

General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/50/669 S/1995/882 23 October 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY Fiftieth session Agenda item 55 QUESTION OF CYPRUS SECURITY COUNCIL Fiftieth year

<u>Letter dated 19 October 1995 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General</u>

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 17 October 1995, addressed to you by Mr. Osman Ertuğ, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 55, and of the Security Council.

(<u>Signed</u>) Hüseyin E. CELEM

Ambassador

Permanent Representative

95-32099 (E) 241095 /...

ANNEX

<u>Letter dated 17 October 1995 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ</u> to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the gross distortion of the realities of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot representative, Mr. Nicos Agathocleous, at the 29th plenary meeting of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, held on 11 October 1995. In view of the absence of any Turkish Cypriot representation at the said meeting, due to the usurpation and continued monopolization of the title of "the Government of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot administration since 1963, I am compelled to exercise my right of reply in writing.

In his statement, the Greek Cypriot representative deliberately ignored the background to the Cyprus question, by portraying it as a question of "invasion and occupation" by Turkey, having arisen in 1974 with the onset of the Turkish intervention. This begs the question why a United Nations peace-keeping force has been stationed on the island since March 1964. The truth of the matter is that the Cyprus question and the present division of the island have not come about as a result of the so-called "invasion and occupation of Cyprus by Turkey", as alleged, but by the Greek-Greek Cypriot conspiracy and overt acts of violence during the period 1963-1974 aimed at converting a bi-communal State into a Greek Cypriot State prior to annexing the island to Greece (enOSIS). In current terminology, the joint action of Greece and the Greek Cypriots during that period was clearly an act of "ethnic cleansing", since it aimed at the complete elimination of the Turkish Cypriot community through massacre, terror, expulsion, and intimidation, in accordance with an insidious plan known as the "Akritas Plan".

The Greek Cypriot representative fails to accept the fact that, as can be seen in the following words of the late Archbishop Makarios, in his dramatic speech before the Security Council on 19 July 1974, prior to the Turkish intervention, there had been an invasion of Cyprus by Greece:

"The coup of the Greek junta is an invasion, and from its consequences the whole people of Cyprus suffers, both Greeks and Turks. ... The Security Council should call upon the military regime of Greece to withdraw from Cyprus the Greek officers serving in the National Guard, and to put an end to its invasion of Cyprus."

Turkey responded to this grave and lawless situation by exercising her rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. The Turkish intervention in Cyprus was, therefore, fully legitimate under the said Treaty, and completely justified, since it saved the Turkish Cypriots from extermination and safeguarded the bi-national independence of Cyprus.

It hardly needs to be stressed that, in the absence of a political settlement, the Turkish military presence on the island is a vital security requirement for the Turkish Cypriot people. This presence has served the cause of peace in the island in the last 21 years, as evidenced by the absence of any armed strife during this period. In the face of the possibility of the

repetition of aggression against the Turkish Cypriots by Greece and the Greek Cypriots, who have again joined forces under the so-called "joint defence doctrine" and are threatening to overrun Northern Cyprus, the maintenance of the Turkish deterrent becomes all the more critical.

It is evident from the Greek Cypriot representative's allegations on "refugees", "settlers" and the "violation of international law" that the Greek Cypriot side will exploit any issue or fabricate new ones simply to provide a smokescreen for its continued campaign of militarization coupled with its rejection of power-sharing with the Turkish Cypriots on the basis of political equality, as also envisaged in the relevant United Nations resolutions. It is clear that under no circumstances does the Greek Cypriot side intend to relinquish the title of "the Government of Cyprus" which it usurped by force of arms in December 1963. Rather than paying lip service to international law, the Greek Cypriot administration should first account for its own systematic destruction of the rule of law in Cyprus since then, which inevitably led to the present situation. In this connection, the following words of the then President of the Supreme Constitutional Court of Cyprus, the late Professor Ernst Forsthoff, are as relevant today as they were then:

"All this happened because Makarios wanted to remove all constitutional rights from the Turkish Cypriots. From the moment Makarios started openly to deprive the Turkish Cypriots of their rights, the present events were inevitable." (Interview given to a UPI correspondent on 30 December 1963)

As for the question of displaced persons, I would like to remind the Greek Cypriot side that this issue has been fundamentally settled between the two sides through the Third Vienna Agreement, dated 2 August 1975, whereby the two sides formally agreed to exchange populations. The Agreement was implemented under United Nations supervision in September 1975, paving the way for a bi-zonal, bi-communal settlement of the Cyprus issue. Both the Agreement and its implementation are well recorded in the relevant United Nations documents (see S/11789 of 5 August 1975 and S/11789/Add.1 of 10 September 1975). Any remaining problem connected with this issue is a subject for the inter-communal talks and the Greek Cypriot side would do well to come to the negotiating table to discuss all issues concerning Cyprus, rather than generating baseless propaganda on this or other subjects thus undermining prospects for reconciliation.

It must also be stated that it is the Greek Cypriot side which, together with Greece, has always attempted to alter the demographic character of Cyprus, not only by introducing thousands of soldiers and settlers from Greece since the 1940s but also by trying to "cleanse" Cyprus of its ethnic Turkish population. At present, the Greek Cypriots continue to admit tens of thousands of immigrants and others from other countries, and as a result of its irresponsible policies, South Cyprus has become, as widely reported in the international press, a centre for money-laundering, drug and arms smuggling and other illicit activity.

It should be obvious from the above that the Greek Cypriots are among the least qualified people to talk of respect for "human rights" when successive reports of the Secretary-General and international press reports attest to the fact that during the period 1963-1974 there was a systematic campaign of ethnic

A/50/669 S/1995/882 English Page 4

cleansing directed against the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot side. Today, the Greek Cypriot side wages a vicious campaign of defamation and propaganda against the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey, which is inherently racist, and an all-out inhuman embargo on the people of Northern Cyprus. In addition, by maintaining the myth of a "Turkish threat" Greece and the Greek Cypriot side are engaged in an unprecedented build-up of arms and armed forces in South Cyprus, within the context of the "joint defence doctrine" which is none other than a manifestation of the age-old irredentist dream of making Cyprus a Hellenic island, as part of creating a "Greater Greece".

I am confident that the international community, in its approach to the Cyprus issue, will duly take into account the implications of such adventurism for the process of negotiations and the peace and stability of the region.

I would be grateful if the present letter is circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 55, and of the Security Council.

(<u>Signed</u>) Osman ERTUĞ Representative Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
