



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/11071
2 November 1973

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 2 NOVEMBER 1973 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
CYPRUS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to refer to a communication of the Permanent Representative of Turkey (S/11008) of 5 October, transmitting a reply by Mr. Denktash to my letter of 17 August in which the latter makes another vain effort to cast doubt as to the "unitary State" being the agreed basis of the current talks, notwithstanding the explicit statements to that effect by both Secretary-General Waldheim and former Secretary-General U Thant. In that effort, Mr. Denktash refers to a statement by the Turkish representative in the Security Council (S/PV.1564 of 10 December 1970) and quotes half a sentence, omitting the other half, which happens to be the part directly bearing upon the point at issue in our present discussion, as showing the concurrence of the Turkish representative to the "unitary State" being the agreed basis of the talks.

The omitted part of the Turkish representative's sentence runs as follows:

"The Turkish community has been motivated by the same purpose expressed by the Secretary-General and has directed itself to the re-establishment of an independent, sovereign and unitary State."

The half-sentence quoted by Mr. Denktash expresses merely the Turkish representative's preference for "local autonomy and not local government" and in no way disputes the agreed basis of "unitary State".

Incidentally, it should be made clear that as between "local autonomy" and "local government" there is hardly any actual difference in the context, inasmuch as both terms are governed and circumscribed by the qualifying word "local", which by necessary implication connotes control by a central government. Furthermore, either of these terms, when used in relation to a unitary State - as is the case with the Turkish representative's statement - can only mean such degree of local autonomy as would be consistent with the concept of unitary State and would fall within its framework, in accordance with generally established constitutional norms.

As to Mr. Denktash's reference to the aide mémoires of 18 October 1971 and of 18 May 1972, these are wholly irrelevant to the issue, as they deal with the procedural aspect only and not the substantial basis of the reactivated talks.

Regrettably, Mr. Denktash appears to be elusively shifting his ground towards positions of such divisiveness as to be patently unworkable and totally unacceptable, aside from their being in direct conflict with the agreed basis of a "unitary State". It should, in this respect, be recalled that the fundamental structure of the Republic of Cyprus since its establishment is admittedly that of a unitary State. And it could not be otherwise by the very realities of the geographic distribution of an intermingled population throughout the island without any pattern of natural separation, as was so categorically declared by the eminent constitutional authority Lord Radcliffe - commissioned to deal with the subject by the British Government shortly before independence - who completely ruled out both partition and federation.

Yet, a lingering obsession for the hopelessness of partition - sad relic of a colonialist policy - lies behind the invariably negative stance of Mr. Denktash towards any workable provisions for an independent, sovereign and unitary State, namely, the objective purpose of the talks.

Concepts of partition, however, even in countries where a pattern of natural separation made them appear as possibly applicable, have definitely proved, during the last 25 years, to be an unending scourge of conflict and bloodshed involving even wider dangers of expanded war. International crises at the present time, with threatening global implications, may serve as cases in point.

In our present era of a rapidly evolving interdependent world, necessarily moving towards more unified political and social structures, as in Europe and other parts of the world, Cyprus could not be compelled to move irrationally and perilously in the reverse direction; nor could it do so without dire consequences to its people and to the cause of peace. We, therefore, hope it will be fully realized by those in the leadership of our co-citizens of Turkish origin that the endeavour for the solution of the problem of Cyprus cannot be advanced by extremist separatism or the sterile pursuit of perpetuated division, antagonism and conflict, but only through co-operation in a spirit of equal justice, mutual understanding and unity. This spirit, I am happy to say, is ever alive among the bulk of the Cypriot people, Greek and Turkish alike, as has been emphasized in a number of reports by the Secretary-General (S/7191, S/7350, S/7969, S/8446 and S/8914). Upon it, a just, democratic and enduring solution of the problem, in accordance with the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, can well be reached to the benefit of all sections of the Cypriot people.

Thus redeemed, our small but historic island, having traditional and close associations with the people of all three neighbouring continents, may be enabled to bring more effectively its modest but constructive contribution towards peaceful and harmonious developments in that sorely tried region of the Middle East and more widely in the world.

Your Excellency is kindly requested to have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Zenon ROSSIDES
Ambassador

Permanent Representative of
Cyprus to the United Nations