Chapter XII

The situation in Cyprus

During the first half of 1974, the situation in Cyprus remained relatively quiet. On 29 May, the Security Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)—which had been serving in the island for successive periods over the preceding ten years—for a further six-month period to end on 15 December. It did so in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a solution would make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force.

However, on 15 July a coup d'état was carried out against the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, followed on 20 July by military intervention by Turkey and full-scale hostilities between the National Guard of Cyprus on one side...
and the Turkish Army and Turkish Cypriot fighters on the other.

On 20 July—by the first of eight resolutions it adopted between 20 July and 30 August on the Cyprus question—the Security Council called on all parties to cease all firing and exercise the utmost restraint. It demanded an immediate end to foreign military intervention and the withdrawal of foreign military personnel not sanctioned by international agreement. It also called on Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom to enter into negotiations for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus, and called on all parties to co-operate with UNFICYP.

On 22 July, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the current strength of UNFICYP was not sufficient to ensure the maintenance of the cease-fire or meet the many requests for assistance it was receiving, and the Council agreed that he should ask troop-contributing countries to reinforce their contingents already serving with the Force. Meanwhile, the fighting in Cyprus had intensified, and on 23 July the Council reiterated its demand for an immediate cease-fire.

On 30 July, a Declaration was issued by the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom—following talks held by them in Geneva, Switzerland, from 25 to 30 July—by which among other things they called for an immediate military standstill in Cyprus, envisaged certain tasks for UNFICYP and provided for further talks in Geneva to begin on 8 August, with representatives of the two Cypriot communities to take part at an early stage in talks relating to the Constitution of Cyprus. On 1 August, the Security Council asked the Secretary-General to take appropriate action under the terms of the Geneva Declaration, taking into account that the cease-fire would be the first step in the full implementation of the Council’s decision of 20 July.

The Council met again in the early hours of 14 August, following the breakdown of the negotiations which had resumed in Geneva on 8 August, and in the face of renewed military operations by Turkey. The Council demanded that all parties to the fighting cease all firing and military action forthwith and called for resumption of negotiations without delay. Later in the day, the Acting President of Cyprus reported that, notwithstanding the Council’s decision, Turkish troops and aircraft were continuing their attacks and extending their area of control.

Heavy fighting continued and the Council met again on 15 August, when the Secretary-General informed it of heavy UNFICYP casualties and appealed for a renewed commitment by the parties to the unimpeded functioning of UNFICYP. He warned that the situation called into question the very essence of the United Nations Charter, weighing upon the credibility of the Organization and its future effectiveness. The Council deplored the casualties suffered by UNFICYP, demanded that all parties respect the international character of the Force and refrain from any action which might endanger its members, and urged the parties to demonstrate clearly their willingness to fulfil their commitments relating to the Force. It demanded also that all parties cooperate with the Force in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions, in all areas of Cyprus and with regard to all sections of the population.

The next day, 16 August, the Security Council recorded its formal disapproval of the unilateral military actions undertaken against Cyprus and urged the parties to resume negotiations without delay. The outcome of the negotiations, the Council declared, should not be impeded or prejudged by the acquisition of advantages resulting from military operations.

On 30 August, the Security Council noted that a large number of people in Cyprus had been displaced and were in dire need of humanitarian assistance; it urged all concerned, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, to search for peaceful solutions to the problems of refugees, to take measures for their relief and welfare and to permit those who wished to do so to return to their homes in safety. The Secretary-General was asked to continue to provide emergency United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population in need of it.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was appointed Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus and reported from time to time on various aspects of the problem, as did the Secretary-General, who gave details of the humanitarian activities carried on by UNFICYP.

The General Assembly considered the Cyprus question at its twenty-ninth session, which opened in September 1974, and on 1 November it unanimously called on all States to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and non-alignment of Cyprus, and urged speedy withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from Cyprus, a halt to foreign interference and the safe return of all refugees to their homes. It considered that constitutional issues were the concern of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities and it urged continuation of the talks going on between them, with the assistance of the Secretary-General. Other negotiations, it said, should take place if needed. Continued United Nations humanitarian aid was requested, and all parties were called upon to continue co-operating with UNFICYP.
The Security Council endorsed the Assembly's decision on 13 December and urged all concerned to implement it as soon as possible. It also extended the stationing of UNFICYP for a further period ending 15 June 1975, and urged the parties to act with the utmost restraint and to accelerate co-operative efforts to achieve the Council's objectives.

Details of these and other related matters are to be found in the sections that follow.

The situation prior to 15 July 1974

Appeal of 28 January 1974 to Governments; report of 22 May 1974 by Secretary-General

On 28 January 1974, the United Nations Secretary-General appealed to Member States of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies for voluntary contributions for the financing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further period ending 15 June 1974. The accumulated deficit for the period through 15 December 1973, he said, stood at $19.2 million; no contributions had as yet been received towards the costs—estimated at $6.5 million, of maintaining the Force during the current six-month period ending 15 June 1974.

On 22 May, the Secretary-General submitted his twenty-fifth report to the Security Council on the United Nations operation in Cyprus, covering the period from 2 December 1973 to 22 May 1974.

He informed the Council that he had appointed Luis Weckmann-Muñoz, of Mexico, as his Special Representative in Cyprus as from 1 July 1974 to replace Bibiano F. Osorio-Tafall, who was to retire on 30 June. Major-General Dewan Prem Chand continued as Commander of UNFICYP.

The Secretary-General observed that more than 10 years had passed since the establishment of UNFICYP. Thanks to its presence, the situation in the island had remained quiet, but some of the basic objectives of the operation had yet to be achieved.

The Secretary-General said he had been deeply concerned by the interruption of the intercommunal talks on 2 April, as he considered the talks to be the most constructive way of carrying on the search for an agreed settlement of the Cyprus problem. The suspension of the talks, he said, had arisen because of the different conceptions held by the two sides about the basis on which the talks had started in 1968. The Government of Cyprus, supported by the Greek Government, sought a solution within the framework of an independent and federal State.

After the interruption of the talks, the Secretary-General reported, he had taken steps that had led to an agreement to resume the talks at the beginning of June 1974, on the same basis as that on which they had been conducted until 2 April. However, he warned that the road ahead would not be an easy one: relations between the two communities in Cyprus were still marred by mutual fear and distrust.

The Secretary-General went on to say that the increase in combat effectiveness of the armed forces of both sides was disturbing, as it tended to increase military pressures in areas of confrontation. There were also reports that additional weapons were being introduced into the island, a further cause for concern to UNFICYP. He hoped the parties would again cooperate in placing the imported weapons and equipment under UNFICYP surveillance or control, as had been done in the past.

He then reported that the second phase of the proposed reduction of the Force had been carried out, with the co-operation of the troop-contributing countries as well as of the parties concerned. The total strength had been reduced to 2,341.

The Secretary-General added that the reduction of the Force had somewhat alleviated its financial problem but had not solved it. Although a number of Member States favoured a further reduction, he felt that such a reduction would be premature. The situation in the island was still tense and potentially dangerous.

The Secretary-General recommended, with the concurrence of the Governments concerned, that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNFICYP until 15 December 1974.

Consideration by Security Council (29 May 1974)

The Security Council considered the Secretary-General's report on UNFICYP at two meetings on 29 May. The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were invited, at their request,
to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The President of the Council said that as a result of prior consultations a draft resolution had been agreed upon, which followed closely the wording of previous Council resolutions on the question. The Council adopted the draft resolution by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (China), as resolution 349 (1974).

By this text, the Council—after reaffirming its previous decisions on the question—(1) urged the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate determined cooperative efforts to achieve the Council's objectives by availing themselves in a constructive manner of the current auspicious climate and opportunities; and (2) extended once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force for a further period ending 15 December 1974, in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution would make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

During the Council's discussion following the vote, the representative of Cyprus said his Government had always been ready to accept general or partial military deconfrontation, as proposed by UNFICYP, despite the lack of cooperation in this regard shown by the Turkish Cypriot leadership. The Turkish Cypriots had also failed to comply with repeated appeals by the Secretary-General with regard to freedom of movement and had resisted all measures for economic cooperation.

He went on to say that the Prime Minister of Turkey had been responsible for the interruption of the intercommunal talks by interjecting the concept of a federal State for Cyprus—a concept which was rejected outright by the Cyprus Government. He hoped that the formula for resumption of the talks—agreed upon by the two communities, with the assistance of the Secretary-General—would create a new cooperative spirit and lead to a just solution.

The Turkish representative said his Government maintained its reservations about the reduction of UNFICYP and agreed with the Secretary-General's view that a further reduction would be premature.

He went on to say that the goal of the Greek Cypriot community was unification of Cyprus with Greece—enosis—the approach to which required getting rid of the bicomunal structure of the State and replacing it with a "unitary State."

On the question of a return to normal conditions, he said that the problem of displaced persons required a practical solution, but the Greek Cypriot side had continued to reject the proposal of the Turkish side to set up a joint committee to arrange for the rehabilitation of Turkish Cypriot refugees.

With regard to the intercommunal talks, the Turkish representative said that the Turkish side had never accepted the idea of a unitary State as the framework for discussions. Turkey, he stressed, favored an independent, sovereign and federative system for Cyprus.

The spokesman for Greece said that in his Government's opinion the concept of an independent, sovereign and unitary State had been from the outset the basis of the intercommunal talks. Greece, he said, hoped that a solution would be found by the interested parties within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. It agreed with the Secretary-General that further reductions in the strength of UNFICYP would be premature, and felt that a new effort should be made to bring more Member States to contribute to UNFICYP's budget.

The United Kingdom's representative reaffirmed his Government's readiness to maintain its troop contingent and continue its logistic support for UNFICYP. The United Kingdom hoped that the Secretary-General would make known his views on possible further Force reduction well before the expiration of the mandate. On the substance of the Cyprus problem, the representative felt that a return to normal conditions was long overdue. It was up to the parties concerned to achieve an acceptable settlement and, for that, mutual concessions were required.

The USSR representative recalled that his country's Foreign Minister had stated on 7 May 1974 that the USSR continued to pursue a policy designed to strengthen the national independence and sovereignty of Cyprus. The solution of the domestic problems of Cyprus was the business of the Cypriots themselves. The USSR, the representative said, had always opposed attempts to settle the problem by means of external intervention, and favored the elimination of foreign bases. It supported the resolution just adopted on the understanding that the extension of the Force's mandate was in full compliance with the Council's original resolution of 1964 and subsequent decisions, that its functions remained the same and that it continued to be financed on a voluntary basis.

France's representative said his Government had voted for the resolution with a certain concern: after 10 years, the circumstances invoked for the establishment of the Force were still being put forward to justify its continued maintenance. In such conditions, France wondered if the Council, while taking note of the positive per-
formance of the Force, did not have the duty to question the operation. His Government had supported the reduction of the Force and considered that a new evaluation of its mission should continue. France, he said, hoped that when the talks were resumed the parties would not take refuge in the status quo, which caused a greater polarization of the intercommunal life of Cyprus.

The representative of the United States said his Government was gratified that the parties had agreed to resume the negotiations, which it supported as the best available means of achieving a just solution based on the concept of a single, sovereign and independent Cyprus, with appropriate guarantees for the safety and well-being of all its people. The United States, he went on to say, was pleased with the completion of the second phase of the reduction of the Force. It considered that UNFICYP could carry out its mandate with substantially fewer personnel, which would have a beneficial impact on alleviating the financial difficulties of the Force. For this reason, the United States supported further reductions in the Force level, although it understood the reluctance of others in this respect. It hoped that as the intercommunal talks resumed, the need for further cuts would be given serious consideration.

Some Council members, among them Australia and Austria, welcomed the results of the reduction in the level of the Force; at the same time they endorsed the Secretary-General's opinion that for the time being a further decrease would be premature.

There was general regret over the lack of progress towards a solution of the basic issues, and several speakers—among them Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon—noted that tension and mistrust between the two communities seemed to be the main characteristics of the situation. Costa Rica, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya and Peru shared the hope that the renewed intercommunal talks would result in agreement on constitutional arrangements satisfactory to all. The Byelorussian SSR noted that UNFICYP continued to play an important role in the establishment of peace and the return to normal conditions. In its view, the problem should be settled by peaceful means—above all, by the Cypriots themselves.

The representative of the United Republic of Cameroon announced that his Government had decided to make a voluntary contribution of 500,000 francs CFA to the special fund for UNFICYP.

In a further statement, the representative of Cyprus observed that, prior to December 1975, the Turkish representative had never objected to the concept of a unitary State. The talks, therefore, would be resumed on the previously agreed basis of a unitary State. The idea of a federation, advanced by the Turkish side, was ruled out, he asserted, by the realities of the situation, as the population of Cyprus was intermingled. The existing Constitution of Cyprus was not that of a federation; the administration was central and the Turkish community had only communal rights.

He went on to say that Turkey had systematically raised the question of enosis in order to confuse the real issue of independence and find some excuse for obstructing any workable solution for an independent State. Turkey's fears of enosis were not genuine but assumed, since it knew that enosis was not considered a viable proposition and was not an official policy of either Cyprus or Greece.

Turkey's representative replied that the Constitution of Cyprus was based on the concept of equality in law of the two communities and consequently had a federalist spirit. The Greek Cypriot concept was of a unitary State in which the majority would make law and dictate it. In such a system, nothing would prevent the majority from opting for union with Greece. However, that would not be possible under a federal system in which the two communities had equal rights regarding any decision on the independence and territorial integrity of the State. In Turkey's view, the agreed formula on the resumption of the talks did not include any pre-conditions or reference to a unitary State.

Following the Council meetings of 29 May, the Turkish representative, in a letter of 30 May, said that since June 1972 Turkey had repeatedly expressed its objections to the use of the term "unitary State" and had suggested the possibility of a federative form.

The Greek representative replied on 6 June that before 1972 Turkey had not disputed the "unitary State" as part of the agreed basis of the talks, but had merely questioned the term "unitary" within that context. In the process of further discussion it had become evident that the term "unitary State" in its main essentials was an established legal definition. He said that the recently agreed formula elaborated by the Secretary-General was aimed at promoting progress in the talks by effecting a more solid adherence to the basis on which they had so far been conducted.

On 12 July, the Secretary-General addressed a further appeal to Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies for voluntary contributions to meet the costs of UNFICYP.
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CONTIGENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS
(by country of origin, as at 23 May 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Military personnel</th>
<th>Civilian police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Grand total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEDGES FOR FINANCING UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS
(UNFICYP Special Account for period 27 March 1964 to 15 June 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,719,875</td>
<td>Khmer Republic</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Republic of Viet-Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,820,000</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,810,084</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>985,666</td>
<td>Sorjia</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,565,000</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Federal Republic of</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Republic of United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>31,667</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>Republic of United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>12,150,000</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>50,500</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>921,000</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4,041,645</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,573,906</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>23,751</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153,264,844</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153,264,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum amount pledged.

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 15 June 1974.

Noting also from the report the conditions prevailing in the island.


1. Urges the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate determined cooperative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council by availing themselves in a constructive manner of the present auspicious climate and opportunities;

2. Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Secu-

Documentary references

Appeal of 28 January 1974 to Governments: report of 22 May 1974 by Secretary-General
S/11206. Letter of 28 January 1974 from Secretary-General to Governments containing further appeal for voluntary contributions for financing of UNFICYP.

Consideration by Security Council (29 May 1974)

Security Council, meetings 1771, 1772.


Resolution 349(1974), as prepared following consultations among Council members, S/11301, adopted by Council on 29 May 1974, meeting 1771, by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (China).

The Security Council,

Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 1974 (S/11294) that in the present circumstances the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed if peace is to be maintained in the island,
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On 15 July 1974, the United Nations Secretary-General, after receiving information of the coup d'état in Cyprus, sent identical messages to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey expressing his deep concern at the developments in the island and stressing the importance of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Cyprus.

He said that until fuller information became available, he was appealing to those Governments closely connected with Cyprus to exercise the maximum restraint and avoid any action which might give rise to further violence.

On 16 July, in a letter to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General asked, in view of the seriousness of the matter in relation to international peace and security and in view of the United Nations involvement in Cyprus, that the Council be convened so that he might report to it on information he had received through his Special Representative in Cyprus and the Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).

A meeting of the Council was also requested urgently by the representative of Cyprus, who said that the critical situation in Cyprus had been created as a result of outside intervention, with grave and threatening implications to the Republic of Cyprus and to international peace and security in the area.

Consideration by Security Council (16 July 1974)

On 16 July 1974, the Security Council met to consider the situation in Cyprus. Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The Secretary-General reported to the Council that the information he had received—beginning early in the morning of 15 July—from his Special Representative in Cyprus and the Commander of UNFICYP confirmed that a coup was being staged in Cyprus against Archbishop Makarios, the President of Cyprus. The Secretary-General described in detail the efforts undertaken by his Special Representative and by the UNFICYP Commander to prevent the spread of violence.

The Secretary-General recalled that the mandate of UNFICYP had been conceived in the context of the conflict between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in Cyprus, and that UNFICYP was therefore deployed along the lines of confrontation between those two communities. For that reason, UNFICYP did not have direct observation of most areas of the current fighting, which was related to rivalries within one community.

The Secretary-General also reported on contacts that his Special Representative and the Force Commander had had at Paphos, Cyprus, with Archbishop Makarios, who had requested that a Security Council meeting be held as soon as possible. The Secretary-General had authorized UNFICYP to extend protection to Archbishop Makarios on a humanitarian basis, and had subsequently been informed that he had left the island.

The Secretary-General said he had followed the recent developments with the deepest concern. In the context of the Cyprus problem, such events carried the serious risk of a threat to international peace and security in a much wider framework, he stated.

The representative of Cyprus said that the coup in Cyprus had been organized by a large number of officers who came from Greece to train and command the Cypriot National Guard. For some time they had been engaging in subversive propaganda, and therefore President Makarios had formally asked Greece to recall them. Violence had followed, interrupting the peaceful progress towards an agreed solution of the Cyprus problem.

The Security Council, the representative continued, had a duty to act to prevent a deterioration in the situation. It was vitally important for the Council to adopt a resolution calling for a cease-fire and for the protection of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus from outside military intervention. He emphasized that Archbishop Makarios was the only legitimate and elected President of Cyprus.

According to the representative of the USSR, the Council's task was to take urgent measures to protect the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus, a Member State. He said that what had taken place was an armed putsch organized by external forces and aimed at the violent overthrow of the lawful Government of Cyprus, headed by Archbishop Makarios. Time would not wait, he declared; the Council should
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urgent measures aimed at immediately bringing an end to the armed interference by the Greek military in the domestic affairs of Cyprus.

Turkey's spokesman said that the coup d'état had been mounted in Athens and fostered and carried out by Greek troops. The violence committed by Greeks against Greeks should serve to explain the lack of trust between the Turkish and Greek communities in Cyprus, he said. The United Nations should now ensure that the balance of forces, so deeply disturbed to the detriment of the Turkish community, was re-established and that all illicit entry of troops and munitions was prohibited. Turkey, he said, was devoted to a peaceful solution of the problems of the island, but it wished to leave no doubt about its intention to safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of the Turkish community.

The French representative said that the unprecedented circumstances had led the nine members of the European Economic Community (EEC) to issue a communiqué expressing their concern at events which seriously threatened stability in the eastern Mediterranean. They reaffirmed their dedication to the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus, and their opposition to any intervention or interference which might jeopardize it.

The United Kingdom's spokesman informed the Council that President Makarios had left Cyprus on board a British aircraft and was in Malta. The Council should perhaps wait to see what he had to say. The situation was highly explosive, not only for Cyprus but for the entire Mediterranean region, and it would clearly be wrong to assess the final blame now. He appealed to those concerned, particularly the Governments of Greece and Turkey, to exercise statesmanship and restraint.

The representative of Greece categorically refuted allegations made by some speakers about events in Cyprus which, in the opinion of his Government, were internal affairs of the Republic of Cyprus. The Greek Government had no relation whatsoever with their origin or incitement, he declared. Greece was convinced that the territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus, as well as the unitary character of the Republic, should be maintained and respected by all parties concerned.

The spokesman for the United States said his Government strongly deplored the violence which had upset the delicate balance on the island. It was difficult at the moment, he said, to see clearly whether and how the Council could make a positive contribution. The United States, he added, continued to support the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and the existing constitutional arrangements and it urged, in particular, that all interested parties exercise the utmost restraint and avoid actions which might further worsen the situation.

Communications (16 and 17 July 1974)

The Prime Minister of Greece, replying on 16 July 1974 to the Secretary-General's message of 15 July, agreed that the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Cyprus should be maintained and respected by all parties concerned. It was the firm belief of the Greek Government, he said, that the Cyprus problem should be solved peacefully through negotiations within the framework of the enlarged intercommunal talks.

On 17 July, the Prime Minister of Turkey, in reply to the Secretary-General's message of 15 July, said that a grave situation had been created concerning the independence, territorial integrity and security of the State of Cyprus as a result of the armed coup which had taken place. Such a situation in the island created another serious problem regarding the protection of the security, rights and interests of the Turkish community. He urged the United Nations—which had particular responsibilities concerning Cyprus—to adopt certain initial measures immediately to prevent the further deterioration of the balance of forces and the illegal entry of military forces, weapons and ammunition into the island. Moreover, in view of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, it was clear that recognition of the administration proclaimed on 16 July as "the Government of Cyprus" was not possible.

Consideration by Security Council (19 and 20 July 1974)

The Security Council met on 19 July 1974 to continue its consideration of the situation in Cyprus. The President of the Council said that in the course of consultations with Council members, the Secretary-General had informed them of two telegrams he had received from Nicosia, Cyprus, on 17 and 18 July. One, signed by Demis Dimitriou, Foreign Minister of Cyprus, stated that Zenon Rossides, Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, had been relieved of his post and duties as from 15 July; the other stated that Ambassador Loucis Papaphilippou had been designated as Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, had been relieved of his post and duties as from 15 July; the other stated that Ambassador Loucis Papaphilippou had been designated as Permanent Representative and would arrive within 24 hours. The latter telegram requested a 24-hour adjournment of the Council's meeting so that the new Permanent Representative and delegation could attend.

The President went on to say that the members of the Council had agreed to receive Archbishop Makarios in his capacity as President of Cyprus and to regard Ambassador Rossides, who had
been duly accredited by the Head of State of Cyprus, as representing Cyprus during the current debate. The representatives of Greece and Turkey, and those of India, Romania and Yugoslavia, at their request, were invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

Archbishop Makarios said that the coup in Cyprus had been organized by the military régime of Greece and put into effect by Greek officers serving in and commanding the Cyprus National Guard. The military junta of Greece, he declared, had extended its dictatorship to Cyprus without a trace of respect for the independence and sovereignty of the Republic. The terrorist organization “EOKA-B”—directed and financed from Athens—had, he said, recently renewed its wave of violence and he had asked the President of the Greek régime, Lieutenant-General Phaedon Ghizikis, to give orders for its dissolution and for the withdrawal of the Greek officers serving with the National Guard. The reply to his letter came in the form of a coup, the Archbishop said.

After the coup, he continued, the agents of the Greek régime in Cyprus appointed a well-known gunman, Nikos Sampson, as President, who in turn appointed as ministers known elements and supporters of EOKA-B.

He went on to assert that the coup was clearly not a revolution—which would be an internal matter—but an invasion from outside, the results of which would be catastrophic for Cyprus if there was no return to constitutional normality and if democratic freedoms were not restored.

Archbishop Makarios urged the Security Council to use all the means at its disposal so that constitutional order and the democratic rights of the Cypriot people could be reinstated without delay. It was not possible for the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus to be effective under conditions of a military coup, he said, and in his view the Council should call upon the military régime of Greece to withdraw the Greek officers in the National Guard and put an end to its invasion of Cyprus.

The representative of Greece said he unreservedly rejected any allegations of Greek involvement in the coup which had led to the overthrow of Archbishop Makarios. The Cypriot armed forces, he said, had been acting on their own. He expressed the opinion that Archbishop Makarios had outlived his usefulness in Cyprus.

According to the Turkish representative, the coup seemed to have eliminated every appearance of legitimacy on the Greek Cypriot side; in the circumstances, the only legitimate constitutional institution in Cyprus was the Turkish Cypriot administration under the Vice-President of Cyprus. It was the duty of the world community to restore the status quo ante. For its part, Turkey considered it its duty to make use of the rights conferred on it by international treaties.

The representatives of India, Romania and Yugoslavia condemned the military coup and urged the Council to act to re-establish constitutional order in Cyprus.

The spokesman for the USSR said that the Soviet people condemned the fascist putsch carried out in Cyprus with the assistance of the Greek military. The coup, he declared, had been planned by certain circles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which could not accept the Cyprus Government’s policy of non-alignment. He called for an end to external interference in the domestic affairs of Cyprus.

According to the representative of China, the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus should be respected by all countries. The question of Cyprus, he said, should be settled by the people of Cyprus and vigilance must be maintained against attempts by the super-powers to take advantage of the situation.

The United States representative said that enosis could not be considered an acceptable solution of the Cyprus problem, nor was military intervention by any party justified in the current situation. The Cyprus crisis demanded a peaceful and constitutional solution, he said, and, for that, consultations—such as those currently taking place in London, United Kingdom, between representatives of Turkey, the United Kingdom and United States—were needed. Other consultations were taking place in the area of the conflict. He urged that time be allowed for a peaceful solution.

The United Kingdom representative said that the Government of Greece had also been invited to attend the London talks and he joined the United States in urging restraint on all concerned so that those talks could be given time to succeed.

Austria’s representative said that the violent overthrow of the constitutional Government of President Makarios had caused the Austrian Government deep concern. Action by the Security Council—in conjunction with all other efforts—was required to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus from all foreign interference.

According to the spokesman for Australia, it was to be regretted that Greece had not responded immediately and favourably to the request of President Makarios for the recall of the Greek officers from Cyprus. He said that the Council, while registering its strong disapproval of what had happened and calling for an end to Greek military interference, must appeal for the utmost restraint everywhere while the process of negotiation went forward.
During the meeting, a draft resolution, later revised, was circulated. By this text, on which no action was taken, the Council would have among other things: called on all States to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus; demanded an immediate end to foreign military intervention in Cyprus that was in contravention of the preceding paragraph and requested the withdrawal without delay of the foreign military personnel in excess of those envisaged in international agreements, as requested by President Makarios; requested all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation; and asked the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed about developments.

The next day, 20 July, the representative of Greece asked the Council to meet urgently in view of the "brutal aggression of Turkish armed forces against Cyprus" which was then in progress. Greece asked the Council to take appropriate steps following the explosive situation thus created for international peace and security.

When the Council convened, the representative of Mauritius was invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in addition to those States previously so invited.

The Secretary-General informed the Council that Turkish military activity both in the air and by sea had begun early that morning—shortly after the Turkish Ambassador in Nicosia, Cyprus, had informed the Commander of UNFICYP that Turkish troops were about to intervene in Cyprus.

After summarizing the day's developments in Cyprus, as reported by his Special Representative and the UNFICYP Commander, the Secretary-General told the Council that it was faced with an appalling and extremely dangerous situation. The fighting on Cyprus, with the arrival of Turkish forces, had reached a new level of violence and bitterness, he said, and the danger of wider conflict had become a tragic reality. Despite all bilateral efforts to avoid it, a major breakdown of the cease-fire had become a tragic reality. Despite all bilateral efforts to avoid it, a major breakdown of the cease-fire had occurred.

The Secretary-General appealed to the parties in conflict to halt the devastating battle and to co-operate with UNFICYP in its efforts to limit the fighting and protect the civilian population.

The Security Council President then informed the Council that, in close co-operation with the Secretary-General, he had maintained continuous consultations with the representatives of Member States—consultations which had begun on 15 July and were intensified as the situation worsened. As a result, a draft resolution had been circulated which he then put to the vote and which the Council adopted by 15 votes to 0 as resolution 353(1974).

By the preambular parts of this text, the Council among other things deeply deplored the outbreak of violence and continuing bloodshed and expressed its grave concern about the situation, which had led to a serious threat to international peace and security and had created a most explosive situation in the whole eastern Mediterranean area. It expressed itself as being equally concerned about the necessity to restore the constitutional structure of the Republic of Cyprus, which had been established and guaranteed by international agreements. After recalling its previous resolutions on the Cyprus question and its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council:

(1) called upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus;
(2) called upon all parties to the fighting as a first step to cease all firing and asked all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation;
(3) demanded an immediate end to foreign military intervention in Cyprus that was in contravention of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity;
(4) requested the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements, including those whose withdrawal was requested by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, on 2 July 1974;
(5) called on Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom to enter into negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus and to keep the Secretary-General informed;
(6) called on all parties to co-operate fully with UNFICYP to enable it to carry out its mandate; and
(7) decided to keep the situation under constant review and asked the Secretary-General to report as appropriate with a view to adopting further measures in order to ensure that peaceful conditions were restored as soon as possible.

(For text of resolution 353(1974), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The representative of the United Kingdom welcomed the unanimity which the Council had shown. There must be immediate talks, he said, and the United Kingdom had asked Greece and Turkey—as the other guarantors of the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee—to hold talks in London the following day, 21 July. The object, he said, would be to reduce tension and work towards a return of constitutional rule. Greece had agreed that
talks were necessary, but no response had been received from the Turkish Government.

The United States representative said his Government deplored the pressures and interventions which had contributed to the Turkish action on Cyprus, for which Greece must bear a heavy share of the responsibility. The United States urged both countries to display the maximum spirit of restraint and compromise and to accept the United Kingdom's proposal for negotiations among the guarantor powers.

France's spokesman deplored the delays which had prevented earlier action by the Council, and which had incited one party to resort to force to preserve its interests. He read a statement on behalf of the nine countries of F.F.C supporting the British initiative to hold talks among the guarantor powers in London, urging Greece and Turkey to avoid a worsening of the situation, and favouring the restoration of constitutional order in Cyprus.

According to the USSR representative, the current state of affairs was the result of open and flagrant military interference by the Athens Government in the internal affairs of Cyprus. Although delaying tactics by certain members had prevented the Council from taking effective measures sooner, the USSR had voted for the resolution just adopted because it called for the restoration of the constitutional arrangements in Cyprus and the Government headed by President Makarios, and demanded an end to foreign intervention against the Republic of Cyprus and the withdrawal of foreign military personnel.

China's representative said that the Chinese Government and people firmly supported the just struggle waged by the people of Cyprus under President Makarios. The two super-powers, he said, were sparing no efforts to sow discord in their contention for hegemony in the Middle East and the Mediterranean region. China had reservations, as a matter of principle, on the two paragraphs of the resolution dealing with the United Nations Force.

Several members, including Austria and Peru, welcomed the fact that the Council had acted with unanimity, although Australia, the Byelorussian SSR and Costa Rica were among those expressing regret that so much time had elapsed before the Council had been able to take action. Costa Rica, for example, felt that a more timely resolution, containing a general warning to all States to abstain from intervening in Cyprus, might have prevented Turkey's intervention.

A number of Council members—among them Austria, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon—emphasized the importance their Governments attached to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to the need to restore constitutional order to that country on the basis of existing agreements.

The representative of Mauritius urged the Council to take decisive action to end the fighting and ward off an open conflict that might erupt between Greece and Turkey, with the possible involvement of other powers.

According to the spokesman for Cyprus, the sad reality was that intervention and aggression had now been committed by two of the countries which were guarantors of the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus. He said it was important that the United Kingdom had said it would keep in contact with President Makarios on the progress of the negotiations between the three guarantors—Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

The Greek representative said that Turkey had launched a full-scale aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus and its attacks were obviously aimed at the permanent occupation of large portions of Cypriot territory—a prelude to the creation of the infrastructure for partition, which was Turkey's permanent and final target. Greece, he said, would take appropriate counter-measures in self-defence and in defence of its national interests, and was demanding that the invading Turkish forces be confined within the limits of the Turkish enclaves pending a resolution of the situation.

Turkey's spokesman quoted the Turkish Prime Minister to the effect that the Turkish armed forces had started a peace operation to end decades of strife in Cyprus. The recent coup had been manufactured by the dictatorial régime of Athens, and Turkey was fulfilling its legal responsibility as a co-guarantor of the independence and constitutional order of Cyprus. Turkey had not invaded but had acted against an invasion, the Prime Minister said.

Communications and reports (20 and 21 July 1974)

On 20 July 1974, the Secretary-General informed the President of the Security Council that he had received a telegram from Loucis Papaphilippou stating that he had been appointed Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, and that, in reply, the United Nations Legal Counsel had—on the Secretary-General's behalf—inform  Mr. Papaphilippou of the Security Council's decision to regard Zenon Rossides as representing Cyprus in the current debate.

Also on 20 July, the Secretary-General trans-
mitted a letter from the Turkish representative stating that the Vice-President of Cyprus, Rauf R. Denktash, requested that he be invited to appear before the Council in person or through a representative.

On the same date, the Turkish representative transmitted two letters from Vice-President Denktash in which he strongly objected to the assignment by Nikos Sampson of a new representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, in violation of the Constitution of Cyprus, and stated that he did not recognize the Sampson administration.

On 21 July, the Secretary-General reported that fighting had intensified throughout the island. He had, he said, appealed to all concerned to bring the fighting to an immediate end and forthwith to begin negotiations for a peaceful settlement in line with the Security Council's resolution of the previous day. He added that UNFICYP had been doing all it could, especially in the humanitarian field, and would continue to do its utmost to limit the fighting and protect the civilian population.

Also on 21 July, the Secretary-General addressed appeals to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey expressing his deep concern at the continuing and savage fighting and appealing for an urgent and positive response to the Council's resolution of 20 July.

The Greek representative replied the same day that his Government had accepted the Council's resolution in toto. The Turkish Prime Minister replied that Turkey had decided to respond positively to the appeal for a cease-fire and that Turkish troops were being instructed to cease firing as from 1400 hours GMT on 22 July.

Also on 21 July, the representative of Greece requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to take all appropriate measures to bring an end to "the continuing indiscriminate bombardment by napalm bombs and rockets of civilian targets and population by the Turkish Air Force."

A letter from the Turkish representative, also dated 21 July, said that the same forces of the Greek National Guard who had engineered the coup had launched relentless attacks against the Turkish Cypriot civilian population, including women, children and the elderly, in areas entirely outside the Turkish military zone. The attacks, he said, had been contained to a large extent only through the intervention of the Turkish Air Force.

A meeting of the Security Council was also requested by Cyprus, in a letter of 21 July, "because of the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus and the urgent need for protection of life and human rights."

Consideration by Security Council (22-24 July 1974)

When the Security Council met on 22 July 1974, it invited the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, India, Mauritius, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with decisions taken earlier.

The Secretary-General informed the Council that, although the cease-fire had been due to take effect at 1000 hours New York time, he had received reports that the fighting was continuing. He went on to say that UNFICYP, although very small in numbers, had been doing its utmost to limit the fighting and protect the civilian population. However, it had received requests for assistance from all sides which were manifestly far beyond its current capabilities. It was obvious, he said, especially in a situation as complex as that existing in Cyprus, that the current strength of the Force was not sufficient for it effectively to ensure the maintenance of the cease-fire. He intended, therefore, as a first step, to ask the troop-contributing countries urgently to reinforce their contingents already serving with UNFICYP.

During the course of the meeting, the spokesmen for Australia, Austria and the United Kingdom promised to give urgent consideration to the Secretary-General's request for reinforcement of their contingents serving with UNFICYP. The United States representative supported the Secretary-General's appeal.

The representative of the USSR said that the composition and mandate of the United Nations Force in Cyprus had to be determined by the Security Council and its financing had to be on a voluntary basis.

Council members who spoke during the meeting urged all concerned to observe the cease-fire. The United Kingdom observed that if there was no cease-fire it was improbable that talks could have any chance of success.

The Greek representative said that Turkey's inhuman and unlawful attacks continued. He charged that Turkey was acting on the basis of a well-conceived plan aiming solely at the partition of Cyprus.

Turkey's representative said he had received reports that eight Greek naval vessels were at Paphos, attempting to land troops. Greeks, he charged, were committing atrocities at that very moment in spite of the presence of UNFICYP, whose purpose was to prevent precisely what was going on.

The spokesman for Cyprus said that the Council's resolution of 20 July had not been implemented. There was no justification whatever for Turkey's actions under the Treaty of Guarani-
Political and security questions

The next day, 23 July, the Secretary-General, stating that he had received information that serious violations of the ceasefire were still taking place, addressed an urgent appeal to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey and the Acting President of Cyprus to give instructions to their military forces that no further violations of the ceasefire should take place.

Also on 23 July, the representative of Greece requested an immediate meeting of the Security Council to examine what he described as the serious situation created by continuous Turkish violations of the ceasefire. He said that unless immediate measures were taken to stop Turkey's efforts to enlarge the territory occupied by its forces, the whole situation would deteriorate and could lead to a general conflagration.

When the Council met later that day, its President informed it that he had received two telegrams from the Permanent Representative of Greece concerning the shelling of the Greek Embassy in Nicosia and appealing for immediate humanitarian action.

The Secretary-General then informed the Council that reports he had received gave rise to serious anxiety about the observance of the ceasefire. A ceasefire had been arranged by UNFICYP at the Nicosia International Airport, which had then been declared a United Nations-controlled area and occupied by UNFICYP troops. He went on to say that, in response to his appeal, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom had undertaken to provide reinforcements to their contingents to a total of some 1,400 men; other Governments were giving urgent, favourable consideration to his appeal.

The Council then unanimously adopted a draft resolution—elaborated after consultations—as resolution 354(1974).

By this text, the Council, after reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 353(1974) of 20 July, demanded that all parties to the fighting comply immediately with the provision of that resolution by which the Council had called for an immediate cessation of all firing in the area and had requested all States to exercise the utmost restraint and refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Following the vote, the representative of the United States said he had supported the resolution because his Government was determined that the ceasefire should be made fully effective at the earliest possible moment. According to France, the Council was duty-bound to call for an effective observance of the ceasefire, and it trusted that both sides would accept it. Austria also called on the parties to heed the Council's unanimous appeal. The United Kingdom said that the resolution just adopted was a clear call to the parties to stop fighting. The USSR spokesman said the resolution was an important step towards implementation of the main resolution—resolution 353(1974) of 20 July—in all its parts.

The Greek representative charged that Turkey had ignored the Council's resolution of 20 July, while Greece was ready to abide by its provisions, including its call for negotiations.

The spokesman for Cyprus urged the Council not merely to express disapproval but to act in an effective way: UNFICYP should ask the side or sides violating the ceasefire to withdraw to the positions held at the time of the ceasefire.

Turkey expressed the hope that the resolution just adopted would prevent further atrocities against Turkish Cypriots.

The Security Council held a closed meeting the next day, 24 July, and took note of a letter from the Foreign Minister of Turkey containing assurances that—without prejudice to Turkey's contentions as to the legality of the United Nations presence at the Lefkose (Nicosia) airport—his Government undertook not to attempt to assume possession of the airport by force.

Communications and reports (22-26 July 1974)

Between 22 and 26 July 1974, several communications were received from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey concerning various aspects of the situation in Cyprus. Turkey submitted complaints charging attacks against the Turkish Cypriot population; Greece submitted charges of landings in Cyprus of Turkish military personnel and equipment and complained of many Turkish violations of the ceasefire.

On 22 July, the representative of Turkey transmitted a note addressed to the Permanent Mission of the United States in connexion with an incident at the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations in New York caused by a group of Greeks. In other communications, Turkey transmitted on 24 July the text of an appeal addressed to Turkish Cypriots by the Vice-President and the Acting President of Cyprus to refrain from any excess against Greeks and to act with moderation, and the text of a message by which the Prime Minister of Turkey sent congratulations to Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis of Greece on his assumption of office.

In response to the Secretary-General's appeal of 23 July concerning the ceasefire, the Prime
Minister of Turkey assured the Secretary-General on that date that Turkey did not intend "to derive new advantages from a troubled situation." Turkey, he said, was looking forward to a speedy and constructive conclusion of the negotiations soon to be held between the guarantor powers—Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom—in Geneva.

The Secretary-General continued during this period to report to the Security Council on the situation in Cyprus on the basis of information received from his Special Representative and the Commander of UNFICYP. On 24 July, he reported that the cease-fire continued to hold. Evacuation of foreign nationals continued, and throughout the island United Nations forces were redeploying and re-establishing contact with the local population, reoccupying evacuated observation posts and base camps and investigating charges and accusations from both sides. A team from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) had arrived in Nicosia and liaison with local Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations was being established with UNFICYP assistance. The Nicosia airport, he said, remained under United Nations control.

The next day, 25 July, the Secretary-General reported that Turkish forces had begun to advance in several directions from the area under their control between Kyrenia and Nicosia. At the same time, National Guard forces in outlying areas had surrounded a number of Turkish Cypriot villages and demanded their surrender. Wherever possible, UNFICYP was assisting the Turkish villagers and was also attempting to gain access to Greek Cypriot villages in areas of the Kyrenia district occupied during the Turkish advance. In Kyrenia, a number of Greek Cypriots and Greek civilians were under United Nations protection.

Throughout the island, the Secretary-General said, UNFICYP was exerting strenuous efforts to further the maintenance of the cease-fire and he reported that the reinforcements he had urgently appealed for had begun to arrive.

In letters of 25 July, the Greek representative submitted charges of cease-fire violations by Turkish forces, including the disembarkation of further military personnel and equipment at Kyrenia.

In a letter dated 26 July, the representative of Cyprus requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider what he described as the grave deterioration of the situation in Cyprus through the continued and flagrant violations of the cease-fire by Turkey which, he said, was daily importing into the island more and more tanks and other weapons of destruction.

**Consideration by Security Council (27-29 and 31 July and 1 August 1974)**

The Security Council met on 27 July 1974 to continue its consideration of the situation in Cyprus and, in accordance with earlier decisions, invited the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, India, Mauritius, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The Secretary-General told the Council that there had been a series of breaches of the cease-fire and that the question of interposing UNFICYP between the Turkish forces and the Cypriot National Guard in order to stabilize the cease-fire had been raised.

He recalled that UNFICYP's original mandate had aimed at preventing a recurrence of fighting between the two communities and did not envisage the interposition of the United Nations Force between the armed forces of another Member State and the armed forces of Cyprus. Accordingly, he had asked his representative at the tripartite talks then under way in Geneva between the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom to discuss with them how best UNFICYP could actively assist in limiting further hostilities and cease-fire violations. Any plan involving the interposition of UNFICYP would obviously require the complete co-operation of both sides. What was needed, he said, was agreement on how to stabilize the cease-fire throughout the island so that negotiations could progress.

In connexion with the negotiations in Geneva, the Secretary-General said he understood that intensive efforts were going on to find a basis for working towards a settlement and that some progress had been made. He expressed the hope that the negotiations would achieve the goals set in the Council's resolution of 20 July (353(1974)).

The representative of Cyprus observed that the Geneva negotiations could not continue without the active assistance of the Security Council to protect international peace or to protect Cyprus. In his view, the Council must be kept apprised of the situation and act to strengthen the negotiations in Geneva.

According to the spokesman for Greece, there was no doubt as to who was violating the cease-fire. If Turkey was not prepared to honour the cease-fire, it should not have accepted it.

Turkey's representative said it was the worst possible moment for Cyprus to ask for a Council meeting, which could only make finding a solution through the Geneva talks more difficult.

Several speakers, among them Austria, the United Kingdom and the United Republic of Cameroon, said that the Geneva talks deserved full support and should be given a chance to succeed. France's spokesman said that as long as the
Geneva conference continued the Council could only express the wish that the situation in Cyprus itself would not be changed in a unilateral manner to the detriment of one or the other of the communities on the island. Several representatives, including those of France and the United States, paid tribute to UNFICYP. Austria and India, among others, said that its mandate should be strengthened.

According to the USSR, the Council's resolution of 20 July was not being implemented in all its parts. Foreign military personnel had not been withdrawn and the lawful and constitutional Government of Cyprus was denied the right to fulfil its functions.

On 28 July, the representative of the USSR requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the implementation of Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July. The letter containing the request said that that resolution was not being implemented and, consequently, a tense situation threatening international peace and security continued to exist in Cyprus.

When the Council met on 28 July, the USSR representative said that not one of the provisions of resolution 353(1974) had been implemented: foreign military intervention continued and the constitutional Government of President Makarios had not been restored. Certain circles within NATO had acted in such a way, he said, that the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Cyprus had become a subject of bargaining in order to serve their military and strategic positions in the Mediterranean. The Council must insist on the withdrawal of Greek and other military personnel from the island. Otherwise, he declared, the State might be dismembered and eliminated as a State.

In other statements during the meeting, the representative of Greece said his Government was anxious not to do anything to endanger the Geneva talks. He observed that there was a difference between his country, which was ready to withdraw its armed personnel from Cyprus, and Turkey, which had invaded Cyprus and was not ready to withdraw its forces.

Turkey's spokesman said that in his view the situation in both Cyprus and Geneva did not warrant a Council meeting. An already tense situation was being dramatized, he said, without due consideration being given to what was happening in Cyprus and to the superhuman efforts being made in Geneva to reach a peaceful solution.

The representative of Cyprus said that, for a week after the Security Council had—on 20 July—called for a cease-fire, the attacks had continued and Turkey continued to pour in war matériel. Implementation of the resolution was a matter for the Security Council, not the Geneva conference, which could make progress only in a peaceful atmosphere.

In the opinion of the representative of the United Kingdom, the meeting had been called by the USSR "in a mischievous way"—a propaganda exercise which did the United Nations no good whatsoever.

The Council met the next day, 29 July, again at the request of the USSR, which submitted a draft resolution on the situation in Cyprus. By this text, the Council—after noting the unsatisfactory situation with regard to the implementation of its resolution of 20 July (353(1974))—would:

1. demand of all the States concerned that they undertake urgent and effective measures for the practical implementation of all the provisions of resolution 353(1974);
2. insist on the immediate cessation of firing and all acts of violence against the Republic of Cyprus and on the speediest withdrawal of all foreign forces and military personnel present in Cyprus in violation of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity as a non-aligned State;
3. decide to send immediately to Cyprus a special mission composed of ... members of the Security Council, to be appointed by the Council President after consultations with Council members and the Secretary-General, for the purpose of verifying on the spot the implementation of resolution 353(1974) and of reporting to the Council;
4. consider it necessary, taking into account the relevant provisions of that resolution, that representatives of the constitutional Government of the Republic of Cyprus participate in the Geneva negotiations; and
5. decide, in the absence of progress in the implementation of its resolution of 20 July, to consider the question of further measures to be taken by the Council to ensure its implementation.

Reporting to the Council on the latest developments in Cyprus, the Secretary-General said that the situation on the island continued to be tense, but was at that time relatively quiet. Concerning the negotiations in Geneva between the three Foreign Ministers, he reported that in spite of strenuous efforts fundamental differences persisted between the positions of Greece and Turkey.

The Secretary-General went on to say that he had been informed by the UNFICYP Commander that the Turkish Corps Commander in Cyprus was requesting that all UNFICYP personnel be evacuated from the area controlled by Turkish forces. He had, he said, asked the Prime Minister of Turkey to use his best efforts so that an
agreed solution could be reached, and had emphasized the humanitarian task of UNFICYP in relation to all the people of Cyprus.

The USSR representative said the Council had a special and growing responsibility in Cyprus and the purpose of the special mission proposed in the USSR draft resolution was to verify the implementation of Council resolution 353(1974) on the spot. It would have to establish contact with the lawful head of the Cypriot Government, President Makarios, or his representatives.

He went on to say that some Council members had urged the Council to await the outcome of the Geneva talks. In his view, that would sanction the arbitrary determination of the future of the Cypriots behind their backs and to the detriment of their fundamental and vital interests. They must be able to determine their own future, he stated, and they should participate in the Geneva negotiations. Any decisions of an international conference without the participation of the lawful Government of Cyprus, headed by President Makarios, could lead to a worsening of the situation and to new conflicts.

The President of the Council said it was his understanding that consultations would be held on the USSR draft resolution and he would convene the Council whenever necessary.

When the Security Council met again on 31 July, it had before it a letter dated 30 July from the Secretary-General by which he transmitted a letter from the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs. The Foreign Secretary forwarded the text of a Declaration and statement agreed to by the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom at the conclusion of their discussions in Geneva, which lasted from 25 to 30 July 1974.

According to the Declaration, the Foreign Ministers, while recognizing the importance of regularizing the situation in Cyprus on a lasting basis, had agreed on the need to decide first on certain immediate measures. The Ministers declared that areas controlled by opposing armed forces on 30 July should not be extended, and agreed on the following measures:

1. a security zone, the size of which was to be determined by the three countries in consultation with UNFICYP, should be established at the limit of the areas occupied by Turkish armed forces on 30 July at 2200 hours (Geneva time), and UNFICYP forces alone should enter and supervise that zone;
2. all Turkish enclaves occupied by Greek or Greek Cypriot forces should be immediately evacuated and should continue to be protected by UNFICYP;
3. in mixed villages UNFICYP would carry out the functions of security and police; and
4. detained military personnel and civilians should be released or exchanged under ICRC supervision.

The three Ministers, reaffirming that Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July should be implemented in the shortest possible time, agreed that measures should be elaborated which would lead to a phased reduction of armed forces and armaments in Cyprus.

They also agreed that further talks aiming at the restoration of peace should begin on 8 August 1974 at Geneva, and that the representatives of the two Cypriot communities should be invited at an early stage to participate in the talks relating to the Constitution.

The three Ministers further agreed to convey the contents of the Declaration to the Secretary-General and invite him to take appropriate action in the light thereof.

In a separate statement, the parties declared that their adherence to the Declaration did not prejudice their respective views on the interpretation or application of the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960.

Also before the Security Council was a draft resolution, submitted by the United Kingdom, by which, among other things, the Council would have: noted that all States had declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus; taken note of the Geneva Declaration of 30 July; and requested the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of that Declaration.

The President of the Council announced at the outset of the meeting that the draft resolution had been withdrawn.

The Secretary-General expressed the hope that the agreement reached in Geneva on the cease-fire would be a first step towards the full implementation of the Council's resolution of 20 July.

He went on to point out that the Declaration called for action in consultation with UNFICYP to determine the size and character of the security zone which would be open only to the United Nations Force. Other functions were also foreseen for UNFICYP, he added. He said he had requested his Special Representative and the Force Commander to give him a preliminary assessment of the practical implications of the Declaration as it related to UNFICYP.

The Secretary-General informed the Council that the total strength of UNFICYP—which as at 31 July was 3,484—would be reinforced to 4,238 by 7 August and was expected to be further strengthened to 4,443 when, by about 12 August,
all of the reinforcements currently pledged had arrived on the island.

The question of the nature of UNFICYP's continued presence in the Turkish area of control still needed clarification, he went on to say. In his view, the Force had been playing and should continue to play a most useful humanitarian role in all parts of the island. The matter was now under discussion by UNFICYP and the Turkish military command and he was confident that the Force would be able to continue to perform its role in all parts of the island with the full agreement of all the parties concerned.

The Secretary-General said he was prepared to co-operate fully with the parties in order to restore peaceful conditions on the island so that negotiations could continue and the Security Council's resolution of 20 July (353(1974)) could be fully implemented.

The President then read out the text of a draft resolution which had been formulated during consultations. By the preambular paragraphs of the text, the Council would recall earlier resolutions on the question, note that all States had declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and take note of the Secretary-General's statement at the current meeting of the Council. The Council would then, by the operative paragraph, request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of his statement.

In the opinion of the Greek representative, the Geneva agreement could be regarded as a step in the right direction. It was now up to the Security Council to take constructive steps towards full implementation of the resolution of 20 July. The Turkish spokesman also said that a first step had been taken at Geneva and he hoped that a lasting solution would be found, with the help of Greece, the United Kingdom and, in time, the duly accredited representatives of the two communities.

The representative of the United Kingdom observed that the Geneva Declaration was neither a perfect document nor a blueprint for the future of the island of Cyprus; it was simply the best response that the three Governments were able to make to the request put before them in the Council's resolution of 20 July. In the United Kingdom's view, the Declaration was important because it introduced conditions for making the cease-fire stick. Without an effective cease-fire future political decisions could not be made, and without the use of UNFICYP the cease-fire could not be as effective as it needed to be. He urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution, as did the representative of France, who called attention to the urgency of the arrangements to be made by the Secretary-General and the arduous tasks that would devolve upon UNFICYP.

The United States representative also expressed support for the draft resolution, as did the spokesmen for Australia, Austria, Indonesia and the United Republic of Cameroon.

Kenya's representative had serious reservations about discussion of the affairs of a sovereign Member State by third parties in the absence of the country concerned. The Declaration in his view was far from satisfactory and clearly demonstrated the need for Cyprus to participate in any future negotiations.

The representative of Peru also regretted the absence of Cyprus from the Geneva talks and hoped that Cyprus would be able to participate in future negotiations.

The USSR representative then proposed suspension of the meeting for two hours to allow his delegation to receive instructions. The United Kingdom and France objected, and the USSR proposal was rejected by a vote of 7 in favour to 0 against, with 8 abstentions.

The USSR then introduced an amendment to the draft resolution which would add to the end of the operative paragraph—by which the Council would request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of his statement—the words "taking into account that the cease-fire will be the first step in the full implementation of Security Council resolution 353(1974)."

The USSR also introduced a second amendment, to add to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution (by which the Council would note that all States had declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus) the words "as a State not belonging to any military alliance."

A procedural discussion ensued when the USSR asked that the texts of its amendments be circulated in all official languages in accordance with the Council's provisional rules of procedure. A motion to that effect was defeated by a vote of 0 in favour to 5 against, with 8 abstentions, and the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR not participating in the vote.

The Council adopted the first USSR amendment by 14 votes to 0. China did not participate in the voting, having explained that in view of its position of principle concerning the dispatch of United Nations forces, it would not participate in the voting on the draft resolution or on the two amendments.

The second USSR amendment received 2 votes in favour to 0 against, with 12 abstentions, and was thus not adopted. China did not participate.

The USSR representative, after proposing a
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Postponement of the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, said that if that request was not respected and the draft resolution was voted upon before he received instructions, he would be obliged to vote against it.

The draft resolution was voted upon and received 12 votes in favour to 2 against (the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR), and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. China did not participate in the voting.

The Secretary-General then informed the Council that his Special Representative in Cyprus had just notified him that the Turkish military command had stated that United Nations forces, having successfully completed their functions, should move outside the Turkish-controlled area to areas where their mandate was most needed, and had asked that the necessary instructions be given. The Secretary-General said it was his duty to inform the Council of his intention to give the appropriate instructions to the UNFICYP Commander, keeping in mind that the Force could operate successfully only if it had the full support of all the parties concerned.

The representatives of both Cyprus and Greece questioned Turkey's intention in requesting the removal of the United Nations Force from Turkish-controlled areas and maintained that the Turkish command's move violated all the agreements with regard to the presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus. The Turkish representative replied that the position of UNFICYP with regard to Turkish-controlled areas and the relationship between the Turkish command and UNFICYP remained to be established.

When the Security Council met the next day, 1 August, it had before it the text of a draft resolution on which, the President stated, agreement had been reached. It was adopted by the Council by a vote of 12 in favour to 0 against, with 2 abstentions (the Byelorussian SSR and the USSR), as resolution 355(1974). China did not participate in the voting.

By the preambular parts of this text, the Council recalled certain of its previous decisions on the Cyprus question; it noted that all States had declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus, and took note of the Secretary-General's statement at the Council's previous meeting.

By the operative part of the resolution, the Council requested the Secretary-General to take appropriate action in the light of his statement and to present a full report to the Council, taking into account that the cease-fire would be the first step in the full implementation of Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July.

Communications from Governments (July 1974)

During the latter part of July 1974, the Secretary-General received a number of communications from Member Governments on the situation in Cyprus.

On 18 and 23 July, the USSR representative transmitted statements issued by his Government charging that the mutiny organized by the Greek military against the legitimate Government of Cyprus was continuing, and that it had been planned by certain NATO circles which could not tolerate the independent existence and policy of non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus. The
USSR supported and would continue to support the independent existence of Cyprus as a sovereign State, and it considered that the situation urgedly demanded the adoption of effective measures to restore Cyprus to that position.

The Syrian Arab Republic complained on 18 July about actions committed by Greek soldiers against the Syrian Embassy and its personnel in Nicosia.

On 19 July, Zambia’s representative transmitted the text of a cable received from the Zambian Minister for Foreign Affairs expressing concern at the events leading to the violent overthrow of President Makarios, and stating that the situation in Cyprus represented a major set-back to the desire of third world countries to determine their own internal affairs.

Also on 19 July, Romania’s representative transmitted a declaration issued by the Romanian news agency Agerpress to the effect that public opinion in Romania resolutely disapproved of the attempted coup d’état in Cyprus, which represented a flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. Romania, the statement went on, fully supported the legal Government of President Makarios. A further Romanian declaration, transmitted on 22 July, expressed profound anxiety about Turkey’s military actions, which, according to the statement, threatened peace in the area, in the Balkans, in Europe and throughout the world.

On 22 July, the representative of Democratic Yemen transmitted the decision of his Government to support Security Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July, and to recognize Archbishop Makarios as the elected President of the Republic of Cyprus.

Oman’s representative on 24 July transmitted the text of a statement of the Sultanate of Oman expressing deep regret and anxiety over the situation in Cyprus, and trusting that the parties concerned would respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the island.

Also on 24 July, the representative of Czechoslovakia transmitted the text of a declaration of his Government condemning intervention by the Greek junta in the internal affairs of Cyprus, calling upon the Greek Government to put an end to the intervention and expressing its solidarity with and support for the legitimate Government of President Makarios.

The representative of Yugoslavia, on 25 July, transmitted the text of a statement by the Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council and the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia in which he said that the responsibility for the crisis in Cyprus was to be borne by the Greek Government and urged implementation of the Security Council’s resolution of 20 July in its entirety. He also reiterated the full support that Yugoslavia, jointly with other non-aligned countries, extended to Cyprus.

On 26 July, the Permanent Mission of Algeria transmitted the text of a message from the Algerian Minister for Foreign Affairs stressing that the aggression against the Republic of Cyprus constituted a new threat to peace and security in the eastern Mediterranean and expressing the conviction that the Security Council would discharge its responsibilities for the independence of Cyprus and for safeguarding its unity and territorial integrity.

Also on 26 July, Brazil’s representative stated that his Government, which had followed with the utmost concern the recent events in Cyprus, had felt greatly relieved when the Council adopted resolution 353(1974) on 20 July, as Brazil had consistently supported all measures aimed at safeguarding the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus.

The representative of Yemen transmitted on 27 July a statement of his Government expressing its full support for the integrity and independence of Cyprus and its recognition of Archbishop Makarios as President of Cyprus.

On 31 July, the representative of the Philippines transmitted a message of his Government’s Secretary for Foreign Affairs, reaffirming the total support of the Philippine Government for the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Cyprus and supporting both the appeal of the Secretary-General for observance of the cease-fire and the role of UNFICYP in preventing the recurrence of fighting.

Reports of Secretary-General (2-14 August 1974)

During the first part of August 1974, the Secretary-General continued to submit progress reports on the status of the cease-fire, on meetings of the military representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom to work out an agreement on a demarcation line, and on the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP.

On 2 and 4 August, he reported that except for sporadic firing the situation was generally quiet throughout the island. The talks between the military representatives of the three countries had begun and Red Cross relief convoys were carrying shipments of food, water and medical supplies to Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

In further reports on 5 and 6 August, the Secretary-General provided details about the situation of Turkish Cypriots in areas controlled by the National Guard and of Greek Cypriots in areas under occupation by Turkish forces. He added that UNFICYP had assumed responsibility for most of the relief convoys.

Subsequent reports issued between 7 and
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12 August gave details of acts in violation of the cease-fire and contained additional information about the continuing reconnaissance of the military representatives in their attempt to fix a demarcation line. The humanitarian activities of UNFICYP and the Red Cross continued. On 12 August the Secretary-General reported that the withdrawal of the National Guard from Turkish enclaves and the assumption by UNFICYP of responsibility for the protection of those areas had begun.

On 10 August, the Secretary-General submitted an interim report on the action taken in pursuance of the Security Council's resolution of 1 August (355(1974)).

He said that, although the cease-fire had been observed by the parties throughout most of the island, intermittent fighting and some forward movement had continued in the area west of Kyrenia, along the coast and on the southern slopes of the Kyrenia mountains. Exchanges of fire and minor movements had occurred in other areas.

The Secretary-General went on to report that on 9 August military representatives of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom had signed an agreement concerning the demarcation line, which had been submitted to the Foreign Ministers meeting in Geneva. He added that UNFICYP stood ready to assume its function of protecting the Turkish enclaves as soon as they were evacuated by Greek and Greek Cypriot forces.

With regard to the exchange or release of detained military personnel and civilians, he reported that both the Turkish Government and the Government of Cyprus had declared their readiness, under certain conditions, to release the detained civilians.

As to the method of operation of UNFICYP, the Secretary-General recalled that all operations outside the Turkish-controlled area were based on a framework of static posts established at sensitive places, supplemented by frequent mobile patrols. Within the Turkish-controlled area, UNFICYP activities were centred on humanitarian and relief measures in Kyrenia and certain surrounding villages. The strength of UNFICYP, which he said was obviously not sufficient, was to be increased to 4,292 as from 14 August.

The Secretary-General then observed that although some progress had been achieved towards bringing peace to Cyprus, the cease-fire was not yet secure in all parts of the island, despite the efforts of the United Nations, of interested Governments and of the parties directly concerned. He added that UNFICYP stood ready to carry out the functions devolving upon it under Council resolution 355(1974); for it to carry out its task fully, however, a greater degree of cooperation by the parties was required if its efforts were to achieve their maximum effect. This, the Secretary-General said, particularly applied to the consolidation of the cease-fire, the establishment of UNFICYP-supervised security zones and the evacuation of occupied Turkish enclaves.

Communications from the parties
(29 July–13 August 1974)

In letters dated 29 and 31 July and 1, 3 and 4 August 1974, the representative of Greece submitted several charges of violations of the cease-fire by Turkish forces in attacks against Greek Cypriot forces and villages in Cyprus.

The Turkish representative, in letters dated 4, 7, 8 and 9 August, charged that National Guard forces had violated the cease-fire by firing at Turkish forces and at the Turkish sector of Nicosia. He also charged, in letters dated 31 July and 2 and 5 August, that Greek Cypriot forces had perpetrated massacres and other atrocities against Turkish Cypriots.

In a letter of 2 August, the Greek representative said that Turkish military authorities had begun mass deportations of Greek Cypriot inhabitants of various villages in the Kyrenia district—the beginning of a methodical and organized Turkish effort to deracinate the Greek Cypriot population of the area.

In a telegram to the Secretary-General, dated 4 August, the Acting President of Cyprus, Glafcos Clerides, complained that the Turkish Army had inflicted unprecedented harassment on the civilian population of the area it had occupied in northern Cyprus. It had looted and plundered the properties of the inhabitants of the Greek-inhabited area in and around Kyrenia, and had indulged in repeated atrocities. Some 20,000 civilians had already been forced to leave their homes.

The Turkish representative rejected these charges in a letter on 7 August, asserting that the Turkish action in Cyprus was aimed at bringing lasting peace and security for all Cypriots, Turkish and Greek alike. The true situation, he said, was that more than 21,000 Turkish Cypriot inhabitants of 37 villages had been forced by the Greek National Guard to take refuge in other Turkish areas.

On 9 August, he transmitted a letter from the Vice-President of Cyprus, Rauf R. Denktash, also rejecting the charges brought by Mr. Clerides.

In a letter dated 12 August, the representative of Cyprus said that, since the signing of the Geneva Declaration of 30 July 1974, Turkey's defiance of the cease-fire had further aggravated the situation in Cyprus. Turkey, he said, had intensified its hostile actions, had seized substantially more territory, and was carrying out further
massive importation of tanks, troops and heavy weapons.

On 13 August, the representative of Cyprus requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council "to consider the dangerously grave situation" that had arisen as the result of "renewed acts of naked aggression" against Cyprus by Turkey.

Also on 13 August, the Greek representative requested an urgent meeting of the Council to take appropriate steps in what he termed the explosive situation for international peace and security created after the interruption of the second phase of the Geneva talks, as a result of the declaration by the Turkish Foreign Minister that he considered the conference terminated. The letter said that the Turkish Foreign Minister had made this declaration despite the fact that the Acting President of Cyprus had already declared that he was prepared to consider the Turkish proposals if given a few hours' time for reflection.

**Consideration by Security Council (14-16 August 1974)**

The Security Council met early on 14 August 1974, as requested by Cyprus and Greece, and also as requested orally by the United Kingdom. In accordance with decisions taken at earlier meetings, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, India, Mauritius, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia were invited to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

Reports from the Commander of UNFICYP circulated before and during the meeting gave details of the renewed fighting in Cyprus and casualties suffered by UNFICYP personnel.

The President of the Council said that in the course of informal consultations Council members had agreed on the text of a revised draft resolution, originally proposed by the United Kingdom, which the Council then adopted unanimously as resolution 357(1974).

By the preamble to this text, the Council, after recalling earlier resolutions, deeply deplored the resumption of fighting in Cyprus, despite the provisions of its resolution 358(1974) of 20 July. By the operative part of the text, the Council: (1) reaffirmed that resolution in all its provisions and called upon the parties to implement them without delay; (2) demanded that all parties to the fighting cease all firing and military actions forthwith; (3) called for the resumption of negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus in accordance with resolution 353(1974); and (4) decided to remain seized of the situation and on instant call to meet as necessary to consider what more effective measures might be required if the cease-fire was not respected.

(For text of resolution, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The United Kingdom representative said that fighting had resumed in Cyprus and it appeared to be severe. At Geneva the previous day, he said, the Turkish representative had presented a proposal, with a deadline for its acceptance, calling for a clearly defined Turkish Cypriot zone covering 34 per cent of the island. The Acting President of Cyprus had asked for an extension of the deadline but the Turkish representative had refused and the conference had therefore dispersed. He expressed the hope that negotiations could be resumed on 15 August and he appealed to the Turkish Government to stop the fighting in Cyprus.

The spokesman for Greece said that Turkey had deliberately failed to observe the first cease-fire because it wanted to extend the territory it held. Turkish-occupied territory had tripled since then, he asserted. Large numbers of Greek Cypriots had been expelled from the Turkish-occupied areas, an expulsion that went almost parallel with the expansion of Turkish-held territory. With regard to Turkey's constitutional proposals in Geneva, Greece took the position, he said, that no sovereign, independent State could accept proposals made at gunpoint from an outside country.

The French representative regretted the excessive haste with which Turkey had interrupted the Geneva negotiations, and particularly the military action which the Turkish forces had just begun. War was not the way to solve the difficult problems separating the two communities. The Council must act to restore the cease-fire; it must also urgently appeal for the resumption of negotiations.

The representative of the United States deeply regretted that the Council had had to meet again to consider new steps to end the violence. The Council must call for an immediate end to the fighting and for the earliest resumption of negotiations.

The spokesman for the United Republic of Cameroon expressed similar views.

The spokesman for Cyprus said that a power of overwhelming military force had attacked a small, undefended country, just as Czechoslovakia had been attacked by Hitlerite Germany for the alleged protection of a minority. Turkey was not concerned with protecting the Turkish Cypriots, only with grabbing a part of Cyprus. The Council's resolution of 20 July (359(1974)), which called not only for a cease-fire but also for an immediate end to military intervention, had not
been implemented and now Turkey was demanding at gunpoint that its terms be accepted.

Turkey's representative said it was clear that the Geneva Declaration was interpreted differently by the parties that had signed it. The concept of autonomy, he said, no longer seemed to be accepted. Turkey had asked for 34 per cent of Cyprus as a basis for establishing an autonomous administration for the Turkish Cypriots, since they had owned at least that much territory before they had been dispossessed on their land during the past 10 years. The reason for the failure in Geneva, however, was the refusal to recognize that the Turkish Cypriots had been and should remain masters of their island to the same degree as the Greeks. As for the future of Cyprus, everything was conceivable as long as the Turkish Cypriots participated under conditions of equality and security.

The Council President, speaking as the USSR representative, said that the failure of the Geneva talks and the resumption of military operations had demonstrated the failure of the efforts of those who had sought to immobilize the Council amid assurances that all was peaceful in Cyprus. Certain NATO circles were trying to present the world with a fait accompli by partitioning Cyprus, he declared. The collapse of the Geneva talks resulted from attempts to solve the question within the narrow circle of NATO and from failure to implement the provisions of Council resolution 353(1974). More effective action was required from the Council, he said.

Before adjourning the meeting, the President noted that in accordance with the resolution the Council had adopted, it remained seized of the situation and on instant call to meet as necessary.

Later on 14 August, the Secretary-General circulated further reports from the UNFICYP Commander in connexion with attacks by Turkish forces in various parts of Nicosia and elsewhere in Cyprus, which caused casualties among the UNFICYP contingents from Canada, Finland and the United Kingdom, and the death of three members of the Austrian contingent. The reports also gave details of damage to UNFICYP posts and the efforts of the Force to arrange local cease-fires.

A message from the designated Acting President of Cyprus, circulated later in the day, charged that Turkish aircraft and troops, in disregard of the Council's resolution, were continuing their attacks and extending the area of their control.

The next day, 15 August, the Secretary-General issued further reports of continued military operations, including an advance by Turkish forces in the direction of Famagusta, and further efforts by UNFICYP to arrange cease-fires, especially in Nicosia.

The Council met on 15 August to continue its consideration of the situation in Cyprus, at the request of Cyprus. Algeria was invited at its request to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in addition to those previously so invited.

At the outset of the meeting, the Council President expressed deep concern over the casualties sustained by the UNFICYP contingents.

The Secretary-General then told the Council that he deeply deplored the resumption of fighting and the breakdown of negotiations. It was clear, he said, that violent fighting continued and that the Council's resolution (357(1974)) of 14 August had gone unheeded.

In the existing situation, he went on to say, it was impossible for UNFICYP to continue with the tasks of implementing Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July, although it was doing its utmost to assist the population, arrange local cease-fires, de-escalate the fighting and prevent the recurrence of intercommunal strife.

The Secretary-General expressed his deep concern and regret for the casualties suffered by UNFICYP, and said that he and the Force Commander had sent strong protests to the parties concerned. He had, he said, received an expression of regret from the Turkish Prime Minister, with assurances that the Turkish forces would exercise care for the full security of UNFICYP troops in Cyprus.

Without the acceptance and the co-operation of the parties, the Secretary-General continued, a United Nations peace-keeping operation, which was not an enforcement action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, could not function effectively. Under its present mandate and at its present strength, UNFICYP could not interpose between the two armies. He concluded by saying that continued fighting, in spite of the cease-fire appeals of the Security Council, called into question the very essence of the Charter and the raison d'être of the Organization.

The Council had two draft resolutions before it. The first, prepared during consultations among Council members, was adopted unanimously as resolution 358(1974).

By the preamble to this text, the Council expressed deep concern about the continuation of violence and bloodshed in Cyprus and deeply deplored the non-compliance with its resolution 357(1974) of 14 August. It then (1) recalled its earli-
ier 1974 resolutions and (2) insisted on their full implementation by all parties and on the immediate and strict observance of the cease-fire.

(For text of resolution 358(1974), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The President then said that a draft resolution, originally sponsored by Australia, Austria, France and Peru, had been revised and was co-sponsored also by the United Republic of Cameroon. The Council then adopted the second draft as resolution 359(1974) by 14 votes to 0, with China not participating in the voting.

By the preambular paragraphs of this text, the Council noted with concern that casualties were increasing among the personnel of UNFICYP and recalled that UNFICYP was stationed in Cyprus with the full consent of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. It also recalled that the Secretary-General had been requested by the Council, in its resolution 355(1974) of 1 August, to take appropriate action in the light of his statement, in which he had dealt with the role, functions and strength of UNFICYP and related issues.

By the operative part of the text, the Council:

(1) deeply deplored the fact that members of UNFICYP had been killed and wounded;
(2) demanded that all the parties concerned fully respect the international status of UNFICYP and refrain from any action which might endanger the lives and safety of its members;
(3) urged the parties concerned to demonstrate in a firm, clear and unequivocal manner their willingness to fulfil their commitments;
(4) demanded further that all parties cooperate with UNFICYP in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions, in all areas of Cyprus and in regard to all sections of the population of Cyprus; and
(5) emphasized the fundamental principle that the status and safety of the members of UNFICYP and any peace-keeping force must be respected by the parties under all circumstances.

(For text of resolution 359(1974), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The representative of China recalled that it had always held differing views on the dispatch of United Nations forces and, since the resolution just adopted had dealt entirely with that issue, China as a matter of principle had decided not to participate in the voting.

The Austrian representative said that three members of the Austrian contingent of UNFICYP had lost their lives in the service of peace as a result of a deliberate attack by a Turkish aircraft. Austria, he said, had protested in the strongest terms against such an irresponsible act and noted with appreciation the expression of condolences by the Turkish Government. However, the Council must see to it that UNFICYP was able to function in safety. Otherwise, he said, the question would arise whether peace-keeping missions of the United Nations could be continued while military attacks put in jeopardy the very essence of such missions.

The spokesman for Cyprus said that, after four ineffective resolutions by the Security Council, the major problem now was the functioning of the Council. Never before, he asserted, had its weaknesses been so revealed. The United Nations should reappraise the functioning of the Council and the use of Chapter VII of the Charter.

The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States expressed sympathy over the deaths of the three members of the Austrian contingent. The United Kingdom representative deplored and condemned the flagrant and continuing breaches of the cease-fire and the attacks on UNFICYP as unacceptable, particularly since the diplomatic process had not been exhausted. He appealed to Turkey to respect the cease-fire and to indicate its willingness to resume negotiations.

The President, speaking as the representative of the USSR, said the Council should place full responsibility for the violence against Cyprus on certain NATO circles. The USSR, he said, was in favour of maintaining the independence of Cyprus and therefore insisted on the immediate cessation of foreign military intervention, the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the restoration of the lawful Government of Cyprus and all its institutions.

He went on to say that the resumption of the Geneva talks within the narrow circle of NATO could not achieve that end; only vigorous action by the Council could do so. The reports of the United Nations Secretariat, he said, did not adequately inform the Council about the situation, and for that reason the USSR continued to be convinced of the need to send a Council mission to Cyprus to provide a full report on the situation and thus assist the Council in carrying out its task.

According to the Greek representative, Council resolution 358(1974) was completely inadequate in the circumstances. More was needed than merely recalling earlier resolutions and insisting upon their implementation. A cease-fire resolution was hardly needed now: it had been needed the day before, but "today it is too late."

The spokesman for Turkey said that Turkish forces had been ordered to exercise the utmost care for the full safety of UNFICYP personnel. He also said that Turkey had intervened in Cyprus only when the very life of the Turkish Cypriot community and the independence of the island were directly threatened. Turkey, he said, was ready to begin negotiations if a constitutional arrangement were accepted under which the Turkish community would maintain its autonomous
administration in one part of the island and the Greek community its own in another.

Algeria's representative, speaking on behalf of the Bureau of Co-ordination of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries at the United Nations, urged the Council to adopt immediate and effective measures so that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus might be fully respected.

The Security Council continued its consideration of the Cyprus situation on 16 August, when it was informed by the Secretary-General that the Prime Minister of Turkey had announced his Government's acceptance of a cease-fire. The UNFICYP Commander had reported that the cease-fire was holding except for small-arms and mortar fire in certain areas.

The Secretary-General also announced that two Danish soldiers had been killed and three wounded when their vehicle ran into a minefield in the Lefka district.

The Council had before it a draft resolution proposed by France, which had been twice revised and which the Council adopted by 11 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions (the Byelorussian SSR, Iraq and the USSR), as resolution 360(1974). China did not participate in the voting.

By the preambular paragraphs of the text, the Council recalled its recent resolutions on the question, and noted that all States had declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. It expressed grave concern at the deterioration of the situation in Cyprus resulting from further military operations, which constituted a most serious threat to peace and security in the eastern Mediterranean area.

By the operative part of the text, the Council:

(1) recorded its formal disapproval of the unilateral military actions undertaken against the Republic of Cyprus;
(2) urged the parties to comply with all the provisions of previous Council resolutions, including those concerning the withdrawal without delay from Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements;
(3) urged the parties to resume without delay—in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation—the negotiations called for in resolution 353(1974) of 20 July whose outcome should not be impeded or prejudged by the acquisition of advantages resulting from military operations;
(4) asked the Secretary-General to report to the Council, as necessary, with a view to the possible adoption of further measures designed to promote the restoration of peaceful conditions; and
(5) decided to remain permanently seized of the question and to meet at any time to consider measures which might be required in the light of the developing situation.

(For text of resolution 360(1974), see documentary references below.)

The spokesman for France observed that since the breakdown of the Geneva negotiations the situation in Cyprus had worsened. On 14 August, the French Government had stated that it disapproved of Turkey's unilateral resumption of military operations and that only negotiations, without the simultaneous quest for military advantages, should govern relations among European States. It was the Council's duty, he said, to make another urgent appeal to the parties to resume the negotiations without those negotiations being affected by the outcome of the recent military operations.

Several Council members—among them Australia, Austria, Mauritania, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United States—emphasized the importance of resuming the negotiations without delay. Iraq's representative, lacking instructions, said he had had to abstain in the voting, but agreed that a return to the negotiating table remained the only way to reach a solution.

The Costa Rican representative said that after what had been occurring in Cyprus there were no grounds for optimism. The measures taken by the Council had fallen in a vacuum. Cyprus—a small country like his own—had been the victim of the appetites of others and the international order had been shaken in the process.

The representative of Kenya called the resolution just adopted another very small and weak move by the Council in its understandably weak efforts to save Cyprus. The problem of Cyprus was not over, however, and would not be over for a long time, he declared.

The Council President, speaking as the USSR representative, said that a solution of the problem must involve the immediate and direct participation of the Security Council and hence of the United Nations. He reiterated his earlier proposal that a special mission of the Council be sent to Cyprus for an on-the-spot investigation of the implementation of the Council's decisions and the submission of a report.

Turkey's representative deplored the fact that the French draft resolution had been accepted and the frame of mind of those who had even thought of adopting such a biased approach. Turkey, he said, could not take part in future negotiations on the basis of so unbalanced and unrealistic a resolution as that just adopted. As soon as the Council adopted any other resolution without those stigmas, Turkey would reconsider its attitude.
Reports of Secretary-General and communications from the parties (12-29 August 1974)

Between 17 and 20 August 1974, the Secretary-General provided information on the situation in Cyprus, based on reports received from the Commander of UNFICYP. Firing was continuing, and advances by Turkish troops were reported in various sectors. The Force Commander had appealed to both sides to refrain from firing or moving forward, and the Secretary-General said he had expressed to the parties his concern at the continuing breaches of the cease-fire. He had appealed to them to exercise the utmost restraint and to observe the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council.

On 19 August, the cease-fire was reported to be holding and there were no reports of firing throughout the island. However, a large crowd attacked the United States Embassy in Nicosia with grenades and small arms. One local employee was killed; the United States Ambassador was wounded and later died.

The situation on 20 August remained relatively quiet, according to reports from the Force Commander. During this period, the Secretary-General received a number of communications from Cyprus, Greece and Turkey concerning various aspects of the situation.

On 14 August, the representative of Cyprus transmitted the text of a statement by President Makarios of Cyprus charging Turkey with aggression against Cyprus and non-compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council. Cyprus, he said, was at the mercy of the Turkish troops. Another statement by President Makarios, transmitted on the same date, accused Turkey of bad faith at the Geneva talks and appealed for urgent action to rescue Cyprus from Turkish aggression.

In a letter dated 18 August, the representative of Greece submitted a list of alleged violations of the cease-fire by Turkey committed since the first cease-fire was accepted by Turkey on 22 July.

Complaints of atrocities committed against the civilian population in Cyprus were submitted by all the parties. In letters dated 12, 18 and 22 August, the representative of Turkey put forward charges of the burning and desecration of mosques, the murder and deportation of civilians, the abuse of women and children and the incarceration of Turkish Cypriots in concentration camps.

The representative of Cyprus, in letters dated 20 and 22 August, cited press reports of Turkish atrocities and the indiscriminate killing of Greek Cypriots by Turkish forces. He charged that over 200,000 people had been expelled from their homes; UNFICYP and ICRC had been forcibly prevented from performing their humanitarian tasks. Reporting on atrocities described in depositions of the victims, he said that no brief report could possibly convey the fear and suffering caused by the inhuman behaviour of the Turkish troops.

In a letter dated 27 August, the Greek representative accused Turkey of trying to divert attention from the atrocities committed by Turks in Cyprus by fabricating slanderous accounts of atrocities committed against Turkish Cypriots and by preventing impartial investigation by UNFICYP.

The representative of Cyprus, in a letter dated 23 August, drew attention to the magnitude of the dislocations of economic life on the island and gave details of the damage suffered by the principal branches of the economy, as well as the situation of the refugees. On 27 August, in another letter, he protested against unilateral measures taken by Turkey to prohibit navigation in the seas around Cyprus and asked that urgent consideration be given to that situation.

On 28 August, the representative of Turkey transmitted the text of a declaration in which the Turkish Government, after reviewing the background of the Cyprus crisis, reaffirmed Turkey's opposition to enosis and to proposals for involving a large number of States in the Cyprus issue. It urged the resumption of negotiations, within the framework already drawn up by the Security Council, and suggested that the three guarantor powers should promptly help to create such conditions as would enable the parties to reach a final settlement.

Reporting on 27 August on developments in Cyprus for the period from 20 to 25 August 1974, the Secretary-General said that except for a few isolated incidents, especially in the Nicosia area, the cease-fire had held. He outlined the activities of UNFICYP in: providing protection to the Turkish-inhabited areas outside the area of Turkish control; investigating alleged atrocities; rendering humanitarian assistance such as escorting or supporting relief convoys to Greek and Turkish Cypriot towns and villages; and negotiating for the restoration of electrical and water supply facilities.

On 28 August, the Secretary-General, reporting on his visit to Cyprus, Greece and Turkey between 25 and 27 August, said he had presided over a joint meeting in Cyprus of the leaders of the two Cypriot communities and had met with the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey during their visits to those countries. On all sides, he said, he had found a strong desire to achieve a negotiated settlement despite existing obstacles to such a course. His conversations had centred in particular on the future of the negotiations, the possible basis of a set-
tlement in Cyprus, humanitarian questions—including refugees and the reopening, for humanitarian purposes, of the Nicosia airport—and the future role of UNFICYP.

The Secretary-General went on to say that it was clear that UNFICYP's functions would soon have to be redefined. In the meantime, it was his intention to ensure that UNFICYP played a useful role in Cyprus, in full cooperation with all the parties.

The situation in Cyprus was, he stressed, still a matter of deep concern as far as international peace and security were concerned; it was vital therefore to make real progress towards peace and to avoid a recurrence of fighting. He believed the Council could play an important role in ensuring that result.

On 27 August, the representative of Cyprus asked that a meeting of the Security Council be held to consider the grave situation in Cyprus, including the refugee problem arising from "the expulsion by force and terror of the whole Greek Cypriot population from their homeland in the invaded territory."

The Turkish representative on 29 August transmitted a letter from Vice-President Denktash of Cyprus protesting that the request for a Council meeting was a unilateral action taken by the Greek Cypriot administration without consulting him.

**Consideration by Security Council (30 August 1974)**

The Security Council met on 30 August 1974 at the request of Cyprus. In accordance with earlier decisions, the representatives of Algeria, Cyprus, Greece, India, Mauritius, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia were invited to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion.

The spokesman for Cyprus said that the Turkish invasion of Cyprus had been a pre-planned and long-prepared attempt to use overwhelming military force to dismember the country. Over 200,000 persons had been ejected from their homes, representing 40 per cent of the entire Greek Cypriot population. The island was losing £2 million worth of production every day; the economic survival of the country was at stake. The representative of Cyprus declared that if the Security Council was unable to insist upon the implementation of its resolutions, it should at least respond effectively to the problem of saving the economy, life and existence of Cyprus.

Greece's representative said that Turkey refused to allow the return of refugees for political reasons, aimed at concentrating all Turkish Cypriots in a Turkish zone and Greek Cypriots in a Greek zone. He went on to say that Turkey was clearly not prepared for negotiations; Greece on the other hand was ready to try, and was open to any other suggestions if the resumption of the Geneva conference was in deadlock.

According to the representative of Turkey, the Greek Cypriot administration, which currently opposed the movement of population, had for the past 10 years encouraged the emigration of Turkish Cypriots. Twenty-four thousand Turkish Cypriots had been living as displaced persons in temporary refugee accommodations for 11 years, and their lands cultivated without payment. He asked whether the return of the refugees to their homes encompassed those Turkish Cypriots as well. Turkey, he said, believed that a satisfactory solution to the problem of displaced persons could be found only within the framework of a political solution: it was intricately related to the over-all settlement.

The Austrian representative observed that the Council had repeatedly addressed itself to the political and military aspects of the situation; it was now imperative for it to deal with the immense humanitarian problems that had arisen. The Council's duty was to call on all parties to deal immediately with the plight of the refugees and displaced persons and to reiterate its call for the cooperation of all sides with UNFICYP in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions. He introduced a draft resolution, sponsored by Austria, France and the United Kingdom, which he hoped would address itself to the refugee problem and also to a new start in the negotiating process.

The USSR representative reiterated that responsibility for the deterioration of the situation in Cyprus must be borne by NATO circles, whose efforts to solve the problem by bypassing the United Nations, the Security Council and its decisions had met with complete failure. He pointed out an international conference, within the United Nations framework and with the participation of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and all members of the Council, should be convened. Other countries, specifically non-aligned countries, could also be involved. This proposal, he said, enjoyed broad support among Member States. He also reiterated the USSR proposal to send a Council mission to Cyprus. The USSR would not oppose the draft resolution which was before the Council, although it was obviously inadequate.

The Council then unanimously adopted the three-power draft resolution as resolution 361(1974).

By the preambular paragraphs of the text, the Council, after recalling earlier decisions on the Cyprus question, noted that a large number of people had been displaced and were in dire need of humanitarian assistance. It also noted that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had been appointed Co-ordinator of United Na-
tions Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus, with the task of co-ordinating relief assistance to be provided by United Nations programmes and agencies and from other sources.

By the operative parts of the resolution, the Council:

(1) expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his part in bringing about talks between the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus;

(2) warmly welcomed this development and called on those concerned in the talks to pursue them actively;

(3) called upon all parties to do everything in their power to alleviate human suffering, ensure respect for fundamental human rights and refrain from action likely to aggravate the situation;

(4) expressed its grave concern at the plight of the refugees and other persons displaced as a result of the situation and urged the parties, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, to search for peaceful solutions to the problems of refugees and take measures to provide for their relief and welfare, and to permit persons who wished to do so to return to their homes in safety;

(5) asked the Secretary-General to submit at the earliest opportunity a full report on the situation of the refugees and decided to keep that situation under constant review;

(6) further asked the Secretary-General to continue to provide emergency humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of the island in need of such assistance;

(7) called upon all parties, as a demonstration of good faith, to take all steps—both individually and in cooperation with each other—which might promote comprehensive and successful negotiations;

(8) reiterated its call to all parties to co-operate fully which UNFICYP; and

(9) expressed its conviction that speedy implementation of this resolution would assist the achievement of a satisfactory settlement in Cyprus.

(For text of resolution 361(1974), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

The spokesman for the United Kingdom said his Government hoped that the talks, while concentrating initially on urgent humanitarian problems, would broaden to include questions of political concern. The United Kingdom's main concern was that the parties should be talking about the future of the island and it hoped that any settlement would enshrine the principle that any law-abiding Cypriot should be able to live wherever he or she wished.

The French representative said that while the Council should play a primary role in matters of peace-keeping, the parties concerned should have an opportunity to state their views on any proposal designed to help them. France, he said, deplored the non-implementation of earlier resolutions and appreciated the sentiments of the USSR in that regard.

The spokesman for the United States appealed to the international community to join in responding to emergency humanitarian efforts. However, the imperative need was to resume negotiations: a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus dispute offered the best hope for all the people on the island to live in peace and security.

The Chinese representative observed that the so-called new proposal of the USSR concerning an international conference was merely a tool to exploit the situation in Cyprus. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus should be safeguarded by opposing all schemes of the two super-powers.

The need for further negotiation between the two communities to settle the Cyprus problem was stressed by other members, including Australia, Indonesia, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon.

Indonesia considered that the USSR proposals for an international conference on Cyprus and a Security Council mission merited serious study.

The Byelorussian SSR said that NATO was responsible for the Cyprus crisis and it supported the USSR proposal for an international conference on Cyprus.

Communications from Governments
(August and September 1974)

On 5 August 1974, the representative of Hungary transmitted an excerpt from a communiqué in which the Hungarian Government condemned activities aimed at liquidating the independent statehood of the Republic of Cyprus and at its partition—activities tending to transform it into an appendage of NATO. The statement expressed support for the proposals put forward by the USSR concerning a settlement in Cyprus and demanded the restoration of the legitimate Government of Cyprus headed by President Makarios.

On 7 August, the representative of Algeria transmitted the text of a declaration on the situation in Cyprus adopted in New York on 6 August by the Group of Non-Aligned Countries at the United Nations. After reaffirming their solidarity with the non-aligned Republic of Cyprus, these countries demanded the immediate and full implementation of the objectives of Council resolution 353(1974) of 20 July, stated that Archbishop Makarios remained the legitimate President of Cyprus, and declared that the tragic situation in Cyprus was a grave warning to all non-aligned countries, calling for their united action.
On 13 September, the Algerian representative transmitted the text of a declaration of the Coordinating Committee of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries regarding developments concerning Cyprus, adopted on 12 September.

On 22 August, the USSR representative transmitted a statement issued by his Government recalling that the Council’s decisions on the immediate ending of foreign military intervention against the Republic of Cyprus, the withdrawal of foreign troops and restoration of the constitutional order remained unfulfilled. Attempts to settle the Cyprus problem within the narrow circle of NATO member States had failed and led only to the resumption of hostilities. The time had come, the USSR considered, to convene an international conference within the framework of the United Nations with the participation of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and all States members of the Council.

The representative of the German Democratic Republic on 26 August transmitted a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of his Government supporting the proposal of the USSR to convene an international conference on Cyprus within the framework of the United Nations.

Communications from the parties (29 August–6 December 1974)

During the period from 29 August to 6 December 1974, the Secretary-General received a number of communications from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. These covered a wide range of subjects, including observance of the cease-fire and violations thereof, the situation of the refugees, acts against the civilian population, and economic matters.

Communications containing charges of violations of the cease-fire were received from Cyprus, dated 29 August, 6 and 14 September, and 19 and 28 October. Greece made similar charges on 26 October and 6 November.

Communications containing charges of ill-treatment of civilians were received from Cyprus, dated 5, 7, and 13 September and 13 December. On 31 August and 6 September, Greece submitted charges of mass arrests of Greek Cypriots. Turkey, on 4 and 5 September, reported the discovery of a mass grave of Turkish Cypriot civilians at the village of Maratha and, on 11 September, charged that 40,000 Turkish Cypriot civilians were being held as hostages by Greek and Turkish Cypriot forces.

Additional communications from the parties during this period dealt with a variety of other complaints and charges.

Cyprus complained on 3 and 7 September of the looting and destruction by Turks of film archives and works of art and the looting of two museums in Kyrenia. It charged on 3 September that Turks were being transported from Turkey to settle in occupied areas of Cyprus where Greek Cypriots had always been in the majority. An appeal by certain school organizations in Cyprus for prompt withdrawal of the invasion forces was forwarded by Cyprus on 5 September. On 16 and 18 September, Cyprus described further measures being taken by the Turkish side to consolidate and annex the occupied portion of Cyprus, confiscate Greek Cypriot property and expel the residents of 40 per cent of the island.

In further complaints, Cyprus on 28 October said that churches in occupied Cyprus were being converted into mosques; on 31 October that villages in Turkish-occupied areas were being looted; and on 6 November that further seizures of Greek Cypriot property were taking place, as well as the leasing of farms and lands belonging to Greek Cypriots. On 15 November, Cyprus charged that produce from occupied Greek Cypriot agricultural areas was being sold in Europe by Turkish exporters.

Greece submitted complaints in letters dated 30 August charging that Turkish forces had committed arson on the Greek Cypriot side of the line in Nicosia. On 31 August, it protested Turkish measures to colonize the occupied part of Cyprus. On 26 September, it submitted further charges that Turkey was taking steps to colonize Cyprus with Turks from Turkey.

Also during this period, Turkey, on 23 September, commented on Greece’s complaints concerning the return of Turkish Cypriots to Cyprus.

Reports of Secretary-General (September and October 1974)

During September and October 1974, the Secretary-General submitted progress reports at regular intervals, giving particulars about the observance of the cease-fire, the meetings between Glafcos Clerides, Acting President of Cyprus, and Rauf R. Denktash, Vice-President of Cyprus, and the humanitarian activities of UNFICYP.

With regard to the observance of the cease-fire, the Secretary-General said that some forward movement by Turkish forces had taken place and minor violations by both sides had been reported. However, he said, relative quiet had prevailed in Cyprus throughout the period.

In connexion with the situation of UNFICYP, the reports noted that in the areas under National Guard control, UNFICYP enjoyed virtually complete freedom of movement. However, its freedom of movement in the Turkish-controlled areas remained restricted. On 10 September, a Canadian soldier was shot and killed by the National Guard, apparently owing to mistaken identification.

On 20 September, the Secretary-General ap-
pealed for voluntary contributions to meet the costs of UNFICYP; he said that, as a result of the strengthening of the Force, there would be an increase in costs of $6.6 million over and above the previously reported estimates.

In the course of his visit to Cyprus on 25 and 26 August, the Secretary-General recalled, he had presided over a joint meeting of the leaders of the two Cypriot communities, Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash. Subsequently, the two leaders held a series of meetings—with the assistance of the Secretary-General’s Special Representative and representatives of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross—to consider a wide range of humanitarian problems, such as the release of prisoners and detainees, the tracing of missing persons and assistance to the aged and infirm. As a result of agreements reached at the meetings, the release of several categories of prisoners began on 16 September.

Humanitarian activities

On 4 September 1974, in pursuance of the Security Council’s resolution of 30 August (361(1974)), the Secretary-General reported on his efforts to provide emergency United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of Cyprus in need of assistance.

He said that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Sadruddin Aga Khan, who had visited the island from 22 to 27 August to study the problem at first hand. He informed the Secretary-General that in order to meet the immediate needs he had been in touch with potential donor Governments, but the problems left in the wake of the hostilities in Cyprus were of such magnitude that substantial resources would be required to continue the emergency assistance required, as requested by the Security Council.

The High Commissioner’s report, annexed to that of the Secretary-General, gave details of the assistance already provided and said that the support of the international community during the coming months would be critical in determining the future of the more than one quarter of a million people concerned.

Accordingly, on 6 September, the Secretary-General cabled an appeal for voluntary contributions to the Foreign Ministers of all Member States of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies. He pointed out that nearly one third of the island’s population had been rendered homeless and lived under conditions of extreme hardship. It was estimated that until the end of the year some $22 million would be required from the international community. He added that the support of the various programmes and specialized agencies of the United Nations was available to UNHCR, and a satisfactory mechanism of co-ordination existed to ensure maximum effectiveness of the humanitarian efforts, both bilateral and multilateral.

On 31 October, in his next report on humanitarian matters, the Secretary-General said that the response to his appeal had been prompt and generous: contributions as at 28 October amounted to approximately $20 million in cash and in kind. The High Commissioner, whose report was annexed to that of the Secretary-General, gave details of his operations and said that although the situation of displaced persons remained far from satisfactory, major problems—such as food shortages and health problems—had been avoided. That was owing, he said, not only to the assistance of the international community but also in large measure to the efficiency of the local administrations and to the resourcefulness of the people of the island.

Consideration by General Assembly

In a letter dated 17 September 1974, Cyprus requested that the question of Cyprus be included as an additional item in the General Assembly’s agenda for its twenty-ninth (1974) session. On 21 September, the Assembly, on the recommendation of its General Committee, decided to include the item in the agenda and to consider it in plenary meetings. It also decided to ask the Special Political Committee to meet to allow the representatives of the two Cypriot communities to express their views.

In an explanatory memorandum accompanying his request, the representative of Cyprus said, among other things, that his country looked to the General Assembly to safeguard its independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. It also sought support, he said, for its demands for the withdrawal of all foreign forces, the return of the refugees to their homes and properties, and the creation of conditions in which negotiations could be carried out.

On 26 September, the representative of Turkey transmitted a letter from Rauf R. Denktash, Vice-President of Cyprus, stating that the representative of Cyprus had no legitimate authority to request inscription of the question of Cyprus on the Assembly’s agenda for and on behalf of the Republic of Cyprus.

The Assembly met on 28 October and heard a statement by the representative of Cyprus. On 29 October, the Special Political Committee held two meetings, at which it heard statements by
Vedat A. Celik, representative of the Turkish Cypriot community, by Tassos Papadopoulos, representative of the Greek Cypriot community, and by the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey.

The Assembly then resumed its consideration of the question during five plenary meetings held between 30 October and 1 November, at the conclusion of which it adopted resolution 3212(XXIX), by a recorded vote of 117 to 0. The text was sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Guyana, India, Mali, Nepal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Yugoslavia. A draft resolution put forward by Cyprus was not pressed to the vote.

By the preamble to the nine-power text, the General Assembly among other things expressed its grave concern about the continuation of the Cyprus crisis, which constituted a threat to international peace and security. The Assembly was mindful of the need to solve the crisis without delay, by peaceful means, in accordance with United Nations purposes and principles.

By the operative part of the text, the Assembly:

(1) called upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from all acts and interventions directed against it;

(2) urged the speedy withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from Cyprus, and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs;

(3) considered that the constitutional system of Cyprus concerned the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots communities;

(4) commended the contacts and negotiations taking place on an equal footing, with the good offices of the Secretary-General, between the representatives of the two communities, and called for their continuation with a view to reaching a freely a mutually acceptable political settlement, based on their fundamental and legitimate rights;

(5) considered that all the refugees should return to their homes in safety and called upon the parties concerned to undertake urgent measures to that end;

(6) expressed the hope that, if necessary, further efforts including negotiations could take place, within the framework of the United Nations, for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this resolution, thus ensuring to the Republic of Cyprus its fundamental right to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity;

(7) asked the Secretary-General to continue to provide United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of Cyprus and called upon all States to contribute to that effort;

(8) called upon all parties to continue to cooperate fully with UNFICYP, which might be strengthened if necessary;

(9) asked the Secretary-General to continue to lend his good offices to the parties concerned; and

(10) asked him to bring the resolution to the Security Council’s attention.

(For text of resolution 3312(XXIX), see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

By the text of the draft resolution submitted by Cyprus which was not pressed to a vote, the Assembly, by the preambular paragraphs, would have, among other things, emphasized the necessity that the Republic of Cyprus should participate in all phases of solving the crisis and noted the position of the Cyprus Government that it was opposed to the annexation of the Republic of Cyprus or any part of it, by, or merger with, any other State, or to its partition or division in any form. The Assembly also would have deplored all acts of aggression or intervention against the Republic of Cyprus.

By the operative parts of the draft text, the Assembly would have:

(1) called upon all States to respect unconditionally the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from all acts of aggression and intervention directed against it;

(2) called for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from Cyprus and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs;

(3) called upon all the parties involved to take urgent measures to ensure the speedy return of all refugees to their homes in safety;

(4) considered that the constitutional system of Cyprus was the concern of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots;

(5) commended the contacts and negotiations taking place with the good offices of the Secretary-General between the representatives of the two communities and called for their continuation in free conditions, with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable constitutional settlement;

(6) expressed the hope that further efforts, including negotiations, could soon be freely conducted within the framework of the United Nations, ensuring to the Republic of Cyprus, for the benefit of its people as a whole, its fundamental right to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity;

(7) requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of Cyprus and called upon all States to contribute to that effort;

(8) called upon all parties concerned to devote
all endeavours, in co-operation with UNFICYP, for the tracing and safe return to their homes of all missing persons;

(9) called upon all parties to continue to co-operate fully with UNFICYP, which should be strengthened so as to enable it to restore and maintain peace in Cyprus;

(10) requested the Secretary-General to continue to lend his good offices to the parties concerned; and

(11) further requested the Secretary-General to bring this resolution to the attention of the Security Council.

In his statement before the Special Political Committee, Mr. Celik, representative of the Turkish Cypriot community, observed that the Republic of Cyprus had been created in 1960 by the Zurich (Switzerland) and London (United Kingdom) agreements, providing for an independent republic, with the two national communities participating in the administration in a bicomunal partnership. The Turkish community had accepted that independence as an end in itself, he said, and had worked to make it a success. The Greek community had considered it only as a means to an end—enosis. Although the Constitution had expressly prohibited any activity likely to promote union of the island with any other State, Archbishop Makarios and the Greek Cypriot leadership had proceeded to declare openly that the 1960 agreements should be regarded as a spring-board for the ultimate consummation and the real objective of their struggle: union of Cyprus with Greece.

Mr. Celik went on to say that after the Greek colonels and their agents on the island had undertaken the coup d'état, directed against Turkish Cypriots, whatever legality was left in Cyprus under its Constitution had been swept away. The State of Cyprus as created by international agreements had been brought to an end. The entire population had been thrown into chaos and an extremely dangerous and explosive situation had been created for the region. It was to redress that situation, he said, that Turkey had undertaken its peace operation in Cyprus.

The Cyprus problem was not organic, the representative of the Turkish Cypriot community continued; it was an artificial, man-made problem and its architect was Archbishop Makarios who, as the Head of State, had disowned one ethnic and religious group and set out to liquidate it. Had it not been for the relentless struggle by the Greek Cypriots to achieve enosis and the planned onslaught on the Turkish community which had been the only obstacle to it, there was no reason why the two communities could not have lived in peace and harmony.

He said that the 15 July coup had destroyed all hopes for the security of the Turkish Cypriot community under the existing system of functional federation. The only solution which could give the Turkish community the actual and physical guarantee of its life and property was a federation based on two territories. It was not enough, he said, for the Greek Cypriots to say they were against enosis. Greece must say the same thing. Any agreement must be binding on the two communities, as well as on Greece and Turkey.

The Turks of Cyprus, he said, favoured an independent, non-aligned, biregional federal republic. In a State where nationalism ran so deep and coexistence was so necessary, federation was the only way to peaceful coexistence.

The representative of the Greek Cypriot community, Mr. Papadopoulos, said in his statement to the Special Political Committee that the Greek Cypriots, who had fought an anti-imperialistic war against a colonial administration and had come to the United Nations seeking self-determination and enosis, had succeeded in getting only independence. The Turkish Cypriot leaders had sided with the British; their professed aim had been the continuation of the British administration of Cyprus.

While the Greek Cypriots had limited their activity to talking about enosis, Mr. Papadopoulos continued, Turkey, using a formidable force against the virtually defenceless island, had brought about its long-planned scheme of partition. It had invaded the island before diplomatic avenues had been fully explored. The Turkish Army controlled about 40 per cent of Cyprus, producing 70 per cent of the economic output, which it claimed as war loot for the invading army. The occupied areas had previously housed a population of 215,000, of which 170,000 were Greek Cypriots. Some 230,000 Greek Cypriots from the occupied and adjacent areas had been driven from their homes and were living in untold misery.

Cyprus, he said, had a population of 632,000, of which 81.6 per cent were Greeks and 18.4 per cent were Turks. There was no area in which the Turks were preponderant. If Turkey were to achieve its aim of partition, either outright or under the guise of a biregional federation, it had to create a geographical area in which the Turkish element would be in the majority. That was being done by driving out the Greek Cypriot population and concentrating Turkish Cypriots in the area. It was a non-viable plan, an inhuman solution and no solution at all, he declared.

As to the plight of the so-called Turkish refugees of the 1963 conflict, Mr. Papadopoulos said, they were to a great extent displaced persons concentrated in a pre-selected area. They were suffering as much as the Greeks and were only
pawns in a gigantic plan orchestrated from outside. The aim had been to create separate Turkish Cypriot zones on which claims for partition could plausibly be based 10 years later. Anyone who visited Cyprus knew that although they chose to term themselves refugees, Turkish Cypriots were free to come and go as they wished, he said.

During the discussion in the General Assembly, Members generally agreed that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus must be safeguarded. Most Members who spoke expressed their deep concern over the presence of foreign armed forces in the island, the suffering of the civilian population, the plight of the refugees and displaced persons, and the highly unstable situation in Cyprus which constituted a constant threat to international peace and security. They called for urgent and effective measures to ensure implementation of Security Council decisions on Cyprus and for negotiations between the parties and the communities involved, based on the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and on respect for the legitimate rights of the Turkish and Greek communities.

Several speakers—among them Cuba, Dahomey, Malta, Mauritius and Panama—expressed support for Archbishop Makarios and said they continued to recognize him as the legitimate Head of State and as the only statesman whose skill could lead Cyprus to a solution; they urged the United Nations to defend his constitutional régime.

Many Members, including Bhutan, Cuba, Egypt, France, Guyana, Iran, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom and the United States, insisted on the necessity of creating a proper climate for meaningful negotiations and compromise between the parties. In that connexion, the United States observed that the Nicosia talks between Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash, which had produced agreements on the exchange of prisoners, had laid a fragile, but for that reason all the more critical, foundation of confidence and co-operation for broadened discussions. According to the United Kingdom, the talks offered the best forum for working out mutually acceptable agreements.

The representative of the Ivory Coast said that as a complement to the mediating efforts of the Secretary-General—to whom the Assembly should give the necessary authority—enlisting the aid of two truly neutral States in the conflict should be envisaged. Malta and the United States, among others, stressed that peace-keeping was not a substitute for peace, nor would it serve as a substitute for the accommodation that must be arrived at between the two Cypriot communities in order to come to grips with political problems.

The USSR representative said the General Assembly must adopt a resolution confirming the need for prompt implementation of the fundamentally important decisions of the Security Council, which had remained unfulfilled because certain Member States had unsuccessfully sought to solve the problem of Cyprus within the narrow closed circle of NATO. The same States, he said, had continued also to oppose the adoption of a USSR proposal to send a Security Council mission of investigation to Cyprus. The USSR, he added, had also proposed an international conference within the United Nations framework involving Security Council members, representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, and other States, particularly the non-aligned. His Government remained firmly convinced that the convening of such a conference would be a major step towards restoring peace and security in the island. Any decision reached at the conference should be effectively guaranteed by the permanent members of the Security Council, which in any case bore prime responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Among those supporting the USSR proposal for an international conference were Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Poland and the Ukranian SSR. These States, and others, felt that the guarantee system in the Zurich and London agreements of 1960 had proved completely unable to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus. As a matter of fact, the spokesman for the Ivory Coast pointed out, the Zurich and London agreements, by granting to the guarantor powers certain rights, had instead of protecting Cyprus served as a pretext for armed intervention against the sovereignty of the country.

Czechoslovakia's representative said that the future of Cyprus could not be based on a system that had broken down, but on a reliable permanent guarantee that would be in accordance with the Charter and that should be determined by the United Nations. In the view of Hungary and Poland, the Zurich-London guarantee system was unjust and outdated. It was impossible to continue with a system that sought to guarantee the status of a non-aligned State through NATO members.

Bulgaria, Dahomey, the German Democratic Republic, the Byelorussian SSR and others said that the system was used solely to exercise interference from abroad in the domestic affairs of Cyprus, to keep British military bases in Cyprus and to divert the attention of the people of Cyprus and of world opinion from the struggle to eliminate those bases.
Political and security questions

A number of Member States, including Guatemala, the Ivory Coast and Panama, considered that any withdrawal of foreign troops should include the removal of foreign military bases in Cyprus as a condition for the establishment of a lasting peace. In Dahomey’s view, the presence of the United Kingdom’s military bases in the non-aligned country of Cyprus could not be justified for very much longer.

Others, among them Australia, Canada, France (on behalf of the nine members of the European Economic Community) and Japan, called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the cessation of foreign interference in the affairs of Cyprus, with the exception of foreign forces in the island under the authority of international agreements.

China’s representative stated that the internal cause of the renewed eruption in Cyprus was the absence of a settlement of the issues between the two Cypriot communities; the external cause was the increasingly fierce contention between the two super-powers for hegemony in Europe, the Middle East and over the seas. The July coup d’état, he said, was inseparable from the meddling of a super-power. Since then the other super-power had done its utmost to incite dissension and exacerbate the situation. Similar views were expressed by the spokesman for Albania, who said that neither the United States nor the USSR could be expected to make a positive contribution to a solution in Cyprus since both were individualistic powers engaged in dividing the world into spheres of influence.

According to Dahomey and Saudi Arabia, policies predicated on balance of power and spheres of influence had boomeranged; they urged the Assembly to warn certain major powers to refrain from interfering for strategic, selfish ends in the internal affairs of Cyprus, a small peace-loving State.

With regard to the future of Cyprus, many Members—including Bhutan, Cuba, Dahomey, France (speaking for the nine members of EEC), India, Iran, Iraq, the Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, and the United Kingdom—specifically expressed opposition to any idea of annexation, partition or enosis as part of a settlement. The United Kingdom’s representative said that the central question on which the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities should agree was the constitutional structure of Cyprus within the sovereign, independent State which all agreed should be preserved. Compromise was essential, he said. Whether there should be a federal system remained the central question; until it was answered, it would be impossible to solve remaining questions.

Consideration by Security Council (13 December 1974)

The Security Council met on 13 December 1974 to consider a report by the Secretary-General, submitted on 6 December, on the United Nations operation in Cyprus. In his report, which covered the period from 23 May to 5 December 1974, the Secretary-General recommended that the current six-month mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), due to expire on 15 December, be extended for a further period of six months. He said that the parties concerned had signified their concurrence in this recommendation.

The period under review, the Secretary-General said, had been marked by the gravest crisis undergone by Cyprus since the establishment of the United Nations operation in the island in 1964. In July, the quiet which had prevailed for so many years—thanks in large measure, he said, to the presence of UNFICYP—had been shattered as a consequence of events which were clearly outside the purview of the United Nations Force.

The coup d’état of 15 July, the Secretary-General recalled, had been followed by military intervention by Turkey and full-scale hostilities between the National Guard on one side and the Turkish Army and Turkish Cypriot fighters on the other. Turkish armed forces were currently in occupation of about 40 per cent of the island; its economy was seriously disrupted and one third of its population was uprooted. The long-standing differences and mistrust between the two communities, he added, had been further deepened by the fighting.

The Secretary-General went on to say that this chain of events had confronted UNFICYP with a new situation not covered by its mandate, which had been conceived in the context of the conflict between the two communities in Cyprus and not of military intervention by outside forces or of full-scale hostilities between two national armies. For more than 10 years, he added, UNFICYP had been able to maintain, mainly through negotiation, persuasion and interposition, the delicate balance of forces in the island, but this balance had been destroyed by the events of July and August. Since the end of hostilities, UNFICYP had continued to carry out its peace-keeping and humanitarian tasks to the maximum extent possible in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, while adapting its operations to the requirements of the new situation.

In the Secretary-General’s view, the situation in Cyprus would remain unstable and potentially dangerous so long as the settlement of the basic problems was not agreed upon. He was convinced that such a settlement could not be achieved by
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violence but only through free negotiations between the parties concerned. In the circumstances, he considered the continued presence of UNFICYP to be essential, not only to help maintain the cease-fire called for by the Security Council, to promote the security of the civilian population and to provide humanitarian relief assistance but also to facilitate the search for a peaceful solution of the current situation.

The Secretary-General said that the deficit in the UNFICYP budget, which exceeded $27 million, had become a serious problem. The recent reinforcement of the Force—which numbered 4,335 as at 4 December—had contributed to that situation, but the main reason, he said, was the insufficiency of voluntary contributions, which had continued to come from a disappointingly limited number of Governments.

At the Council's meeting on 13 December, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also extended an invitation to Vedat A. Celik, representative of the Turkish Cypriot community, to make a statement.

Before the Council were two draft resolutions prepared in the course of consultations among Council members. The first draft resolution was adopted as resolution 364(1974), by 14 votes to 0, with China not participating in the vote.

By the preamble paragraphs of the resolution, the Council: noted from the report of the Secretary-General that in the existing circumstances the presence of UNFICYP was still needed; further noted that the parties concerned had signified their concurrence in the extension of UNFICYP and that the Government of Cyprus had agreed to it; and noted that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3212(XXIX) unanimously adopted on 1 November, had enunciated certain principles intended to facilitate a solution to the current problems of Cyprus by peaceful means.

By the operative paragraphs of the text, the Council: (1) reaffirmed its resolutions on the question of Cyprus adopted between 1964 and the outbreak of new hostilities in July 1974; (2) reaffirmed its resolutions adopted since then; (3) urged the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue to accelerate determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council; (4) extended once more the stationing in Cyprus of UNFICYP for a further period ending 15 June 1975, in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution would make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force; and (5) appealed again to all parties concerned to extend their full co-operation to the Force in the continuing performance of its duties.

The second draft resolution was adopted by the Council by consensus as resolution 365(1974). By the preamble paragraphs of this text, the Council acknowledged receipt of resolution 3212(XXIX) of the General Assembly on the question of Cyprus, and noted with satisfaction that it had been adopted unanimously. By the operative paragraphs, the Council: (1) endorsed the Assembly's resolution and urged the parties concerned to implement it as soon as possible; and (2) requested the Secretary-General to report on the progress of implementation of this resolution.

The representative of Turkey asked the Secretary-General to identify "the parties concerned" referred to as having been consulted on the extension of the stationing of UNFICYP. The Secretary-General replied that through his Special Representative he had consulted the then Acting President of Cyprus and the Vice-President, as well as the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

The representative of Cyprus questioned the reference to "the parties concerned." By the original resolution, of 4 March 1964,3 he said, the Security Council had established UNFICYP with the consent of the Government of Cyprus alone.

Turkey's spokesman regretted that the Council, by referring to the Government of Cyprus in the first of the resolutions just adopted, had failed to take into account the reality of the situation. Turkey, he said, would accept the presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus but it would not consider itself bound by the provisions of the resolution. The extension of the mandate of UNFICYP was taking place under completely new circumstances, which was why the Secretary-General had judged it necessary to obtain the consent of both communities in Cyprus for that action. There was no Government of Cyprus, only a de facto administration. There was no alternative to a peaceful solution in Cyprus and a biregional federal solution was the only way to deal with the question. It was in this spirit, he said, that Turkey welcomed the constructive dialogue between the heads of the two communities.

According to the representative of Greece, the extension of UNFICYP's mandate was necessary, not only for the security of the population and for the humanitarian relief assistance it provided but because its presence was needed in the search for a peaceful solution of the current situation, which was spreading misery not only to the beaten
Greek Cypriots but to the victorious Turkish Cypriots as well.

Mr. Celik said that since 1964, when the Turkish Cypriots had been forcefully ousted from their Government, Cyprus had been represented at the United Nations by a Greek Cypriot delegation which did not and could not represent the Turkish Cypriot community. Since 1964, there had been two completely separate, distinct administrations in Cyprus. The so-called Government of Cyprus did not represent the Turkish Cypriot community, and for that reason the resolution just adopted would not be binding on it. The Turkish Cypriot community, he said, stood for a biregional federation, which would be an effective guarantee for the independence and true non-alignment of Cyprus.

The USSR representative said that the General Assembly's resolution of 1 November 1974 (3212(XXIX)) provided a sound basis for a settlement in Cyprus and one specific way of implementing it would be by holding an international conference as proposed by his Government. The USSR, he said, did not object to the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP on the understanding that the Government of Cyprus agreed to it and that the operation would be financed on a voluntary basis.

The French representative said there was no doubt about the usefulness of maintaining UNFICYP, whose presence was essential to assist in maintaining the cease-fire, to ensure the safety of the population, to distribute humanitarian aid and to act as a link between the parties. France, he said, opposed any settlement leading to partition or annexation of all or part of the island.

Austria's spokesman agreed that the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP was necessary, as did the representatives of Australia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru and the United Republic of Cameroon. All of these speakers felt that the presence of UNFICYP, apart from providing security and essential humanitarian services to the population of the island, could enable the parties to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the crisis.

The Chinese representative said China had voted for the General Assembly's resolution of 1 November, but he reiterated that that resolution should in no way be construed as a pretext for permitting the super-powers to interfere; on that basis China, he said, had supported the second resolution adopted by the Council. Because of its position on the dispatch of United Nations forces, it did not participate in the vote on the resolution concerning the extension of UNFICYP's mandate.

According to the representative of the United Kingdom, the Force remained essential to the maintenance of peace on the island and his Government would maintain its commitment. He hoped for a reduction in the costs of the Force and hoped also that those countries which did not contribute troops to UNFICYP would urgently review their financial contributions so that UNFICYP's deficit might be reduced.

The representative of the United States said that the Council's decision to extend UNFICYP's mandate would help provide further time for a negotiated settlement on Cyprus. His Government hoped that the parties would make good use of that time. The United States believed that peace in Cyprus could come about only through free negotiations among the parties concerned.

### CONTINGENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS

(by country of origin, as at 4 December 1974)

#### Military personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Civilian police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>4,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLEDGES FOR FINANCING UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS

(UNFICYP Special Account for period 27 March 1964 to 15 December 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,819,875</td>
<td>Germany, Federal</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>Republic of</td>
<td>31,867</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2,151,117</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>12,550,000</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>11,812</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>23,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>965,666</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>27,157</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,685,000</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>Khmer Republic</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,839,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2,876,806</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>35,676,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>United Republic of Cameroon</td>
<td>4,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan Arab Republic</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>26,791</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>76,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>Republic of Viet-Nam</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>40,475</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4,120,000</td>
<td>Total pledges</td>
<td>166,073,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,171,000</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2,525,975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum amount pledged.
* Maximum amount pledged. The ultimate contribution was to be dependent on contributions of other Governments.

### Documentary references

**Recalling its resolution 186(1964) of 4 March 1964 and its subsequent resolutions on this matter,**

**Conscious of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations,**

1. **Calls upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus;**
2. **Calls upon all parties to the present fighting as a first step to cease all firing and requests all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation;**
3. **Demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus that is in contravention of the provisions of paragraph 1 above;**
4. **Requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements, including those whose withdrawal was requested by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, in his letter of 2 July 1974;**
5. **Calls upon Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to enter into negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus and to keep the Secretary-General informed;**
6. **Calls upon all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus to enable it to carry out its mandate;**
7. **Decides to keep the situation under constant review and asks the Secretary-General to report as appropriate with a view to adopting further measures in order to ensure that peaceful conditions are restored as soon as possible.**


S/11356. Exchange of messages dated 21 and 22 July 1974 between Secretary-General and Greece and Turkey.


S/11358. Letter of 21 July 1974 from Cyprus (request to convene Council).


S/11368. Note of 23 July 1974 by Secretary-General.

S/11369. Draft resolution.


The Security Council,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 353(1974) of 20 July 1974,

Demands that all parties to the present fighting comply immediately with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 353(1974) calling for an immediate cessation of all firing in the area and requesting all States to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action which might further aggravate the situation.


S/11376/S/11377. Notes verbales of 24 July 1974 from Turkey (transmitting texts of message dated 23 July 1974 from Prime Minister of Turkey to Secretary-General and message to Prime Minister of Greece, respectively).


S/11390. Letter of 28 July 1974 from USSR.

S/11391. USSR: draft resolution.


S/11398. Letter of 30 July 1974 from Secretary-General to President of Security Council (transmitting letter of 30 July 1974 from Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of United Kingdom annexing declaration and statement of 30 July 1974 by Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and United Kingdom).

S/11399. United Kingdom: draft resolution.

S/11400. Draft resolution, as amended by USSR (S/11401, para. 1), rejected by Council, owing to negative vote of a permanent member, on 31 July 1974, meeting 1788, by 12 votes in favour to 2 against (Byelorussian SSR, USSR) (China did not participate in voting).


Resolution 355(1974), as proposed following consultations among Council members, S/11402, adopted by Council on 1 August 1974, meeting 1789, by 12 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions (Byelorussian SSR, USSR) (China did not participate in voting).

The Security Council,


Deeply deploiring the resumption of fighting in Cyprus, contrary to the provisions of its resolution 353(1974),

1. Reaffirms its resolution 353(1974) in all its provisions and calls upon the parties concerned to implement those provisions without delay;

2. Demands that all parties to the present fighting cease all firing and military action forthwith;

3. Calls for the resumption of negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus, in accordance with resolution 353(1974);
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4. Decides to remain seized of the situation and on instant call to meet as necessary to consider what more effective measures may be required if the cease-fire is not respected.

S/11353/Add.26, 27. Further reports, dated 15 August 1974, of Secretary-General on developments in Cyprus.

S/11447. Note by Secretary-General (transmitting communication received on 14 August 1974 from designated Acting President of Cyprus).


The Security Council,  
Deeply concerned about the continuation of violence and bloodshed in Cyprus,  
Deeply deplores the non-compliance with its resolution 357(1974) of 14 August 1974,  
2. Insists on the full implementation of the above resolutions by all parties and on the immediate and strict observance of the cease-fire.

S/11449. Australia, Austria, France, Peru: draft resolution.

S/11449/Rev.1. Australia, Austria, France, Peru, United Republic of Cameroon: revised draft resolution.

Resolution 359(1974), as proposed by 5 powers, S/11449/Rev.1, adopted by Council on 15 August 1974, meeting 1793, by 14 votes to 0 (China did not participate in voting).

The Security Council,  
Noting with concern from the Secretary-General's report on developments in Cyprus, in particular documents S/11353/Add.24 and 25, that casualties are increasing among the personnel of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus as a direct result of the military action which is still continuing in Cyprus.

Recalling that the United Nations Force was stationed in Cyprus with the full consent of the Governments of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece,  
Bearing in mind that the Secretary-General was requested by the Security Council in resolution 359(1974) of 1 August 1974 to take appropriate action in the light of his statement made at the 178th meeting of the Council in which he dealt with the role, functions and strength of the Force and related issues arising out of the most recent political developments in respect of Cyprus,

1. Deeply deplores the fact that members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus have been killed and wounded;

2. Demands that all parties concerned fully respect the international status of the United Nations Force and refrain from any action which might endanger the lives and safety of its members;

3. Urges the parties concerned to demonstrate in a firm, clear and unequivocal manner their willingness to fulfill the commitments they have entered into in this regard;

4. Demands further that all parties co-operate with the United Nations Force in carrying out its tasks, including humanitarian functions, in all areas of Cyprus and in regard to all sections of the population of Cyprus;

5. Emphasizes the fundamental principle that the status and safety of the members of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, and for that matter of any United Nations peace-keeping force, must be respected by the parties under all circumstances.

S/11353/Add.28, 29. Further reports, dated 16 August 1974, of Secretary-General on developments in Cyprus.

S/11450 and Rev.1.2. France: draft resolution and revisions.

Resolution 360(1974), as proposed by France, S/11450/Rev.2, adopted by Council on 16 August 1974, meeting 1794, by 11 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions (Byelorussian SSR, Iraq, USSR) (China did not participate in voting).

The Security Council,  

Noting that all States have declared their respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus;

Gravely concerned at the deterioration of the situation in Cyprus, resulting from the further military operations, which constitutes a most serious threat to peace and security in the Eastern Mediterranean area,

1. Records its formal disapproval of the unilateral military actions undertaken against the Republic of Cyprus;

2. Urges the parties to comply with all the provisions of previous resolutions of the Security Council, including those concerning the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements;

3. Urges the parties to resume without delay, in an atmosphere of constructive co-operation, the negotiations called for in resolution 353(1974) whose outcome should not be impeded or prejudiced by the acquisition of advantages resulting from military operations;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council, as necessary, with a view to the possible adoption of further measures designed to promote the restoration of peaceful conditions;

5. Decides to remain seized of the question permanently and to meet at any time to consider measures which may be required in the light of the developing situation.

S/11353/Add.30-33. Further reports, dated 17-20 August 1974, of Secretary-General on developments in Cyprus.

S/11453, S/11456. Letters of 14 August 1974 from Cyprus (transmitting statements of 14 August 1974 by President of Cyprus).


S/11475, S/11476. Letters of 27 and 29 August 1974 from Cyprus.

Security Council, meeting 1795.

S/11471. Letter of 27 August 1974 from Cyprus (request to convene Council).


S/11477. Letter of 29 August 1974 from Turkey (transmitting letter from Vice-President of Cyprus).

S/11478. Austria, France, United Kingdom: draft resolution.
Resolution 361(1974), as proposed by 3 powers, S/11479, adopted unanimously (15-0) by Council on 30 August 1974, meeting 1795.

The Security Council, conscious of its special responsibilities under the United Nations Charter,
noting that a large number of people in Cyprus have been displaced, and are in need of humanitarian assistance,
mindful of the fact that it is one of the foremost purposes of the United Nations to lend humanitarian assistance in situations such as the one currently prevailing in Cyprus,
noting also that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has already been appointed Co-ordinator of United Nations Humanitarian Assistance for Cyprus, with the task of co-ordinating relief assistance to be provided by United Nations programmes and agencies and from other sources,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/11473,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the part he has played in bringing about talks between the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus;
2. Warmly welcomes this development and calls upon those concerned in the talks to pursue them actively with the help of the Secretary-General and in the interests of the Cypriot people as a whole;
3. Calls upon all parties to do everything in their power to alleviate human suffering, to ensure the respect of fundamental human rights for every person and to refrain from all action likely to aggravate the situation;
4. Expresses its grave concern at the plight of the refugees and other persons displaced as a result of the situation in Cyprus and urges the parties concerned, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, to search for peaceful solutions to the problems of refugees and take appropriate measures to provide for their relief and welfare and to permit persons who wish to do so to return to their homes in safety;
5. Requests the Secretary-General to submit at the earliest possible opportunity a full report on the situation of the refugees and other persons referred to in paragraph 4 above and decides to keep that situation under constant review;
6. Further requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide emergency United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of the island in need of such assistance;
7. Calls upon all parties, as a demonstration of good faith, to take, both individually and in co-operation with each other, all steps which may promote comprehensive and successful negotiations;
8. Reiterates its call to all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in carrying out its tasks;
9. Expresses the conviction that the speedy implementation of the provisions of the present resolution will assist the achievement of a satisfactory settlement in Cyprus.

S/11469. Letter of 4 September 1974 from Turkey.
S/11491. Letter of 5 September 1974 from Cyprus (transmitting letter from President of Panpuryan Federation of UNESCO Clubs at School).
S/11493. Letter of 5 September 1974 from Turkey (transmitting message of 4 September 1974 from Vice-President of Cyprus).
S/11501. Letter of 7 September 1974 from Cyprus (transmitting cable from Ministry of Communications and Works of Cyprus to Director-General of UNESCO).
S/11528. Letter of 20 September 1974 from Secretary-General to Governments containing further appeal for voluntary contributions for financing of UNFICYP.
S/11531 (A/9791). Letter of 4 October 1974 from Turkey (transmitting message of 29 September 1974 from Vice-President of Cyprus).
S/11557. Letter of 7 November 1974 from Secretary-General (transmitting text of Assembly resolution 3212(xxix) of 1 November 1974).

Consideration by General Assembly

General Assembly—29th session
General Committee, meeting 219.
Special Political Committee, meetings 922, 923.
Plenary meetings 2236, 2237, 2270-2275.
A/9743. Letter of 17 September 1974 from Cyprus (request for inclusion in agenda of item entitled: "Question of Cyprus").
A/9778 (S/11521). Letter of 26 September 1974 from Turkey (transmitting letter of 21 September 1974 from Vice-President of Cyprus).
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A/9791 (S/11531). Letter of 4 October 1974 from Turkey (transmitting message of 29 September 1974 from Vice-President of Cyprus).
A/9819 (S/11549). Letter of 26 October 1974 from Cyprus.
A/SPC/171. Letter of 28 October 1974 from President of General Assembly to Chairman of Special Political Committee.
A/L.736. Cyprus: draft resolution.
A/SPC/172. Resolution 3212(XXIX), as proposed by 9 powers, A/L.739, adopted by Assembly on 1 November 1974, meeting 2275, by recorded vote of 117 to 0, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

The General Assembly,
Having considered the question of Cyprus,
Gravely concerned about the continuation of the Cyprus crisis, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security,
Mindful of the need to solve this crisis without delay by peaceful means, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations,
Having heard the statements in the debate and taking note of the report of the Special Political Committee on the question of Cyprus,
1. Calls upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from all acts and interventions directed against it;
2. Urges the speedy withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from the Republic of Cyprus, and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs;
3. Considers that the constitutional system of the Republic of Cyprus concerns the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities;
4. Commends the contacts and negotiations taking place on an equal footing, with the good offices of the Secretary-General, between the representatives of the two communities, and calls for their continuation with a view to reaching freely a mutually acceptable political settlement, based on their fundamental and legitimate rights;
5. Considers that all the refugees should return to their homes in safety and calls upon the parties concerned to undertake urgent measures to that end;
6. Expresses the hope that, if necessary, further efforts including negotiations can take place, within the framework of the United Nations, for the purpose of implementing the provisions of the present resolution, thus ensuring to the Republic of Cyprus its fundamental right to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity;
7. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide United Nations humanitarian assistance to all parts of the population of Cyprus and calls upon all States to contribute to that effort;
8. Calls upon all parties to continue to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, which may be strengthened if necessary;
9. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to lend his good offices to the parties concerned;
10. Further requests the Secretary-General to bring the present resolution to the attention of the Security Council.

Consideration by Security Council (13 December 1974)

Security Council, meeting 1810.

Resolution 364(1974), as prepared following consultations among Council members, S/11573, adopted by Council on 13 December 1974, meeting 1810, by 14 votes to 0 (China did not participate in voting).

The Security Council,
Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 6 December 1974 (S/11568) that in existing circumstances the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed to perform the tasks it is currently undertaking if the cease-fire is to be maintained in the island and the search for a peaceful settlement facilitated,
Noting from the report the conditions prevailing in the island,
Noting also the statement by the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 81 of his report, that the parties concerned had signified their concurrence in his recommendation that the Security Council extend the stationing of the Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,
Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1974,
Noting also the letter dated 7 November 1974 (S/11557) from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council together with the text of resolution 3212(XXIX) entitled "Question of Cyprus" adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its 2275th plenary meeting on 1 November 1974,
Noting further that resolution 3212(XXIX) enunciates certain principles intended to facilitate a solution to the current problems of Cyprus by peaceful means, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations,
Chapter XIII

Questions relating to United Nations organs, membership and the Charter of the United Nations

Admission of new Members in 1974

In 1974, the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Grenada, and the Republic of Guinea-Bissau were admitted to United Nations membership. Their admission increased the number of United Nations Member States to 138.

The admission of all three Members was unanimously recommended by the Security Council, and, at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 17 September, the resolutions concerning their admission were adopted unanimously.

The following table indicates the dates of United Nations actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Date of recommendation by Council</th>
<th>Date of admission by Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>10 June 1974</td>
<td>17 September 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>21 June 1974</td>
<td>17 September 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>12 August 1974</td>
<td>17 September 1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For texts of resolutions and supporting documentation, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES below.)

Documentary references

Admission of Bangladesh

Security Council, meetings 1775, 1776.

S/11316. Report of Security Council Committee on Admission of New Members concerning application of People's Republic of Bangladesh for admission to membership in United Nations (containing draft resolution).

Resolution 351(1974), as recommended by Council Committee on Admission of New Members, S/11316, adopted without vote by Council on 10 June 1974, meeting 1776.

The Security Council, having examined the application of the People's Republic of Bangladesh for admission to membership in the United Nations, recommends to the General Assembly that the People's Republic of Bangladesh be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

S/11185/Add.22.23. Addenda to summary statement by Secretary-General on matters of which Security Council is seized and on stage reached in their consideration.