



**General Assembly
Security Council**

Distr.: General
2 July 2001

Original: English

**General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 64
Question of Cyprus**

**Security Council
Fifty-sixth year**

**Letter dated 28 June 2001 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 25 June 2001, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Umit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



Annex to the letter dated 28 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I would like to refer to the letter dated 29 May 2001 addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative at the United Nations (A/55/970-S/2001/541) concerning the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) by the Security Council.

It is clear from the tone of this letter that the Greek Cypriot side is not interested in a new partnership with the Turkish Cypriot side on the basis of political equality as a former partner in the 1960 Republic of Cyprus which was destroyed by the Greek Cypriot side in 1963. The purpose of the Greek Cypriot onslaught in 1963 was to convert the island into a Greek Cypriot republic and render the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner a minority. The Greek Cypriot side has not succeeded in achieving this aim as the Turkish Cypriots valiantly defended their rights for 11 years from 1963 to 1974 and defied the illegal Greek Cypriot regime which tried to impose its will on them as the so-called "Government of Cyprus", after declaring the Constitution to be dead and buried. The Greek Cypriot side is still of the opinion that they can dictate their terms and their authority on the Turkish Cypriot people. One should never lose sight of the fact that the Greek Cypriot side, in pursuit of an unlawful aim, namely the union of the island with Greece, tried deliberately to destroy a guaranteed system of partnership resting on the political equality and effective participation of the two sides in the Government and on the mutually agreed principle that one community would not impose its will on the other. The *state of affairs* created by the 1960 Agreements was based on the internal balance between the two co-founder peoples in Cyprus and the external balance between Turkey and Greece over the island.

The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was set up by the Turkish Cypriot people, 20 years after having been forced out of the state by force of arms. After the failure of all attempts to settle the Cyprus issue by establishing a new partnership on the basis of equality, the Turkish Cypriot people had no alternative but to declare their own independent state in order to prove to the Greek Cypriots, and those who supported them as the so-called legitimate "Government of Cyprus", that Turkish Cypriots have not and will not accept this *fait accompli* created by Greek Cypriot aggression.

The reference made by the Greek Cypriot representative in his letter to the TRNC as a "subordinate local administration in the occupied areas of Cyprus" is an insult to each one of us, an insult which we cannot ignore. The allegation that we are trying to exploit the issue of the renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP in order to gain some form of recognition or acknowledgement for what they call a "secessionist entity" is a further insult and an affront to our efforts to re-establish a new partnership on the basis of absolute equality between the two existing States in Cyprus.

The allegation by the Greek Cypriot representative that Turkey is pursuing a long-standing objective of legalizing its aggression against the "Republic of Cyprus" is a further insult to injury, knowing full well that it is the Greek Cypriot side which has taken up arms in order to destroy an internationally established partnership Republic for purposes which the 1960 Agreements prohibited. There was no

secession on the part of the Turkish Cypriot side but there was a bloody coup d'état by the Greek Cypriot side to take over a partnership state by ejecting the Turkish Cypriots from the state. As a consequence, the Turkish Cypriots exercised their right to establish their own legal administration in order to survive as a nation.

The Government of Turkey has been pursuing its efforts to help the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus to establish with the Greek Cypriot side a new partnership on the basis of a new agreement. Turkey's recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is a valid proof of the intention of Turkey to continue to protect the Turkish Cypriot people as co-founder partner of the former 1960 Republic and as co-founder partner of any agreement that will be made in the future. Without this guarantee it is clear that there can be no new partnership with the former Greek Cypriot partner.

It is an irrefutable fact that UNFICYP cannot function in Cyprus without the consent of the parties involved in the conflict and Security Council resolutions clearly indicate that the parties in the conflict and the parties which will settle this conflict, without any interference from outside, are the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot parties. The attempt to enforce UNFICYP's presence in the North under the pretext that the so-called Government of Cyprus (i.e. the Greek Cypriot party) has consented to its creation is unacceptable and will be resisted.

Furthermore, the fact that the composition and size of the force shall be established by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a clear indication that without the consent of the parties involved there can be no renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus. The Government of Cyprus in resolution 186 (1964) clearly refers to the bi-communal partnership government as envisaged by the 1960 Agreements.

The bi-communal partnership set-up has been destroyed by force of arms by the Greek Cypriot side. Currently, there exists an authority in the North which has all the attributes of a proper, democratically constituted State. Therefore it is necessary that until the dispute is settled between the two parties, the consent of both parties should be taken while extending the mandate of the Force.

In this context, it should be emphasized that the local military arrangements along the ceasefire line have been established with full participation of Turkish Cypriot authorities in those efforts. The Greek Cypriot representative has tried to conceal this fact. Even the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Brahimi report) is purposely misrepresented. The Brahimi report explicitly states that peace operations have to be with the consent of the parties involved. This principle is underlined in paragraph 48 of the Brahimi report (A/55/305-S/2000/809): "The panel concurs that consent of the local parties, impartiality and use of force only in self-defence should remain the bedrock principles of peacekeeping".

The allegation by the Greek Cypriot side that the Cyprus issue is a question of foreign invasion and occupation of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, by the Republic of Turkey, is not borne out by historical facts. I would like to emphasize that Turkey intervened in Cyprus, in accordance with her rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, following the Greek-Greek Cypriot coup d'état in July 1974, the aim of which was the annexation of the island by Greece. Turkish

intervention prevented not only the colonization of the island by Greece but also the annihilation of the Turkish Cypriot people at the hands of the Greek Cypriots and the invading Greek troops.

It is alleged that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus depends entirely on the “occupying power” which finances its budget. The Greek Cypriot side, which has thrown out the Turkish Cypriots from the budget of Cyprus, now for 38 years, is not the authority to complain about who finances the budget of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Had it not been for the assistance and protection provided by Turkey, there would have been no Turkish Cypriot today in Cyprus.

The attempt to deal with the Cyprus issue on the basis of percentages of population is totally wrong and misleading because the relationship of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot partners in the body politic of Cyprus was not that of a majority and minority but that of two politically equal national communities, one looking at Turkey and the other at Greece as motherlands, which became the guarantors of the *state of affairs* created by the international Cyprus agreements. The *state of affairs* rested on the principle that neither of the parties had the right to rule the other, nor could either of them assume the right to be the government of both or the island as a whole.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that the attempt by the Greek Cypriot side to misuse Security Council resolutions which wrongly treat the Greek Cypriot side as the Government of Cyprus at the expense of the rule of law and international agreements is a clear indication that they are not for settling the issue on the basis of a new partnership. The Turkish Cypriot side will work towards a settlement on the basis of two States which would respect the sovereign and equal rights of both peoples and their security interests. We hope that the international community will urge the Greek Cypriot side to adopt a realistic approach that would facilitate such a settlement in Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ Plümer
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus