



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2689
13 June 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 13 June 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. RABETAFIKA

(Madagascar)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Congo
Denmark
France
Ghana
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT
Mr. TS VETKOV
Mr. LIANG Yufan
Mr. BALE
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. de KEMOULARIA
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. KASEMSARN
Mr. GRANDERSON
Mr. SAFRONCHUK
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. MAXEY
Miss BYRNE
Miss PULIDO SANTANA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS
(S/18102 and Add.1 and 2)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In conformity with decisions taken at the 2688th meeting, I invite the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Dountas (Greece) and Mr. Turkmen (Turkey) took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The first speaker is the representative of Turkey, on whom I now call.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): Mr. President, let me first thank you and the other members of the Security Council for granting me this opportunity to participate in the discussion on Cyprus.

I wish to extend to you my warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. I am confident that your long and rich experience at the United Nations and your diplomatic talents will prove to be invaluable in guiding the work of the Council.

Let me also pay a tribute to Ambassador Gbeho, who guided the Council with great distinction in May.

Our views on the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) have been outlined several times before this Council. I wish in particular to stress that UNFICYP's continued presence in Cyprus after more than two decades has to be considered in the light of the profound changes that have taken place on the island since the Council adopted its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The reports of the Secretary-General over the last few years have made it abundantly clear that the function that UNFICYP performs is no longer to prevent fighting between the two communities. Since the regrouping of the two communities in two different zones - the Turks in the North and the Greeks in the South - the Greek Cypriot military units and armed bands have been deprived of the possibility of assaulting and massacring Turkish Cypriots, and as a result the island has been remarkably quiet and peaceful. The physical aggressiveness of the Greek Cypriots has been replaced by a verbal aggressiveness, which is rambunctiously displayed by the Greek Cypriot representatives at each Council meeting.

Under the present circumstances, we share the Turkish Cypriot views on UNFICYP, which are based on the expectation that there will be a concrete peace-making process within an agreed framework, which UNFICYP will be called upon to support by performing certain specific functions. But if the peace process continues to be hampered by Greek Cypriot intransigence the need for the continued presence of the Force, especially in the light of the financial difficulties faced by the contributing countries, will become more and more questionable. The recent statement by the troop-contributing countries is in this respect significant.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

I believe that I do not have to go into the details of our fundamental objections to the content of the resolution just adopted by the Council. The objections we have expressed in previous meetings remain valid since the present resolution lacks the support of two of the directly interested parties. I wish therefore to reconfirm my Government's full agreement with the position of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the modalities of UNFICYP's presence in Northern Cyprus, as has been reiterated today by Mr. Ozer Koray.

The period which elapsed since the last Council meeting on Cyprus has been marked by the sustained efforts of the Secretary-General to work out an agreed framework of negotiations in consultation with both parties. I wish here to express to the Secretary-General the deep appreciation of my Government for the dedication and wisdom with which he has carried out the mission entrusted to him by the Security Council. It is gratifying that the members of the Security Council have also collectively and individually given unqualified support to the Secretary-General's efforts in full knowledge of the parameters of his initiative.

The initiative the Secretary-General has pursued since August 1984 is in fact a prolongation of previous efforts deployed since 1975 with the aim of evolving the outline of an agreement for a federal solution in Cyprus. Notwithstanding the deeply disappointing experience of January 1985, the Secretary-General engaged in detailed and arduous talks with both sides and finally put forward a "draft framework agreement on Cyprus".

What the Secretary-General proposes is not a final settlement in all its details, but a framework within which the two sides can negotiate a solution. Obviously the draft agreement does not satisfy completely any of the parties, and we are all aware that if this framework is accepted the negotiations which will ensue will still be difficult and time-consuming. But, on the other hand, after more than 10 years of discussions at every level, including several summit meetings,

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

the framework agreement put forward by the Secretary-General constitutes the only basis on which meaningful negotiations can at last begin.

The Secretary-General is certainly justified in insisting on the significance of the step he has taken. He says in his report of 11 June 1986 that

"Because of the significance of the stage we have reached, I gave a copy of the draft framework agreement together with the substance of my covering letter to the President of the Security Council and I requested him to give a copy to the members of the Council." (S/18102/Add.1, p. 3, para. 8)

He also adds that, at the invitation of the President of the Council, he briefed the Council members at an informal meeting.

One of the most important characteristics of the "draft agreement" is the delicate balance it foresees between the components of a solution. This is the reason for which the Secretary-General underlines the concept of the "integrated whole". No special priority can be attributed to any of the elements since a solution can be feasible only if there is an agreement on all the issues that are important for one or the other party.

These considerations explain the need for an unequivocal reply by the two sides to the proposals of the Secretary-General. An unequivocal reply means a readiness to sign the draft agreement. President Denktash has indicated that he was ready to do so. The first reply of the Greek Cypriots was a non-reply. The voluminous second reply, by contrast, has the merit of being a very clear and specific answer. It is an unqualified and extremely detailed rejection of the Secretary-General's proposals, and the statements we heard today were even more explicit.

We are aware of the many discussions that took place between Greek Cypriot politicians before Mr. Kyprianou forwarded his latest letter to the Secretary-General. We understand that some of these politicians have apparently

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

warner Mr. Kyprianou of the dangers inherent in a rejection of the draft agreement. But the decisive discussions were not held in Nicosia; they took place in Athens in what seems to be an agonizing atmosphere.

As far as we are concerned, the outcome of the talks between the Greeks and the Greek Cypriots was not a surprise. The consistently negative attitude of Prime Minister Papandreu to the draft agreement from the very beginning had left no doubts in our minds.

We knew, therefore, that Prime Minister Papandreu was dead set against the proposals of the Secretary-General and also that he had the power to impose his will on Mr. Kyprianou. Nevertheless, we were surprised to see in their detailed second reply that the Greek Cypriots were reneging on their word on every point to which they had obviously agreed during discussions with the Secretary-General and Secretariat officials. As a result, the Greek Cypriot administration looks really like a degraded and humiliated subordinate.

The in extremis circulation of the letter dated 20 March 1986 by Mr. Kyprianou to the Secretary-General is not changing anything. If that was really the Greek Cypriot basic position, why had they not said so in their first reply and why did they wait until today? Is it possible that they have forgotten about it for so long? Anyway it is fascinating that with the Greek and Greek Cypriot logic, conciliation would mean rejection of the Secretary-General's proposals and intransigence towards accepting them. A twisted logic for those who claim to be descendants of Aristotle.

The irony is that the Greek Cypriots have long accused the Turkish Cypriots of being subservient to the policies of Ankara and insisted on the preposterous demand for direct negotiations with the Turkish Government. It seems now that the reverse is true, and there are probably some lessons to be drawn from it. The Greek Cypriots have lost their right to speak on their own destiny. Their only freedom

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

seems to be the freedom to flood the United Nations Secretariat with a torrent of abusive letters and to subject this Council to pathetic rhetoric. It is clear that there can be no negotiated solution to the Cyprus problem as long as the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. Papandreou, can dictate to the Greek Cypriots the policies they should follow.

I must add that I heard with amazement the statement of Ambassador Dountas today. Not satisfied with the total submission of the Greek Cypriot side to the diktats of Athens, he wanted also to dictate to the Secretary-General how to conduct his good offices mission, to the Council how it should act and to Turkey what it should accept. I understand that under Mr. Papandreou the famous Greek megali idea - the Great Idea - the concept of Greek expansionism and grandeur, is taking a rather global and ominous dimension.

In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm our thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General. I should like to express our appreciation to Major-General Greindl, Commander of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, and his staff. I should like to thank also Mr. James Holger, Acting Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus, as well as the members of the Secretariat dealing with Cyprus here in New York.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

I call on the representative of Cyprus, who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I was prompted to ask to be allowed to speak because of the casual way in which Ambassador Turkmen described the uprooting and expulsion of 200,000 Cypriots from their ancestral homes and lands; he described it as "regrouping of the two communities". Apparently, Ambassador Turkmen expects us and the international community to be appreciative of the orderly manner in which the Turkish army of occupation uprooted and segregated our people and is strangling a small country 100 times smaller than Turkey. His description of the invasion and the expulsion of the thousands of our people from their homes and lands is as accurate as his understanding of our reply to the Secretary-General. Our reply of 10 June 1986 is clear, constructive and in full accord with the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.

May I also add: small we are, conquered we are, occupied we are; but, by God, free and always independent to decide our own destiny. The very fact that we are here pointing an accusing finger at Turkey is evidence of our freedom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of Greece has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): Ambassador Turkmen made reference to Prime Minister Papandreou and his influence in the developments in Cyprus. If I understood him correctly, he said that as long as Prime Minister Papandreou is in government there can be no solution of the Cyprus problem - or something to that

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

effect. I should like to say to Ambassador Turkmen that he tends to overstate Prime Minister Papandreou's role and to understate the role of the Turkish army of occupation in Cyprus. We believe that so long as the Turkish army of occupation in Cyprus remains there a solution cannot be found.

As to the pursuit by Greece of the idea of expansionism and that sort of demagogical, phraseological fireworks, I am afraid that does not hold water by the logic of either Aristotle or Ionesco.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of Turkey has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I merely want to clarify a point. I did not say the Cyprus problem could not be resolved as long as Prime Minister Papandreou was in power but as long as Prime Minister Papandreou could dictate his will on the Greek Cypriots - as is the case today.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no more names on the speakers' list. The Security Council has therefore concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind members that the Council will consider the question of South Africa later this afternoon. I therefore invite the members of the Council to proceed immediately to the Security Council consultations room.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.