

UNITED NATIONS



GENERAL ASSEMBLY SECURITY COUNCIL

Distr.
GENERAL

A/33/98
S/12702
12 May 1978

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Thirty-third session
Item 28 of the preliminary list*
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Thirty-third year

Letter dated 12 May 1978 from the Permanent Representative of
Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to a letter dated 26 April 1978 circulated at the request of the Permanent Representative of Turkey (NV/78/36), to which was annexed a document by Mr. Rauf Denktash as President of the so-called "Turkish Federated State of Cyprus".

Mr. Denktash's statement starts with a deliberate misnomer. There is no Turkish State in the Republic of Cyprus and none is recognized by the international community and the United Nations.

The reality is as follows:

First, the territory on which the illogical claim for such a state is made, is none other than the 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus invaded by Turkey in July 1974 and still under its aggressive occupation in violation of the United Nations resolutions for the withdrawal of the foreign occupation forces and the return of the refugees to their homes in safety.

Second, the legitimate population of this territory is, and has been over the ages, 82 per cent Greek Cypriot and 18 per cent Turkish Cypriot. The recent criminality in the genocidal expulsion of the Greek Cypriot majority from the invaded area and the forcible implanting in their usurped homes of alien population imported from Turkey cannot alter the legitimate population of the territory involved, nor wipe out their inalienable right to return to their homes in safety. How can the offspring of such a complex of international crimes claim to be a state and be tolerated by the United Nations or any civilized world society?

The Turkish proposals for a so-called "solution" of this grave problem of Cyprus, submitted to the Secretary-General, are in substance and effect but a bid for the legitimization of the aforesaid acts of aggression and faits accomplis, on a pre-planned design by Ankara for the virtual partition of the island, with

* A/33/50/Rev.1.

annexation in prospect. The proposals are, therefore, basically different in kind from the agreed basis of a federation in an independent, sovereign and territorially integral State.

Suffice it to say that they are for two completely separate states, providing separate passports and consequently separate national identity and allegiance. In the proposals there is express division of sovereignty, which is totally incompatible with any concept of federation. The unity of the territory is denied and destroyed, while numerous provisions are clearly aimed at promoting and perpetuating the partition of the territory and the division of the people.

Such proposals do not envision even confederation. Their obvious purpose is but the legitimization of the aggression and its effects.

The President of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, as is natural, rejected these proposals, which by their nature violate the oneness of the State, its territorial integrity and sovereign independence as well as the agreed constitutional basis for a federation.

It is true that the Secretary-General referred to these proposals as "concrete and substantial". But Mr. Denktash bypasses the clarification, made immediately afterwards by the Secretary-General, to the effect that his statement had no relevance to the merits of the proposals and was no indication that the proposals were either positive or negative. The proposals, however, should primarily be positive on the agreed lines of a federation for the survival of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus as one State, and obviously not be "concrete and substantial" in the negative direction, as the death sentence of the Republic and the abolition of its independent existence.

The illogical insistence on the part of Ankara, expressed through Mr. Denktash, that proposals of such kind must be accepted as a basis for negotiation is but a manifestation of the aggressor's arrogance. Characteristic also of such arrogance are the threatening statements by Ankara's official, Mr. Soysal, to the effect that, in case of non-acceptance of the proposals, "regrettable things may happen" (see A/33/93-S/12685 of 4 May 1978).

It is ludicrous for Mr. Denktash to suggest - unless the design is to entrap - that, after accepting to start negotiations on a particular basis, either side could in the course thereof depart from that accepted basis. Such conduct of bad faith we cannot adopt.

It should be made abundantly clear that no representative of the Government or the people of Cyprus, in whatever capacity, would be prepared to sit and discuss proposals so aggressively illogical and so ominous in their implications for the independence, territorial integrity and the very survival of his country and its people.

In reference to Mr. Denktash's rehashing of unsubstantiated and misleading statements regarding ill-treatment allegedly suffered by the Turkish Cypriots

/...

during the period 1963-1974, they have been effectively and unanswerably refuted by my statements in the Security Council on 30 August 1974 (S/PV.1795), the Special Political Committee on 29 October 1974 (A/SPC/PV.923) and the General Assembly on 8 October 1975 (A/PV.2380), quoting the authority of the six-monthly reports of the Secretary-General. The relevant records are available and speak for themselves.

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

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