

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/6267
2 April 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF TURKEY
AND THE SECRETARY-GENERAL REGARDING THE REPORT OF THE UNITED
NATIONS MEDIATOR ON CYPRUS 1/

1. Letter dated 31 March 1965 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to convey the following to Your Excellency.

The Turkish Government has carefully studied the Report of Mr. Galo Plaza concerning the question of Cyprus which was transmitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the United Nations Representative for Technical Assistance and the Special Fund in Ankara at 14.00 hours on 30 March 1965, attached to Your Excellency's letter of 26 March 1965.

It has been observed that in spite of the Mediator's mandate being defined in the 4 March 1964 Resolution of the Security Council as promoting "an agreed settlement", Mr. Galo Plaza, without securing the agreement of all parties to the dispute, has proceeded to express his convictions as to the substance of the problem by way of observations, views or suggestions. On several occasions in the past, the Turkish Government had made it clear to Mr. Galo Plaza that such a course would not be compatible with his mandate and had earnestly requested him to refrain from such action in order that he may fruitfully continue his mediation attempts, the pursuance of which was also desired by the Turkish Government.

During the conversations which were held with him in Ankara on 23-25 February last, Mr. Galo Plaza had agreed to refrain from inserting in his Report any recommendations or suggestions as to substance and to confine himself to the procedure of mediation by observing that there no longer seemed to be any prospect

1/ Documents S/6253 and Corr.1.

in mediation by individual contacts and that from now on joint and multilateral negotiations with the mediator might be advisable. In fact, in paragraph 121 of his Report, Mr. Galo Plaza states that one of the parties had informed him that in its view the inclusion of substantive proposals in his Report would carry him beyond his terms of reference. Furthermore, in paragraph 170 of his Report, he states that the parties concerned should try to see their way clear to meet together with or without his presence, according to their wishes.

The Report of Mr. Galo Plaza contains sections which go beyond his terms of reference as specified in the 4 March 1964 Resolution of the Security Council. It is obvious that those sections cannot be taken into consideration, cannot be entertained as a mediation effort and cannot therefore constitute in any manner a basis for future efforts. This creates a situation whereby it must be deemed that Mr. Galo Plaza's functions as a Mediator have come to an end upon the publication of his present Report. At any rate, the Turkish Government can no longer expect positive results from the continued mediation efforts of a person who has given vent to his convictions on the substance of the question without the agreement of all parties concerned.

The Turkish Government, therefore, placing itself on record as above, would like to express to Mr. Galo Plaza, at this time when his functions as a Mediator have come to an end, its thanks for his efforts in trying to find a settlement agreeable to all the parties.

(Signed) Orhan ERALP
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Turkey
to the United Nations

2. Letter dated 1 April 1965 from the Secretary-General
addressed to the Permanent Representative of Turkey

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 31 March 1965 by which you conveyed to me the observations of the Government of Turkey on the report of the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus which I circulated as a Security Council document (S/6253 and Corr.1). I have, of course, shown this letter to the Mediator and have invited him to submit to me his comments upon it, particularly with regard to matters of fact.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the various points made in your letter. However, I note that your Government states that during the conversations which were held with the Mediator in Ankara on 23-25 February, he "had agreed to refrain from inserting in his report any recommendations or suggestions as to substance and to confine himself to the procedure of mediation by observing that there no longer seemed to be any prospect in mediation by individual contacts and that from now on joint and multilateral negotiations with the Mediator might be advisable". Since this is a question of fact concerning discussions which took place between your Government and the Mediator under the authority and responsibilities conferred upon him by the Security Council's resolution of 4 March 1964, you will appreciate that I am in no position to comment upon it from personal knowledge. The Mediator, however, at my request, has given to me his own understanding of the purport of the conversations in question. He informs me that what is referred to as an agreement about the content of his report would more accurately be described as a statement of the Turkish Government's own views on what the report should contain, and that while he felt able to agree that his report would not present formal recommendations for a solution, he could not and would not agree that he should confine himself solely to what the Turkish Government refers to as the "procedure of mediation", in the limiting sense of not dealing with matters of substance. He states that, in fact, he made it clear that his report would include a detailed analysis of the positions of the various parties, from which would inevitably flow certain ideas which might lead the way to an agreed solution, and that he prepared his report accordingly.

I also note that it is the view of the Turkish Government that the Mediator's report "contains sections which go beyond his terms of reference as specified in the 4 March 1964 resolution of the Security Council"; that "it is obvious that those sections cannot be taken into consideration, cannot be entertained as a mediation effort and cannot therefore constitute in any manner a basis for future efforts"; and that "this creates a situation whereby it must be deemed that Mr. Galo Plaza's functions as a Mediator have come to an end upon the publication of his present Report".

It is, of course, for the members of the Security Council themselves to make authoritative interpretations of the provisions of resolutions of the Council. But I feel bound to say here that I have found nothing in the Mediator's report which I could consider as going beyond, or being in any other respect incompatible with, the functions of the Mediator as defined in paragraph 7 of the resolution of 4 March 1964, which consist of "promoting a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting Cyprus".

While I note with regret the view of your Government that the functions of the Mediator "have come to an end upon the publication of his present Report", I would like to inform you that I do not consider that any action by me at this juncture affecting the status of the Mediator is called for.

Indeed, I seize this opportunity to appeal most earnestly to your Government not to insist on the extreme position that the services of the Mediator have come to an end. I take this liberty only because I fear that this might well mean the end, for all practical purposes, of the mediation effort itself, thus greatly diminishing hopes for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem. This appeal, of course, does not apply in any way to the attitude of the Government of Turkey toward the substance of the Mediator's Report.

I am circulating your letter and my reply to the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) U THANT
