

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 751st  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 15 December 1954,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 62:

Page

Application, under the auspices of the United Nations,  
of the principle of equal rights and self-determination  
of peoples in the case of the population of the island  
of Cyprus (*continued*) ..... 555

**Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 62**

**Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus (A/2703, A/C.1/747, A/C.1/753, A/C.1/L.124, A/C.1/L.125) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that his delegation was somewhat perplexed by the First Committee's decision to give priority in the discussion to the New Zealand draft resolution (A/C.1/L.125), which called upon the General Assembly not to consider further the present item. In the opinion of his delegation, the rules of procedure did not provide for priority in the discussion, but only for priority in voting. Normally, the Committee first held a general debate on a given item and then considered specific proposals before voting on them. Whenever there were a number of proposals or draft resolutions before the Committee, the Committee usually discussed them and adopted one of them. Although the Committee was at present discussing only the New Zealand draft resolution, it was in fact holding a general debate. That illogical situation had been created because of the Committee's earlier decision to give priority of consideration to one proposal only.

2. No reasons were given in the New Zealand draft resolution, nor was any provision of the Charter cited, in support of the demand contained therein. It merely stated that the item should not be considered further. Usually a request of such a nature was based on some valid reasons. The Ecuadorian delegation could only conjecture that the New Zealand delegation either did not consider the Assembly competent or did not consider the time appropriate for such a discussion.

3. The Committee was not discussing the question of the sovereignty of Cyprus, because Cyprus did not belong either to the United Kingdom or to Greece. Cyprus belonged to the Cypriots, and it was only administered by the United Kingdom, in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter. That article referred to the responsibilities of the administering Powers towards territories whose peoples had not yet attained a full measure of self-government, and assumed that, in due

course, the peoples of those territories would acquire independence. The concept of administration was thus not identical with that of sovereignty. For example, Turkey, in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-Turkish treaty of 1878, had ceded the administration of Cyprus to Great Britain, but not its sovereignty. The delegation of Ecuador considered that, in the discussion of the question of Cyprus, Article 73 of the Charter should be taken into account; it believed that the administering Power did not possess sovereignty over the territory which it administered, because that territory was not part of the territorial entity of the administering State.

4. Mr. Benites Vinueza recalled that Cyprus had been a British colony since 1925, and that the United Kingdom Government was submitting information on Cyprus in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter. In that respect, the case of Cyprus was very similar to that of Puerto Rico. The United States had administered Puerto Rico and had promoted the development of self-government, permitting the Puerto Ricans to express their will freely. By virtue of that right of self-determination, the people of Puerto Rico had decided to form a Commonwealth freely associated with the United States.

5. Some confusion had been created by comparing the *enosis* movement with the *Anschluss*. The Committee was not discussing *enosis*. The question under discussion was the application of the principle of self-determination to a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The people of Cyprus alone could decide on its future, and Greece could not take such a decision on its behalf.

6. Although Cyprus was not, and had not been, under Greek administration, it had always lived in the atmosphere of Greek culture. The ethnological concept of race had already been superseded by that of culture. In spite of the vicissitudes of its history, Cyprus had been able to maintain its links with Greek culture.

7. The treaty of 1878, which had ceded the administration of Cyprus to Great Britain, had not taken into consideration the wishes of the people of Cyprus. In fact, it had been in that year that the *enosis* movement had been born. The Treaty of Lausanne, signed in 1923, had again ignored the wishes of the Cypriots. The delegation of Ecuador believed that treaties based on the use of force were not valid in the light of the Charter. No treaty could deny the right of self-determination or cancel the obligations of administering Powers to lead the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories to the ultimate goal of self-government.

8. Mr. Benites Vinueza expressed the view that the present item did not relate to a dispute, but was in fact a request that the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Cyprus be granted the right to self-determination. He also believed that the General Assembly was competent to consider it, although he felt that it could more appropriately be discussed by the Fourth Committee than by the First Committee.

9. The delegation of Ecuador did not consider the New Zealand draft resolution appropriate, and would support it only if it incorporated a provision to the effect that the Cyprus question should be considered by the General Assembly at its following session. It would vote in favour of the Greek draft resolution. That did not mean, however, that Ecuador recognized Greece as having any rights over Cyprus; it meant only that Ecuador recognized the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination.

10. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria) said that his delegation regretted that a dispute should have arisen between two countries which were such old friends as Greece and the United Kingdom, both of which were Members of the United Nations and belonged to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. However, the dispute related to freedom, and disagreement among friends on such an issue was not disheartening.

11. The Syrian delegation believed that the population of Cyprus was a people just like any other people in the world, and was entitled to the right of self-determination. The present population of Cyprus legitimately belonged to that territory, and had not acquired any rights there by invasion. That was an important consideration because, in the case of an invasion, the invaders did not acquire any rights and could be repelled at any time and by any means.

12. Greece was well advised in submitting the item to the General Assembly as an issue of self-determination and not of unification or annexation. The United Nations was not required to establish the sovereignty of Greece over Cyprus. At the moment, the matter related only to the question of self-determination. Therefore the first stage would be to ascertain the wishes of the people of Cyprus, the legitimate interests of the various groups living on that island, and the political life they would like to establish. It was obvious that the future status of Cyprus could be determined only in the light of the wishes and interests expressed by all the people concerned, without excluding any party, group, or community.

13. In the opinion of the Syrian delegation, the United Kingdom was not entitled to sovereignty over the territory or the people of Cyprus. Cyprus had been part of the Ottoman Empire but, when its transfer to Great Britain had taken place, the Ottoman Empire had no longer been in existence. The transfer had been made by the Turkish Government, without taking into consideration the wishes of the people of Cyprus.

14. At that time, the principle of self-determination had taken root and gained international recognition. The concept of sovereignty had now become restricted to a people in its fatherland, and the concept of imperial sovereignty had given way to that of national sovereignty. Thus, to accept the contention of the United Kingdom delegation regarding its sovereignty over Cyprus would amount to abrogating the principle of self-determination and violating the terms of the Charter.

15. The Syrian delegation was also unable to accept the argument concerning security as put forward by the United Kingdom delegation in the case of Cyprus. The fact that a territory was needed for purposes of defence was no reason for denying the right of self-determination to the people of that territory. Drawn to its logical conclusion, such an argument might open the way to the violation of the integrity of any territory

for reasons of defence and security. It had been stated that Cyprus was needed for the defence of the Arab world, but that raised the simple question as to the danger against which the Arab world was to be defended. So far, the Arab world's acute problems had been with the West. Mr. Shukairi believed that the defence of the Arab world could in no way be maintained by holding Cyprus as a military base. That defence primarily rested on the final solution of all the disputes involving the Arab world with the West.

16. Mr. Shukairi wished to draw the attention of the Turkish delegation to the inaccuracies contained in the map it had submitted at the previous meeting.

17. The representative of Syria concluded by stating that, at the present stage, no resolution on the item under discussion would be helpful. For that reason, his delegation would abstain on the draft resolution submitted by New Zealand (A/C.1/L.125), as well as on the Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.124). Syria hoped, however, that all the parties concerned would try their best to find a solution to the present question through peaceful means.

18. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey) explained that the map submitted by his delegation was a rough sketch and was meant to show approximate distances from Cyprus to Turkey and Greece. It had been prepared by a New York group called the "Anti-Enosis Society". He regretted the inaccuracies in the map and apologized for anything in it which might have hurt the feelings of the representative of Syria or his Government.

19. Mr. KYROU (Greece) said that the statement of the representative of Turkey, Mr. Sarper (750th meeting), had greatly surprised him, as the question of Cyprus did not constitute a dispute between Turkey and Greece. The difference between the two Governments was only in their approach to the Cyprus question.

20. Mr. Sarper apparently believed that the present status of Cyprus should not be changed for geographical reasons. Mr. Kyrou recalled, however, that a number of Greek islands, such as Symi, Samos, Cos and Chios lay far closer to the Turkish coast than Cyprus. Only in the totalitarian philosophy of geopolitics did racial distinctions and geography determine the fate of peoples. The fact that an island lay at a comparatively small distance from Turkey should not constitute a sufficient reason for maintaining its population in subjection.

21. Mr. Sarper also believed that, for historical and ethnological reasons, the present political status of Cyprus should not be changed. But whatever might be the racial, ethnic or religious status of the Cypriots, the fact remained that they had an inalienable right freely to determine their own political future. Other peoples of the world enjoyed the right of self-determination and there was no reason why the Cypriots should be denied that right.

22. The representative of Turkey had also referred to economic reasons for not changing the status of Cyprus. Mr. Kyrou pointed out, however, that the report of the Cyprus Government for the year 1953 did not even list Turkey as one of the countries engaged in trade with Cyprus. Mr. Kyrou had not dealt with the economic aspect in his earlier statement (750th meeting), considering it irrelevant. Indeed, even were it admitted that the Cypriots were economically better

off today than before the British occupation—which was, of course, not the case—economic advantages were no substitute for freedom. No people would be prepared to exchange freedom for better living conditions. However, if there was any doubt about the preferences of the Cypriots on that question, it could well be decided by letting them make their own choice.

23. The representative of Turkey had also compared the Cypriot liberation movement to the *Anschluss*. The people of Greece had had first-hand experience of Nazi and Fascist methods, and thus had a greater abhorrence for tactics such as the *Anschluss* than the people of Turkey, who had not had similar experience of those methods. The purpose of the *Anschluss* had been to impose foreign domination on a free people. Self-determination for Cyprus, on the other hand, meant the liberation of a people subjected to colonial rule.

24. The representative of Turkey had also drawn the incorrect inference that the Government of Greece was trying to repudiate the Treaty of Lausanne. Mr. Kyrou pointed out that his Government was firmly attached to the principle of the sanctity of treaties. Greece was not seeking a revision of the Lausanne Treaty. It was only seeking self-determination for a colonial people. In fact, any Member State could have brought the question before the United Nations. The Cyprus question should not be transformed into a dispute between Greece and Turkey. It was essentially a question where the people of a colonial territory was seeking its inherent right to self-determination, and the Greek delegation hoped that all Member States would help the Cypriots in achieving their goal.

25. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) considered that, in the circumstances, it was neither politic nor logical to go very far into the substance of the problem. While there might appear to be a solid case, closer inquiry led to serious misgivings. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Committee was not a court of law and that priority had been given to the New Zealand draft resolution, which indicated the Committee's apparent wish for a comparatively short debate of a mainly procedural character.

26. Paying tribute to the representative of Greece and stressing the friendly relations between that country and Iraq, Mr. Khalidy said that his delegation's position was based not on any lack of consideration for the Greek attitude, but upon reasons of its own which were partly connected with the island of Cyprus itself and partly with the general picture in the Middle East.

27. With regard to the island itself, historical considerations had been mentioned. Mr. Khalidy noted, however, that such considerations did not seem to have weighed very heavily in contemporary international decisions. Another consideration directly related to the island was the question of the large Turkish and Moslem minority in Cyprus. That constituted a human problem which must be borne in mind, and much could be said for the feeling with which the representative of Turkey had expressed himself on the matter at the previous meeting. It was also understandable, incidentally, that Mr. Sarper should have spoken with such conviction on the subject of the proximity of the island to Turkey, to which the matter was undoubtedly of such importance that its implications could only be ignored at mortal risk.

28. Iraq was also concerned in the matter because of the proximity of the island to the Arab world.

Emphasizing the importance of the defence of the area in the current state of the world, Mr. Khalidy noted that his country enjoyed an enviable strategic position which it was loth to compromise, and that it was consequently vitally interested in the stability of the area.

29. The Cyprus question involved the principle of self-determination, a principle which today was a real and living force, and which the delegation of Iraq had supported on many occasions. One such occasion had been the time in 1953, when the Asian-African group had requested a debate on Morocco in the Security Council. Mr. Khalidy recalled that Greece, on that question, had abstained on the question of including the item in the agenda. He mentioned that fact in order to ask the representative of Greece not to pass the kind of judgment on Iraq today that Iraq could have—but had not—passed on Greece at that time. Self-determination in the case of Cyprus was a valid argument if there was enough information and sufficient reason to enable the United Nations to give a clear-cut decision in its favour, but that was not the case. Moreover, before a problem was presented to the United Nations, some or all of the avenues for settlement prescribed by the Charter should be explored, and negotiation was not the only means of settling disputes. To force a clear-cut decision in the United Nations at the present stage would perhaps be premature.

30. For all those reasons, the Iraqi delegation would vote in favour of the New Zealand draft resolution (A/C.1/L.125).

31. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) observed that the curious procedural situation resulting from the failure of efforts to keep the Committee working within the framework of the rules of procedure and of normal practice found the Committee engaged in a general debate both on the New Zealand draft resolution and on the item as such, and he reserved the right to refer to both aspects.

32. On the question of competence, the representative of Turkey had quoted statements made by the representative of El Salvador in the General Assembly (477th meeting) to the effect that the inclusion of an item in the agenda did not necessarily mean that the Assembly confirmed its competence. However, Mr. Sarper had not quoted the further point made at that time by the representative of El Salvador, namely, that that was neither the time nor the place for a full discussion of competence. In that connexion, Mr. Urquía pointed out that rule 122 of the rules of procedure and the other relevant rules made it clear that the issue of competence should be determined in relation to specific proposals. His delegation felt that the measures envisaged in the operative part of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.124), relating to the principle of self-determination, was within the competence of the General Assembly and of the United Nations as a whole, in view of the specific references to that principle in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. That view was supported by General Assembly resolution 637 A (VII) of 16 December 1952, under which the General Assembly had recommended that States Members of the Organization recognize and promote the realization of the right of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. All agreed that Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

33. Some delegations had viewed the matter as a dispute between two States, and reference had been made in that connexion to the Treaty of Lausanne. However, Cyprus was under the administration of the United Kingdom not because of a transfer of sovereignty, but because Turkey had decided to recognize a fact resulting from the First World War. Therefore the idea that Turkey, as a kind of third interested party, had a right to defend the present status of the island, must be disregarded from a juridical standpoint.

34. Since Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory, it came under the relevant provisions of the Charter. If it were to be argued in such cases that the Assembly had no competence to discuss the matter, the result would be to stultify the powers of the General Assembly, since it was always possible to invoke a part of the Charter as a basis for such arguments. The problem was one of self-determination, not one of a dispute between two States, of a claim to sovereignty over Cyprus, or one involving the principle of the non-revision of treaties. Referring to the provisions of Article 73 of the Charter, which stated specifically that an administering Power was under the obligation to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the people and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, Mr. Urquía observed that the only way in which such a question could be brought before the Assembly was for some Member State to submit it. The fact that Greece had raised the question was what had given rise to the belief that a Greek claim was involved. That step could very well have been undertaken by any other country to which ulterior motives could not have been ascribed. Moreover, as the representative of Greece had pointed out, the will of the people of Cyprus might well be something other than *enosis*. The Cypriots might decide to continue in their present status, or to follow the course chosen in a recent plebiscite by Puerto Rico, which had expressed its desire to become an associated State of the United States, or to become an independent sovereign State. The Greek delegation had never insinuated that the people of Cyprus desired *enosis*. Part of the population seemed to desire it, but only a plebiscite could give the answer as to whether that part was a minority or a majority.

35. As for the New Zealand draft resolution, Mr. Urquía agreed with the representative of Ecuador that there should be a preamble giving some reason for the action proposed. There was no reason to follow a different course from that which had been adopted on the Moroccan question. Moreover, the draft resolution involved a contradiction, since it stated that the Assembly decided not to consider further an item that had not even been debated. As in the case of Morocco, it could be said in the draft resolution that, in view of the existing situation, it was preferable to postpone the consideration of the item. The delegation of El Salvador would be willing to support a draft resolution of that character.

36. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) said that his delegation shared the view of the majority of delegations which had decided that the United Nations had not only the right but indeed the duty to discuss thoroughly and seriously the item submitted by the Greek delegation.

37. He agreed with those representatives who had stated that Cyprus, as a Non-Self-Governing Terri-

tory, came fully under the authority of the United Nations and within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. Article 73 placed the United Kingdom under obligation to recognize that the interests of the inhabitants were paramount and to take due account of their political aspirations, as well as to ensure their just treatment and protection against abuses. The United Nations, for its part, must see to it that those principles were fully carried out.

38. Under Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, the people of Cyprus had the full right to determine their own future. To ignore that right would entail violation of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 637 A (VII) of 16 December 1952.

39. So far, the United Kingdom had neglected its duties as an administering Power. Cyprus was administered as a colony, its inhabitants were deprived of their basic political rights, they were subjected to a police régime, and their political aspirations were being stifled. The natural resources of the island were exploited by foreign corporations, with all the profits going abroad. No serious efforts had been made to raise the standard of living. That situation had prevailed with minor changes since the island had been acquired by a bargain described by Gladstone as a gross act of lawlessness and an unpardonable breach of international law.

40. The ties between the inhabitants of Cyprus and their Greek motherland were very close, and the aspirations of the Greek inhabitants of the island had recently become particularly manifest, expressing themselves in a national movement supported by all social groups and political parties. Their struggle for self-determination had neither succumbed to nor been weakened by the obstacles and repressive measures resorted to by the colonial administration. They continued to reject all attempts to impose on them a pseudo-constitution which would only symbolize colonial subjugation to an alien metropolis. There could be no convincing arguments by the administering Power justifying its further refusal to grant the Cypriots the right of self-determination. Likewise, there could be no valid arguments justifying the laws and ordinances repressing all manifestations of what the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, when Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1907, had described as the natural desire of the Cypriot people, who were of Greek descent, for incorporation into Greece.

41. In the face of the widespread support for the aspirations of the people of Cyprus in the world and in the United Kingdom itself, the United Kingdom Government had taken refuge behind far-fetched arguments concerning strategy and the military needs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Greek representative had cited statements by members of the British Government which clearly implied that, for the sake of retaining a military base on Cyprus, that Government even refused to recognize a future right of self-determination for the population of the island. Citing the condemnation of such actions by the British Press, as long ago as 1919, Mr. Winiewicz declared that the United Nations must take a clear stand on the issue. The least it could do was to pass a decision reaffirming the rights of the people of Cyprus to self-determination. At a time when the struggle for national liberation was wiping out the vestiges of colonialism in Asia and Africa, the remnants of British colonialism in the Eastern Mediterranean—the cradle of European civilization—were clearly obsolete.

42. Unfortunately, the decision taken with regard to West Irian (509th plenary meeting) had belied the conviction expressed at the beginning of the session, that the ninth session would be significant for its attempts to solve colonial problems. The principles of the Charter would indeed be disregarded should the vote on the problem of Cyprus confirm the negative impression which the decision on West Irian had evoked among the millions still struggling against colonialism all over the world.

43. In conformity with its support for the right of the inhabitants of Cyprus to self-determination, the Polish delegation would vote against the New Zealand draft resolution (A/C.1/L.125).

44. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia) said that the question of Cyprus was admittedly a colonial problem. Experience showed that by its very nature colonial rule, however beneficial it might think itself to be, was no substitute for self-government, not only for political reasons but also because of the psychological aspect which was too often overlooked or underestimated by the colonial Powers.

45. National sentiments such as those existing in Cyprus were inevitable under such conditions and could not be disregarded as of no consequence. The Indonesian delegation, with its country's history in mind, supported the idea of the free expression of such sentiments, because failure to grant opportunity for such expression would inevitably create a tense situation and would not promote peace and friendly relations among nations.

46. Greece did not and could not have any territorial claim to Cyprus; it was asking only that the Cypriots be given the opportunity freely to determine their own future status. The reply was a categorical "no" from the colonial Power. In that connexion, Mr. Sudjarwo referred to the statement made by the British Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, quoted at the previous meeting by the representative of Greece, intimating that Cyprus could never expect to be fully independent owing to circumstances relating not to the people of that territory, but to the interests of the colonial Power itself. Such a deplorable statement was contrary to the obligations assumed by administering Powers under the Charter. In its defence, it had been argued that the principle of self-determination could not apply in all places. Mr. Sudjarwo would not discuss the matter, but was bound to note that the noble principle of self-determination had often been handled in a very curious manner by the colonial Powers and their supporters, motivated solely by their own interests.

47. While he did not wish to minimize the strategic interest of any country, his delegation was not convinced by the old-fashioned argument that considerations of military strategy outweighed the principle of self-determination in regard to Cyprus. In that respect, he concurred with the view that to build security on the suppression of freedom and the retention of colonial rule was always to build on quicksand. That lesson had been taught—most painfully—by history.

48. One facet of the question, the position of the Turkish minority in Cyprus, deserved particular consideration. The Indonesian delegation attached great importance to respect for the desires of minorities, and welcomed the statement of the representative of Greece in that connexion. There was no reason to believe that different communities could not live and

work peacefully side by side in Cyprus as in other parts of the world. There should certainly be no question of creating antagonism where none existed, particularly for the purpose of dividing a people and depriving them of their legitimate right to freedom.

49. The Greek Government, which had brought the question to the United Nations only as a last resort, after trying for many years to remove the source of friction through bilateral negotiations, was rebuked for taking that course on the ground that it would impair harmony. But harmony did not exist, since the question had not been peacefully resolved outside the United Nations. To disregard that source of friction would only further impair harmony and would run counter to the duty of the Organization to be the centre for harmonizing the actions of nations.

50. The Indonesian delegation would therefore vote against the New Zealand draft resolution and would support the Greek draft resolution.

51. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) said that observance of the principle of self-determination was an obligation incumbent on every Member State under Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, and under General Assembly resolution 637 A (VII). It was the fundamental duty of every Member to contribute to the realization of that principle.

52. Reviewing the discussion, he stated that the theories of the representative of Turkey, to the effect that the principle of self-determination ran counter to the principle of sovereignty, were not convincing. A nation was not a juridical concept, but a community of people created by history, bound by a common language, a common territory, economy and culture. The requirements of nationhood were fulfilled by the people of Cyprus, or at least by the 80.2 per cent of the Cypriots who were of Greek origin. The principle of sovereignty presupposed the existence of a State, and the possibility of the application of the right of self-determination preceded the existence of a State, so that the two could not be confused. Self-determination led to freedom and national sovereignty.

53. The Czechoslovak delegation supported the demand of Cyprus for self-determination, just as it would support such a demand by any people which was not free. In the case of Cyprus, that demand was eminently justified. The *New York Times*, for instance, had recently quoted the Archbishop of Cyprus as stating that the British administration had brought no good to the island and that the British Treasury owed to Cyprus more than it had contributed. On the other hand, the measures taken by the British administration against sedition and the *enosis* movement were both severe and well known. A letter of the Mayor of the city of Nicosia dated 6 September 1954 (A/C.1/753) had expressed, on behalf of all the mayors of the island, the general opposition to the arbitrary imposition of the will of the British Government and was eloquent evidence of the refusal of the people of Cyprus to tolerate the imposition of an unacceptable régime. According to the statement of the British Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, Cyprus was never to expect full self-determination or independence. In such circumstances, the struggle of the people of Cyprus was a just one, and conducive to peace in that part of the world.

54. The Czechoslovak delegation would vote against the New Zealand draft resolution.

55. Mr. THORSING (Sweden), noting that reference had been made to the question of the Åland islands by the representative of Turkey, explained to the Committee that the essential aspects of the dispute had been the following. Ninety-five per cent of the population, which was of Swedish origin, had desired to be associated with Sweden to which, together with Finland, it had belonged for a very long period of their common history. Despite the fact that, on the strength of language and race, that population might just as well have been incorporated into Sweden, the islands had been adjudged to Finland by the League of Na-

tions, which had regarded them as part of the archipelago of Finland. There was, therefore, a great difference between the Åland question as opposed to that of Cyprus. However, it should be remembered that, despite Swedish disappointment, the decision could not sever the bonds of friendship between Sweden and Finland, which had continued to gain in strength.

56. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) said that he was in full agreement with what had been said by the representative of Sweden.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.