



General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 December 2020

Original: English

Seventy-fifth session

Agenda items 44 and 130 (b)

Question of Cyprus

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and other organizations: cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation

Letter dated 9 December 2020 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 3 December 2020, addressed to you by Mehmet Dâna, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I would be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 44 and 130 (b).

(Signed) Feridun H. Sinirlioğlu
Permanent Representative



Annex to the letter dated 9 December 2020 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I am writing in response to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot representative during the 31st plenary meeting of the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly, on 23 November 2020, following the adoption of the resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) under agenda item 130 (b).

At the outset, it should be noted that the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus, in its current form, is not the 1960 Republic of Cyprus, the legitimacy of which lay in the joint and effective participation of the two peoples, namely the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. The 1960 Republic of Cyprus was converted, by force of arms, into a purely Greek Cypriot administration in 1963, and, since then, there has not been a single Government or Republic representing both peoples on the island. Rather, there exist two independent, self-governing States, each exercising sovereignty and jurisdiction within their respective territory. Therefore, the continuous attempts by the Greek Cypriot side, through oft-repeated false statements, to confer legitimacy upon the long-defunct “Republic of Cyprus” is devoid of any legal or moral basis.

Despite the well-known claims of the Greek Cypriot representative, the insistent rejection by the Greek Cypriot administration to share power and prosperity with the Turkish Cypriot side, the prerequisite of any partnership, has always been the main stumbling block for the efforts to find a settlement in Cyprus. Indeed, the language used by the Greek Cypriot leadership often reveals the Greek Cypriot perception of the Turkish Cypriot people. Most recently, the Greek Cypriot leader, Nicos Anastasiades, has made a statement during his address to the United Nations General Assembly to the effect that Turkish Cypriots cannot be afforded effective participation in a settlement as they are controlled by Turkey and this will continue even after a negotiated settlement. This utter disrespect to the Turkish Cypriot people, their democratic will, elected representatives as well as their institutions, is yet another indication that the Greek Cypriot leadership is only paying lip service to a partnership settlement based on equality and power-sharing.

The Greek Cypriot representative continues to employ diversion tactics to conceal the sole responsibility of the Greek Cypriot side in the failure of the settlement efforts to this date, including the Comprehensive Settlement Plan, which was put into separate and simultaneous referendums in April 2004 on both sides of the island as a manifestation of the fact that there are two separate populations in Cyprus, namely the Turkish Cypriot people and Greek Cypriot people. As it would be remembered, the Greek Cypriot people overwhelmingly rejected the United Nations-brokered peace plan by 76 per cent of the votes, while 65 per cent of the Turkish Cypriot population voted in favour of the Plan. The fate of the latest process of negotiations held in Crans-Montana in July 2017 unfortunately was not very different due to the lack of political will of the Greek Cypriot side to share power and prosperity with the Turkish Cypriots on an equal footing.

In this context, I also would like to refer to the report submitted to the Security Council in 2004 ([S/2004/437](#)) by the then Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, whereby he states: “I would hope they [the members of the Security Council] can give a strong lead to all States to cooperate both bilaterally and in international bodies to eliminate unnecessary restrictions and barriers that have the effect of isolating the Turkish Cypriots and impeding their development, deeming such a move as consistent with Security Council resolutions [541 \(1983\)](#) and [550 \(1984\)](#).” Hence, the remarks of the

Greek Cypriot representative can only be considered as yet another attempt to distort the realities with a view to severing the ties and presence of the Turkish Cypriots in international organizations and to further solidifying the unjust isolation imposed on them by limiting their access to and contact with the rest of the world. Furthermore, you rightly urged in the most recent report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus dated 10 July 2020 (S/2020/682) “[promotion] of closer cooperation between the communities, local and international actors”, adding that “concerns about recognition should not in themselves constitute an insurmountable obstacle to increased cooperation”.

It is ironic that a representative of the Greek Cypriot administration, which has paid lip service to the United Nations parameters for settlement in Cyprus for 50 years and actively drove its people to overwhelmingly reject “not the blueprint but the settlement itself” at the separate and simultaneous referendums held in April 2004 on both sides on the island, as expressed by the then Secretary-General in his above-mentioned report, complains about references in the OIC documents contradicting the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus. OIC documents, rather than contradicting United Nations resolutions, in fact reflect the realities on the ground, namely that there are two administrations/states on the island, which came about as a result of usurpation by the Greek Cypriot side of the title of the 1960 partnership Republic of Cyprus and forcible and illegal expulsion of the Turkish Cypriot partner from all state organs, culminating in the attempt to annex the island to Greece in 1974. This situation had left the Turkish Cypriot side with no other alternative but to organize and rule itself under its own administration evolving into a State. The missing part of the puzzle which has prevented a negotiated settlement on the island all these years has been the failure by the international community to honour the fact that as two equal co-owners of the island, if the Greek Cypriot side has the right to a state, it follows that the Turkish Cypriot side does so too.

I also would like to remind the Greek Cypriot representative that United Nations resolutions merely reflect the common vision agreed by the two sides and not vice versa. Today there is no longer an agreed common vision in Cyprus since it has been rejected over and over again, most recently in 2004 and 2017, by the Greek Cypriot administration itself, making the Cyprus problem intractable. It is clear to us as the Turkish Cypriot side that talks for the sake of talks merely serve the Greek Cypriot side’s purpose, which is to keep the Turkish Cypriot side hostage to the negotiation table, while it continues to abuse the benefits of the so-called Government of Cyprus in violation of the inalienable rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, including their right to have their voice heard at the 31st plenary meeting of the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly, held on 23 November 2020. As the Turkish Cypriot people we see this for what it is and will not allow this mala fide to continue.

As the Greek Cypriot representative is clearly aware, the Turkish intervention, which was carried out in accordance with Turkey’s rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, did not come about until 1974 and was the direct result of the coup d’état carried out by the joint Greek-Greek Cypriot front, which aimed to annex the island to Greece (enosis) and annihilate the Turkish Cypriot people in line with the notorious Akritas Plan. Therefore, in a futile attempt to divert attention from the gross human rights violations perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots between 1963 and 1974 and the illegal occupation of the seat of “the Government of Cyprus” by the Greek Cypriot administration, the Greek Cypriot representative is levelling baseless allegations against Turkey.

In closing, the Greek Cypriot administration should once again be reminded that its counterpart is, and has always been, the Turkish Cypriot side, and denial of this fact does not bode well for the prospects of finding a sustainable negotiated settlement on the island.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 44 and 130 (b).

(Signed) Mehmet **Dânâ**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
