

**Security Council**

Distr.: General  
8 May 2024

Original: English

---

**Letter dated 7 May 2024 from the Permanent Representative of Türkiye to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 6 May 2024, addressed to the Secretary-General 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 Security Council.

(Signed) Ahmet Yıldız  
Permanent Representative



## **Annex to the letter dated 7 May 2024 from the Permanent Representative of Türkiye to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I am writing in response to the letters of the Greek representative dated 4 April 2024 (S/2024/291) and the Greek Cypriot representative dated 8 April 2024 (S/2024/298), which once again blatantly distort facts pertaining to Cyprus. Greek and Greek Cypriot representatives have long been exploiting the absence of the Turkish Cypriot side at international platforms in order to mislead the international community and to divert the attention from their sole responsibility for the creation as well as the continuation of the Cyprus problem. Therefore, I am compelled to respond in writing in order to set the record straight.

Let me underline, once again, at the outset that, as a matter of fact, none of the United Nations Security Council resolutions on Cyprus describe the legitimate and justified Turkish intervention in the island, carried out in line with the 1959 international Cyprus treaties, as “invasion” or its subsequent presence on the island as “occupation”. As is known, guarantor Türkiye had to intervene after 11 years of Turkish Cypriot ordeal at the hands of the Greek Cypriot militia, which culminated in the coup attempt organized by the military junta in Athens and its Greek Cypriot collaborators, aiming to annex the entire island to Greece (enosis) and the total annihilation of Turkish Cypriot people. In view of the foregoing, as well as the current human suffering inflicted by recent conflicts worldwide, it is without any doubt that the guarantee system in Cyprus is more relevant and necessary than ever.

Furthermore, it should be underlined that the Cyprus problem commenced in 1963, not in 1974, when the Greek Cypriot side forcibly usurped the title of the partnership Republic of Cyprus and expelled the Turkish Cypriot partner from all State organs. During the years from 1963 to 1974, a period that Greek and Greek Cypriot representatives have conveniently chosen to ignore, the Greek Cypriot militia, aided and encouraged by Greece, took part in an ethnic cleansing campaign against Turkish Cypriots, known as the Akritas Plan, with the ultimate aim of achieving enosis. This large-scale violence and ensuing gross human rights violations necessitated the Security Council deploying the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus in 1964 in order to stop the bloodshed and the atrocities perpetrated against the Turkish Cypriot people. Notwithstanding the plethora of United Nations documents attesting to these crimes against humanity, the fact that there is no single reference to it in the said letters is a testament to the fact that they are not fact based, but another episode of the well-known Greek and Greek Cypriot propaganda machinery.

Regarding the comments made by the Greek and the Greek Cypriot representatives about the Cyprus problem, it should be noted that, after more than 50 years of negotiations on the same framework and outdated parameters, it has become unequivocally clear that insisting on this categorically failed formula only serves the perpetuation of the unacceptable and unsustainable status quo on the island, where the Greek Cypriot side is treated as if it is the “legitimate government of the whole island” and the Turkish Cypriot side is treated as if it is a mere “community”. This disparity in the treatment of sides allows the Greek Cypriot administration to enjoy the benefits of its unlawful and unjust status and keep the Turkish Cypriot people under an all-encompassing inhuman isolation. These are the reasons why the Turkish Cypriot side no longer consents to an agreement based on a “bi-zonal, bi-communal federation”. As is known, the Greek Cypriot side indeed only pays lip service to this failed framework, as evidenced by its intransigent approach in the past negotiation processes, including the Annan Plan in 2004 and the Conference on Cyprus held in Crans-Montana, Switzerland, in 2017. In line with your remarks that “this time must be different”, we have been sincerely and positively engaged with your Personal

Envoy since her appointment in carrying out her agreed time-bound mandate, i.e. to explore whether common ground exists or not between the two sides to start a new and formal negotiation process, which can only take place following the reaffirmation of our sovereign equality and equal international status.

Against this background, it is clear that the misleading remarks of the Greek and the Greek Cypriot representatives are not corroborated by legal and historical facts pertaining to the island. Thus, instead of levelling unfounded accusations, they should adopt a sincere approach for an agreement to be reached on the Cyprus issue in line with the current realities of the island, which would, inter alia, respect the inherent rights of the Turkish Cypriot people.

Availing myself of the present opportunity, I would like to also remind the Greek Cypriot administration that its counterpart is, and has always been, the Turkish Cypriot side, not Türkiye.

I would be grateful if the present letter were circulated as a document of the Security Council.

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

---