



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/38/296
S/15866
12 July 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Thirty-eighth session
Item 41 of the preliminary list*
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Thirty-eighth year

Letter dated 11 July 1983 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

I have the honour to attach herewith a letter dated 11 July 1983 addressed to you by Mr. Nail Atalay, representative of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 41 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Onur GÖKÇE
Deputy Permanent Representative
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

* A/38/50/Rev.1

A/38/296
S/15866
English
Page 2

ANNEX

Letter dated 11 July 1983 from Mr. Nail Atalay to the
Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter dated 1 July 1983 addressed to Your Excellency by His Excellency Dr. Kenan Atakol, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 41 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nail Atalay
Representative of the Turkish
Federated State of Kibris

/...

APPENDIX

Letter dated 1 July 1983 from Mr. Kenan Atakol
to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to a letter dated 22 June 1983 addressed to you by Mr. Constantine Moushoutas, the so-called "Permanent Representative" of the Greek Cypriot administration to the United Nations, which was circulated as General Assembly and Security Council document A/38/284-S/15842 on 24 June 1983, and which concerns a resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris on 17 June 1983, reaffirming the inalienable right of the Turkish People of Cyprus to determine their own destiny.

I would like to point out at the outset that Mr. Moushoutas does not, and could not, represent the Republic of Cyprus as a whole, for he has no legal or moral right, authority or competence to represent the Turkish Cypriot people, which is the legitimate co-founder partner of the bi-national Republic of Cyprus. His above-mentioned letter, therefore, does not concern or bind, in any manner whatsoever, the Turkish Cypriot people, who have equal rights in the independence and sovereignty of the bi-national Republic, by virtue of this co-founder partner status.

I would like to point out at this juncture that the Turkish Cypriot people owe allegiance to the "legitimate" Government of Cyprus and to no one else, and in order for any Government in Cyprus to be legitimate, it has to be bi-communal. As the Turkish Cypriot component of the legitimate Government of Cyprus was forcefully ejected from the said Government in December 1963, and has not since been rehabilitated in a partnership Government no one can or should assume that the Turkish people of Cyprus, in any way, owe allegiance to the Greek Cypriot wing of that Government. UN documents since early 1964 prove beyond any doubt that the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner of the sovereignty and independence of Cyprus has never bowed to the illegal Greek Cypriot pretenders

/...

to the seat of Government and that their writ never ran over Turkish Cypriots or Turkish areas since December 1963.

The fact that the Greek Cypriot wing of the Republic has managed to pass itself off as the "Government of Cyprus" usurping and benefiting from all facilities of the State, does not in any way bind the Turkish Cypriot People, who have never accepted the illegal authority of the Greek Cypriot Administration and hence owe it no allegiance.

Claims which appear in Mr. Moushoutas' above-mentioned letter asserting that the Turkish Cypriots are only an "ethnic group" within a nation and, therefore, have no right of self-determination, and that this right belongs only to the Greek Cypriots as "the people of Cyprus" are an affront to both the principle of equality of peoples and their right to self-determination, provided for by the United Nations Charter, and runs counter to all political, juridical and international realities which gave birth to the bi-national Republic of Cyprus and to the process of inter-communal negotiations which provide for the re-establishment of the partnership Republic. The Turkish people of Cyprus have reacted to this most provocative challenge to their fundamental rights, with indignation. This false projection of the facts, realities and legal position in Cyprus destroys the very basis of the summit agreements of 1977 and 1979, as well as the efforts of Your Excellency in the direction of helping the two peoples to find a solution to the Cyprus problem, within the context of these summit agreements.

I draw Your Excellency's attention to the above policy of the Greek Cypriot administration, as reflected in the letter of Mr. Moushoutas, so that a way may be found which will prevent the projection of the Cyprus problem in this totally false "Greek light". I wish to reiterate that in their capacity as one of the two equal peoples in Cyprus and having the right to administer themselves in their own soil in a free and democratic order, the Turkish Cypriot people are determined to protect their existence, national and cultural identity and fundamental rights and liberties which all men possess equally from birth.

The UN General Assembly resolution 37/253 of 13 May 1983 has done a great disservice to justice attempting to decide on a bilateral issue without hearing the Turkish Cypriot side, thus encouraging the Greek Cypriot leaders to assail us further

/...

with letters like the one under review. It should be stressed that such resolutions have no moral or practical value.

In the light of this one-sided, counter-productive and unacceptable resolution, it was natural for the legislative Assembly of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris, as the sole legitimate spokesman of the Turkish Cypriot people, to react to this latest provocation of the Greek Cypriot side, by adopting its own resolution reaffirming the inalienable right of the Turkish Cypriots to determine their own destiny, and thereby indicating to the Greek Cypriots, perhaps for the last time, that the Turkish Cypriots will not remain silent in the face of the continued violation or usurpation of their political and human rights in the international arena, and the denial of their very existence in Cyprus.

It is absurd to try to link, as Mr. Moushoutas purports to do in his said letter, the adoption of this resolution of the Legislative Assembly to the policy of Turkey towards Cyprus, which is based on the preservation of the bi-national independence of Cyprus, the maintenance of the peace between the two communities, and the protection of the Turkish people of Cyprus against Greek aggression - a task which she has successfully carried out since 1974- without having anything to do with the internal affairs of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris, much less the adoption of resolutions by the completely autonomous Legislative Assembly of the Turkish Federated State. With his unfounded accusations against Turkey and his "partition" rhetoric, therefore, Mr. Moushoutas could only be attempting to cloud the issue of Greece's expansionist, aggressive policy in Cyprus since three decades and their attempts to annex the whole of the Island to Greece.

Mr. Moushoutas' assertion, on the other hand, that by the above-mentioned resolution, the Turkish Cypriot Legislative Assembly is purporting to "arrogate to itself the right to apply separately self-determination in the occupied areas" is equally ludicrous and aims to misrepresent the actual truth. It is in fact the Greek Cypriot side which has arrogated itself that right, and exploited it at the expense of the Turkish Cypriots since 1963, as has been indicated above.

The very claim of Mr. Moushoutas and his so-called "Government" to the exclusive right to represent Cyprus, at home and abroad, is itself illegal, immoral and without any foundation whatsoever. As has been pointed out above, one-sided

resolutions taken in international fora in total disregard of the above facts, which represent political expediency and interests of certain political groups, rather than the higher principles of the U.N. Charter, cannot be presented as "the verdict of the international community", contrary to what Mr. Moushoutas claims. They are merely the result of the 20 year-old violation of the right of equal representation of the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot side, which continues to masquerade as "the Government of Cyprus", and by exploiting this usurped title, carry out its long-standing aggression against the Turkish Cypriots in the international field.

By his so-called "Turkish 'Doctrine' for separate independence for communities and ethnic groups," and the alleged "fundamental fallacy and world-wide dangers" that such a doctrine involves, Mr. Moushoutas once more reveals what a totally distorted approach he has towards the Cypriot problem, Mr. Moushoutas cannot relegate the Turkish Cypriot people, the co-founder partner of the Republic of Cyprus and one of the two equal parties involved in the Cyprus dispute, to the position of an ethnic minority in a non-existent "Cypriot Nation". The very notion that the agreements had brought about a nation was rejected by Archbishop Makarios himself, immediately after the signing of the London and Zurich Agreements which gave rise in 1960, to the establishment of the bi-national State of Cyprus. It should be emphatically reiterated that it was to that bi-national Republic, with its bi-national institutions, including its bi-national Government, and not to the present Greek Cypriot administration, which represents solely the Greek Cypriot community, that the Turkish people of Cyprus had pledged allegiance.

The Turkish Cypriot people are, as they have always been, ready to re-establish that bi-national Republic in the form of a bi-zonal federal one, as agreed between the two communities at the highest level in 1977 and 1979. Whether such re-establishment can come about is a matter which depends entirely on the attitude of the Greek Cypriot side and their willingness to accept the realities and the equal rights of the Turkish Cypriots in the Island.

We earnestly hope that Your Excellency will duly inform the Greek Cypriot leaders that their present attitude runs counter to all efforts to settle the Cyprus problem on the basis of the partnership of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot peoples, for if they truly regard Cyprus as projected

/...

in Mr. Moushoutas' letter, this will constitute further proof of the fact that the Greek Cypriot side attends the intercommunal talks merely for tactical reasons.

We also hope that Your Excellency will point out to the Greek Cypriots and to the world at large, that the purpose of the intercommunal talks is to find the means of re-establishing a partnership which was destroyed by the Greek Cypriots in 1963, giving the mandate to Greek Cypriot aggressors to impose themselves as the Government of Cyprus by force of arms over the Turkish Cypriots, in a bi-national Republic of partnership.

I should be grateful if this letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 41 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Dr. Kenan Atakol)
Minister for Foreign Affairs
and Defence
