



Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1988/86
11 March 1988

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-fourth session
Agenda item 12 (a)

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES

QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CYPRUS

Letter dated 11 March 1988 from the Permanent Representative of
Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the
Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, transmitting a
letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence on
behalf of the Turkish Cypriot community

I have the honour to enclose herewith a message addressed to you on behalf of one of the two main parties to the Cyprus dispute, i.e. the Turkish Cypriot community, by H.E. Mr. Kenan Atakol, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence.

As will be recalled, a debate was initiated in the Commission on Human Rights on the question of Cyprus, unfortunately in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot community, one of the two main parties to the conflict. Under these circumstances, the Turkish Cypriot community has been left with no alternative but to submit its views in writing, so that its views could at least appear on the records.

It will be appreciated if the present letter and the attachment thereto would be issued as a document of the Commission on Human Rights under agenda item 12 (a).

(Signed) Ercument YAVUZALP
 Ambassador
 Permanent Representative

Annex

LETTER FROM THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE
ON BEHALF OF THE TURKISH CYPRIOT COMMUNITY

With reference to the unfounded allegations made in the absence of our representative by the Greek Cypriot representative during the recent meeting of the Commission, I would like to bring to your attention the following:

We believe that the Greek Cypriot Administration of southern Cyprus is the least qualified to speak on human rights, for it has violated practically every single human right of the Turkish people of Cyprus in an attempt to unite Cyprus with Greece (ENOSIS). In accordance with the notorious Akritas Plan, prepared also by its leadership, they brought terrorism to Cyprus as far back as the late 1950s, and as of 1963 launched an all-out armed onslaught against the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner of the bi-national Republic of Cyprus of 1960, killing, oppressing and persecuting the Turkish Cypriot population in the process. They forcibly usurped the entire machinery of government and ejected the Turkish Cypriots from all the organs of the State, thus violating the basic provisions of the treaties establishing the bi-national Republic of 1960; they trampled upon the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the constitutional, legal and economic rights of their co-founder partners long before the legal and justified Turkish intervention of 1974 aimed at preventing this unconstitutional fait accompli of the Greek Cypriot wing.

It should be obvious therefore, that the question of Cyprus did not start in 1974 and is not, as alleged by the Greek Cypriot representative "a problem of invasion and occupation". The question arose in 1963 with the forcible destruction of the bi-national Republic by the Greek Cypriot wing and the ensuing usurpation of its powers by this wing.

Violation of the human rights of the Turkish Cypriot people between 1963 and 1974 was the most tragic aspect of the Cyprus question. There is abundant documentation and reports by impartial personalities, including reports of the then Secretary-General of the United Nations, that Turkish Cypriots were hunted down in their own land, abducted from the roads and even hospital beds, never to be seen again, that Turkish children were slaughtered in bath-tubs and that Turkish Cypriots were pushed into enclaves where they had to endure for 11 years an ordeal under a "veritable siege", as the then Secretary-General of the United Nations described the situation in one of his reports to the Security Council (S/5950).

The degree of the Greek Cypriot insincerity and lack of concern for human rights in Cyprus can most alarmingly be seen from the existence of Turkish Cypriot mass graves all over the island where, in some instances, the entire population of villages was massacred. What is equally terrifying is that the Greek Cypriot atrocities against the Turkish Cypriots were committed systematically under a plan, prepared and implemented by the Greek Cypriot leadership, the declared aim of which was the total annihilation of the Turkish Cypriot people seen as a major obstacle to the union of Cyprus with Greece (ENOSIS) (see Akritas Plan (A/33/115-S/12722)).

Against this background, it is indeed ironic that the Greek Cypriots, as the authors of this extermination plan should have the insolence to raise the issue of "human rights in Cyprus" before this esteemed body or in other international forums.

The claim that the rightful and justified Turkish intervention was a violation of international law is totally baseless. The Turkish intervention in Cyprus in 1974, five days after the Greek-engineered coup, which was the final provocation in the chain of faits accomplis in Cyprus, was carried out in accordance with international law, namely the Treaty of Guarantee, in order to prevent the annexation of Cyprus by Greece and to save the Turkish Cypriots from mass extermination. The infamous coupiste, Nicos Sampson, who was installed as "President" after the 15 July coup, is on record as saying "I was about to declare ENOSIS when I was forced to quit" by the legitimate and timely Turkish intervention (see Makarios' statement in the Security Council on 19 July 1974 (SPV/1780)).

Referring to the absurd allegation made by the Greek Cypriot mission that, owing to the presence of the Turkish troops, there are restrictions to the free expression of opinion in northern Cyprus, I wish to point out that the existence in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus of six political parties representing all shades of political opinion and enjoying full freedom in their activities categorically refutes such groundless allegations.

As regards the allegations concerning the demographic structure, the truth of the matter is that it is the Greek Cypriot side which has long been trying to bring about forced changes in the demographic structure of Cyprus by aiming to squeeze out and eliminate the Turkish Cypriot population. The Greek Cypriots cannot gloss over these well-documented facts by trying to present the return of Turkish Cypriots living abroad (who had been previously forced to emigrate from the island through Greek terrorism and oppression) and the limited, legal imports of much-needed labour into northern Cyprus, as measures aimed at changing the demographic structure of the island.

The question of "missing persons", contrary to the Greek Cypriot presentation on the issue, dates as far back as the 1963 Greek Cypriot assault on the Turkish Cypriots during which over 200 Turkish Cypriots, all civilians, were abducted by the Greek Cypriot police and irregulars, before eyewitnesses, never to be returned or accounted for. Soon after the 1974 events, additional Turkish Cypriots disappeared making a total of 803. The Turkish Cypriot people were therefore the first to experience the agony of missing persons. Furthermore, the Greek Cypriot manoeuvres to include in the number of their missing persons their heavy casualties during the internecine killing of Greek by Greek in the days of the coup of 15 July 1974, about which there is abundant documentation, and their casualties in combat, is the epitome of distortion and self-deception.

The Greek Cypriot side would be well-advised to stop obstructing the work of the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus which is trying to resolve this humanitarian issue, in accordance with its terms of reference agreed upon by both sides.

How *can* the Greek Cypriot side persistently ignore, or at best misinterpret the Population Exchange Agreement reached between the leaders of the two sides at the third round of the intercommunal talks held in Vienna

from 31 July to 2 August 1975, facilitating the voluntary exchange of populations between the North and the South, which was implemented with the assistance of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). With the Population Exchange Agreement, the way was paved for a solution of the Cyprus question on the basis of a bi-national, bi-zonal federal republic. Indeed this formula was later formally accepted at summit meetings held between the leaders of the two communities in 1977 and 1979 respectively, and formed the basis of the Secretary-General's draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986 which is still on the table awaiting the acceptance of the Greek Cypriot side, as it was accepted in total by the Turkish Cypriot side.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that the Greek Cypriot notion of the settlement of the Cyprus problem invariably implies a settlement based on their political supremacy vis-a-vis the Turkish Cypriots, which in turn implies a return to the period from 1963 to 1974, during which the most sacred human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to life, were ruthlessly denied to the Turkish people of Cyprus. Needless to say, the Turkish people of Cyprus cannot be expected to go through that terrible experience once again.

(Signed)

Kenan ATAKOL
Minister of Foreign Affairs
and Defence