



General Assembly

Distr.: General
3 April 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Nineteenth session

Agenda item 2

Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Note verbale dated 21 March 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland presents its compliments to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and has the honour to transmit herewith a copy of the letter of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Hüseyin Özgürgün,* reflecting the Turkish Cypriot views on the report of the Office of the High Commissioner on the question of human rights in Cyprus (A/HRC/19/22), submitted to the Human Rights Council at its nineteenth session.

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey would appreciate it if the present note and the attachment thereto could be duly circulated as a document of the nineteenth session of the Human Rights Council.

* Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

Annex

I have the honor to refer to the Report on the “Question of Human Rights in Cyprus” dated 27 January 2012 and to bring to your kind attention the following facts and considerations:

First of all, I wish to underline, once again, that the references in the report to the so-called “Republic of Cyprus”, “Government of Cyprus” and “Supreme Court of Cyprus” reflect neither the realities nor the legal position in Cyprus. Ever since the forcible expulsion of the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner from the legitimate bi-national Government of the 1960 partnership Republic, there has been no constitutional Government representing both peoples of the island. The Turkish Cypriots did not accept the forceful takeover of the partnership State by the Greek Cypriot side in 1963 and, through its decisive resistance, prevented the Greek Cypriot side from extending its authority over the Turkish Cypriot people. Hence, since December 1963, there has not been a joint central administration in the island, capable of representing the whole of Cyprus, either legally or factually. Each side has since ruled itself, while the Greek Cypriot side has continued to claim that it is the “Government of Cyprus”.

In view of the reference in the Report to the term “Cypriot”, I would like to underline that there exist no such nation as “Cypriot” in Cyprus. The 1960 Agreements had created a State, albeit a short-lived one, but not a nation. Cyprus is comprised of two peoples, namely the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots who are negotiating on an equal basis to reach a just and viable settlement of the Cyprus issue. It should be remembered that even the Constitution of the now-defunct 1960 Republic of Cyprus states that there exists in Cyprus two peoples who are of Turkish and Greek origin. Article 2 of the Constitution reads “the Greek Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Greek origin and whose mother tongue is Greek or who share the Greek cultural traditions or who are the members of the Greek-Orthodox Church; the Turkish Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Turkish origin and whose mother tongue is Turkish or who share the Turkish cultural traditions or who are Moslems”. As it would be unfounded to claim that a “Cypriot” nation had emerged during the short period between 1960-1963, leading to the collapse of the partnership republic, any reference to a “Cypriot” nation is factually wrong and misleading.

We have taken note of the remarks in the prologue that, “In the absence of an Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) field presence in Cyprus or any specific monitoring mechanism, the OHCHR relied on a variety of sources with particular knowledge of the human rights situation on Cyprus for the purposes of the present report”. Indeed, the fact that documents of European bodies have been used extensively on the issues of property claims and missing persons unfortunately gives the false impression that Turkey is to be held accountable on these issues and that, therefore, Turkey and not the Turkish Cypriot side is the counterpart of the Greek Cypriot administration. This is not only erroneous and unacceptable, but also contradicts the established UN parameters. The repeated references to Turkish authorities (rather than Turkish Cypriot authorities) and the so-called “Government of the Republic of Cyprus” indicate that most disappointingly the principle of the political equality of the two sides in Cyprus has been seriously undermined by an institution of the UN itself. Similarly, the report now appears to be employing EU language in view of the reference made to Northern Cyprus as “the areas of Cyprus in which the Government does not exercise effective control”. This is totally unacceptable and is not conducive to a settlement.

As regards the “Introduction” section of the Report, it is observed once again that the present Report conveniently sidesteps the overall political picture and developments on

the island, thus failing to reflect the full perspective on the question of human rights in Cyprus. It is astonishing to observe that while on the one hand, the current report refers to the outdated resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights and in this context to the so-called “sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus”, on the other hand it fails, once again, to refer to the Greek Cypriot rejection of the 2004 UN Plan for a comprehensive settlement, following which the then Secretary-General of the UN had rightly underlined in his report dated 28 May 2004 (S/2004/437) that “The rejection of such a plan by the Greek Cypriot electorate is a major setback. What was rejected was the solution itself rather than a mere blueprint.”(para.83)

It is unfortunate to observe that different from the previous reports, the current report under paragraph 8 refers to the report transmitted by the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus and the said administration’s unfounded allegations and claims against the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey. Undoubtedly, such an approach is in contradiction with the most vital UN parameter, namely the equality of the two sides in Cyprus. In this context, since the report under the same paragraph includes the oft-repeated claim of the Greek Cypriot side that it had been “prevented by armed force from exercising its authority and control, and ensuring implementation and respect of human rights in the occupied area”, I deem it necessary to reiterate that throughout the years following the destruction of the partnership Republic of Cyprus in 1963, the Greek Cypriot side has exerted every possible effort to misinform the international community, disguising the years of torment they inflicted upon the Turkish Cypriot people and to portray the Cyprus problem as one of “invasion” and “occupation”. The Turkish intervention in Cyprus in 1974 was conducted in accordance with her rights and obligations arising from the 1960 International Cyprus Treaties. None of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus refer to the Turkish intervention in Cyprus as “invasion” or its subsequent presence in Cyprus as “occupation”. The Turkish troops are present in North Cyprus with the consent and cooperation of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus authorities which have full control and jurisdiction over the territory of the Republic. It should not be forgotten that currently there are considerable number of Greek military forces in South Cyprus and the commander of the so-called Greek Cypriot “National Guard” is an officer appointed from Greece.

In view of the repetitive Greek Cypriot claims in this regard, it would suffice to put on record once again that the Athens Court of Appeal, in its decision of March 21, 1979, also acknowledged that the intervention of Turkey in Cyprus was legal:

".... The Turkish military intervention in Cyprus which was carried out in accordance with the Zurich and London Agreements was legal. Turkey, as one of the Guarantor powers, had the right to fulfil her obligations. The real culprits... are the Greek Officers who engineered and staged a coup and prepared the conditions for this intervention."

(Decision No. 2658/79 23 March 1979)

As regards the “Human Rights Concerns” section of the Report, which reiterates that “the persisting division of Cyprus continues to have consequences for a number of human rights issues on the whole island...”, one must qualify that the history of human rights violations in Cyprus dates back to 1963 when the Greek Cypriots launched an organized attack against the Turkish Cypriots throughout the island in pursuit of realizing their dream of annexing the island to Greece (ENOSIS) in line with the Greek Cypriot notorious “Akritas Plan”, prepared by the Greek Cypriot leadership, which was also circulated as a UN document (A/33/115 and S/12722 of 30 May 1978).

In accordance with the Akritas Plan, an ethnic-cleansing campaign was practiced in the Island against the Turkish Cypriot population by the Greek Cypriot armed elements. As a result of the horrible deeds carried out in line with the said Plan, hundreds of Turkish

Cypriots were killed by armed Greek Cypriot paramilitaries and a quarter of Turkish Cypriot population (some 30,000 people) rendered homeless. Hundreds more were abducted never to be seen or heard of again. The survivors were confined into small enclaves, the total area of which corresponded to a mere 3 % of the territory of Cyprus. It should be recalled that as early as 10 September 1964, in his report to the UN Security Council, the then UN Secretary-General described the inhuman restrictions imposed upon the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot authorities, under the usurped title of the “Government of Cyprus,” as being so severe that it amounted to a “veritable siege” (UN Doc.S/5950). Between 1963 and 1974, Turkish Cypriot people were systemically subjected to all kinds of brutal treatment and human rights abuses.

Although the Turkish Cypriot people were saved from total extermination with the timely intervention of Turkey, the Greek Cypriot assault against Turkish Cypriots continued in the form of inhuman embargoes on their economic, social, cultural and political life. Utilizing its hijacked title of the “Republic of Cyprus”, the Greek Cypriot side managed to keep the Turkish Cypriot people under embargoes and isolation which range from denying the Turkish Cypriot people the right to representation in international fora; preventing or restricting their travel abroad and their communication with the outside world; curtailing trade and tourism between the TRNC and other countries, and to hampering all cultural and sporting relations of the Turkish Cypriot people with other countries. In a manner adding insult to injury, instead of displaying the necessary courage to accept its responsibilities in Cyprus in respect to abuses of human rights and use of force, the Greek Cypriot side still attempts to put the blame on Turkish Cypriot side and on Turkey.

One such issue that is repeatedly being exploited by the representatives of the Greek Cypriot administration in all international platforms, including the UN, is the issue of “displaced persons”. The Greek Cypriot side tries to portray the issue of displaced persons as an issue affecting only the Greek Cypriot people and that it is the result of the Turkish intervention in 1974 whereas in reality, the issue of displaced persons dates long before 1974 when many Turkish Cypriots were forced to abandon their homes, being internally displaced three or four times between the period of 1963 and 1974. Moreover, the Greek Cypriot side equally omits the fact that in accordance with the Voluntary Exchange of Populations Agreement reached between the two sides at the third round of inter-communal talks in Vienna on August 2, 1975 under United Nations auspices, Turkish Cypriots remaining in the South moved to the North and Greek Cypriots remaining in the North moved to the South with the exception of a few hundred Greek Cypriots who chose to reside in the North. All Greek Cypriots applying for permanent transfer to the South are interviewed in private by UNFICYP in order to verify that the transfers are voluntary. Both the Agreement and its implementation are well-recorded in relevant UN documents (S/11789 of 5 August 1975, S/11789/Add.1 of 10 September 1975).

Under the subsection on “Right to Life and the question of missing persons” paragraph 10 notes that “However, during the reporting period, the Committee’s access to military areas in the north has been restricted”. The truth of the matter is that the Turkish Cypriot authorities have been facilitating the Committee’s access to all relevant areas, including military zones in Northern Cyprus. Accordingly, as recorded in paragraph 28 of the UNFICYP report of the UN Secretary-General dated 28 May 2010 (S/2010/264) the Turkish Cypriot side has granted “access to four new exhumation sites located in military areas in the north”. Despite the fact that permission was granted last year for exhumation in a military area, it could not have been realized in 2011 due to technical reasons. It should be also noted in this regard that permission has recently been granted to the Committee for exhumation in a military area in Northern Cyprus in 2012. Thus, allegations contained in the report to the effect that access to military areas in the North has been restricted are

unwarranted, and totally undermines the cooperative approach of the Turkish Cypriot side in this matter.

Moreover, paragraph 10 of the Report states that “As a result of the inter-communal fighting as well as the events of July 1974 and afterwards, a total of 1,493 Greek Cypriots and 502 Turkish Cypriots have been officially reported as missing by both communities to the Committee”. It is unfortunate in this regard that the present report refrains from referring to the Greek Cypriots attacks perpetuated against Turkish Cypriots between 1963 and 1974. As a matter of fact, the question of missing persons in Cyprus dates back to 1963. Between the years of 1963-1974 around 502 Turkish Cypriots went missing after being abducted or detained by armed agents of the Greek Cypriot administration. The fate of the missing persons in Cyprus cannot be taken up in a vacuum, nor can it be addressed in a general framework without considering the historical circumstances that led to this human tragedy. The majority of the Turkish Cypriot missing persons since 1963 have proved to be civilians, one-fourth comprising women and children, who were abducted from their homes, work places, hospitals or roads by the Greek Cypriot police and militia, who were then murdered and thrown into wells or mass graves. The majority of the Greek Cypriot missing persons on the other hand were military personnel. Nevertheless, the TRNC authorities, looking at it from a human rights perspective, have always displaced their goodwill and constructive attitude on this issue.

It is observed that paragraph 13 refers to CoE CMD decision and states that “...Deputies renewed with insistence their calls on Turkish authorities to ensure the CMP’s access to all relevant information and places without impeding the confidentiality essential to carrying-out of its mandate, to inform the Committee of the measures envisaged in the continuity of the CMP’s work with a view to the effective investigations required by the judgement and to provide responses to the questions posed by the Committee”. Similarly paragraph 11 refers to the declaration adopted by the European Parliament on 9 June 2011, which “...called on the Governments of Turkey and Cyprus to continue to support the Committee’s work...”. This kind of approach which attempts to bypass or override Turkish Cypriot authorities and institutions, thereby undermining the political equality of the Turkish Cypriot side, clearly does not contribute to the resolution of the issues at hand or to the prospects of a comprehensive settlement on the island.

We note paragraph 12 of the Report referring to Security Council Resolution 1986 (2011) which states that “Security Council welcomed the progress and continuation of the important activities of the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, trusting that this process would promote reconciliation between the communities”. This sentence is a further proof of the commitment of the Turkish Cypriot side to the work carried out by the CMP in line with the mandate agreed by the two sides under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General. It has been due to the commitment of the Turkish Cypriot side and the diligent cooperation of the relevant TRNC authorities that 253 Greek Cypriot and 61 Turkish Cypriot remains have been exhumed, identified and returned to their families to this date.

With respect to the reference, under the subsection on “Non-discrimination”, in paragraph 16 of the Report to the basketball match played between the Turkish team Pınar Karşıyaka and the Greek Cypriot team Apoel on 21 December 2010, it is unfortunate to observe that the wording of the paragraph falls short of reflecting the realities and the seriousness of the incident. Despite the Report refers to the blatant attack on the Turkish team members only as an act of hooliganism, it is crystal clear that this was an incident motivated by xenophobia and hostility against the Turkish nation rather than being a mere act of hooliganism. Furthermore, it is observed in the report that there is an effort to downplay the role of the Greek Cypriot administration in the incident by making reference to the so-called “decisive” intervention of the Greek Cypriot police and the condemnation

of the incident by both sides. The truth of the matter is that the Greek Cypriot fanatics attacked the members of the Turkish team with knives, sticks, gas bombs and rocks as soon as the game had ended and some of the members of the Turkish team were injured as a result of the violence. The report omits to mention the most dramatic part of the incident which was the insufficiency, and indeed the unwillingness, of the Greek Cypriot police to take necessary precautionary measures prior to the event.

It is noted that the paragraphs 17 and 18 of the report, which deal with the Greek Cypriot authorities' attitude towards the elimination of discrimination and racist attacks against the Turkish Cypriots, has been drafted in line with the Greek Cypriot portrayal of the issues. We are surprised to observe in the Report that racist attacks have been presented as isolated incidents. Another serious shortcoming of the Report in connection with discrimination and racism against Turkish Cypriots has been the failure to mention the repeated cases of maltreatment of the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot side, instances which have intensified over the recent years. The most appalling fact regarding the matter is that the Greek Cypriot authorities, by failing to take action against the perpetrators, appear to condone these incidents. Ultimately, consistent violations of the Turkish Cypriot community's human rights are being coupled with, and therefore further perpetuated by, racially motivated atrocities. Moreover, it should be noted that the longer they remain ignored, the alleviation of these problems become more difficult. Unfortunately, similar incidents continue to take place in South Cyprus. Another glaring example of the rising trend of racism, chauvinism and ultra-nationalism among the Greek Cypriot populace is the incident which took place at the Women's European Volleyball Confederation game played between Galatasaray of Turkey and Apollon Limassol of Southern Cyprus on 8 December 2011. As widely reported in the media, during and after the game, verbal and physical attacks were perpetrated against the Turkish players as well as the supporters. In this connection, please find enclosed herewith a document which gives a summary of human rights violations against the Turkish Cypriots which occurred in 2011.

Paragraph 20 of the report acknowledges that "The 'direct trade regulation' proposed by the European Commission is still pending adoption". However, the Report fails to give any satisfactory background about the said Regulation. It has been almost eight years since the Turkish Cypriots expressed their desire for a political settlement and membership to the European Union with their overwhelming "yes" vote to the UN Comprehensive Settlement Plan. The plan was nevertheless rejected by the Greek Cypriot voters and as a result, only the Greek Cypriot part of the island joined to the EU. The EU Council of Foreign Ministers then produced a decision dated 26 April 2004 calling for an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots and accordingly, the EU Commission drafted and submitted two regulations, namely the Financial Aid Regulation and Direct Trade Regulation. An important fact that should not be overlooked is that the said decision was taken without any preconditions attached to or any concessions expected from the Turkish Cypriot side. On the contrary, the two regulations were seen as the least the EU could and should do to remedy the unjust situation which arose as a result of Greek Cypriot rejectionist attitude. Due to the Greek Cypriot obstructions, firstly the two regulations had to be decoupled and then the Financial Aid Regulation could only be adopted after a delay of two years and following many changes which were made to please the Greek Cypriot side. As a matter of fact, the Financial Aid Regulation is not functioning effectively, again due to the obstacles created by the Greek Cypriots. On the other hand, the Direct Trade Regulation which is considered as a step towards easing the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot people, is still pending, again, due the objectionist policy of the Greek Cypriot side. Adding insult to injury, the Greek Cypriot side has launched a vigorous campaign against the adoption of the Direct Trade Regulation and the Greek Cypriot Minister of Foreign Affairs is on record stating on 13 September 2010 that if the Direct Trade Regulation was to be

adopted by the EU, they would not only terminate the ongoing negotiating process but also block Turkey's EU accession candidature.

I would like to point out that the subsection of the Report on "freedom of movement" does not adequately address the issue of trade between the two sides within the context of the Green Line Regulation and fails to reflect the difficulties encountered by the Turkish Cypriots in the area of intra-island trading due to the Greek Cypriot side's obstructionist policies. As a matter of fact, the Green Line Regulation which sets out the legal framework for the crossing of persons and goods, as of 1 May 2004, from the North to the South has also faced many obstacles ever since its initial implementation. The physical and psychological barriers created by the Greek Cypriot side still hinder trade from North to South. For example, the Turkish Cypriot traders are unable to display their products on the shelves of the supermarkets in the South and cannot advertise in the Greek Cypriot press. Due to such obstacles, the volume of trade between the two sides is far below its potential. Furthermore, contrary to the Turkish Cypriot practice of allowing unhindered access to all Greek Cypriot vehicles and the EU Commission's view that unless restrictions were lifted the Green Line Regulation would be meaningless, the Greek Cypriot administration is still preventing Turkish Cypriot commercial vehicles from transporting goods and people across the Green Line on the pretext of refusing to recognize driving licenses issued in Northern Cyprus. Limited in both scope and value, the Green Line trade, which the Greek Cypriot administration claims to be an adequate tool for the Turkish Cypriot economy to flourish, is totally inadequate in reducing the economic disparity between the two sides. Furthermore, the Green Line Regulation covers only the movement of goods and people from North to South Cyprus while the services dimension is not adequately addressed. What constitutes bigger urgency for the Turkish Cypriot people is the adoption of the Direct Trade Regulation, which would be a positive step towards eliminating the restrictions and the creation of the necessary conditions for the economic and social development of the North.

In paragraph 24, the reference to the so-called restrictions on UNFICYP's movement is also erroneous. There has always been good coordination and cooperation between UNFICYP and the Turkish Cypriot Security Forces on such matters. During the reporting period, relevant Turkish Cypriot authorities have not been informed by UNFICYP of any such problems pertaining to the movement of UN personnel. The so-called restrictions referred to in the relevant report only relate to crossings of local personnel of Greek Cypriot origin, which fall outside the mission of UNFICYP. It should be also pointed out that denying the existence of the Turkish Cypriot authorities and institutions and referring to "Turkish Forces" rather than Turkish Cypriot Security Forces is totally unacceptable.

Although I will deal with that issue in detail in the following paragraphs, I deem it necessary to put on record also under the "freedom of movement" section our disappointment that the Report does not refer to the racist policy of the Greek Cypriot administration which restricts the freedom of movement of the TRNC citizens originating from the Republic of Turkey and their descendants.

As regards to the "property rights" subsection, I wish to underline that one of the most fundamental issues regarding the Cyprus question is the property issue and it affects not only the Greek Cypriot people but also the Turkish Cypriot people. In fact, many Turkish Cypriots were forced to abandon their homes at gunpoint as early as the late 1950's becoming refugees three or four times during the period between 1963-74 and leaving a considerable amount of property in South Cyprus. As is known, the reciprocal property claims of the two sides constitute one of the major topics of discussion at the ongoing negotiations between the leaders of the two sides conducted under the UN Secretary

General's auspices. Therefore, it is a great disappointment to observe that the report omits to mention the property rights of the Turkish Cypriots.

As for the property rights of Greek Cypriots, the Turkish Cypriot side never denied the unalienable right to property, and, thus, established the Immovable Property Claims Commission (IPC) to deal with the claims of Greek Cypriot individuals regarding immovable property located in the North. As is also acknowledged in the Report in paragraph 27, "On 27 October 2011, the deadline for applications of Greek Cypriots to the Immovable Property Commission, which was 21 December 2011, was extended for a further two years". However, since the establishment of the said Commission, the policy of the Greek Cypriot leadership has always been to discourage its citizens from applying to it. In this context, the Greek Cypriot leader Mr. Christofias has urged Greek Cypriot property owners to stay away from the Immovable Property Commission. Contrary to the Turkish Cypriot side's constructive attitude in this regard, the Greek Cypriot side has so far failed to propose any mechanism to handle the property issue similar to the IPC in the North. Furthermore, it is also noteworthy that the Turkish Cypriots who managed to file complaints with the Greek Cypriot courts regarding their property rights have all been rejected.

We welcome paragraph 28 of the Report referring to the Demopoulos decision of the European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), in which it has been legally acknowledged that IPC provides an effective domestic remedy for the Greek Cypriot claims related to properties in North Cyprus. At the sometime, however, it is difficult to comprehend the reason for referring in paragraph 29 of the report to the cases where the ECHR had already issued a judgment on the merits prior to the abovementioned Demopoulos decision.

Paragraph 31 of the Report refers to the Maraş (Varosha) issue and claims that "The situation in Varosha, the former resort town near Famagusta which is currently under control of the Turkish military, remains unchanged and the United Nations holds the Government of Turkey responsible for the status quo in Varosha". With regard to Maraş, it should be underlined that no organization or country, including the UN or Turkey, has political authority and/or jurisdiction over Maraş other than the democratically elected authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). As such, Maraş has never been treated any different than other parts of the TRNC and the future status of Maraş cannot be discussed outside the negotiating table as a separate issue. All the parties interested in the Cyprus problem is well aware of the Greek Cypriot refusal of the comprehensive settlement plan on Cyprus in 2004, which envisaged, inter alia, the return of Maraş to the Greek Cypriot administration. It needs to be stressed, however, that this was not the first time that a settlement initiative of the UN was rejected by the Greek Cypriot side. All of the settlement plans proposed to this date by the Secretaries-General of the United Nations, including the 1985 Draft Framework Agreement of Perez de Cuellar as well as the 1992 Set of Ideas and 1994 Confidence Building Measures proposed by Boutros Boutros Ghali, were rejected by the Greek Cypriot leadership at their final stages. It is important to note, in this context, that all the foregoing UN proposals provided for the return of the fenced area of Maraş to the Greek Cypriot side. It is, therefore a complete hypocrisy on the part of the Greek Cypriot side that on the one hand it claims to seek the return of Maraş, but on the other rejects all UN proposals envisaging its return. After almost half a century since the inception of the Cyprus problem, it has become clear that what is needed in Cyprus is a settlement plan which deals with all aspects of the Cyprus problem in a comprehensive manner. Thus, efforts aimed at taking up certain aspects of the Cyprus problem in isolation would only serve to undermine the comprehensive settlement negotiations.

Under the subsection on “freedom of religion and cultural rights” of the Report, paragraph 34 mentions the Greek Cypriot’s allegations on the freedom of religion and religious activities held in the TRNC. In TRNC, all the faithful belonging to Greek Orthodox and Maronite Churches and the Christians belonging to Protestant, Catholic and Anglican sects as well as the Greek Cypriots and Maronites coming from Southern Cyprus freely exercise their religious duties in accordance with our Laws. As regards the Christmas mass incident on 25 December 2010, it should be underlined that according to the regulations existing at the time of the mass in question, notification in the form of a written application was required in advance for services to be held at any day of the week other than Sundays. This was aimed at enabling the local authorities to take the necessary measures for the safe conduct of the mass. Although the procedure was well-known by the Greek Cypriot administration as well as the Greek Cypriots living in the TRNC, Greek Cypriots did not make an application for Christmas services within the expected time frame despite the fact that our authorities had reminded the Greek Cypriots living in the area that they should make an application to conduct a Christmas Mass on 25 December 2010. The Greek Cypriots instead of making an application in line with the procedure, preferred to make a last minute telephone call in late afternoon of Friday, 24 December 2010, to our Ministry to request the facilitation of a Christmas Service for the following day. However, as all the relevant government offices were closed by then, it was not possible to make the necessary arrangements despite our best efforts and the Greek Cypriot representative in the Karpaz area was informed accordingly. As for the allegation that “Turkish Cypriot authorities interrupted a Christmas service...” it should be stressed that all the individuals present freely exercised their religious duties at the Ayios Sinesios Church and our authorities did not enter the premises. Regarding the alleged restriction to holding an evening mass by Greek Orthodox worshippers in the Karpaz area on 4 February 2011, I would like to clarify that this allegation is also unfounded, since there has been no application or notification made to our authorities regarding such a mass. Therefore, any restriction on an alleged intended service is out of the question.

In relation to the reference in the same paragraph to the confiscation of religious books by our authorities, it is disappointing that yet another attempt of the Greek Cypriot side to create “artificial crisis” for political propaganda purposes is being included in the Report. As a matter of fact, there is a well-established procedure in place for the books to be delivered from South Cyprus to the Greek Cypriot schools in the North. Accordingly, the books are conveyed to our Ministry by the United Nations Peace Keeping Forces in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and following the completion of the relevant procedure, they are delivered to the Greek Cypriot schools again through UNFICYP. Despite being well-aware of this procedure, the Greek Cypriot side attempted to bring certain books to the North without the prior knowledge of our authorities and without following the established procedure, which can only be treated as a failed attempt to smuggle items into the country. In relation to the allegation that pilgrims to the Monastery of Apostolos Andreas are required to pay an entrance fee, it should be stressed that the entrance fee in question (which was less than half a Euro) is for entrance to the Karpaz Peninsula National Park and not for the Monastery of Apostolos Andreas. The purpose of collecting this fee was to raise funds for the protection and the maintenance of the National Park as is the case for many other national parks worldwide. Following the misunderstanding that the fee was collected as an entrance fee to the Monastery, our relevant authorities have made statements to the effect that no fee will be collected for entrance to the National Park. In relation to the allegation regarding the request to hold religious services at the Saint Gergios Church in the Vadili (Vatyli) village on 20 April 2011, it should be underlined that for the total population of around 500 Greek Cypriots and Maronites residing in the North, currently there are 19 churches in use for religious ceremony and the one in Vadili is not amongst them. As a matter of fact, a religious service has never been conducted in this church as there is no Greek Cypriot community living in the area.

As another gesture of good-will, as stated in paragraph 35 of the Report, our Government has revised the existing procedure and made certain important openings as regards the matter. According to the revised procedure currently in effect; Greek Cypriots living in the TRNC can hold religious services on any day of the week at the churches situated in their areas of residence without any need for prior application, and for the Greek Cypriots living in the South, the minimum number of days required to make an application for services which require prior notification has been reduced to ten working days.

As for the allegations regarding the religious places in North Cyprus, I would like to reiterate that protection of the Island's cultural heritage is of great importance to the Turkish Cypriot side. The cultural heritage of Cyprus, whether in the North or in the South, emanates from the diverse and rich cultures as well as civilizations which have populated the Island throughout history and it is the common heritage of humanity regardless of its origin, which should be protected and preserved. With this belief, we have supported all sincere efforts to protect and preserve all cultural assets, whether Greek-Orthodox or Turkish-Muslim, that are in need of care.

In this context, the Turkish Cypriot side is doing its best, with limited resources, to protect and preserve the diverse cultural monuments, including the churches, in North Cyprus. Despite the ongoing obstructionist policies of the Greek Cypriot side which prevent the international community from providing any direct assistance for the protection of the cultural heritage monuments in the TRNC, the Turkish Cypriot side has always tried to take the necessary measures to protect these monuments. While claiming to care very much for the cultural heritage of the Island, the Greek Cypriot administration, at the same time, blocks the attempts of the Turkish Cypriot authorities to receive funds from international institutions and the third parties for the protection of cultural heritage in North Cyprus, where most of the cultural monuments lie.

The report also fails to mention the utter contempt of the Greek Cypriot side towards the Turkish-Muslim heritage in Southern Cyprus, where Ottoman-Turkish cultural and religious monuments, including mosques, baths, fountains and cemeteries are under threat of destruction. Most of the mosques in the South are either locked or in extremely poor condition. Within this context, it should also be noted that so far the Greek Cypriot policy of maintaining mosques in South Cyprus has been limited to several monuments in the main city centers and touristic areas. Dozens of mosques in remote and rural or mountainous areas of South Cyprus have been destroyed or neglected, i.e. the Dereboyu (Evretu) Mosque, the Finike Mosque and the Denya Mosque to name a few. Recent field studies conducted by our experts and the information gathered from the Turkish Cypriots visiting the South has also identified that out of the more than 130 mosques in South Cyprus, 32 of which have simply disappeared while the rest are in a very poor condition. Furthermore, all the movable cultural objects of these monuments, namely hundreds of manuscript Korans, prayer rugs, Koran reading desks and pieces of Islamic iconography have been destroyed or looted.

We welcome paragraph 37 of the Report that mentions the limitations that exist in the South on the freedom of religion or belief of Turkish Cypriots both living in Southern Cyprus and in the TRNC. As a matter of fact, as opposed to the extensive opportunities and facilities provided by the Turkish Cypriot side to those wishing to exercise their religious freedoms, Southern Cyprus allows for only limited exercise of religious rights to Turkish Cypriots by allocating only a few mosques for religious practice. Moreover, the fact that some of the TRNC citizens are not allowed access to the holy site of Hala Sultan Mosque and Tekke in order to practice their religion simply because they are originating from Turkey, is a clear indication of the discriminative policies of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, and an open violation of human rights as well as freedom of religion. In this context, I wish to put on record another unfortunate incident

which took place on 19 August 2011, in the holy month of Ramadan which is celebrated as the most important holy period of the year for the Islamic world. The Greek Cypriot administration did not grant permission for Dr. Talip Atalay, the Head of the TRNC Religious Affairs Department, to cross to the South Cyprus to conduct Friday prayers at Köprülü Mosque in Limassol and the Bayraktar Mosque in South Nicosia, on the grounds that Mr. Atalay is a TRNC citizen originating from the Republic of Turkey. Undoubtedly, this and similar incidents are a clear violation of a basic human right, i.e. freedom of religion, on the basis of ethnicity and place of birth. It is also worthwhile to refer to the Inter-religious Youth Dialogue Forum which was organized within the framework of European Union-backed interreligious dialogue initiative under the auspices of the TRNC Religious Affairs Directorate and Greek Orthodox Church on both sides of the island between 25-30 July 2011 with the contribution of the Swedish Embassy in South Cyprus. Around forty young people from TRNC, Greek Cypriot administration, Israel and Palestine attended the Forum. Although the coordinators or participants did not face any difficulties in North Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot administration once again demonstrated its racist policy and did not grant permission to the TRNC citizens of Republic of Turkey origin for crossing over to South Cyprus in order to attend the meetings in line with the programme of the Forum. We would like to underline that the Turkish Cypriot side provides every opportunity to all the citizens of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus regardless of their origin, with a view to enabling them exercise their religious duties at the churches located in the TRNC.

On the issue of “Right to Education”, the reference in the Report under paragraph 41 to school textbooks and to the so-called denial of permission for teachers to teach in the North is unfounded and misrepresents the situation. It is a universally accepted fact that textbooks, in general, should refrain from injecting feelings of intolerance and animosity. In the case of Cyprus, it is imperative that all concerned comply with this principle in order to help promote the establishment of friendly and constructive relations between the two peoples on the Island necessary for creating the atmosphere conducive to a comprehensive settlement. In this spirit, the Turkish Cypriot side approaches the issue of textbooks with great sensitivity and has, in the past years, revised all its textbooks ensuring that they contain no elements of racial hatred or intolerance. However, it is unfortunate that the Greek Cypriot textbooks still unequivocally contain materials offensive to the Turkish Cypriots and inciting feelings of animosity amongst the Greek Cypriot children towards Turkish Cypriots.

The Turkish Cypriot side has always followed a constructive approach towards the Greek Cypriots residing in the North and, in line with this understanding, in addition to the existing primary school which has been functioning in Karpaz for over three decades, opened a secondary school in September 2004 for the Greek Cypriot students residing in that area, thus enabling students to complete their education uninterrupted, without having to move away from their families while fulfilling their secondary education. The Greek Cypriot children residing in North Cyprus have their own primary and secondary schools and are educated by Greek Cypriot teachers applying the same curriculum in South Cyprus. In fact, the said Greek Cypriot teachers are appointed by the Greek Cypriot Ministry of Education with the permission of the relevant Turkish Cypriot authorities.

The situation pertaining to schools in the TRNC and the South is only one example that unilateral steps, taken by the Turkish Cypriot side in good faith, are not reciprocated by the Greek Cypriot side, which still refrains from fulfilling its commitment to open a Turkish primary school in Limassol. The present report, unfortunately, fails to urge the Greek Cypriot administration to honour its commitment regarding the establishment of a separate Turkish Cypriot school in Limassol in order to meet the educational needs of the Turkish Cypriot children living in Southern Cyprus. Needless to say, the right to education in one's mother tongue is a fundamental human right which is enshrined in international human

rights doctrines. In this context, it should be underlined that, the interviews carried out by UNFICYP amongst the families of Turkish Cypriot children residing in Limassol in 2004 demonstrate that there is considerable demand among the Turkish Cypriots for a separate Turkish medium school and that there are a considerable number of Turkish Cypriot children who are not attending primary school at all. It is also established that these children, who are home tutored in the Turkish language, would be happily attending state schools if there was a Turkish medium school in South Cyprus. The issue of opening a Turkish medium school for Turkish Cypriots living in Limassol dates back many years and is also recorded in the relevant UN documents. It is clearly stated in the report of the then UN Secretary-General dated 7 June 1996 (S/1996/411) that the Greek Cypriot side had sent a written commitment for the opening of a Turkish medium primary school in Limassol. Despite the fact that more than 15 years have elapsed since this report, the Greek Cypriot administration is yet to take any initiative towards opening a Turkish Cypriot school in the South. In a manner adding insult to injury, it has been falsely claimed in paragraph 44 of the Report that the “Greek Cypriot administration is taking every necessary step for the education of the Turkish Cypriots in South Cyprus”. Such a blatant distortion of facts is totally unacceptable.

In paragraph 43, it is stated that ...The European Commission is currently in contact with the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus regarding the possibility of offering the Turkish Cypriots the option of studying at the universities under in the areas under the effective control of the Government of Cyprus in the near future”. The linkage of the European Union scholarship scheme with education of the Turkish Cypriot students in South Cyprus is unacceptable. The scheme is supposed to allow Turkish Cypriot students access to European Union educational programs outside Cyprus. Moreover, the Report fails to state that the Greek Cypriot administration blocks Turkish Cypriot students’ access to European Union exchange and educational programs. This, undoubtedly, constitutes a violation by the Greek Cypriot administration of the fundamental right to education of the Turkish Cypriot students whose plight continue despite efforts to rectify the situation. Of particular concern, in this context, is the need to find the modalities to allow the participation of the Turkish Cypriot higher education institutions in the Bologna process. However, the Greek Cypriot side is sparing no effort to curtail all initiatives that would allow the integration of the 6 Turkish Cypriot Universities into the Bologna process.

As for the observation contained in the “Conclusions” section of the report that “it is hoped that the current efforts made by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders to negotiate and achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem will open avenues to improve the human rights situation on the island”, I would like to reiterate once again that the Turkish Cypriot side is doing its utmost for the success of the full-fledged negotiations that are currently being carried out under the auspices of the UN Secretary-General which have been continuing on the Island since September 2008 with a view to reaching a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus problem. However, due to the reluctance of the Greek Cypriot side to enter into a genuine power-sharing arrangement with the Turkish Cypriot people on the basis of the established UN parameters, a just and viable settlement continues to elude us after decades of negotiations.

We hope and trust that the foregoing considerations will be taken into account and that the Human Rights Council will pay due attention to the rights and interests of the Turkish Cypriot people in its future Reports on the “Question of Human Rights in Cyprus” and make a serious effort in reflecting the human rights realities on the island in order to avoid its exploitation by the Greek Cypriot administration.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that the Turkish Cypriot side remains fully committed to the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue in the shortest possible time

under the UN Secretary General's mission of good offices and on the basis of the established UN parameters.

Hüseyin Özgürün
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Concrete examples of human rights violations against the Turkish Cypriots in 2011

Ongoing human rights violations in Cyprus are being committed by the Greek Cypriot leadership through the all-encompassing isolation that has been imposed upon the Turkish Cypriot people since 1963. Today, despite the expressed will of the international community to lift the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot people as a result of the Turkish Cypriot “Yes” vote to the UN Comprehensive Settlement Plan of 2004, the restrictions on the Turkish Cypriots remain unabated in all aspects of life. The decisions made and actions taken by the United Nations, European Union, Council of Europe, the Organization of Islamic Conference, as well as other international organizations for the lifting of the isolation have yet to produce tangible results due namely to the relentless efforts of the Greek Cypriot side aimed at preventing any steps that might ease the suffering of the Turkish Cypriots. The all-encompassing isolations imposed on the Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriot side range from denying the Turkish Cypriot people the right to representation in international fora; preventing or restricting their travel abroad and their communication with the outside world; curtailing the trade and tourism between the TRNC and the outside world, and hampering all cultural and sporting relations of the Turkish Cypriot people with other countries.

The Turkish Cypriot people have been suffering from isolation and embargoes for many years; a situation which has substantially hindered the island’s economic development and interaction with the international community. Furthermore, the Turkish Cypriots are being repeatedly victimized by verbal and physical assaults perpetuated by the Greek Cypriots, fueled by increasing racist and discriminatory sentiments, particularly in the recent years. This view of the Greek Cypriots is further apparent through their recent assertions claiming that “Cyprus is a Hellenic island,” as well as their maltreatment of minority and immigrant groups in South Cyprus in the form of racially-motivated verbal and physical attacks. A most aggressive attack took place on 21 December, 2010 after a basketball game in South Cyprus between Karsiyaka team from Turkey and Greek Cypriot team Apoel where Apoel fans advanced onto the basketball court after the game and physically attacked the Karsiyaka players. Similar incidents continue to take place today, and some concrete examples of incidents that took place in 2011 are listed below:

- On January 21, leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration Dimitris Christofias expressed that the Archbishop of the Greek Cypriot Orthodox Church, Chrisostomos, supports ELAM, an organization known to be ultranationalist and racist. Greek Cypriot daily newspaper Fileleftheros stated that Christofias referred to the attacks against the Turkish Cypriots in the Greek Cypriot National Council held the day before and stated that Archbishop Chrisostomos finances ELAM. According to the news, DIKO and the spokesperson of the Greek Cypriot Assembly, Marios Karoyan, tried to defend the Archbishop in the discussion when the attack by APOEL against the Turkish basketball team Pınar Karşıyaka was brought up. Responding to Karoyan, who stated that Chrisostomos denied having any relation to ELAM, Christofias pointed out that he had information proving that this was untrue. Christofias stated that acts of racism have been escalating in South Cyprus, the cars of Turkish Cypriots who visit to shops in the South have been attacked on numerous occasions, and a Turkish Cypriot living in South Cyprus was recently stabbed.
- While some Greek Cypriot academicians continue to express their discontent with the idea of collaborating with Turkish Cypriot universities, Greek Cypriot Minister of education and culture, Andreas Dimitriu, reiterated his claim on 25 January 2011 that Turkish Cypriot universities are “illegal”. According to Greek Cypriot daily

newspaper, Haravgi, Dimitriu commented on the matter by stating that “universities are autonomous institutions and have bodies which determine their own political infrastructures. Furthermore, people have the free right of crossing the border and everyone is responsible for their own actions,” sending the message that they could not prohibit Greek Cypriot academicians from crossing to the North. Dimitriu reiterated the fact that the Greek side does not recognize the TRNC as a state or the universities within its borders, warning his people to “stay away from activities that might imply [the TRNC’s] recognition.” Stating that Greek Cypriot academics are aware of the non-recognition policy of the South, Dimitriu added that the Greek side has been lobbying within the international arena for Turkish Cypriot universities to remain unrecognized. This news is a direct example of the Greek Cypriot administration’s deep pursuit of maintaining the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots, even at the expense of fruitful academic exchange.

- According to Greek Cypriot daily Fileleftheros newspaper’s February 1, 2011 article, a group of Kyrenia-based Greek Cypriot members of a non-governmental organization called “Free Kyrenia” demanded for passages from South Cyprus to North Cyprus to be banned. This organisation also demanded that Greek Cypriots be prohibited from shopping or spending money in North Cyprus, implying that financial transactions in the North would legitimize the Turkish “occupation” on the Island. The NGO also requested that those who do shop in the North be liable to legal procedure, once again indicative of the Greek Cypriot fear of recognizing the TRNC or contributing to its economic development.
- On February 7, it was reported that a convoy of military families on their way to Erenkoy were forced to wait at the Pirgo checkpoint for three and a half hours before being allowed to cross to the Greek Cypriot side. The convoy of four vehicles was protested by the Greek Cypriot side and crossed the Yesilirmak border in the North at 10:00 am, only to be kept waiting at the subsequent Greek Cypriot police checkpoint for hours. The convoy included both children and elderly people. The 3.5 hour-long delay is against the procedure agreement for crossings between the two sides of the Island, and a clear demonstration of the Greek Cypriot side’s lack of will to facilitate the freedom of movement and healthier relations between the two communities.
- An article in Fileleftheros newspaper’s February 19 publication indicated that Greek Cypriots protested Vodafone, a British telecommunications company, for buying the Turkish mobile phone network company TELSİM in both Turkey and the TRNC; a development which was advertised on Vodafone’s website. Shortly after the online advertisement of Vodafone’s new business endeavor, the Greek Cypriot officials at Cyta telecommunications (who also work with Vodafone) demanded that the “illegal entity” – the TRNC – be removed from the website. Furthermore, Fileleftheros referred to the fact that tourists visiting South Cyprus often pick up Vodafone’s reception from North Cyprus on their cell phones upon arrival in Cyprus and end up using it assuming it works collaboratively with their own phone providers.
- TRNC Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement on 22 February 2011, emphasizing that thousands of Maronite and Greek Cypriot religious ceremonies have taken place in the TRNC over the years at several monasteries and churches. While the Turkish Cypriot authorities have allowed for such services to take place without hindrance, the same right is not given to Turkish Cypriots at religious sites in the South. At the holy site of Hala Sultan Tekke Mosque in the South, there is no appointed Imam by the Greek Cypriot administration, and worshipers are only allowed access to the mosque during office hours. It has also been noted by the

Turkish Cypriot authorities that the Greek Cypriot Administration is not giving permission to TRNC citizens of Turkish Republic origin to exercise their religious duties at Hala Sultan Mosque. These attitudes are clear violations of the basic human right to freedom of religion and proof of the Greek Cypriots' relentless separatist policies.

- The European Network Against Racism (ENAR) recently reported that there has been a gradual increase in racially motivated crimes and violence in South Cyprus, particularly against refugees and people requesting political asylum. Fileleftheros Newspaper wrote on 22 March that in its 2009-2010 report, ENAR emphasizes an increase in the number of extreme nationalist organizations and extremist political parties in South Cyprus. Furthermore, it is reported that the strict immigration policy of South Cyprus continues to ostracize refugees and those seeking political asylum from social and political spheres, often depriving them of even their most basic human rights. It is also reported that laws meant to hinder racism are not completely implemented and South Cyprus has not been able to take the necessary precautions to control discrimination on the basis of national origin, race, and colour.
- According to Turkish Cypriot daily Star Kibris newspaper dated 4 April 2011, some members of the Greek Cypriot extremist nationalist group National Popular Front were prevented on the commemoration day of EOKA's armed terror campaign from entering the cemetery of former EOKA members and some were arrested for swearing at Greek Cypriot leader Christofias. Claiming that prior permission to enter the premises had been received, event organizer Hristodolus Nikolaidis stated that the ensuing arrests were therefore illegal. ELAM press spokesman Aristidu Marinos spoke as follows: "We do not consider ourselves Hellenic Nationalists. We believe that the Cyprus problem is a matter of invasion and occupation, not of two equal communities. We view the Turkish Cypriots as a minority, not a community."
- According to the Turkish Cypriot daily Havadis newspaper's April 21, 2011 publication, Eastern Mediterranean University's Visual Arts & Visual Communication Design Faculty's acceptance to the International Council of Graphic Design Association (ICOGRADA) has been protested by South Cyprus. South Cyprus' Nicosia University, also a member of ICOGRADA, demanded that EMU withdraw its membership immediately.
- According to the 2010 Human Rights Report of the US State Department, racist conflicts in South Cyprus in the form of terror, arbitrariness and whitewash have been recorded. Greek Cypriot daily Politis newspaper reported on April 11, 2011 that discrimination against minority groups, women and children were prevalent in South Cyprus, and cited that a fascist attack against Turkish Cypriots was perpetrated by APOEL and ELAM supporters, and a Turkish Cypriot musician was stabbed during the Rainbow Festival in Larnaca.
- According to the Turkish Cypriot daily Havadis newspaper's April 26 article, Greece hindered the TRNC's participation in the International Children's Games and caused it to withdraw from the competition. The newspaper also stated that South Cyprus publically declared that it would never participate in the same competition as Northern Cyprus.
- The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) Fourth Report on Cyprus, published on May 31 2011, strongly recommends that Greek Cypriot authorities take steps to ensure that free legal aid is offered to victims of human rights violations, racism and racial discrimination, indicating that this is currently not being done. The report further recommends that security forces, judges and

prosecutors pursue intensive human rights training, emphasizing that the current level of training in this field is inadequate.

- According to ECRI, the protection of the human rights of immigrants has also been reported as inadequate and their integration into the rest of the Greek Cypriot society has been difficult. ECRI therefore recommends that Greek Cypriot authorities offer wider support to immigrants and asylum seekers. Mistreatment is not, however, limited to these groups and Turkish Cypriots living in South Cyprus also suffer from insufficient protection. Furthermore, Turkish Cypriots visiting South Cyprus from the North are often confronted with intolerance and many groups wishing to limit the freedom of movement across the Greek Line exist.
- Regarding intolerance and discrimination in the Greek Cypriot education system, ECRI recommends that human rights courses should be made compulsory at both the primary and secondary school level. Again, these recorded observations are proof of the current lack of attention to matters of human rights in Greek Cypriot society and that little has been done thus far to remedy the situation.
- According to the Greek Cypriot weekly Cyprus Weekly newspaper's June 3-9 publication, ECRI states that there is a general lack of will to effectively fight racism in South Cyprus. It is also reported that there is a lack of will to eliminate the legal and political issues related to the education system which affect Turkish Cypriots residing in South Cyprus. The report also highlights and criticizes the denial by South Cyprus to issue citizenship documents to those whose one parent or both parents are citizens of Turkey.
- According to Turkish Cypriot daily Kibris newspaper's Friday July 22 publication, various members of the Greek Cypriot extreme nationalist organization, ELAM, recently terrorized and vandalized a Turkish Cypriot neighborhood in Larnaca by painting over signs bearing Turkish street names. It was reported that no one was arrested as a result of the attacks. In response to the 20th of July celebrations to take place in North Cyprus the following day, ELAM members gathered at a church on the night of July 19th, advanced into the Turkish Cypriot neighborhood and painted all of the Turkish street names in black. When residents of the neighborhood notified the authorities of what was happening, attention was drawn to the fact that the Greek Cypriot press appeared uninterested in the matter. It has been recorded that while approximately 200 Turkish Cypriots resided in Larnaca up until a few years ago, this number has gradually diminished due to the notable escalation of acts of racism in South Cyprus. A Greek Cypriot resident of Larnaca was later interviewed regarding the incident and was reported stating that "If we are unable to make such a small number of Turkish Cypriots here happy and are working towards getting rid of them instead, I wonder how we will all live together in the future", and blamed Greek Cypriot leader Christofias for failing to take the necessary precautions in this respect. A Greek Cypriot resident who chose to remain anonymous claimed that they informed the Greek Cypriot press of the incident as soon as it occurred, but that nothing appeared in the news the following day. "Everyone is afraid," he spoke. It was also discovered that various ELAM members have threatened to kill the Turkish Cypriots in the area in the past. A Turkish Cypriot resident further stated that threats have been made towards various Greek Cypriots with differing ideals as well, and added "EOKA has surfaced in the South once again. Don't be surprised if internal conflict erupts soon."
- As of April 2011, hotels in North Cyprus were being advertised on tourism website booking.com. Upon this development, the hotels were informed by booking.com that they have been receiving letters from Greek Cypriot lobbies pressuring them to

remove the North Cyprus hotel advertisements from their website and stop all bookings to these hotels.

- The office of the Euro-Mediterranean Medical Informatics and Telemedicine 7th International Conference, which was scheduled to take place between 6-12 October 2011 in North Cyprus in cooperation with the Near East University, has been contacted recently by the Greek Cypriot authorities who have been pressuring the relevant authorities to change the location of the conference. The Greek Cypriots exerted undue pressures on the organization to change the location of the conference to a location other than the TRNC, alleging that the TRNC is not eligible to host an international conference due to matters concerning its “legality”.
 - During the second half of the game between APOEL and Zenit on Wednesday, 23 November, fanatic fans set fire to the TRNC flag. The game was held in Saint Petersburg Stadium and during the first half of the game tensions arose, requiring the referee to stop the game for a few minutes until they subsided. In the second half of the game, however, the fans of Zenit opened posters declaring that ‘Cyprus is Greek’s’ and set fire to the TRNC flag, demonstrating once again the ongoing acts of hatred towards Turkish Cypriots. It is expected for UEFA to impose serious sanctions on Zenit in the future.
 - The women’s volleyball game between Apollon and Galatasaray on Thursday, 8 December in Limassol was disrupted by fan violence. Apollon fans threw objects, advanced onto the court after the game and tried to physically attack the players. The police intervened in attempts to stop the fanatic fans, having to use tear gas to control them. After the final set, Galatasaray left the field under the protection of the police. The fans shouted racist slogans against Turkey and waved flags of Greece during and after the game. The Galatasaray team was accompanied by the police until they arrived at their hotel.
-