

# UNITED NATIONS



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY SECURITY COUNCIL

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/33/359  
S/12915  
4 November 1978

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-third session  
Agenda item 28  
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL  
Thirty-third year

Letter dated 3 November 1978 from the Permanent Representative of  
Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to a letter from the Permanent Representative of Turkey of 9 October 1978 (A/33/299-S/12892), attaching as annex a letter signed by Mr. Rauf Denktash, "President" of the so-called "Turkish Federated State of Cyprus".

In my previous letters and more recently that of 17 October 1978 (A/33/315-S/12895), it has been conclusively shown that the so-called "State is but a fictitious set-up by Ankara in an attempt to cover up its invasion and continuing aggressive occupation of 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus in violation of the unanimous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the subject.

In his said letter, Mr. Denktash strongly remonstrates that President Kyprianou spoke in the General Assembly as though representing also the Turkish Cypriot community. The President of Cyprus, however, has a right and a duty to speak on behalf of the whole people of Cyprus and was justified in expressing concern over the fate also of the Turkish Cypriot community, whose basic rights and vital interests have been trampled upon by the army of occupation and by the massively transported alien population from Anatolia, Turkey.

This flooding colonization from Turkey furthermore endangers the very survival of the distinct identity of the Turkish Cypriot community as a people, as well as their standards of civilization and culture. Thus, by the conditions of forced separation from their ancestral homes and properties in the south, imposed on them by the partitionist policy of Ankara, the large majority of the Turkish Cypriots live in a climate of distress and misery under the oppressiveness of the army of occupation and of the imported colonizers from Turkey. The stark reality of this situation and its consequences on the Turkish Cypriots causing genuine concern to all Cypriots, is common knowledge and cannot be concealed through any pretence by the instruments of Ankara.

Mr. Denktash simulates wonder why President Kyprianou in his address did not touch upon the accord between the late Archbishop Makarios and himself of February 1977, and its guidelines. He knows, or ought to know, however, that the Turkish proposals prepared in Ankara and presented to the Secretary-General in April 1978 are in no sense for a federation but for two completely separate States in an express division of sovereignty, totally incompatible with any concept of unity of the State, as has been generally admitted and recognized. Thus they provide for separate and distinct passports, for separate defence forces without a joint command, separate currencies, separate central banks and separate rights to negotiate international treaties. They run counter, therefore, to the agreed basis of preserving the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the island.

The effect of these partitionist proposals is to violate, transgress and negate the aforesaid accord. In consequence, the two sides are now shown to be at cross purposes and the end result of any negotiation unattainable. The uselessness of negotiations in the present circumstances is recognized also by the Secretary-General. Particularly so, as Mr. Denktash in his said letter reasserts that he stands by those partitionist proposals, thereby making it obvious that there is in reality no common basis for a federal constitution in an undivided State.

The rest of the letter under reply is but a systematized repetition of unsubstantiated charges to the effect that the Turkish Cypriots since December 1963 were the victims of an "onslaught" by the Greek Cypriots and were for 11 years, until 1974, harassed and compelled to be secluded in enclaves, deprived of their homes and their freedom of movement. These irresponsible allegations made at various forums and times were refuted by reference to the concrete and authoritative evidence contained in the official six-monthly reports of the Secretary-General, covering the whole 11-year period in question. Extracts from these reports were quoted in our statements in the United Nations on more than one occasion, namely in the Security Council on 30 August 1974, 1/ in the Special Political Committee on 29 October 1974 2/ and the General Assembly on 8 October 1975, 3/ and more recently in our letter to the Secretary-General of 30 March 1978 (A/33/74-S/12626). Yet the Turkish side seems undeterred from reverting after a time to those same untrue assertions. The relevant facts, therefore, and the conclusive evidence on them have to be recalled. They are given in an over-all picture of the situation in annex I. Extracts from the reports of the Secretary-General appear in annex II attached hereto.

---

1/ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, 1795th meeting.

2/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Special Political Committee, 923rd meeting.

3/ Ibid., Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2380th meeting.

Mr. Denktash's further allegation of an agreement on 2 August 1975 for an "exchange of population" is directly contradicted by the report of the Secretary-General (S/11789) 4/ which shows the very reverse, namely, that the remaining Greek Cypriots in the north (15,000) would be free to stay and enjoy security of life, freedom of movement and other facilities, and that all relatives and others in the south would be allowed to rejoin them in the north.

It is in a persistent effort to cover up the international crimes committed against Cyprus with the design of changing its demographic structure that such propaganda of systematic misrepresentations was lodged and still continues. We believe, however, that the policy of the "big lie" cannot for long stand up against truth, which eventually always prevails.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 28, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Zenon ROSSIDES  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representative of  
Cyprus to the United Nations

---

4/ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975.

ANNEX I

Over-all picture of the situation in Cyprus

Since the day of the establishment of the Republic in 1960, under the Zurich and London Agreements, the Turkish Cypriot leadership prompted by Ankara - and assisted by the underground organization TMT manned by officers from Turkey - has been continuously obstructing the functioning of the State with a view to promoting divisiveness, friction and conflict. It was this policy, well under way by 1961, that led the Turkish Cypriot members of the House of Representatives to abuse their rights under the Constitution for a separate majority, by preventing the passage of an admittedly normal and unobjectionable income tax bill. The result was a serious financial crisis and trouble. They next insisted on a house-by-house division of the towns, a proposition which was predictably impractical and proved unworkable.

This persistent obstructionism made it necessary for the President of Cyprus to address a letter to the Turkish Vice-President in November 1963, proposing amendments which would modify the excessively divisive and unworkable elements in the Constitution and, in exchange, increase the authority of the Turkish Vice-Presidents of the Republic and of the House of Representatives. Before the Turkish Cypriots had time to consider the proposals the negative response, openly directed from Ankara, was an outright rejection, coupled with the provocative appearance of Turkish Cypriot fighters, who showed themselves fully armed and ready for combat.

It should be recalled that already in October 1959, even as the Zurich and London Agreements were being drawn up, Turkey was secretly shipping arms and ammunition to Cyprus in preparation for armed uprising. The vessel "Denis" was at that time actually caught by the British authorities in the very act of unloading an arsenal of weapons at the north of Cyprus. At the same time, a special invasion force was being prepared in the Mersina area, opposite the coast of Cyprus.

The armed clashes of December 1963 were thus the culmination of continued and provocative hampering of the machinery of Government by the Turkish Cypriot leadership at the bidding of Ankara.

No sooner had the clashes begun than the underlying purpose for them became apparent by Turkey's attempt to invade Cyprus on 27 December 1963. Recourse to the Security Council halted the attempt. Vice-President Kutchuk, however, encouraged from outside, continued to give the signal of rebellion by declaring publicly that he was "no longer a Vice-President and that the Constitution is dead", and that "partition is the best solution". He went so far as to propose the thirty-fifth parallel as "an ideal demarcation line", as reported in The New York Times of 4 and 11 January 1964, respectively, as well as in the Herald Tribune of 9 January 1964.

/...

It was at the bidding of Dr. Kutchuk that the Turkish Cypriot members of the House of Representatives resigned from the House. At the same time, all Turkish officials and employees in the civil service by orders of their leadership ceased functioning and withdrew from the public service.

These proven facts fully counter the Turkish pretences of an allegedly persecuted Turkish Cypriot minority, deprived of their rights and their share in the administration.

Furthermore, the allegation that the Turkish Cypriots were a defenceless community under siege and terror by the Greeks, is flatly contradicted even by Turkish evidence, which at the same time reveals that the clashes were provoked and pursued by the Turkish side under the banner of partition.

The Turkish Cypriot newspaper Halkin Sesi, the mouthpiece of the then Vice-President Kutchuk, in its issue of 29 February 1964, writes: "The Greeks are in a state of distress in the full sense of the word. Starting from Nicosia in all clashes the Greeks suffered great losses, but they do not give the casualty figure." The paper continues: "The Turkish fighters have pledged to fight on until the realization of partition". Thus, the attitude of the Turkish minority has been admittedly one of provoking division and instigating armed conflict with the aim of partition.

In yet another issue of Halkin Sesi, it is made clear that the avowed aim of partition is actually for annexation. In its issue of 9 August 1965, Halkin Sesi writes:

"Cyprus is another Alexandretta in the history of Turkey. The power of Turkey will ensure an honourable life for the Turkish Cypriots in the same way as it did in Alexandretta by annexing it and bringing it under Turkish domination. The road in this direction has been opened by the Turkish fighters at Kokkina who are now fighting in every corner of Cyprus."

In June 1964, Mr. Erkin, then Foreign Minister of Turkey, offered another clear insight when he said in a newspaper interview in Athens: "The radical solution would be to cede one part of Cyprus to Greece and the other, closest to the Turkish Asiatic coast, to Turkey".

/...

Further evidence that the partitionist motivation of clashes came from Ankara appears in Prime Minister Inonu's words to the National Assembly of Turkey in October 1974: "Officially, we promote the federation concept rather than the partition thesis so as to appear as though within the provisions of the Treaty".

It is these designs of Ankara for partition and ultimate annexation which over the years have assiduously cultivated and nurtured a climate of friction and enmity between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The task of breaking the long-existing good relations between the two communities was known to be a difficult one; so much so that it had to be furthered through violence. An underground terrorist organization - TMT - set up and manned by officers from Turkey, began in 1958 systematically forcing the Turkish Cypriots, through threats of heavy punishment, into discontinuing any friendly contacts and associations with their Greek Cypriot compatriots in a sustained effort to keep them apart as enemies.

In that effort, all human rights of the Turkish Cypriots were denied them by their own leadership, imposed from Ankara. Their right of freedom of movement, freedom of residence - and even to life - was violated by the Turkish Cypriot leaders working in league with TMT, which terrorized the rank and file of the Turkish Cypriot community into complete submissiveness to its orders.

A considerable part of the Turkish Cypriot people had thus been compelled by their leadership in conjunction with TMT to abandon their homes and properties, even in areas far removed from the site of conflict, and to be segregated in enclaves so as to create the nucleus of a geographic division and promote the objective of partition. From those enclaves they were not permitted by order of the Turkish Cypriot leadership and TMT to get out, although longing to return to their homes. They could not leave the enclaves without special permit and had to be back at a specific time. Those who tried to escape were shot on the spot. Many instances were quoted in our letters to the Secretary-General at that time.

In his report of 15 June 1964, the Secretary-General states:

"... However, the lack of movement of Turkish Cypriots outside of their areas is also believed to be dictated by a political purpose, namely, to reinforce the claim that the two main communities of Cyprus cannot live peacefully together in the island without some sort of geographical separation. ..." a/

---

a/ Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964, document S/5764, para. 113.

In his report of 10 June 1965, the Secretary-General states:

"The Turkish Cypriot leaders have adhered to a rigid stand against any measures which might involve having members of the two communities live and work together, or which might place Turkish Cypriots in situations where they would have to acknowledge the authority of Government agents. Indeed, since the Turkish Cypriot leadership is committed to physical and geographical separation of the communities as a political goal, it is not likely to encourage activities by Turkish Cypriots which may be interpreted as demonstrating the merits of an alternative policy. The result has been a seemingly deliberate policy of self-segregation by the Turkish Cypriots." b/

The Government's contention is thus borne out that:

"... the hardships suffered by the Turkish Cypriot population are the direct result of the leadership's self-isolation policy, imposed by force on the rank and file." b/

During the intercommunal clashes in the period 1963-1974, there were no doubt occasions of regrettable acts of violence from which both sides suffered. But how can these sporadic instances of irresponsible violence compare with the systematic violation of human rights by the army of invasion through verified mass executions of innocent civilians by the thousands in a genocidal expulsion of over 200,000 Greek Cypriots. In their usurped homes and properties alien population, imported from Turkey, is being implanted in a pre-planned design to change by force the demographic composition of Cyprus. A horrifying account of the atrocities involved in this sinister operation is contained in the studied report of the European Commission of Human Rights, partly published in the Sunday Times of 23 January 1977.

Yet, the rank and file of the Cypriot people - Greek and Turkish alike - yearn for conciliation and the resumption of their former amicable relations. They are forcibly prevented, however, by outside interference in a divisive policy for purposes alien to the interest of the people of Cyprus as a whole.

---

b/ Ibid., Twentieth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1965, document A/6426, para. 106.

ANNEX II

Extracts from the reports of the Secretary-General during  
the 11-year period in question (1963-1974)

A. Turkish Cypriots in enclaves forcibly prevented by their  
leadership from returning to their homes and properties

8 December 1966

"... the Turkish Cypriot leadership does not favour the return of refugees to their homes and deters them from going back to their villages ..." a/

8 December 1967

"For a considerable time, the Government has urged the refugees to return to their homes ... it has repaired or rebuilt abandoned Turkish Cypriot houses ... It is known that the Turkish Cypriot leadership does not favour the return of the refugees to their former homes located in Government-controlled areas at present. To justify this position, the Turkish Cypriot leadership stresses considerations of security and safety of the refugees, although there can be little doubt that one of the major reasons for its attitude is a political one ..." b/

"... the maximum possible number of Turkish Cypriots must remain outside the Government's authority." b/

B. All Greek Cypriots forcibly denied by Turkish Cypriot leadership  
entry into all areas under Turkish Cypriot control and even use  
of a number of main communication roads

8 December 1966

"Except in rare and special cases, the Turkish Cypriot leadership denies entry into areas under its control to all Greek Cypriots, whether government officials or private individuals. This ban appears to be enforced as a matter of political principle with little attempt at justification on practical grounds ... even where Greek Cypriots would be escorted by UNFICYP personnel and security factors could not possibly be at stake." c/

---

a/ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1966, document S/7611, para. 139.

b/ Ibid., Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967, document S/8286, para. 127.

c/ Ibid., Twenty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1966, document S/7611, para. 109.



3 June 1969

"... Whereas Turkish Cypriots may move freely throughout the Island except in a few militarily restricted areas, access to Turkish Cypriot enclaves, a number of Turkish Cypriot villages and certain roads continues to be denied to Greek Cypriots. Of particular concern is the lack of free access to the following public trunk roads:

- (a) Nicosia-Kyrenia;
- (b) Famagusta-Chatos-Nicosia;

...

This abnormal situation, if not remedied, could mar the present favourable atmosphere, because there is growing impatience and discontent among Greek Cypriots, now that the Turkish Cypriots have enjoyed full freedom of movement over the whole Island for some time, whilst the Greek Cypriots are still prevented from using some of the Republic's main roads." d/

3 December 1969

"In the matter of freedom of movement there has regrettably been no major change. The Government has continued to express serious concern at the lack of free access by Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriot-controlled areas. Besides the Turkish Cypriot enclaves, a number of Turkish Cypriot villages and public trunk roads remain closed to Greek Cypriots although Turkish Cypriots have been moving freely throughout the island for nearly two years except in militarily restricted areas (S/9233, para. 55)." e/

20 May 1971

"Again it is regretted that there has been no improvement on the problem of freedom of movement. The Government has repeatedly expressed its disapproval of the policy of the Turkish Cypriot leadership in denying to Greek Cypriots the use of a number of major public roads. Complaints are also still being received from areas where Greek Cypriot farmers are being denied access to fields which lie in Turkish Cypriot-controlled areas, particularly in the Chatos/Lefkoniko region." f/

-----

---

d/ Ibid., Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969,  
document S/9233, para. 55.

e/ Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1969, document S/9521,  
para. 54.

f/ Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1971,  
document S/10199, para. 57.