the mandate of UNFICYP be extended for six months instead of the usual three-month period, subject to the understanding contained in paragraph 184 of that report.<sup>234</sup> He then noted that the situation in Cyprus during the period covered by the report had been generally calm, and called attention to the efforts by his Government in co-operation with the United Nations Force to bring about a return to normality. After outlining several instances of “provocation” and “self-segregation” on the part of the Turkish Cypriot leadership designed to obstruct his Government's “pacification programme” he alleged that Turkey “by means of a combination of internal subversion through its agents in Cyprus and continued threats of aggression and invasion, systematically and continuously undermines all efforts for a return to normality and frustrates the possibilities for a peaceful solution”. These he felt were a source of permanent tension and a threat to international peace.<sup>235</sup>

The representative of Turkey \* stated that despite proclamations regarding independence for Cyprus, *enosis* remained the real objective of the “Greek Cypriot régime”. Noting that the Secretary-General had suggested that the mandate of the Force be extended for six months, he explained that his Government had agreed to that suggestion with the prospect that within that period an end might be put to the threat to peace brought about by the Greek Cypriot leadership which had burdened the international machinery. Turning to the question of alleged threats of invasion by Turkey

he noted that the report of the Secretary-General had indicated that the “frequent and indiscriminate invocation of external threats” had seriously curtailed UNFICYP in its efforts to reduce tension in the island and effectively to prevent the recurrence of fighting between the two Communities. Then calling attention to “the steady build-up of Greek-Cypriot armed personnel on the island” and other threats to the Turkish community, he contended that such developments constituted a “real setback” to the efforts of the United Nations in finding a peaceful solution and had cast doubt on the professed interest of the Greek Cypriots in a peaceful solution. The representative then drew the attention of the Council to reports appearing in the Greek Cypriot Press urging the Government to hold “a general election for both the Greek and Turkish communities under a unified electoral roll” and warned that such a violation of the constitution if implemented would irrevocably separate the two communities.<sup>236</sup>

The representative of Greece \* felt that the situation in Cyprus showed signs of improvement largely because of the presence of the United Nations Force and the continued efforts of the Cyprus Government. He regretted that the Turkish Cypriot leadership did not respond to the Government's pacification offers and measures as these would have improved the situation even further. Noting that the Governments of Greece and Turkey had agreed to enter into discussions to review all aspects of Greek-Turkish relations, which had been affected by the Cyprus crisis, he suggested that if the talks were to succeed a new impulse should be given to “pacification and to a comprehensive return to normalcy” and in this connexion he urged that leaders of the Turkish community establish contact with the Greek community with a view to meetings and discussions with the Government. In conclusion he asserted that his Government had concurred with the proposed extension of the mandate of the United Nations Force.<sup>237</sup>

At the same meeting the representative of Uruguay introduced a draft resolution<sup>238</sup> submitted jointly by the delegations of Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay. He noted that the draft resolution was prepared pursuant to the same spirit and wording of resolutions previously adopted by the Council and had taken note of the Secretary-General's report particularly with regard to the extension of the mandate for six months. It was hoped however that the mandate of UNFICYP could be completed prior to the expiry of that date.<sup>239</sup>

The representative of the USSR did not object to the extension of the United Nations presence in Cyprus for another six months, provided that the conditions laid down in the Council's resolution of 4 March 1964 were observed.<sup>240</sup>

The draft resolution was unanimously adopted.<sup>241</sup> It read as follows:<sup>242</sup>

“The Security Council,

“Noting that the report of the Secretary-General

<sup>236</sup> 1224th meeting: paras. 37-45, 50-52, 62.

<sup>237</sup> 1224th meeting: paras. 77-78, 81, 89, 92.

<sup>238</sup> S/6440, 1224th meeting: para. 128.

<sup>239</sup> 1224th meeting: paras. 129-130. For decision concerning prolongation of the mandate, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>240</sup> 1224th meeting: para. 142.

<sup>241</sup> 1224th meeting: para. 145.

<sup>242</sup> S/RES/206 (1965), *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965*, p. 3.

<sup>232</sup> S/6426 and Corr.1, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1965*, pp. 247-290.

<sup>233</sup> 1224th meeting: para. 1.

<sup>234</sup> That paragraph emphasized that the proposed extension of six months did not necessarily mean that the Force would be firmly committed to remain in Cyprus for six months beyond 26 June. But should developments occur at any time during the six-month period which would raise the issue of withdrawal of the force before the expiry of that period the matter would be submitted to the Council for consideration and appropriate action. S/6246, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1965*, p. 288.

<sup>235</sup> 1224th meeting: paras. 8-9, 12-13, 20-28.



(S/6426 and Corr.1) recommends the maintenance in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force created by the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 (S/5575) for an additional period of six months,

"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has indicated its desire that the stationing of the United Nations Force in Cyprus should be continued beyond 26 June 1965,

"Noting from the report of the Secretary-General that, while the military situation has on the whole remained quiet during the period under review and while the presence of the United Nations Force has contributed significantly to this effect, nevertheless the quiet which prevails in the island is tenuous and, in fact, it is very likely that without the Force there would be an early recurrence of fighting,

"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts in the implementation of the Security Council resolutions of 4 March, 13 March (S/5603), 20 June (S/5778) 25 September (S/5987) and 18 December 1964 (S/6121) and resolution 201 (1965) of 19 March 1965,

"Renewing the expression of its deep appreciation to the States that have contributed troops, police, supplies and financial support for the implementation of the resolution of 4 March 1964,

"1. Reaffirms its resolutions of 4 March, 13 March, 20 June, 9 August, 25 September and 18 December 1964 and 19 March 1965 and the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting on 11 August 1964;

"2. Calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to comply with the above-mentioned resolutions;

"3. Calls upon the parties concerned to continue to act with the utmost restraint and to cooperate fully with the United Nations Force;

"4. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General (S/6426 and Corr.1);

"5. Extends the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 for an additional period of six months, ending 26 December 1965."

**Decision** of 10 August 1965 (1236th meeting):

- (i) Reaffirming its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964;
- (ii) Calling upon all parties in conformity with the said resolution to avoid any action likely to worsen the situation

By letter <sup>243</sup> dated 30 July 1965, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Turkey called attention to the enactments by the Greek members of the House of Representatives of Cyprus of two laws which were considered, from the "constitutional point of view", to be in violation of international agreements upon which the Constitution of Cyprus was based. It was further contended that by so acting the Greek Cypriot Government had disregarded Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, which called upon all Member States to refrain from any action likely to worsen the situa-

tion and upon the communities in Cyprus and their leaders to act with the utmost restraint. It was also noted that the Security Council, as a principal peace-keeping organ of the United Nations, should be alert to "any inchoate danger" to the peace and should take full account of any violation of its recommendations as well as steps to prevent the recurrence of such violation. The letter then requested a meeting of the Council to consider the situation arising from the acts of the Greek Cypriot Government.

By letter <sup>244</sup> dated 31 July 1965, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of Cyprus, "in accordance with articles 34, 35 and 39 of the United Nations Charter", complained about the intervention by Turkey in the internal affairs of Cyprus and a threat of force against its territorial integrity and political independence in violation of Article 2, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Charter. It called attention to a note by the Turkish Government threatening to take military action against Cyprus because of certain legislation adopted by that country; the letter then requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council "to discuss the complaint, as forming part of the complaint of 26 December 1963".

At the 1234th meeting on 3 August 1965, the Council included <sup>245</sup> the question in its agenda and considered it at the 1234th to the 1236th meetings held between 3 and 10 August 1965.

At the 1234th meeting, after the Council had invited <sup>246</sup> the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece to participate in the discussion, the President (United Kingdom) called attention to two reports <sup>247</sup> of the Secretary-General on recent developments in Cyprus.

At the same meeting the representative of Turkey \* recalled his apprehension expressed at an earlier meeting over the intention of the Greek Cypriot leadership unilaterally to attempt to alter the constitutional structure of the State of Cyprus by enacting an electoral law which would disregard the basic principle of partnership between the Greek and Turkish communities of the island upon which the independence of Cyprus was built and without which it could not survive. He alleged that the Greek Cypriot leadership was attempting to achieve its objective through a "succession of *faits accomplis*" which, when taken individually, did not seem of sufficient consequence to prompt the Council to take appropriate action. Recent legislation and other activities, however, which clearly violated the Security Council decision of 4 March 1964, jeopardized not only the rights of the Turkish Cypriot community and of Turkey but also the peace of the area and the effectiveness of the Council in keeping peace. Furthermore, the Council had before it "the measured but solemn warning embodied in the present report of the Secretary-General" and if it permitted actions contrary to its recommendations as well as to international obligations then a dangerous precedent would be set. The Turkish delegation therefore left it to the Council "to put itself on record, in any way it may see fit," against such action which posed a danger to the peace.<sup>248</sup>

<sup>244</sup> S/6581, *ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>245</sup> 1234th meeting: p. 1.

<sup>246</sup> 1234th meeting: para. 5.

<sup>247</sup> S/6569, S/6586, *O.R.*, 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 125-129; 149-150.

<sup>248</sup> 1234th meeting: paras. 8-26.

The representative of Cyprus \* denied that peace was being endangered because the House of Representatives of Cyprus had thought it necessary to enact two laws or that the actions of his Government in the exercise of its sovereignty had violated the Council's resolution of 4 March 1964. After explaining the reasons behind the recent legislation, he expressed the opinion that Turkey's allegation against the laws in question were groundless and noted that while the Security Council had the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, it could not "in the nature of things, be concerned with the passing of electoral legislation in a Member State, since this is by definition, a matter of domestic concern". On the other hand, the Council should be concerned when another Member State "by using various pretexts" was threatening the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus and the peace of the world.<sup>249</sup>

The representative of Greece \* while recognizing that there might be misgivings as to the timing of the legislative measures recently enacted in Cyprus, was "at a loss . . . to grasp the purport and purpose of the Turkish recourse to the Security Council on that matter", or the alleged danger to peace arising therefrom. He reminded the Council, moreover, that the report of the Secretary-General submitted prior to the Turkish request for a meeting, contained "nothing alarming, or disturbing or even disquieting" about developments in Cyprus, and although an increase of tension was noted in the introductory paragraph, the concluding paragraph was "as reassuring as one might wish". Recalling that the policy of Turkey had always been negative and obstructive, he maintained that of all the features envisaged by the Council for a settlement, Turkey had concentrated only upon the fact that "the settlement should be agreed upon by all concerned" and had arrogated to itself the right to veto any arrangement that might not please it, for any reason whatsoever. Noting that the constitutional arrangement upon which Cyprus had been founded had proved totally unworkable, he saw the two legislative acts recently passed by the Cyprus Parliament as designed to correct this "constitutional oddity" and urged the Council to concentrate on a solution of the Cyprus problem and not allow itself to be distracted from that principal task by "diversionary and confusing moves like the one which . . . has brought us here again today."<sup>250</sup>

At the 1235th meeting on 5 August 1965, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the Council to a report<sup>251</sup> by the Secretary-General on recent developments in Cyprus and to a request<sup>252</sup> by the representative of Turkey dated 4 August 1965 that Mr. Rauf Denktas be given the opportunity to address the Security Council at an appropriate time under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.<sup>253</sup> Then, speaking as the representative of the United Kingdom, and as one of the Guarantor Powers, he considered the two laws passed by the Cyprus Government to be a breach of the Constitution that ac-

corded "neither with the spirit nor the letter of resolution 186 (1964) of the Council".<sup>254</sup>

At the same meeting Mr. Denktas was invited to address the Council. He considered the actions of the Cypriot Government and the recent legislative enactments illegal and unconstitutional, designed with the purpose of "depriving the Turkish community of its political and constitutional rights". As a result of the tensions which had accompanied these measures, and the dangers of chaos inherent in their implementation, he requested that the Security Council "censure and condemn these measures without any reservation as . . . contrary to resolution 186 (1964)". After describing conditions in the Turkish community, he disputed certain points raised earlier by the Greek and Cypriot representatives and in conclusion he reaffirmed the determination of the Turkish community to resist all measures to abrogate their rights as a political entity, or to bring about union with Greece.<sup>255</sup>

At the 1236th meeting on 10 August 1965, the representative of Malaysia introduced a draft resolution<sup>256</sup> jointly submitted with Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay. He explained that while the co-sponsors had pursued a formulation that would "steer a middle course between the two opposing positions" their primary objective had always been to make sure that the "peace in the island and an agreed solution to all the problems" that had beset the country were not in any way hampered or delayed "by any words that may be used in this draft resolution".<sup>257</sup>

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>258</sup> It read as follows:<sup>259</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting the report of the Secretary-General of 29 July 1965 (S/6569 and Corr.1) that recent developments in Cyprus have increased tension in the island,*

*"Noting the further reports of the Secretary-General of 2 August (S/6586), 5 August (S/6569/Add.1) and 10 August 1965 (S/6569/Add.2),*

*"Having heard the statements of the parties concerned,*

*"1. Reaffirms its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964;*

*"2. Calls upon all parties, in conformity with the above resolution, to avoid any action which is likely to worsen the situation."*

**Decision** of 5 November 1965 (1252nd meeting):

*Appeal by the President to all the parties for the utmost moderation and co-operation in the total application of the Council's resolution and that they refrain from any action likely to worsen the situation*

By letter<sup>260</sup> dated 4 November 1965 the permanent representative of Turkey requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider "the extremely dangerous and explosive situation created by a new Greek Cypriot armed attack which at the moment is in progress against the Turkish quarter of the

<sup>249</sup> 1234th meeting: paras. 29-55, 62.

<sup>250</sup> 1234th meeting: paras. 77-81, 92-103.

<sup>251</sup> S/6569/Add.1, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 129-134.

<sup>252</sup> S/6594, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, p. 155.

<sup>253</sup> For discussion concerning the initial extension of the invitation, see chapter III, Case 1.

<sup>254</sup> 1235th meeting: paras. 5, 10-13.

<sup>255</sup> 1235th meeting: paras. 66-68, 73-116.

<sup>256</sup> 1236th meeting: para. 5.

<sup>257</sup> 1236th meeting: paras. 2-6.

<sup>258</sup> 1236th meeting: para. 8.

<sup>259</sup> S/RES/207 (1965), O.R., 20th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, p. 4.

<sup>260</sup> S/6877, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965, pp. 320-321.

port city of Famagusta". The letter contended that "this new Greek Cypriot offensive" was part of a planned effort on an island-wide scale "to extend the unconstitutional authority of the Greek Cypriot régime", in order to impose a solution based on "*faits accomplis*" upon the Turkish community in Cyprus. Noting that the present action violated the Council's resolutions of 4 March 1964 and 10 August 1965, and was contrary to the cease-fire agreement concluded between the communities under the auspices of UNFICYP on 15 May 1964, the letter urged that the "offensive" be brought to an immediate end, since delay would most likely result in an extension of hostilities and unforeseen consequences.

At the 1252nd meeting on 5 November 1965, the Council, after deciding<sup>261</sup> without objection to include the question in the agenda, invited<sup>262</sup> the representatives of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus to participate in the discussion. The President (Bolivia) then drew the attention of the Council to a report<sup>263</sup> by the Secretary-General on developments in Cyprus.<sup>264</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Turkey \* contended that the "Greek Cypriot aggression" against the Turkish community in Cyprus was designed "to put an end to the existence of the Turkish community first and the independence of the State of Cyprus thereafter", in accordance with their plan for *enosis*. He drew attention to the restraint of his Government in the face of those developments and alleged that the "good will of Turkey" with regard to a peaceful settlement had not been matched by the Greek side. In that connexion he accused Greece of secretly dispatching troops to the island and of helping to arm and equip an army of Greek Cypriots. After describing the series of incidents leading up to the present situation, he declared that the Turkish Government and Turkish public opinion could not be expected to stand idly by while the confidence it had placed in the peaceful solution of the problem was turned around and used as a weapon to jeopardize the lives and vital interests of "Turkish kinsmen" in Cyprus. Nor could the flouting of the Council's authority and resolutions be permitted to go unchecked. Thereupon he appealed to the Council "to take any measures" it considered appropriate to secure observance of its resolutions by all parties, and to call upon the Greek Cypriots, in accordance with the agreement of 15 May 1964, to withdraw from the position they had occupied as a result of their "aggression".<sup>265</sup>

The representative of the United States inquired whether the Secretary-General had received any information from Cyprus later than that contained in the report submitted at that meeting which might help the Council in its consideration of the matter.<sup>266</sup>

The Secretary-General stated that he had just received a cabled report from his Special Representative and Force Commander in Cyprus that the cease-fire in the Famagusta area was being observed.<sup>267</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Cyprus \* stated that contrary to the impression that the representative of Turkey had tried to create, the informa-

tion just presented by the Secretary-General coincided with that of his delegation. He then disputed the Turkish version of the events at Famagusta and after describing the incidents leading up to the present situation contended that the "actual firing" was started by the Turkish Cypriots and that "the Turkish leadership" was preventing a restoration of normal conditions and as such was responsible for the situation.<sup>268</sup>

The representative of Greece \* expressed doubts about the "opportuneness and the advisability" of convening a meeting for the purpose of considering the Famagusta incidents. He considered the Turkish version of the incidents as exaggerated and was of the opinion that both the General in command of UNFICYP and the Secretary-General's personal representative there had the "mandates, the means and the authority", to cope with the situation, and that the Council had already provided for such contingencies. He then suggested that the Council consider the question in its larger context, particularly in terms of the rejection by the Turkish minority of efforts by the Government of Cyprus to maintain calm and to guarantee them their "human and political rights". After calling attention to increasing pressures being exerted by Turkey against Cyprus and Greece, he urged that "in order that UNFICYP may retain its full effectiveness, it is necessary that the Council reaffirm its full confidence in the ability of the Force and its command to cope with local developments as they arise".<sup>269</sup>

The President, after consulting the members of the Council and taking into account the statements made by the representatives of Turkey, Cyprus and Greece, concluded the discussion by "making an appeal to all the parties to give evidence of the utmost moderation and to co-operate in the total application of the Council's resolutions, and to refrain from any action likely to worsen the situation in Cyprus".<sup>270</sup>

**Decision** of 17 December 1965 (1270th meeting):

- (i) *Reaffirming its resolutions of 4 March (S/5575), 13 March (S/5603), 20 June (S/5778), 9 August (S/5868) 25 September (S/5987) and 18 December 1964 (S/6121), the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964, and its resolutions 201 (1965) of 19 March, 206 (1965) of 15 June and 207 (1965) of 10 August 1965;*
- (ii) *Extending once again the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964, for an additional period of three months ending 26 March 1966*

On 10 December 1965, the Secretary-General submitted his sixth report<sup>271</sup> on the United Nations operation in Cyprus, which was considered by the Council at its 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965.

At the same meeting, after the representatives of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus were invited<sup>272</sup> to participate in the discussion, the Secretary-General made a brief comment supplementing the observations set forth in his report. He urged that the new extension of the mandate of UNFICYP recommended by him

<sup>261</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 2.

<sup>262</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 3.

<sup>263</sup> S/6881, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965*, pp. 328-334.

<sup>264</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 4.

<sup>265</sup> 1252nd meeting, paras. 10-27.

<sup>266</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 28.

<sup>267</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 30.

<sup>268</sup> 1252nd meeting, paras. 33-67.

<sup>269</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 80.

<sup>270</sup> 1252nd meeting, para. 129.

<sup>271</sup> S/7001, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965*, pp. 438-486.

<sup>272</sup> 1270th meeting, para. 1.

be for a six month period since this would make for "better planning, management and economy in the conduct of the operation". He also observed that if the mandate were extended it would be done in the light of "the expectation" of members that the parties directly concerned would make an intensified effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problem.<sup>273</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands raised five points concerning the responsibility for progress toward a solution and the question of financing the United Nations operation in Cyprus which his delegation would have wished to see reflected in a draft resolution. Owing to the pressure of time and the fact that the matter was also being deliberated in the First Committee he did not press for a draft resolution incorporating all the points he had raised.<sup>274</sup>

At the same meeting after the representatives of Cyprus,<sup>275</sup> Turkey,<sup>276</sup> and Greece,<sup>277</sup> had commented on the report of the Secretary-General and offered explanations as to why the situation had not been more greatly improved or a solution found, the representative of Malaysia introduced a draft resolution<sup>278</sup> submitted jointly by the six non-permanent members of the Council (Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, Netherlands and Uruguay). He noted that this draft resolution followed closely the language of earlier resolutions, and that while it kept clear of unnecessary controversies, it faced up to the urgent and immediate task of having to extend the mandate of the United Nations Force in Cyprus. Recalling that the Secretary-General had recommended an extension of the mandate for a period of six months rather than a shorter period, he observed that after consultation it was felt that "in the prevailing context of events in Cyprus as reflected in the Secretary-General's report, an even longer period would probably give rise to more complacency". However, in order to emphasize a sense of urgency that the parties should get together and settle the problem with whatever means might be available to them a period shorter than six months was more desirable.<sup>279</sup>

The representative of Jordan suggested that in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution referring to "a peaceful settlement of the problem of Cyprus" be reformulated to read "a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement" thereby following the language of the resolution of 4 March 1964.<sup>280</sup>

After a brief suspension of the meeting, the representative of Malaysia stated that during consultation among the co-sponsors of the draft resolution it was decided that operative paragraph 3 should be dropped from the draft resolution.<sup>281</sup>

The revised draft resolution was unanimously adopted.<sup>282</sup> It read as follows:<sup>283</sup>

*"The Security Council,*

<sup>273</sup> 1270th meeting: paras. 3-4. For the statement of the Secretary-General see chapter I, Case 30.

<sup>274</sup> 1270th meeting: paras. 9-33.

<sup>275</sup> 1270th meeting: paras. 35-66.

<sup>276</sup> 1270th meeting: paras. 68-77.

<sup>277</sup> 1270th meeting: paras. 79-82.

<sup>278</sup> S/7024.

<sup>279</sup> 1270th meeting: para. 87. For decisions of the Council concerning prolongation of the mandate of the Force, see chapter V, Case 1.

<sup>280</sup> 1270th meeting: para. 115.

<sup>281</sup> 1270th meeting: para. 154.

<sup>282</sup> 1270th meeting: para. 162.

<sup>283</sup> S/RES/219 (1965), O.R., 20th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, pp. 5-6.

"Noting that the report of the Secretary-General dated 10 December 1965 (S/7001) states that the United Nations Peace-keeping Force is needed in Cyprus,

"Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to continue the Force beyond 26 December 1965,

"1. Reaffirms its resolutions of 4 March (S/5575), 13 March (S/5603), 20 June (S/5778), 9 August (S/5868), 25 September (S/5987), and 18 December 1964 (S/6121), the consensus expressed by the President at the 1143rd meeting, on 11 August 1964, and its resolutions 201 (1965) of 19 March, 206 (1965) of 15 June and 207 (1965) of 10 August 1965;

"2. Extends once again the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964, for an additional period of three months, ending 26 March 1966."

#### COMPLAINT BY YEMEN

##### INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter<sup>284</sup> dated 1 April 1964, the deputy permanent representative of Yemen requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting of the Council to consider "the deteriorated situation resulting from the British continuous acts of aggression against the peaceful Yemeni citizens", the culmination of which was the attack on 28 March, which had caused the death of twenty-five Yemeni citizens and several injuries besides material damage. The request was made in accordance with Articles 35 (1) and 34 of the United Nations Charter. It was further stated that the attack and the massing of British troops and heavy equipment between Beihan Protectorate and Harib, together with the many frequent British raids and attacks against Yemeni villages and towns constituted an act of war against the Yemen Arab Republic, endangering the international peace and security and creating a situation the continuation of which would lead to unfavourable consequences. So far, the Yemen Arab Republic had adopted an attitude of self-restraint and patience, but its Government wanted to make it well known that it would not hesitate to use all means and ways to ensure its self-defence and territorial integrity and the protection of its people. The Yemen Arab Republic was placing "this very grave situation" before the Council in the hope that an end would soon be reached.

At the 1106th meeting on 2 April 1964 the Council, after including<sup>285</sup> the item in its agenda, invited<sup>286</sup> the representatives of Yemen, Iraq and the United Arab Republic to participate in the discussion. At a later stage<sup>287</sup> the representative of Syria was also invited to participate, and the question was considered at the 1106th to the 1111th meetings held between 2 and 9 April 1964.

**Decision of 9 April 1964 (1111th meeting):**

(i) *Condemning reprisals as incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations;*

<sup>284</sup> S/5635, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1964, pp. 1-2.

<sup>285</sup> 1106th meeting: preceding para. 1.

<sup>286</sup> 1106th meeting: paras. 1-2. For discussion on participation, see chapter III, Case 2.

<sup>287</sup> 1107th meeting: para. 2.