

External Affairs  
Supplementary Paper

No. 64/2

Text of an Address by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, to a Joint Meeting of Both Houses of the Parliament of Canada on May 26, 1964.

From the earliest years of the United Nations, Canada has been one of the most stalwart supporters both of the general activities and of the peace-keeping operations of the organization. The first of the peace-keeping forces, the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, was largely a result of the efforts of your Prime Minister, Mr. Lester Pearson, who was then foreign minister, and this remarkably successful operation, which was initiated by him in the General Assembly, has shown the way and set out the guiding lines for all subsequent United Nations operations of this kind.

Besides their gallant service in Korea, officers and men of the Canadian armed forces have been a vital part of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, of the forces in the Congo and now in Cyprus, and have, in addition, played an important role in the observer operations in the Middle East, in Kashmir and in Yemen. In the Middle East, the Canadian reconnaissance squadron helps to keep the peace on a long and vital stretch of the desert frontier between Israel and the United Arab Republic, and units of the Canadian Army also run the supply and maintenance depot of the Force. The first Commander of UNEF was a Canadian, Lieutenant-General Burns, who served the United Nations with great distinction. In the Congo, where the United Nations military force will be withdrawn fully by June 30 of this year, the Royal Canadian Signals have provided the communications which are the nerve system of the United Nations Force which, for the last four years, has been stationed all over that vast country. Officers of the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force have held many key staff positions in the headquarters, and the present United Nations Chief of Staff in the Congo is a Canadian officer who has served the United Nations with great courage and ability. A Canadian air unit formed part of the United Nations Security Force in West Irian (West New Guinea) and provided valuable assistance in an operation which relied heavily on air communications. In Yemen, the Royal Canadian Air Force is the communications link which not only provides all internal transportation between the various posts of the Mission and also the sole means of communication and transport between the Mission and the outside world. In Cyprus, the Canadian contingent, the Royal 22nd Regiment and the Royal Canadian Dragoons, was the first to arrive in the island after the adoption of the Security Council resolution of March 4, and to join with the British troops already in the island to take up, under United Nations command, the immensely difficult task which the Security Council has given us. The Canadian contingent is now responsible for the vital sector of the island north of Nicosia to the port of Kyrenia.

It is clear from this very fine record of Canadian participation in every stage of the development and operation of United Nations peace keeping that successive Canadian Governments have shown the greatest understanding and support of these pioneer efforts. This is why Canada has been one of the foremost exponents of the principle and practice of stand-by units for United Nations use. I could have no better opportunity than this occasion to pay my very warm tribute to the Canadian Government and people for the leading role they have taken in these United Nations activities, which are of immense importance to the whole world and to our future. I would add that I know very well that such activities often present great difficulties for governments. It is not easy for any government to lend its soldiers to an international organization and to put

them under control of that organization. The nature of the tasks that the United Nations is given often adds to this difficulty, for these are by no means conventional military tasks but rather a new form of military activity requiring the greatest restraint, fortitude and understanding, both from the soldiers themselves and often from the people in their home countries as well. Their role may often give rise to questions which create anxiety for their families and political difficulties for the government which has made them available. In this context, may I express my special appreciation of the understanding and active support which the Government of Canada, and particularly the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Paul Martin, have given to the United Nations in the Cyprus operation.

Such problems require that the support and understanding of the government be matched by the responsibility and restraint of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Force Commander and others who exercise authority over United Nations forces. I hope that my presence here and my words on this occasion may strengthen this relationship, upon which so much depends.

In the light of what I have just said, it seems appropriate that I should talk today about this aspect of the United Nations work and about some of the problems which now face us. The situation in Cyprus is of great concern at this time and provides an example of a problem of unique difficulty, with which the United Nations has been asked to deal because it has defied all attempts at solution outside the framework of the United Nations. It is a problem in which human lives are being lost almost daily. It is a problem in which the world has a vital interest, since the effects of a total breakdown in Cyprus will be felt far beyond the shores of the island and could all too easily lead to a far wider and more lethal conflict. It is, finally, a problem on which there is general agreement on one point only among the parties concerned - namely, the imperative necessity of a peaceful solution.

I will not discuss here the historical details of the conflict in Cyprus. It is a complicated story and one which the United Nations Mediator, Ambassador Tuomioja, is at the present time seeking to unravel with a view to finding a solution with the co-operation of all the parties concerned. Meanwhile the main task of the United Nations is, through its Peace-Keeping Force in the island, to try to prevent a recurrence of fighting, to restore and maintain law and order, to promote a return to normal conditions and to provide an atmosphere in which a negotiated solution may be feasible. The United Nations Force, consisting presently of some 7,000 men from seven countries, has now been operating in Cyprus for nearly two months. It must be admitted without any discredit to the Force, which is performing magnificently, that at present it is still far from achieving all of its aims, although it has already done much to control and regulate incidents and to prevent the spread of violence or the recurrence of large-scale fighting, and it continues to carry out its duties with increasing self-confidence and effectiveness.

The Cyprus operation differs from previous United Nations peace-keeping operations in one highly significant way. Although the United Nations is present in Cyprus in the context of the potential threat to international peace and security which the consequences of strife in the island present, it is also specifically required to deal with intercommunal strife. This means that in Cyprus the United Nations is for the first time dealing directly with forces inside a state and with conflicts between sectors of the population of that state. In the Middle East, the United Nations Emergency Force polices the frontier between Israel and the United Arab Republic, but has no responsibilities vis-à-vis the population on either side of the frontier. In the Congo, the main aim of the United Nations Force has been to protect the territorial integrity of the Congo and to assist the government in the maintenance of law and order and the protection of human lives and property. As the situation in the Congo developed, its mandate was strengthened by the Security Council with regard to the situations in which ultimately force could be used. In Cyprus the United Nations has to come to grips with the disruptions of day-to-day life due to the conflict between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities, and it must do this in such a way as not to prejudice

the final solution of the conflict between them. This is a task of great difficulty and complexity, which inevitably makes large demands on the courage, patience and ingenuity of the United Nations Force.

There has been, of course, much comment and criticism of the performance of the United Nations Force in Cyprus. It is, after all, not only a question of the outcome in Cyprus -- the functioning of a United Nations Force is also of the greatest interest and importance for the future and is rightly a subject of public discussion all over the world. It does seem to me, however, that some of the criticisms of the Cyprus operation are based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of its nature and purposes, which is another reason for taking this opportunity to speak of this problem.

We in the United Nations in the past weeks have received a good deal of advice and admonition on the conduct of the Force in Cyprus. Much of it, coming from sources some of which in the past were not always in favour of strong action by United Nations peace-keeping forces, advocates stern measures and the use of force in Cyprus to quell disorders, to disarm irregulars, and to impose peace upon the island, not by common consent but by military force. To some extent, this is understandable enough, for the spectacle of disorder and civilian suffering in Cyprus is deeply disturbing, and all possible efforts must be made to put an end to it. The United Nations Force has undoubtedly had the effect of limiting the bloodshed and misery (in fact, a much greater effect than to date it has been given credit for), but this is not enough, and better results must, and I believe will, be achieved. The problem is how to achieve them without creating worse problems and disasters for the future, and it is here that there seems to be some misunderstanding.

There appears to be a latent assumption in some quarters that the Cyprus Force is a military expedition on traditional lines and should be conducted as such. Leaving aside the question of the adequacy or suitability of the existing United Nations means for the suggested ends, this is a proposition that must be flatly rejected, for it stems from a concept of action which is not, and cannot be, the basis of a peace-keeping operation authorized by the Security Council of the United Nations in the sovereign territory of an independent member state. This is not a collective action against aggression undertaken under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is something far more intricate and, if I may say so, something of the greatest value, if it can succeed, as a precedent for the future. It is, in brief, an attempt on the international level to prepare the ground for the permanent, freely agreed solution of a desperate and dangerous situation by restoring peace and normality. The nature of this operation is far nearer to a preventive and protective police action; it is not a repressive military action.

What are the prerequisites of a successful preventive police action? One essential is the co-operation, understanding and renunciation of violence by the overwhelming majority of the people concerned. No police force in the world could function without such co-operation, and this is a condition we have to get, and are taking steps to get, in Cyprus. A police force does not fight the population it serves or seek a military victory; its business is the protection of persons, the keeping of the peace by enlisting the support of the largest possible number, by persuasion and by establishing mutual trust and confidence. Only in extreme situations may it consider the use of quasi-military methods as an emergency measure.

We are -- and let us be proud of it -- trying to move forward from the age of military force to a saner, more creative period of peace, order and justice. However incensed we may be at brutal killings and the senseless taking of hostages (and, if I may say so, we are deeply incensed), we are not conducting a punitive expedition; we are trying to help the people of an embattled and embittered island to live in peace and prosperity again. We are not guided by martial criteria, however glamorous and momentarily decisive they may seem, but by the deep desire to solve a human problem by civilized means. It may take a little longer -- perhaps very much longer -- but I have

no doubt that, in terms both of the present and of the future, the effort is worth it and the results will be enduring.

What is more, I believe that the soldiers of the United Nations Force, whatever their dangers and discomforts, understand and believe in what they are trying to do, as do the governments that sent them. For my part, I am acutely aware that their situation is a very difficult and, at times, a dangerous one. I, the Commander of the Force, General Gyani, and my Special Representative, Mr. Galo Plaza, will continue to do everything within our power both to enable them to carry out their tasks effectively and to ensure that they are not exposed to unnecessary risks and tribulations. I assure you of my very deep concern for both the security and the dignity of the United Nations personnel in Cyprus, military and civilian alike. It follows that I find no place in a United Nations peace-keeping operation for either weakness or bravado. In this endeavour we shall need the understanding and the support of the people at home, as well as of the soldiers in the field. I take this opportunity to salute them and their civilian colleagues in Cyprus for their courage and patience, for their discipline and their humanity. I believe that their example will be not the least of the factors that will lead to an improvement in Cyprus.

I hope that the leaders and peoples concerned will also make an effort to understand the United Nations operation in this light. The old people and the children, who perhaps suffer most from the disorders in Cyprus, do not need to be exhorted to be peaceful. There are many others, however, to whom I would appeal. The leaders of armed bands on both sides, whatever their official status, serve no interest, except perhaps their own self-esteem, by random shooting, abductions, terrorism, harassment and martial demonstrations. The world is long past being impressed by such performances. I have noticed with regret that the local newspapers and information media of both communities in Cyprus also do little to lessen the hatred or to calm the fears of their readers and listeners. Rather, they tend to fan the flames of violence and suspicion by sensational reporting and propaganda, and thus aggravate the very conflicts and disasters which have brought death and suffering to so many of the people of Cyprus.

There are great issues at stake in Cyprus for Greece and Turkey, and their preoccupation with the situation is understandable and understood. The press and public opinion of these countries inevitably exercise a strong, if indirect, influence on events in Cyprus, and, here again, too often the voices that should be urging moderation and humanity tend to be, wittingly or unwittingly, the instigators of suspicion and hatred. The leaders, in Cyprus and outside it, have given assurances of their earnest desire to find a peaceful solution and to co-operate with the United Nations. I hope they will also increasingly exercise a restraining influence on violence and extremism.

In the Cyprus situation there has been a tendency for both sides to engage in highly vituperative exchanges of accusations and threats, often issued in the heat of some particular incident. A vicious circle of accusation and counter-accusation, of incident and reprisal, has been created which, far from easing the tension, tends to increase it and to harden the positions and build up the resentments of both parties. This is a process which only the leaders concerned can arrest and reverse, and I most earnestly urge them to do so. The United Nations Force is doing, and will do, its utmost to ensure that moderation on both sides brings benefits to all and disadvantages to none.

I make these comments because there is so very much at stake in Cyprus. It is often said, in this as in other crises, that the prestige of the United Nations is at stake. No doubt it is, but our concentration must always be on doing our very best to resolve the conflict. If we do that steadfastly, the prestige issue is likely to take care of itself. I believe that the United Nations is strong enough, and solidly enough founded in the principles of the Charter and in the loyalty and support of its members, to stand the strains put upon it. What concerns me is that at stake are the lives, happiness and

prosperity of the people of Cyprus -- the young and old, the farmers, the shepherds and the townsmen, who now go about in fear of their lives or, too often, cannot go about at all. At stake, too, are the peaceful relations of two great and historic countries -- Greece and Turkey -- and with them peace in the Eastern Mediterranean and the dread possibilities of war in that highly sensitive area. And in the ultimate analysis, at stake is the ability of the world community to organize itself so that we can put war behind us once and for all, and can put peace, order and justice in its place.

These are the real issues which we face in Cyprus. We face them together with an agreed objective, and that in itself is a great source of hope. But, for all its moral authority and good intentions, the United Nations, like any peaceful agent of order and justice, cannot be effective without some co-operation, some give and take, some effort to move forward, on the part of the peoples primarily concerned. We cannot and will not force them to a solution of their problems, but we appeal to them to help us to help them before it is too late.

Before concluding, I should like to turn to some more general aspects of the problem of peace keeping. The basic dilemma which we have to face is a large but simple one. On the one hand, governments and peoples generally accept the need for the United Nations and its central role as the keeper of the peace. Thus the organization is entrusted, especially in times of crisis, with great problems of incalculable importance and danger. On the other hand, we have not yet come to a stage where the necessary political or material support is regularly forthcoming which would enable the United Nations to meet these problems with the authority and the efficiency with which, for example, an effective national government meets its responsibilities on the national level. This fundamental dilemma not only puts a considerable strain upon the United Nations itself, but, on occasion, involves it in serious and understandable criticism or even hostility. It can also put a severe strain upon governments such as your own, which are determined to live up to their undertakings under the Charter and to support, by deeds as well as words, the United Nations in its endeavours to keep the peace.

It is obviously most desirable that this dilemma should be faced with a view to making the United Nations more effective and more able to serve its members and the peace of the world at large. At the same time, it would be naive to suppose that the obstacles to such progress can be easily or quickly surmounted. There is no short cut. Political, economic, constitutional and even psychological conditions and concepts of long standing are not changed overnight, nor is it desirable that they should be. There must be, therefore, a sound and gradual development of thought and action at the national and the international level, if, on this matter of peace keeping, we are to profit from the lessons of the past and plan and act for a more stable and happier future.

Your Prime Minister recently delivered a very thoughtful and constructive lecture in the Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Series, on the subject of increasing the strength and capacity of the United Nations to respond to the demands made of it. In that lecture he emphasized the necessity for preparation and planning in advance of United Nations peace-keeping operations, since the ideal solution of a permanent United Nations force is clearly not politically feasible at the present time. Canada was one of the first countries to earmark troops for United Nations service, and Mr. Pearson has made some most constructive suggestions for the further development and co-ordination of such stand-by forces, including consultations among the governments who have already earmarked such forces. I believe that consultation and co-operation among interested governments can be of much value in contributing to the improvement of the peace-keeping effectiveness of the United Nations.

Quite apart from such practical consultations, a wide public discussion of this question is most desirable. Such a discussion should range over the whole complex of problems, political, financial, constitutional, juridical and psychological, which have to be solved in evolving a dependable world agency for keeping the peace. The kind of problems which are widely, and sometimes hotly, debated today in relation to Cyprus -- the extent of the authority of an international force, its relation to the authorities of the state concerned, its right to use force, the lengths to which it can go to restore order and maintain peace -- are problems which will constantly arise in the future.

These problems have a fundamental bearing on concepts of sovereignty and on principles of law, as well as on military and civilian organization and method.

They need to be weighed and developed in the broad perspective of world affairs in the future, as well as in the narrow context of Cyprus.

I am gratified that Canada, which has on other occasions given a lead in peace-keeping matters, is here once again looking ahead.

To address this joint session has been a great occasion and a great honour for me. In our different positions, we have, I believe, fundamentally the same aim -- the creation of a world where justice, peace and order can flourish and be enjoyed by all. Together we must develop the means toward this end. Without the confidence and support of its member governments, in good times as well as in bad, the United Nations can never live up to the great ideals and aims of its Charter. For that reason, we must continually make the effort to examine problems openly and frankly from all viewpoints. With this end particularly in mind, I am most grateful to have had the opportunity of sharing my thoughts with you today.

