

- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 6 and 7.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 12-20.
- ³⁸ For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 22. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- ³⁹ 2330th mtg., paras. 26-31. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed similar concerns in explaining his delegation's abstention.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 35-38.
- ⁴¹ S/14917, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982.
- ⁴² For the vote and the statement by the President in his capacity as representative of the United States, see 2334th mtg., paras. 2-8. See also chap. 111 of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁴³ 2334th mtg., paras. 9 and 10.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 14-29.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 33-55.
- ⁴⁶ GAOR, 36th sess., Suppl. No. 35 (A/36/35), paras. 49-53.
- ⁴⁷ General Assembly resolution 36/120 D.
- ⁴⁸ 2334th mtg., paras. 60-65. Views similar to those expressed by the first three speakers were expressed at the same meeting by Egypt, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic, and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2338th mtg. by Jordan, Morocco and Turkey; at the 2340th mtg. by the German Democratic Republic and Iran; and at the 2344th mtg. by Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia.
- ⁴⁹ 2334th mtg., paras. 135-141.
- ⁵⁰ S/14943, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982. The draft resolution failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.
- ⁵¹ 2348th mtg., para. 3.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, paras. 5-8.
- ⁵³ For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 9. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁵⁴ 2348th mtg., paras. 11-15.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 16-20.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 66-73.
- ⁵⁷ S/14967, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- ⁵⁸ S/14969, *ibid.*
- ⁵⁹ For the vote and discussion, see 2352nd mtg., paras. 2-7. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁶⁰ 2352nd mtg., paras. 8 and 9.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 12-15.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, paras. 16-40.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, paras. 42-49.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 51-83.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 86-94. Similar views were expressed at the 2353rd mtg. by Malaysia, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2354th mtg. by Bangladesh, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Senegal, Sudan and Turkey; at the 2355th meeting by China, India and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; at the 2356th mtg. by Djibouti, Somalia, the USSR and the United Arab Emirates; and at the 2357th mtg. by Kuwait and Poland.
- ⁶⁶ S/14985, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982. The draft resolution was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.
- ⁶⁷ See 2357th mtg., para. 101, for the vote. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁶⁸ 2357th mtg., paras. 107-116.
- ⁶⁹ S/15481, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982.
- ⁷⁰ S/15483, *ibid.*
- ⁷¹ For the discussion and vote, see 2401st mtg., paras. 9-16. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁷² See 2401st mtg., paras. 17 and 18.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, paras. 26-44.
- ⁷⁴ S/14268, dated 25 November 1980, OR, 35th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1980.
- ⁷⁵ 2401st mtg., paras. 49-70. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the Niger, the PLO and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.
- ⁷⁶ S/15599, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983.
- ⁷⁷ 2412th mtg.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.* Similar views were expressed at the 2412th mtg. by Egypt, India, Yemen and Yugoslavia and by the PLO; at the 2413th mtg. by Algeria, China, Guyana, the Islamic Republic of

Iran, Jordan, Malta, Pakistan, Poland, Turkey and Zimbabwe; and at the 2414th mtg. by Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Kuwait, Nicaragua and the United Arab Emirates, and by the President, speaking in his capacity as representative of the Soviet Union.

⁷⁹ 2414th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

⁸⁰ 2414th mtg.

⁸¹ S/15764, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983.

⁸² 2438th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by India, the Syrian Arab Republic and the PLO. The spokesman for the PLO offered a very detailed description of recent violence in the occupied territories.

⁸³ 2438th mtg.

⁸⁴ S/15890, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983.

⁸⁵ 2457th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the representatives of Democratic Yemen, India and Pakistan, and by the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Observer for the PLO; at the 2458th mtg. by the representatives of Egypt and the USSR; at the 2459th mtg. by the representatives of Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Kuwait and the Syrian Arab Republic and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2460th mtg. by Afghanistan, Bahrain, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Poland, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Yugoslavia; and at the 2461st mtg. by Djibouti, the German Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Morocco and Togo.

⁸⁶ S/15895, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983. The draft was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

⁸⁷ 2461st mtg.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

⁸⁹ S/15673, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983. See also the letter dated 30 March 1983 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (S/15667, *ibid.*) and the letter dated 3 April from the representative of Israel (S/15674, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1983) rejecting the changes.

⁹⁰ S/15680, OR, 38th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983. See also the letter dated 5 April 1983 from the representative of Israel rejecting the Council's statement (S/15683, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1983).

⁹¹ The Secretary-General submitted a report dated 10 May 1983 to which a report of the Director-General of WHO was annexed (S/15756, *ibid.*).

4. THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

Decision of 4 June 1981 (2279th meeting): resolution 486 (1981)

On 27 May 1981, before the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was due to expire, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report¹ covering the period from 1 December 1980 to 27 May 1981. In his report, the Secretary-General stated that within the framework of the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Council the intercommunal talks in Cyprus had continued in a generally constructive atmosphere, although with limited practical results. A more intensive pace for those deliberations was planned as from the beginning of July. The Secretary-General concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary, both in helping to maintain calm on the island and in creating the conditions under which the search for a peaceful settlement could best be pursued, and he therefore recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months. In an addendum* issued on 4 June, the Secretary-General indicated that, following consultations, the parties concerned had signified their concurrence with the proposed extension.

At its 2279th meeting, on 4 June 1931, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda under the item "The situation in Cyprus" and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey³ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Nail Atalay⁴ to participate under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at its 2279th meeting.

At the outset of the meeting, the President put to the vote a draft resolution⁵ prepared in the course of consultations, which was adopted by 14 votes in favour to none against, with no abstentions, as resolution 486 (1981).⁶ The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 27 May 1981,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 June 1981,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. *Extends* once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 December 1981;

2. *Notes with satisfaction* that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1981.

Following the vote, the Secretary-General assured the Council that he was taking steps to give effect to the resolution just adopted. Concerning his mission of good offices, he referred to his report⁷ of 27 May 1981 and observed that the intercommunal talks⁷ were scheduled to enter a more active phase at the beginning of July.⁸

The representative of Cyprus stated that both his biannual appearance before the Council and the resolution just adopted, while essential for the preservation of peaceful conditions, were at the same time a sad commentary on the ability of the United Nations to apply the principles of the Charter and the peremptory norms of international law to a small and defenceless country in whose case they had been violated. He noted that while the talks were still alive they had as yet produced no results whatsoever, and he hoped that when he appeared before the Council again in six months' time he would have something positive to report on them.⁹

The representative of Greece asserted that the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP represented an admission of failure on the part of the United Nations in its mission of guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of its Members, particularly the small countries. Despite the praiseworthy efforts of the Secretary-General and his colleagues and the dedication of the Force no real progress had been made in the dialogue. The intercommunal talks

had reached a turning-point and could not be extended indefinitely, and this might be the last opportunity to achieve an agreement which would maintain the independence, unity, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus.¹⁰

Mr. Nail Atalay stated that the reference in the resolution to the Greek Cypriot administration as the so-called Government of Cyprus made the resolution unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side. He stressed that the principle of the equality of the two communities must be maintained whenever and wherever there had to be a reference to the intercommunal talks or to the respective status of each community. Moreover, the *modus operandi* of UNFICYP would have to be changed and its mandate revised accordingly, since under the terms of resolution 186 (1964), which provided that it was to prevent a recurrence of fighting and contribute to the restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions, it had no legitimate function to perform in the north of Cyprus. If UNFICYP were adjusted to the present realities of Cyprus, 30 per cent of its personnel would suffice to control the cease-fire lines and thus adequately fulfil its mandate. In addition, the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph two of the resolution did not accurately reflect the fact that the intercommunal talks had been resumed and were continuing on the basis of the Secretary-General's opening statement of 9 August 1980,¹¹ which incorporated the high-level agreement of 12 February 1977, the IO-point agreement of 19 May 1979 and other important elements; however, he would not insist on a change in the wording so as not to create an impasse.¹²

The representative of Turkey asserted that in the current circumstances the discussion in the Council was both inappropriate and harmful to the search for a solution by means of the intercommunal negotiations. His Government was satisfied at the continuation of the intercommunal talks, which were the only valid means for arriving at a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus, and reiterated its support for, and co-operation with, the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices. However, he objected to references to the "Government of Cyprus" in the Secretary-General's report and in the third preambular paragraph of the resolution the Council had just adopted. His delegation's position concerning that title was well-known and remained unchanged, and all of Turkey's reservations regarding previous Council resolutions referred to in the current resolution remained unchanged. He noted as well that the Council had not adopted the wording his delegation had proposed for paragraph 2 of the resolution, which would have referred to the Secretary-General's statement of 9 August 1980¹¹ as providing the framework for the resumption of the intercommunal talks, and stressed that his Government nevertheless interpreted the text of the resolution, and particularly the reference to the resumption of the talks, in that light.¹³

Decision of 14 December 1981 (2313th meeting): resolution 495 (1981)

On 1 December 1981, the Secretary-General submitted a report¹⁴ covering the period from 28 May to 30 November 1981. He noted that during the period under review UNFICYP had continued to perform its peace-keeping functions by supervising the cease-fire lines, providing security in the area between the

lines, looking after the safety and welfare of Cypriots residing in areas under the control of the other community and supporting relief operations **co-ordinated** by the **Office** of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). These activities had made a major contribution to maintaining calm in the island. During the same period the search for a solution of the Cyprus problem had undergone a rapid evolution, with both sides in the **intercommunal talks** submitting new or revised proposals which included for the first time concrete arrangements as the proposed basis for a comprehensive settlement. On 22 October 1981, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General had submitted on his behalf an evaluation paper drawn up in the exercise of his mission of good offices which analysed the positions of the **parties**. The Secretary-General expressed the hope that the consideration of that paper would mark the beginning of a new and fruitful phase in the search for a negotiated settlement. He concluded that, under the circumstances, the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary and recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months. In an addendum dated 14 December 1981, the **Secretary-General** indicated that, following consultations, the concerned parties had signified their concurrence with the proposed extension.

At its 2313th meeting, on 14 December 1981, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and **Turkey**¹⁶ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Nail **Atalay**¹⁷ to participate in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at its 2313th meeting.

The President drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution* prepared in the course of consultations, which he then put to the vote. It was adopted **unanimously**¹⁹ as resolution 495 (1981), and reads as follows:

The Security Council.

Taking **note** of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 December 1981,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the **recommendation** by the Secretary-General that the **Security Council** should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 1981**,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant **resolutions**,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. **Extends once more** the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1982;

2. **Notes with satisfaction** that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue **these** talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. **Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices**, to **keep** the **Security Council** informed of the progress made and to submit a **report** on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1982.

In explanation of the vote, the representative of China pointed out that, for historical and political reasons, China had until then adhered to a well-

known position *vis-à-vis* United Nations peace-keeping operations. However, having taken into **consideration** the changes in the international arena and the evolution in the role of the peace-keeping operations, his delegation would from then on actively consider and support such United Nations peace-keeping operations as were conducive to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the preservation of the sovereignty and independence of the States concerned, in strict conformity with the purposes and **principles** of the **Charter**.²⁰

The Secretary-General observed that after almost 18 years of United Nations involvement in Cyprus the problem was still far from a solution, leading some, perhaps, to question whether the United Nations road to peaceful accord, involving the concurrent use of peace-keeping and good offices, had justified its political and **financial** cost. However, considering the enormously complex pattern of conflicting interests involved, it would have been idle to **look** towards an immediate solution. By managing effectively to keep the threatening situation on the **ground** under control and maintaining the peace, the **United Nations** had helped to create conditions conducive to the search for a political settlement of the underlying dispute. Instead of confrontation there had been **gradual** movement, and the pace of that movement had been **distinctly** accelerated over the past few months. He appealed to all the parties concerned not to allow impatience to obscure a sober assessment of the progress achieved, nor to lose sight of the great distance that remained to be travelled. Calling for **greater efforts**, greater restraint and more concrete achievements, he concluded that the path had been charted, and while the obstacles were formidable, he was convinced that with the co-operative efforts of all concerned they could be overcome.*

The representative of Cyprus indicated that his Government found the Secretary-General's evaluation of the status of the negotiations helpful and hoped it **would** pave the way to a more productive phase in the talks. However, **it** had never been meant to form the basis for the negotiations, which was, and always **would** be, the United Nations resolutions and the two high-level agreements, including the **priority** on Varosha. He noted that, as a gesture of good will, his Government had agreed to the adjournment of the debate on the question of Cyprus during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in the previous year and again **during** the current year's regular Assembly session, but **if** the talks did not register progress within a reasonable time they would **ask** for, and have, a full-fledged debate and a resolution during a resumed session of the Assembly. That was not meant as a threat, but if the other side did not reciprocate his Government's good will, determination and **bona fides** to achieve progress then they would have to act to safeguard the interests of their country, both in the United Nations and in every other available forum.**

The representative of Greece stated that, while UNFICYP had contributed greatly to the stabilization of the situation in Cyprus and was rendering invaluable services to all the Cypriots, it would be a fatal mistake to consider the peace-keeping operation as a **goal** in itself. He claimed that it was because the Turkish Cypriot proposals had been so unsatisfactory that the Secretary-General had found it necessary to play a more active role in the negotiations within his

mandate of good offices, and had thus presented the parties with his evaluation of the various aspects of the problem, which the Government of Cyprus had accepted as a vehicle for advancing the negotiations. His Government found that to be a constructive and helpful step, and was committed to helping to find a solution that would be consistent with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council and the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979.²³

Mr. Nail Atalay reiterated his objection to the terminology referring to the Government of Cyprus contained in the resolution just adopted, and once again referred to the need to alter the modus operandi of UNFICYP. In addition, he asserted that the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 of the resolution did not accurately reflect the actual basis on which the talks were continuing, which now included, in addition to those elements he had mentioned at the Council's 2279th meeting in connection with resolution 486 (1981), the Secretary-General's recent evaluation paper. The Turkish Cypriot side supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and had accepted the evaluation paper as the framework and the basis for the intercommunal negotiations. He stressed that the Cyprus problem was a matter between the two communities and that a just and lasting solution could be found only through intercommunal talks held on an equal footing. The Turkish Cypriot side was determined to do all it could to keep the process of the intercommunal talks alive, despite the unconstructive attitude of the other side.²⁴

The representative of Turkey declared that, following 16 months of uninterrupted talks, the intercommunal talks had reached a crucial stage. The Turkish Government endorsed the view expressed by the Secretary-General concerning his evaluation paper in paragraph 56 of his report and fully supported the Turkish Cypriot proposal that the Secretary-General's evaluation paper should constitute the framework for the intercommunal negotiations. He regretted that the resolution lacked any encouragement for the two communities along the lines of paragraph 56 of the Secretary-General's report. Commenting on the reference to the Government of Cyprus contained in the third preambular paragraph of the resolution just adopted, the Turkish representative stated that Turkey did not recognize that status as belonging to the leaders of the Greek Cypriot community, who had placed themselves in the position of usurpers of that title. The Republic of Cyprus would not have a legal and legitimate government until, through the intercommunal negotiations, the bicomunal essence of the Republic guaranteed by international treaty had been restored, with each community having its own federated state within a biregional and bicomunal framework.²⁵

Decision of 15 June 1982 (2378th meeting): resolution 510 (1982)

In a report²⁶ covering the period from 1 December 1981 to 31 May 1982, submitted on 1 June 1982, the Secretary-General noted that during the period under review the search for a negotiated, just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem had entered a new phase. Under the auspices of his Special Representative the two interlocutors at the intercommunal talks had embarked on a systematic review of the main elements of the constitutional aspect using the evaluation paper as a framework for the talks. They had

succeeded in arriving at "points of coincidence" in a number of cases, which did not mean that the major substantive elements of the Cyprus problem were about to be resolved, but that they were being systematically reconsidered, reformulated and reduced. When this task had been completed it would still be necessary to undertake the politically challenging enterprise of devising solutions for major constitutional and territorial issues. The Secretary-General concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary and recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months. In an addendum issued on 14 June 1982²⁷ the Secretary-General stated that the parties concerned had agreed to the proposed extension.

At its 2378th meeting, on 15 June 1982, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey²⁸ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Nail Atalay²⁹ under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the report of the Secretary-General at its 2378th meeting.

At the beginning of the 2378th meeting, the President put to the vote a draft resolution³⁰ that had been prepared in the course of consultations. The draft resolution received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 510 (1982).³¹ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 June,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 June 1982,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions.

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. *Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 December 1982;*

2. *Notes with satisfaction that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;*

3. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1982.*

The representative of Cyprus stated that the problem of Cyprus was not one of differences between the two communities or of religious differences, but rather a problem of the invasion and occupation of a small, non-aligned country striving to protect its independence against the expansionist policy of a large and powerful neighbouring country. Pointing to the strategic location of Cyprus and to the number of years that the problem had been before the General Assembly and the Council, he stated that the problem of Cyprus was international in nature, and directly affected the peace and security of the area and of the world in general. Despite the provisions of the many resolutions adopted by the Assembly and the Council

there had been no withdrawal of the Turkish troops, no refugees had been permitted to return to their homes, and the intercommunal talks had failed to achieve any progress on matters of substance.

He called upon the Council and countries not members of the Council to bring pressure to bear upon Turkey to end its aggression and to withdraw its troops from Cyprus. He referred to the proposal of the President of the Republic of Cyprus for the total disarmament and demilitarization of Cyprus and the creation of a mixed Greek-Turkish Cypriot police force under the control of an international United Nations police force, and cited the positive response of his President to the proposal of the Prime Minister of Greece, who had offered to withdraw the Greek contingent stationed in Cyprus under the 1960 **Agreements**³² provided that the Turkish troops were also withdrawn and a United Nations police force was stationed in Cyprus. Pledging his country's support for the strengthening of the United Nations, he declared that if the world community, through the United Nations, did not choose to give the Organization the means to carry out its task there would be no end to the aggressive use of force.³³

The representative of Greece stated that free and meaningful negotiations between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots were inconceivable as long as a substantial part of the Republic of Cyprus remained under military occupation. Since both communities were concerned about their security his Government had proposed that, along with the Greek contingent, the Turkish troops should withdraw from Cyprus and an enlarged United Nations peace-keeping force should be established. His Government was willing to assume all the additional expenses that such an increase of the Force would entail. After that step, intercommunal talks should start with a view to drafting a constitution which would be based on internationally recognized safeguards for the protection of minorities. A demilitarization of the Republic of Cyprus, coupled with international guarantees, should complement the settlement in order to meet further security demands of the parties concerned.³⁴

Mr. Nail Atalay affirmed that, as stated in the report of the Secretary-General, progress was beginning to be made at the intercommunal talks. However, the Turkish Cypriot community was concerned about the future of the talks as a result of certain actions of the Greek Cypriot leaders and certain statements by the Prime Minister of Greece.³⁵

The representative of Turkey noted at the outset that, in the light of the positive developments that had taken place since the resumption of the intercommunal talks and the fact that the search for a solution in Cyprus was continuing steadily, his Government would have wished to avoid a discussion that was certain to involve acrimonious exchanges, whereas the renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP was a formality. He further stated that, in the view of the Turkish Government, the encouragement of the intercommunal talks was the best way to arrive at a solution in Cyprus, and any action or initiative that could jeopardize the talks or encourage those who desired to internationalize the problem should be avoided as it would result in a breakdown of the talks between the two communities.³⁶

Decision of 14 December 1982 (2405th meeting): resolution 526 (I 1982)

On 1 December 1982, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report³⁷ on UNFICYP covering the period from 1 June to 30 November 1982. He indicated that the new phase of his mission of good offices, which had been initiated at the intercommunal talks on 7 January 1982, had continued at a steady pace and in a constructive atmosphere during the reporting period. The interlocutors, who continued to follow the evaluation paper submitted by his Special Representative, had completed the discussion of almost all of the constitutional aspects and were about to begin an examination of the territorial aspect. He hoped that the parties concerned would demonstrate the political will necessary to undertake the next phase of the negotiations as soon as possible. The Secretary-General concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary, and recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months. In an addendum issued on 13 December 1982,³⁸ the Secretary-General stated that the parties concerned had agreed to the extension.

At its 2405th meeting, on 14 December 1982, following the inclusion of the Secretary-General's report in the agenda, the Council invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey³⁹ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, and invited Mr. Nail Atalay⁴⁰ under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the report of the Secretary-General at its 2405th meeting.

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution⁴¹ prepared in the course of consultations, which he then put to the vote. The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes in favour⁴² as resolution 526 (1982). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 December 1982,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 1982,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. *Extends* once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1983;

2. *Notes with satisfaction* that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1983.

The representative of Cyprus declared that the principle of the non-use of force in international relations enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations was being violated in Cyprus and stated that if the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations continued to be disregarded the reputation of the Organization would be further eroded, as its credibility depended upon its

living up to its decisions. Regarding the **intercommunal** talks, he maintained that, except for identifying the negotiating positions of both **sides**, no substantive **progress** had been achieved since the last renewal of UNFICYP. He hoped that the Council would follow developments in Cyprus vigilantly and continue to recognize its **special** responsibility towards Cyprus and its people.⁴³

The representative of Greece asserted that the intercommunal talks had been dealing mainly with minor issues, creating a totally **misleading** impression of progress. He recalled that, in addition to the proposal for an enlargement of UNFICYP, his Government had proposed that the situation be re-examined by a special committee of the United Nations or by an international conference. Since Turkey had taken a negative stand with regard to those proposals it might be time for the Council to exert its influence on Turkey in order that it might abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council.⁴⁴

Mr. Nail Atalay reaffirmed the Turkish Cypriot community's support of the intercommunal talks as the best means available for the solution of the problem of Cyprus and stated that interference by parties not directly involved would only harden the positions of the parties. He urged that the Council encourage negotiations in conditions of equality between the two national communities and restrain all interference. His people hoped that the Council would induce the two communities to resolve their differences through talks on the basis of the principles and agreements they had concluded between themselves.⁴⁵

The representative of Turkey stated that his Government considered it essential to safeguard the intercommunal negotiations, especially at a time when they were suffering a set-back, and declared that the problem would not be solved by invoking unrealistic recommendations that had been rejected by the Turkish community of Cyprus and Turkey. Rejecting the view that the question of Cyprus was a problem born of military intervention, he asserted that the Turkish community of Cyprus and Turkey had used the right of self-defence in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee to recreate the state of affairs provided for in the Cypriot Constitution, but this time in a sound and durable manner, which could not be other than as a federation. The Turkish armed forces would remain on the territory until the conclusion of a final agreement between all the parties because, as experience had unfortunately shown, international forces had never been able to ensure the full security of **populations**.⁴⁶

Decision of 15 June 1983 (2453rd meeting): resolution 534 (1983)

In his report dated 1 June 1983,⁴⁷ covering the period from 1 December 1982 to 31 May 1983, the Secretary-General stated that the intercommunal talks had continued regularly on the basis of his evaluation paper, but noted that following the adoption on 13 May 1983 of General Assembly resolution 37/253 the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community had announced their decision not to attend the meeting of the talks scheduled for 31 May 1983. He hoped that the talks could be continued as soon as possible on the existing, mutually acceptable basis and had strengthened his personal involvement within the framework of his mission of good offices. It

was his intention to follow up on the work done during the current phase of the talks in order to give fresh impetus to the talks. He appealed to all concerned to show restraint. The Secretary-General concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary and recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of the Force for another six months. In an addendum dated 14 June 1983,⁴⁸ the Secretary-General stated that the parties concerned had agreed to the proposed extension.

At its 2453rd meeting, on 15 June 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited the representatives of Canada, Cyprus, Greece and **Turkey**,⁴⁹ at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Nail **Atalay**⁵⁰ under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at its 2453rd and 2454th meetings, on 15 June 1983.

At the outset of the 2453rd meeting, the President put to the vote a draft **resolution**⁵¹ prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. The draft resolution was unanimously adopted as resolution 534 (1983). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 June 1983,

Noting the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 June 1983,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

Reiterating its support of the ten-point agreement for the resumption of the intercommunal talks which was worked out at the high-level meeting on 18 and 19 May 1979 at Nicosia under the auspices of the Secretary-General,

1. *Extends* once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 December 1983;

2. *Notes with satisfaction* that the parties have resumed the intercommunal talks within the framework of the ten-point agreement and urges them to pursue these talks in a continuing, sustained and result-oriented manner, avoiding any delay;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1983.

The representative of Cyprus stated that the United Nations resolutions were as far as ever from being implemented, and that as a result the problem of Cyprus continued to pose a grave threat to the peace of the region and to international peace and security in general. Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leader had embarked on new secessionist steps directed against the territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus, and were undermining the intercommunal talks. He rejected the Turkish argument that the Cypriot Government's efforts to internationalize the question of Cyprus while negotiations were going on were contrary to the spirit of the intercommunal talks. The talks were held to solve the internal aspects of the problem, whereas the international aspects were matters rightly to be considered by the **United Nations**. Furthermore, the talks originated from Council and General Assembly resolutions, and since the Assembly had called for the talks it was appropriate and necessary on the part of his Government to keep that body informed and to request its further

assistance in the search for a solution. He expressed regret that following the adoption by the Assembly of resolution 37/253, whose operative paragraph 16 welcomed the intended initiative of the Secretary-General, Turkey had refused to respond to the Secretary-General's call for a meeting to discuss his intended initiative. He reiterated his Government's support for negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General and appealed to the Turkish side to abandon its present policies and to work at the negotiating table to reach a just and durable solution based on relevant United Nations resolutions and high-level agreements.⁵⁰

Mr. Nail Atalay stated that the problem of Cyprus existed because there was no Government by the consent of the two communities on the island, and he cited his own presence before the Council as a clear indication that the Greek Cypriot administration did not represent the Turkish Cypriot people. The attempt to split the problem into an internal and an external factor was really an attempt to prevent Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots from arresting the Hellenization of the island. Decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies which ignored the rights and status of the Turkish Cypriot community only made an agreed political settlement more difficult. He stated categorically that General Assembly resolution 37/253, which, *inferred*, "calls upon all States to support and help the Government of the Republic of Cyprus"—meaning the Greek Cypriot administration—to exercise "sovereignty and control over the entire territory of Cyprus", was totally unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side. It was the understanding of the Turkish Cypriots that, if and when the negotiations started, that resolution would not be taken into consideration. The Turkish Cypriot side had decided to reassess its position in the light of resolution 37/253; he affirmed, however, that the Turkish Cypriots would continue to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and were determined to continue the negotiating process in a spirit of good will and with a constructive attitude. He deplored the fact that some of the States contributing troops to UNFICYP had departed from their traditional equidistant posture by voting in favour of resolution 37/253 and hoped that they would return to the position of not taking sides in the dispute in order to retain the impartiality that was essential to the carrying out of peace-keeping operations in Cyprus.⁵⁰

At the Council's 2454th meeting, the representative of Canada noted that, as a troop contributor to UNFICYP, his Government remained willing to assist in the peace-keeping process but was anxious to ensure that there would be tangible evidence that the complementary process of peace-making was progressing. The formation and maintenance of UNFICYP had provided the necessary stable conditions under which the peace-keeping process should have succeeded long ago. The United Nations had done all that was possible to create and maintain those conditions in Cyprus, but UNFICYP of itself could not bring about an intercommunal settlement. His Government believed that the failure to achieve a negotiated settlement and a return to peaceful conditions was attributable to a lack of will on the part of the parties to make the necessary difficult compromises and called upon them to enter into serious and fruitful discussions in a spirit of good will and compromise. Noting that neither the patience

nor the resources of Canada were without limits, he reaffirmed Canada's strong support for the Secretary-General in his efforts to give fresh impetus to the negotiating process and expressed the hope that all interested countries would do likewise.⁵²

Decision of 18 November 1983 (2500th meeting): resolution 54 I (1983)

On 15 November 1983, the representatives of the United Kingdom,⁵³ Cyprus⁵⁴ and Greece⁵⁵ addressed separate letters to the President of the Council calling for an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Cyprus. In requesting the meeting, the representative of Cyprus stated that on 15 November 1983 the so-called Assembly of the "Turkish Federated State of Kibris" had proclaimed an independent State in the part of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus which was under military occupation by Turkey in an attempt to secede from the Republic of Cyprus. The purported secession was in clear violation of specific provisions of Council resolutions and created an explosive situation that threatened the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus and jeopardized international peace and security. His Government requested that the Council take urgent and effective action to deal with that grave development in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

At its 2497th meeting, on 17 November 1983, the Council included the three letters in its agenda. The following representatives were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2497th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Canada, Cyprus, Greece, India, Romania, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Turkey and Yugoslavia; at the 2498th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba and Democratic Yemen; and at the 2500th meeting, the representative of Egypt.⁵⁶ At the 2498th meeting, the Council invited Mr. Rauf Denktas⁵⁷ to participate in the discussion under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at its 2497th to 2500th meetings, on 17 and 18 November 1983.

At the 2497th meeting, the Secretary-General stated that the matter before the Council concerned the announcement on 15 November of a Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and the issuance of a declaration in which that entity was described as an independent State. He had been informed of the announcement by a letter from the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, Mr. Denktas, and had responded with an expression of his deep regret at the announcement, which he considered contrary to the resolutions of the Security Council and at variance with the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979, and an appeal to all those involved to exercise the utmost restraint.

The Secretary-General told the Council that, based on the suggestion made by Mr. Denktas on 1 October, his Special Representative had arrived in Cyprus on 14 November to begin consultations regarding a high-level meeting between the leaders of the two communities, which was meant to pave the way for a resumption of serious intercommunal negotiations. Against that background, he felt constrained to express once again his deep disappointment at the action taken on 15 November. However, Mr. Denktas had informed him that the proposal for a high-level meeting under the auspices of the

Secretary-General remained valid and that the good offices of the Secretary-General and the negotiations must continue.

The Secretary-General stated that he was determined to attempt to induce the parties to return to the search for an agreed, just and negotiated settlement, and to that end he **would** utilize to the fullest the presence at the United Nations of high-ranking representatives of all concerned. Regarding the situation on the island, he informed the Council that access to the north of Cyprus had been temporarily closed prior to the Turkish Cypriot announcement and had **been** reopened shortly thereafter. The situation remained calm, and the presence of UNFICYP provided a measure of assurance that the calm would not be **disturbed**.⁵⁸

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus declared that his Government considered the declaration of the independence of the entity described as the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" null and **void**, and that all States were duty-bound to recognize no Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus. He asserted that Turkey was solely responsible for the purported **declaration** of independence, and that the **Denktaş régime** was a mere puppet maintained and controlled by Turkey. Those actions represented a breach of Turkey's obligations under the Treaty of Guarantee and the Treaty of **Establishment** and constituted a threat to international peace and security with implications which extended **beyond** the confines of Cyprus. His Government appealed to the Council to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter by adopting effective measures which would reverse the situation in the occupied part of Cyprus. He urged that the Council seriously consider taking effective measures to implement its own mandatory resolutions, in accordance with the **Charter**.⁵⁸

At the 2498th meeting, Mr. **Denktaş** indicated that he stood ready to resume the negotiations within the agreed procedure. As the declaration of **independence** had made clear, the Turkish Cypriot side favoured continued negotiations under the **good** offices of the Secretary-General and believed that the **declaration** of statehood would help the negotiating process because it underlined the equality of the parties. The Turkish Cypriot side **stood by the 1977** and 1979 summit agreements, the 1980 opening statement of the Secretary-General and the **Secretary-General's** evaluation paper, all of which foresaw the establishment of a **bizonal** federal republic.

He charged that the problem of Cyprus existed because the Greek Cypriots **sought** to **destroy** the bicommunality of **Cyprus** and to make of it a Greek Cypriot State, **relegating** the Turkish Cypriots to the status of a minority within that State. The recognition by international force of the Greek Cypriot wing as the legitimate Government of Cyprus had **led** the Greek Cypriots to feel that they had achieved what they had set out to achieve and had removed any incentive for re-establishing a bicommunal State. Mr. **Denktaş** urged that the Council give Cyprus a chance to establish **bizonal**, bicommunal federalism. The Greek Cypriot call for condemnation and non-recognition of the Turkish Cypriot move should **be** ignored, for it was only when the world started to **recognize** them that the Greek Cypriots would feel the need to come to the negotiating **table**.⁵⁷

The representative of Turkey contended that the Turkish Cypriot declaration of independence and the Turkish military presence in Cyprus were in **accordance** with the international treaties by which the Republic of Cyprus had been established. The **unilateral** amendments by the Greek Cypriots to the 1960 Cypriot Constitution were in contravention of the Treaty of Guarantee concluded between the Republic of Cyprus, the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, and of the Constitutional Order of Cyprus, **which** Turkey, as a guaranteeing Power, was duty-bound to preserve and restore. On that basis the Turkish military continued to protect the Turkish Cypriot **community** in order to prevent union with **Greece** and to restore the **conditions** that the 1960 Constitution had aimed at establishing, namely, a **bicommunal** republic within which the two communities, under the protection of the appropriate safeguards and guarantees, could live in peace and security. States that recognized the Greek Cypriot administration as the **Government** of Cyprus were endorsing a flagrant violation of international law. The **Cypriot** State had been co-founded **by** the two **communities**; how then could one **of** them form a Government to rule over both? The Council had recognized that the right to self-determination **was exercised in Cyprus jointly by** the two communities, since the **Council** considered that only the two communities together were competent to bring about a negotiated solution.

The Greek Cypriots, however, had persisted in referring to the **Turkish** Cypriot community as a minority or ethnic group, making it clear that they had no intention of restoring to it its legal and legitimate position as **co-founder** of the Republic. Turkish Cypriot exasperation had finally **led to the** declaration of **independence**. It was not a secession, however, for the **Turkish Cypriots** had proclaimed themselves bound by the **Treaties of Guarantee, Establishment and Alliance** which had given birth to the Republic of Cyprus. The **representative** of Turkey proposed that the Council should, above all, call upon the two communities to resume intercommunal negotiations within the framework of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General. It should **take into** account the willingness of the Turkish Cypriots to negotiate and refrain from judgements **based on** distortions and prejudices. Unilateral condemnation of the Turkish community in Cyprus would **aggravate** its exasperation but would never deflect it **from** its aspiration for equality, protected and sustained by **Turkey**.⁵⁷

The representative of Nicaragua stated that the decision to declare an independent Turkish Cypriot State was unacceptable because it destroyed the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial **integrity** of a Member State. It endangered **international** peace and security, violated Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, and violated relevant decisions of the General Assembly and Council, in **particular**, Assembly resolutions 3212 (XXIX) and 37/253 and Council resolutions 365 (1974) and 367 (1975), which formed the foundation on which the search for a solution should be based. The two communities in Cyprus must come to an agreement between themselves without interference. The Council should promote the efforts of the Secretary-General to achieve a **negotiated** solution, should declare the Turkish **Cypriot** action null and void and should call upon **Member States** not to recognize the declaration of **independence**.⁵⁹

The representative of Australia, noting that his Government was a troop contributor to UNFICYP, called upon all parties to allow the Force to carry out its mandate unimpeded and stated that if the Force were placed in jeopardy his Government would have to review the participation of its **contingent**.⁵⁷

At the outset of the 2499th meeting, the President (Malta) brought to the Council's attention a draft **resolution**⁶⁰ submitted by the United Kingdom.⁶¹

At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan asserted that without an appreciation of the circumstances leading to the **decision** to proclaim the independence of a Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus it would be impossible to arrive at a correct judgement on it. That decision was attributable to the neglect shown by the international community regarding the interests and concerns of the Turkish Cypriots and to the failure of the Greek Cypriot leadership to mitigate the misgivings of their Turkish compatriots. A resolution condemning the Turkish Cypriot community, whose co-operation was a *sine qua non* for the **re-establishment** of the unity of Cyprus, would aggravate the situation, and an attempt to isolate the Turkish Cypriot community would impede the resumption of the intercommunal negotiations and the resolution of the problem. The Turkish Cypriot declaration was not an irreversible act of secession. The Turkish Cypriot community had expressly reaffirmed its desire for the resumption of negotiations and the continuation of the Secretary-General's mission of good **offices**. Therefore, the representative of **Pakistan** urged the Council to strengthen the hand of the **Secretary-General** to continue his good **offices** in **Cyprus**.⁶¹

At the 2500th meeting, the representative of Guyana expressed the view that the draft resolution to be adopted by the Council should have condemned the Turkish Cypriot declaration of independence as being in defiance of the United Nations, and in particular of resolutions 365 (1974) and 367 (1975). The Council should have declared that the United Nations would not accord any recognition to the so-called independent entity, and an appeal should have been directed to Member States not to recognize it. However, his delegation appreciated the effort made by the authors of the draft resolution and in a spirit of compromise would vote in **favour**.⁶²

The representative of Turkey rejected the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution because of its reference to the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and, defending the legitimacy of the Turkish Cypriot community's right to self-determination and its decision in the exercise of that right to create its own independent State, he further rejected the second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 7. He expressed surprise that, **contrary** to the Council's normal practice, the **draft resolution** contained no reference to the **negotiations** between the two communities, and stated that the **only** possibility for the Secretary-General to conduct his mission of good **offices** outside the framework of the intercommunal negotiations would be between two independent Cypriot States and with their prior consent. He concluded **that, as** the draft resolution was based on a distortion of **historical** events and showed no concern for an equitable approach to the two communities of Cyprus, Turkey would reject it in its **entirety**.⁶²

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the draft resolution sponsored by his delegation reflected the views of his Government: it deplored the action by the Turkish Cypriot community, which was incompatible with the treaties **governing** the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, and it recognized only one Cypriot State, under the Government of President Kyprianou. His Government hoped that the intercommunal negotiations would be resumed, and that could best be done through the Secretary-General, whose statement of 17 November his Government warmly welcomed and whose efforts it fully **supported**.⁶²

The representative of Pakistan noted that his delegation had proposed certain amendments to the draft resolution circulated by the United Kingdom and regretted that those proposals had not received the attention they deserved from the Council. The draft resolution had contained a reference to the intercommunal negotiations, which Pakistan considered essential, and whose deletion from the revised version of the draft resolution rendered that draft **unacceptable**.⁶²

At the same meeting, the draft **resolution**⁶³ was adopted by 13 votes in favour to 1 against, with 1 abstention, as resolution 54 1 (1983). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus,

Concerned at the declaration by the Turkish Cypriot authorities issued on 15 November 1983 which purports to create an independent State in northern Cyprus,

Considering that this declaration is incompatible with the 1960 Treaty concerning the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus and the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee,

Considering, therefore, that the attempt to create a "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" is invalid, and will contribute to a worsening of the situation in Cyprus.

Reaffirming its resolutions 365 (1974) and 367 (1975).

Aware of the need for a solution of the Cyprus problem based on the mission of good offices undertaken by the Secretary-General.

Affirming its continuing support for the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus,

Taking note of the Secretary-General's statement of 17 November 1983,

1. Deplores the declaration of the Turkish Cypriot authorities of the purported secession of part of the Republic of Cyprus;

2. Considers the declaration referred to above as legally invalid and calls for its withdrawal;

3. Calls for the urgent and effective implementation of its resolutions 365 (1974) and 367 (1975);

4. Requests the Secretary-General to pursue his mission of good offices in order to achieve the earliest possible progress towards a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus;

5. Calls upon the parties to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices;

6. Calls upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus;

7. Calls upon all States not to recognize any Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus;

8. Calls upon all States and the two communities in Cyprus to refrain from any action which might exacerbate the situation;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed.

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution in the belief that it adequately met the needs of the situation and that it had been guided by the fact that the text was acceptable to the Government of Cyprus. However, he maintained that the Zurich-London agreements referred to in the preambular part of the

resolution had been imposed upon Cyprus and represented a serious curtailment of the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus, that the guarantees envisioned therein were essentially used to serve interests that were alien to the Cypriot people, and that they had failed both in the past and in the current circumstances to prevent armed intervention and other acts aimed at splitting up the State of Cyprus.⁶²

Mr. **Denktaş** responded to the adoption of the resolution by reiterating the position he had expounded at the Council's 2498th meeting. He stressed that, even if the entire world recognized the present administration as the legitimate Government of Cyprus, his people would never do so. The only solution was to reestablish the bicomunal, bizonal federal system with the aid, help and good offices of the Secretary-General, for which the Turkish Cypriot community remained **ready**.⁶²

Decision of 15 December 1983 (2503rd meeting): resolution 544 (1983)

On 1 December 1983, the Secretary-General submitted a **report**⁶⁴ on the United Nations operation in Cyprus covering the period from 1 June to 30 November 1983. He noted with regret that, despite intensive efforts on his part in cooperation with the parties concerned, the search for a settlement of the problem of Cyprus had suffered a set-back during the period under review. In his meetings with the parties following the action of the Turkish Cypriot community of 15 November 1983 he had strongly urged them to observe all of the provisions of **resolution 541 (1983)** and had drawn their attention to the call for their cooperation in his mission of good offices. He stated that the chances for success in his efforts would depend on the cooperation of the parties involved and their willingness to engage in serious negotiations. The Secretary-General concluded that, based on the situation on the ground and political developments, the presence of UNFICYP remained indispensable, and he recommended a further six-month extension of its mandate. In an **addendum**⁶⁵ dated 15 December 1983, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension.

At its 2503rd meeting, on 15 December 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and **Turkey**⁶⁶ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, and also invited Mr. Nail **Atalay**⁶⁷ under rule 39 of its provisional rules of **procedure**. The Council considered the item at its 2503rd meeting.

The President drew the Council's attention to a draft **resolution**⁶⁸ prepared in the course of consultations, which he then put to the vote. The draft resolution received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 544 (1983). It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 December 1983,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 1983,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1984;*

2. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1984;*

3. *Calls upon all the parties concerned to continue to co-operate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.*

The representative of Pakistan expressed regret that the resolution just adopted contained certain elements that had no direct bearing on the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP. He cited the third and fourth preambular paragraphs, which had remained unchanged despite the objection of the Turkish Cypriot community, and pointed out that the second preambular paragraph had been altered to indicate, for the **first** time, that the resolution did not enjoy the agreement of all the parties concerned. The resolution retained the reference to "other relevant resolutions" contained in the fourth preambular paragraph, despite his delegation's suggestion that it be deleted because of its implicit inclusion of resolution 541 (1983), which Pakistan and the Turkish Cypriot community had rejected. It also made no reference to the intercommunal talks and the important agreements that had been reached both within and outside the United Nations framework. Nevertheless, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to underscore the importance it attached to the United Nations peace-keeping role and the continued presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus.⁶⁷

The representative of Cyprus referred to resolution 541 (1983) and stated that mere condemnation of the purported secession of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was not enough. The Council should take the measures provided for in the Charter to ensure the withdrawal of Turkish settlers from Cyprus, the lifting of the declaration and the withdrawal of Turkish recognition of the illegal **entity**.⁶⁷

The representative of Greece expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would be able to **contribute** to the implementation of paragraph 2 of resolution 541 (1983). Greece welcomed the renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP with particular satisfaction because its presence helped to avert dangerous crises in Cyprus and also helped to create an atmosphere of moderation and **confidence**.⁶⁷

Mr. Nail Atalay stated that the Turkish Cypriots would have preferred a clear-cut, concise resolution **extending** the mandate of UNFICYP and **supporting** the good offices mission of the Secretary-General while avoiding delving into the substance of the conflict. Instead, the resolution referred again to the Greek Cypriot administration as the Government of Cyprus, and the paragraphs relating to the **intercommunal** talks in previous resolutions had been deleted. Therefore, the Turkish Cypriots rejected the resolution *in toto*; in the future, the principle, scope, modalities and procedures of cooperation between the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and UNFICYP would be based **solely** on the **decisions** to be taken by that Government. He further stated that, while he did not question the right of any country to exercise its right to vote as it deemed fit on any issue, the voting records on General Assembly resolution

37/253 and Council resolution 54 I (1983) of some of the troop-contributing countries had impaired the Turkish Cypriots' trust in UNFICYP operations, which required meticulous **impartiality**.⁶⁷

The representative of Turkey endorsed the Turkish Cypriots rejection of the resolution just adopted and informed the Council that his Government rejected the resolution for the same reasons. He supported Mr. Atalay's statement concerning the future basis for contacts between the Turkish authorities in Cyprus and UNFICYP. He noted that UNFICYP demonstrated the interest of the United Nations in Cyprus and in that way fulfilled a political function to which the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey were not in principle opposed; however, the interest shown in the Cyprus problem by any international organ which continued to support usurpation would leave the Turkish people **sceptical** and would exasperate the Turkish Cypriots. The Turkish Cypriot community would not rescind its decision nor would Turkey withdraw its recognition. He suggested that efforts should be concentrated instead on bringing the two parties to the negotiating **table**.⁶⁷

On 1 May 1984, the Secretary-General submitted a **report**⁶⁹ on the latest progress in his mission of good offices.

Decision of 11 May 1984 (2539th meeting): resolution 550 (1984)

In a **letter**⁷⁰ dated 30 April 1984, the representative of Cyprus requested that the Council be convened urgently to consider the grave situation in Cyprus caused by the "exchange of ambassadors" between Turkey and the illegal regime in the areas of Cyprus under Turkish occupation and to take urgent and effective measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter for the full and effective Implementation of its resolutions in all their respects.

At its **2531st** meeting, on 3 May 1984, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The following representatives were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2531st meeting, the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia; at the 2532nd **meetin**, the representative of Afghanistan; at the 2534rd meeting, the **representatives** of Australia, Ecuador, Sri Lanka and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2534th meeting, the representative of Algeria; at the 2535th meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Guyana, Jamaica, Mongolia and Viet Nam; at the 2536th meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Hungary, Panama and Saint Lucia; at the 2537th meeting, the representative of the German Democratic Republic; and at the 2538th meeting, the representatives of Czechoslovakia and **Malaysia**.⁷¹ In addition, at the **2531st** meeting, Mr. Rauf **Denktas** was invited in his individual capacity under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of **procedure**.⁷² The Council considered the item at its 2531st to 2539th meetings, from 3 to 11 May 1984.

At the **2531st** meeting, the President of Cyprus observed that the international community was in agreement about the question of Cyprus, and the problem was whether or not that **agreement** could be implemented. After the event of 15 November 1983 the international community had promised that it would take measures to reverse the situation. The Secretary-General had proposed to the Turkish side to freeze the process, **despite** the call for reversal in

the Council resolution, but Turkey had **gone** ahead and exchanged ambassadors. The **President** of Cyprus concluded that there could no longer be any doubts as to the intentions of Turkey, whose long-standing plan had been the partition of Cyprus and the destruction of the Republic, and he warned of the coming end of Cyprus as an independent State unless the Council acted quickly and effectively. If it became too late to act, the Council, through its condonation and lack of action, would be an accomplice to what had been happening at the expense of **Cyprus**.⁷²

Mr. Denktas asserted that the Turkish Cypriots were not **flouting** the decisions of the Council, as had been suggested, but were defying the attempt by one section of a **bi-national** country to deceive the world assembly and the Council by falsehoods. The Turkish Cypriot policy had developed in **defence** against the Greek Cypriot plan for union with Greece. The Turkish Cypriots were trying to prevent their destruction as one of the peoples of Cyprus and one of the co-founders of the Republic, and they could not accept that, because the partnership had been destroyed by force in 1963, they had no right to claim justice. Mr. Denktas confirmed his **willingness** and desire for negotiations and dialogue and suggested that the Council insist that the other side meet with **them**.⁷²

At the 2532nd **meeting**, the representative of Turkey stated that those who wished to prevent the Turkish Cypriot community from progressing on the path of independence should persuade the Greek Cypriot administration and Greece to consent to the resumption of the intercommunal negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General's good **offices**, with a view to reaching a comprehensive settlement within the framework of a bicomunal, bizonal and non-aligned federation based on the principle of the equality of the two communities. His Government continued to support the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and considered, as always, that the interlocutors of the Secretary-General in his efforts to resume the intercommunal negotiations were the Turkish Cypriot community and the Greek Cypriot **community**.⁷³

The representative of Greece expressed the belief that, had the resolution of the situation in Cyprus been a question of finding an intercommunal balance within the framework of internationally accepted patterns, that goal could have been attained within a matter of a few weeks. He suggested that what had happened in Cyprus stemmed **instead** from Turkish expansionism in the eastern Mediterranean and from Turkey's so-called geopolitical interest in Cyprus. Turkey was asking for an unconditional surrender based on Turkish military might, which would never be **accepted**.⁷³

The representative of India expressed regret that the Turkish Cypriot leadership had taken further actions in direct contravention of resolution 541 (1983) and the endeavours of the Secretary-General. His delegation had always advocated an equitable solution to the Cyprus question that would ensure the dignity and equal rights of both communities in an undivided country, and had pointed to **intercommunal** negotiations as the only means towards that end. India **believed** that the Secretary-General's mission of good **offices** remained the only possible channel through which both sides could be engaged in **meaningful** negotiations. The Council should request

the Secretary-General to persist in his efforts and should strengthen his hand in doing so. States that had influence in the region should actively support the Secretary-General's **efforts and** display greater determination to ensure the implementation of resolution 541 (1983).⁷³

The representative of Pakistan, at the 2534th meeting, stated that the right of the Turkish community in Cyprus to equal status was *sui generis* and could not be qualified or diminished by **distinguishing** between a majority and a minority community in a State. A basis for the fruitful continuation of the Secretary-General's good **offices** clearly existed and should not be impaired **by** the adoption of another one-sided resolution, which could result in the irretrievable loss of the co-operative attitude of one of the **communities**. He urged the Council to adopt a resolution that would provide the necessary support to the good offices of the Secretary-General and be acceptable to both **sides**.⁷⁴

At the 2535th meeting, the representative of Viet Nam called upon the Council to show more serious concern about the events in Cyprus, to **support** fully the Secretary-General's mission of good **offices** and to take effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to **guarantee** the implementation of the **relevant** resolutions adopted by the General **Assembly** and the **Council**.⁷⁵

The representative of the United Kingdom stated at the 2538th meeting that it was necessary to make a distinction between the immediate problem of the purported exchange of ambassadors, which, **beyond** doubt, was in contravention of resolution 541 (1983), and the more **fundamental** long-term problem of the situation in Cyprus, which was **getting** increasingly complicated. The Council's message should be that the resolution of the long-term problem required that all parties cooperate with the Secretary-General's mission of good **offices** while in the meantime refraining from any action that might exacerbate the situation. That would best be done on the basis of certain fundamental principles that had the backing of the parties and of the international community as a **whole**.⁷⁶

At the outset of the 2539th **meeting**, the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**⁷⁷ sponsored by India, Nicaragua, the Upper Volta and Zimbabwe.⁷⁸

Prior to the vote the representative of Pakistan stated that his delegation had **little** choice but to vote against the draft resolution as it made no reference to the intercommunal talks or to the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979, and it attempted to redefine the mandate of the Secretary-General in terms that would give his efforts little chance of success, by **requesting** him to undertake new efforts in **conformity** with the Charter and pertinent United Nations resolutions, including resolution 541 (1983) and the draft **resolution**.⁷⁸

At the same meeting, the draft **resolution**⁷⁷ was adopted by 13 votes in favour to 1 against, with 1 abstention, as resolution 550 (1984). It reads as follows:

The Security Council.

Having considered the situation in Cyprus at the request of the **Government of the Republic of Cyprus,**

Having heard the statement of the President of the Republic of **Cyprus,**

Taking note of the **report of the Secretary-General,**

Recalling its resolutions 365 (1974), 367 (1975), 541 (1983) and 544 (1983),

Deeply regretting the non-implementation of its resolutions, in particular **resolution 541 (1983),**

Gravely concerned about the further secessionist acts in the occupied part of the Republic of Cyprus which are in violation of resolution 541 (1983), namely, the purported exchange of ambassadors between Turkey and the legally invalid "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" and the contemplated holding of a "constitutional referendum" and "elections", as well as by other actions or threats of actions aimed at further consolidating the purported independent State and the division of Cyprus,

Deeply concerned about recent threats for settlement of Varosha **by people other than its inhabitants,**

Reaffirming its continuing support for the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus,

1. **Reaffirms** its resolution 541 (1983) and calls for its urgent and effective implementation;

2. **Condemns** all secessionist actions, including the purported exchange of ambassadors between Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership, **declares them illegal and invalid and calls for their immediate withdrawal;**

3. **Reiterates** the call upon all States not to recognize the purported State of the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" set up by secessionist acts and calls upon them not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid secessionist entity;

4. **Calls upon** all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of **Cyprus;**

5. **Considers** attempts to **settle any part of Varosha by people other than its inhabitants** as inadmissible and calls for the transfer of that area to the administration of the United Nations;

6. **Considers** any attempts to interfere with the status or the deployment of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus as contrary to the resolutions of the United Nations;

7. **Requests** the Secretary-General to promote the urgent implementation of Security Council resolution 541 (1983);

8. **Reaffirms** the mandate of good offices given to the Secretary-General and requests him to undertake new efforts to attain an overall solution to the Cyprus problem in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions for such a settlement laid down in the pertinent United Nations resolutions, including resolution 541 (1983) and the present resolution;

9. **Calls upon** all parties to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices;

10. **Decides** to remain seized of the situation with a view to **taking urgent and appropriate measures, in the event of non-implementation of resolution 541 (1983) and the present resolution;**

1. **Requests** the Secretary-General to promote the implementation of the present resolution and to **report** thereon to the Security Council as developments require.

Following the vote, the representative of the United States indicated that his delegation was substantially in agreement with the resolution but had abstained because, in view of the strong feelings that existed among the parties, any **exacerbation** of the conflict must be **avoided**.⁷⁸

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed reservations about paragraphs 5, 6 and 10, and regarded the correct interpretation of paragraph 8 as crucial. He explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on the understanding that paragraph 8 meant that the Secretary-General's mandate as set out in resolution 367 (1975) remained valid, and that the Secretary-General would take account of the principles of the Charter and of the relevant resolutions but would be as free under this resolution as he had been in the **past**.⁷⁸

The representative of the Netherlands stated that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, it had some reservations as to its wording, in particular paragraph 10, and regarded paragraph 8 as in no way **restricting** the freedom of action of the **Secretary-General**.⁷⁸

Mr. **Denktas** indicated that the present resolution was unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriots because it was based on resolution 541 (1983), which they had not accepted. An attempt by the Secretary-General to promote the implementation of resolution 541 (1983) would kill the intercommunal talks and any prospect of a negotiated settlement; he therefore hoped that the Secretary-General would find a parallel way of approaching them. He noted that the Council, in reaffirming the good offices mandate, had tied it to resolution 541 (1983), and stated that the Secretary-General would have to convince them that his good offices mission would be based exclusively on the powers granted in resolution 367 (1975). Paragraph IO was unacceptable because it failed to mention summit or high-level agreements.⁷⁸

The representative of Turkey rejected the resolution as a whole at the outset because it was based on resolution 541 (1983), and then commented on specific unacceptable provisions: the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 represented improper interference by the Council in the search for a solution, which was the exclusive responsibility of the two communities of Cyprus; paragraph 3 expressed a policy of ostracism that was neither realistic nor just and could only impede the quest for ultimate reconciliation between the two communities; the inclusion of paragraph 6 was incomprehensible, in view of the position reiterated that morning by Mr. **Denktas**;⁷⁶ paragraph 8 was not only untimely, but dangerous; and paragraph IO had no meaning and no legal basis in the Charter.⁷⁸

Decision of 15 June 1984 (2547th meeting): resolution 553 (1984)

On 1 June 1984, prior to the expiration of the mandate of UNFICYP, the Secretary-General submitted a report⁷⁹ covering the period from 1 December 1983 to 31 May 1984 in which he indicated that the search for a settlement of the Cyprus problem had continued during the period under review without success. He concluded that the presence of UNFICYP remained indispensable and recommended that the Council extend its mandate for a further period of six months. In an addendum dated 15 June 1984,⁸⁰ the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension, whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they were not in a position to accept the text of the draft resolution contained in document S/16622 and would explain their stand at the meeting of the Council.

At its 2547th meeting, on 15 June 1984, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey⁸¹ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Necati M. **Ertekin**⁸² to participate in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at the 2547th meeting.

The President put to the vote a draft resolution⁸³ prepared in the course of consultations, which was adopted unanimously with 15 votes in favour as resolution 553 (1984). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council.

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 1 June 1984,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 June 1984,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions.

1. *Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 December 1984;*

2. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1984;*

3. *Calls upon all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.*

The representative of Greece noted that, along with the renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP, the resolution just adopted reaffirmed the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. He stated that the Secretary-General's mission, as defined in resolutions 367 (1975), 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), had the full support of his Government.⁸²

Mr. **Ertekin** observed that the present resolution was an updated version of resolution 544 (1983). The Turkish Cypriot side was therefore left with no alternative but to reject the resolution *in toto* and for the same reasons it had rejected resolution 544 (1983), although it was prepared to accept the presence of UNFICYP on the same basis as that stated in December 1983. He further stated that since UNFICYP had been set up, 20 years ago, the situation on the island had changed considerably, and a revision of the mandate would seem in order.⁸²

The representative of Turkey also rejected the present resolution *in toto*.⁸²

Decision of 14 December 1984 (2565th meeting): resolution 559 (1984)

With the agreement of the members of the Council, the Secretary-General delayed the submission of his report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus in order to be able to incorporate the results of the final round of high-level proximity talks on Cyprus, held on 12 December 1984. Accordingly, on 12 December 1984, he submitted a report⁸⁴ covering developments relating to UNFICYP from 1 June to 30 November 1984 and reporting on his mission of good offices for the period from 1 June to 12 December 1984. The Secretary-General indicated that during the period under review the two sides had engaged in a series of high-level proximity talks. By 12 December he had judged that the documentation for a draft agreement could be submitted to a joint high-level meeting under his auspices starting on 17 January 1985, at which he expected that the interlocutors would conclude an agreement containing the necessary elements for a comprehensive solution of the problem aimed at establishing a Federal Republic of Cyprus. Once again, the Secretary-General concluded that the presence of UNFICYP remained indispensable, and recommended that the Council extend its mandate for a further period of six months. In an addendum⁸⁵ dated 14 December 1984 the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension, whereas the Gov-

ement of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept the draft resolution contained in document S/16862 and would convey their views at the meeting of the Council.

At its 2565th meeting, on 14 December 1984, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda and invited, at their request, the representatives of Canada, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey⁸⁶ to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The Council also invited Mr. Denktas,⁸⁷ under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. The Council considered the item at its 2565th meeting.

At the outset of the meeting, the President made a statement* on behalf of the Council expressing the Council's appreciation to the Secretary-General and the hope that the forthcoming high-level meeting would be useful and advance the developments on the question of Cyprus. He then put to the vote a draft resolution⁸⁸ prepared in the course of consultations, which was adopted unanimously with 15 votes in favour as resolution 559 (I 1984). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 12 December 1984,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also 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 1984.

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (I 1964) and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1985;*

2. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1985;*

3. *Calls upon all the parties concerned to continue to co-operate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.*

The representative of Greece expressed his Government's earnest wish that the crucial round of negotiations between the President of Cyprus and Mr. Denktas during their meeting in January would lead to a fair and viable solution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of the provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.*

Mr. Denktas rejected the resolution just adopted and stressed that the summit meeting in January would take place between the two leaders of the two communities, and not between the President of the Republic of Cyprus and Mr. Denktas. In addition, the draft agreement prepared and presented by the Secretary-General would have to be submitted for the official approval of the two leaders. The text could not be rewritten or modified, and as far as the Turkish Cypriot side was concerned, the only point to be discussed pertained to certain dates that would be filled in at the high-level meeting. Furthermore, the draft agreement constituted an integrated whole and did not allow for the introduction of reservations of any kind. He was certain that the Secretary-General would conduct the high-level meeting on 17 January 1985 mindful of the Juridical requirements stemming from the nature of the draft agreement.*

The representative of Turkey stated that, since the Turkish Cypriots had rejected the present resolution,

Turkey also rejected it, and for the same reasons. He pointed out that since December 1983 neither the Turkish Cypriots nor Turkey had accepted the Council resolutions on UNFICYP. If a high-level agreement was concluded its implementation would undoubtedly require the allocation of new responsibilities to UNFICYP, in which case it would be essential to find a legal foundation for its presence and activities that would be acceptable to everyone. His Government expected that a resolution taking that new situation into account would be submitted to the Council in June 1985.⁸⁷

The representative of Greece observed that certain statements had created the impression that the Cypriot President would be presented at the January meeting with a document to be signed on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. He suggested that the outcome of a dialogue must always be the product of mutual agreement, and hoped that the proximity talks would initiate a process that would solve remaining points of difference with a view to achieving a final agreement.*

NOTES

¹ S/14490, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1981.

² S/14490/Add. I, *ibid.*

³ 2279th mtg., para. 8. See also chap. III of the present Supplement.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 9.

⁵ S/14500, adopted without change as resolution 486 (1981).

⁶ 2279th mtg., para. 12. One member did not participate in the voting.

⁷ See S/13369, OR, 34th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1979. para. 5 I.

⁸ 2279th mtg., paras. 14-18.

⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 23-35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 39-42.

¹¹ S/14100, OR, 35th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1980.

¹² 2279th mtg., paras. 48-62.

¹³ *Ibid.*, paras. 68-79.

¹⁴ S/14778 and Corr. 1 and 2, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

¹⁵ S/14778/Add. I, *ibid.*

¹⁶ 2313th mtg., para. 2. See also chap. III of the present Supplement.

¹⁷ 2313th mtg., para. 3.

¹⁸ S/14790, adopted without change as resolution 495 (1981).

¹⁹ 2313th mtg., para. 5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 7-9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 11-20.

²² *Ibid.*, paras. 26-39.

²³ *Ibid.*, paras. 43-50.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 57-73.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 76-100.

²⁶ S/15149 and Corr. 1, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.

²⁷ S/15149/Add. I, *ibid.*

²⁸ 2378th mtg., para. 1. See also chap. III of the present Supplement.

²⁹ 2378th mtg., para. 2.

³⁰ S/15216, adopted without change as resolution 510 (1982).

³¹ 2378th mtg., para. 4.

³² 1960 Treaty concerning the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 382, No. 5476, p. 10) and the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 382, No. 5475, p. 4).

³³ 2378th mtg., paras. 15-38.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 44-53.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 60-88.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 93-118.

³⁷ S/15502 and Corr. 1, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982.

- ³⁴ S/1 5502/Add. 1, *ibid.*
- ³⁵ 2405th mtg., para. 1. See also chap. 111 of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁴⁰ 2405th mtg., para. 2.
- ⁴¹ S/1 5523, adopted without change as resolution 526 (1982).
- ⁴² 2405th mtg., para. 4.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, paras. 12-14.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 47-57.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 63-104.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 107-128.
- ⁴⁷ S/1 581 2 and Corr. 1, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1983.
- ⁴⁸ S/1 5812/Add. 1, *ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ 2453rd mtg. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁵⁰ 2453rd mtg.
- ⁵¹ S/1 5828, adopted without change as resolution 534 (1983).
- ⁵² 2454th mtg.
- ⁵³ S/1 6147, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983.
- ⁵⁴ S/1 6150, *ibid.*
- ⁵⁵ S/1 6151, *ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁵⁷ 2498th mtg.
- ⁵⁸ 2497th mtg.
- ⁵⁹ 2498th mtg. Similar views were expressed by a number of other delegations. See 2498th mtg.: India, Seychelles, Australia, Algeria and Canada; 2499th mtg.: USSR, Sri Lanka, Cuba, Yugoslavia and Netherlands; and 2500th mtg.: Guyana, Zimbabwe, Poland, Democratic Yemen and France.
- ⁶⁰ S/1 6149, adopted without change as resolution 541 (1983).
- ⁶¹ 2499th mtg.
- ⁶² 2500th mtg.
- ⁶³ S/1 6149, adopted as resolution 541 (1983).
- ⁶⁴ S/1 6192, OR, 38th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983.
- ⁶⁵ S/1 6192/Add. 1, *ibid.*
- ⁶⁶ 2503rd mtg. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁶⁷ 2503rd mtg.
- ⁶⁸ S/1 6217, adopted without change as resolution 544 (1983).
- ⁶⁹ S/1 6519, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1984.
- ⁷⁰ S/1 6514, *ibid.*
- ⁷¹ For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁷² 2531st mtg.
- ⁷³ 2532nd mtg.
- ⁷⁴ 2534th mtg.
- ⁷⁵ 2535th mtg.
- ⁷⁶ 2538th mtg.
- ⁷⁷ S/1 6550, adopted without change as resolution 550 (1983).
- ⁷⁸ 2539th mtg.
- ⁷⁹ S/1 6596 and Corr. 1 and 2, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1984.
- ⁸⁰ S/1 6596/Add. 1, *ibid.* An additional addendum was submitted on the same date (S/1 6596/Add. 2, *ibid.*).
- ⁸¹ 2547th mtg. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁸² 2547th mtg.
- ⁸³ S/1 6622, adopted without change as resolution 553 (1984).
- ⁸⁴ S/1 6858, OR, 39th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984.
- ⁸⁵ S/1 6858/Add. 1, *ibid.* An additional addendum was submitted on 2 February 1985 relating to the latest developments in the Secretary-General's mission of good offices (S/1 6858/Add. 2, OR, 40th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1985).
- ⁸⁶ 2565th mtg. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- ⁸⁷ 2565th mtg.
- ⁸⁸ S/1 6862, adopted without change as resolution 559 (1984).

5. COMPLAINT BY IRAQ

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

Decision of 19 June 1981 (2288th meeting): resolution 487 (1981)

By a letter dated 8 June 1981,¹ the representative of Iraq transmitted the text of a letter from the

Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, requesting the convening of an immediate meeting of the Council to deal with an act of aggression by Israel against Iraq with far-reaching consequences for international peace and security. He reported that on Sunday, 7 June 1981, at 1837 hours, Israeli war-planes had raided Baghdad and that their objective had been to destroy the Iraqi nuclear reactor installations. The Foreign Minister also drew attention to the fact that whereas Iraq, the victim of the attack, was a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Israel had consistently refused to sign and ratify the Treaty. He concluded that the international community could not remain silent regarding the serious escalation of aggression, which Israel had already admitted.

In a letter dated 8 June 1981,² the representative of Israel drew attention to his Government's announcement that on 7 June the Israel Air Force had launched a raid on the atomic reactor Osirak, near Baghdad, and had destroyed the reactor, which reportedly had been designed to produce atomic bombs to be used against Israel.

At its 2280th meeting, on 12 June 1981, the Council included the letter dated 8 June 1981 from the representative of Iraq in its agenda. **Following the adoption of the agenda, the following were invited**, at their request, to **participate** without vote in the discussion of the item: at the 2280th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, the Sudan, Turkey and Yugoslavia; at the 2281st meeting, the representatives of Bulgaria, **Guyana**, Somalia, Viet Nam and Zambia; at the 2282nd meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Hungary, Mongolia, Sierra Leone and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2283rd meeting, the representatives of Indonesia, Italy, Morocco, Poland and Yemen; at the 2284th meeting, the representatives of Nicaragua and Sri Lanka; at the 2285th meeting, the representative of Malaysia; and at the 2288th meeting, the representative of the Libyan Arab **Jamahiriyah**.³

At the 2280th meeting, the Council also decided, **following a short discussion**⁴ and a **vote**,⁵ in accordance with the Council's usual practice, to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to participate in the debate.

At the same meeting, the Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Chedli Klibi under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.⁶ A similar invitation was extended, at the 2284th meeting, to Mr. Sigvard Eklund, Director-General of the **International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)**,⁷ and, at the 2286th meeting, to Mr. Clovis **Maksoud**.⁸

The Council considered the item at its 2280th to 2288th meetings, from 12 to 19 June 1981.

At the 2280th meeting, the **Foreign Minister of Iraq** offered a detailed description of the Israeli air raid against the Iraqi nuclear installations near Baghdad and of the circumstances surrounding that act of **aggression**. He charged that Israel had persistently **striven** to obtain a nuclear military capacity and that with the support of the United States and through occasionally questionable operations it had managed to produce several nuclear bombs of at least the strength of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima. He also pointed out that while the Iraqi Government had faithfully adhered to the Treaty on the **Non-Prolifera-**