

**Security Council**

Distr.: General  
16 April 2025

Original: English

---

**Letter dated 15 April 2025 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 15 April 2025, 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 Security Council.

(Signed) Ahmet Yıldız  
Permanent Representative



## **Annex to the letter dated 15 April 2025 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 statement of the Greek Cypriot representative dated 24 March 2025, made during the Security Council open debate on the theme “Advancing adaptability in United Nations peace operations: responding to new realities”, which once again blatantly distorts facts pertaining to Cyprus. 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 issue. Therefore, I am compelled to respond in writing in order to set the record straight.

At the outset, let me underline once again that none of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus describe the legitimate and justified Turkish presence on the island, which is in line with the 1959 international Cyprus treaties, as “occupation”. As is known, guarantor Türkiye had to intervene after 11 years of Turkish Cypriot suffering 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 today the guarantee system in Cyprus is even more relevant and necessary than it has ever been.

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 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 Cypriot people, known as the Akritas Plan, with the ultimate aim of achieving enosis. This large-scale violence and the ensuing gross human rights violations necessitated the Security Council to deploy the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) in 1964 in order to stop the bloodshed and the atrocities perpetrated against the Turkish Cypriot people. The persistent attempts of the Greek Cypriot side to create a smokescreen before this reality by exploiting to the fullest its usurped title cannot change the historical facts of the island in relation to who is the aggressor and who is the victim in Cyprus. 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 statement is a testament to the fact that it is another episode of the well-known Greek Cypriot propaganda machinery.

With regard to the comments made by the Greek Cypriot representative about the UNFICYP mandate, it should be recalled that the Brahimi report on peacekeeping operations ([A/55/305–S/2000/809](#)) clearly states that “consent of the local parties [and] impartiality ... should remain the bedrock principles of peacekeeping”. As specified in the publication *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*, in the absence of such consent, a United Nations peacekeeping operation risks becoming a party to the conflict and being drawn away from its inherent role of keeping the peace. In this context, in order to uphold the fundamental principles of successful peacekeeping operations and ensure that 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”, is not perpetuated, the United

Nations must also seek and obtain the consent of the Turkish Cypriot side regarding the activities of UNFICYP in Cyprus.

Against this background, it is clear that the misleading remarks of the Greek Cypriot representative are not corroborated by legal and historical facts pertaining to the island. Thus, instead of levelling unfounded accusations, the Greek Cypriot side should adopt a sincere approach for the solution of the Cyprus issue on the basis of 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 also like to 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 could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

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

---