



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/6394
29 May 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 27 MAY 1965 FROM THE DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF TURKEY ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

In his letter addressed to Your Excellency on 12 May 1965 (S/6350), the Greek Cypriot representative endeavours once again to present the policy of the Turkish Government in a doubtful light with the apparent purpose of creating a misleading impression about the true intentions of the parties to the problem of Cyprus. It is to be hoped, however, that the Members of the United Nations will not allow themselves to be taken in by these now familiar tactics of the Greek Cypriots.

The Turkish Government does not have anything to hide about its policy with regard to Cyprus which has been clearly stated time and again before the Security Council and the General Assembly. Turkey genuinely desires to see an independent Cyprus under an administrative system which will take into account and safeguard the legitimate rights of the two ethnic communities making up the people of Cyprus, who in 1959 and 1960 undertook, through solemn international commitments and in exercise of their rights of self-determination, to establish in clearly defined terms of partnership an independent state on the island. The policy followed by the Turkish Government aims, through peaceful means envisaged in the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964, at the realization of this legitimate situation in Cyprus which, it may be useful to recall, is under the guarantee of valid international treaties. The Turkish Government is seeking nothing more in Cyprus.

In contrast to this positive attitude of the Turkish Government, Archbishop Makarios on at least six occasions* within the last few weeks, declared publicly that there can be no other solution to the problem than annexing Cyprus to Greece. I have no doubt that Your Excellency and the distinguished representatives of the Member States will be able to draw your own conclusions as

* (On 4, 9, 27 April and 14, 16 May 1965 in various towns of Cyprus and on 11 May 1965 in Salonica, Greece).

to which of the parties to the Cyprus problem is following a policy consistent with the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus, and which is trying to exploit certain lofty principles in furtherance of Hellenic expansionism.

Under the illusion that "Enosis" can be achieved through faits-accomplis based upon illegitimate force, the Greek Cypriots, in collusion with the Government of Greece, have, since December 1963, pushed aside the Constitution which specifically prohibits the total or partial union of Cyprus with any other State. It is precisely because of this, i.e. because the present Greek administration in the island derives its authority not from the Constitution of the land but from the Greek Cypriot and Greek armed force assembled in Cyprus without any valid legal basis, that it is devoid of any legality. My Government's point of view on this matter was explained in the Security Council on 11 September 1964 and can easily be referred to in the Security Council document of the same date (S/1147). Furthermore, if Ambassador Rossides cared to examine the situation more carefully, he will have noticed that both the United Nations and other States who have accredited missions in Nicosia continue to recognize, perhaps to the disappointment of the Greek Cypriots, the constitutional set-up of the de jure administration of Cyprus by according the due constitutional respect to the Turkish Vice-President and his Office.

Ambassador Rossides and his administration should very well know by now that authority based on illegal armed force is anathema to the rule of law and cannot be accepted in any civilized society without reaction. It is only natural that neither Turkey nor the Turkish Cypriot community would accept it in Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot efforts to extend this authority and impose it on the Turkish Cypriots in disregard of the constitutional and treaty rights of the Turkish Cypriot community, cannot therefore be countenanced. The Turkish Cypriot resistance to this encroachment on and usurpation of constitutional authority is nothing other than legitimate self-defence. Hence, the Turkish Cypriot "strongholds" and "enclaves" which Ambassador Rossides tries to deride in his letter are positions of defence against Greek and Greek Cypriot aggression.

Notwithstanding the technicalities attendant on the United Nations presence in Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot administration cannot and should not expect the support of this august Organization in its efforts to extend its illegal authority

over the island under the guise of a "return to normal conditions". The Turkish Government is in favour of a return to peace and normality on the island. But it goes without saying that this return can only be accomplished by legal means and measures. The Turkish Cypriot community also has reiterated this view on several occasions and expressed their readiness to co-operate both with UNFICYP and the Greek Cypriots. It is to be noted with regret, however, that these Turkish Cypriot offers have fallen on deaf Greek ears.

In spite of what has been said in Ambassador Rossides' letter, there can be no denying the fact that the arbitrary siege imposed on the Turkish quarter of Nicosia in mid-April was solely aimed at extending the illegal authority of the unconstitutional Greek Cypriot administration to this area where constitutional authority is maintained by the Turkish Cypriots to the extent possible under the present circumstances.

As pointed out in my letter dated 5 May 1965 (S/6335), the truth about the situation on the green line in Nicosia was conveyed to Your Excellency in Vice-President Kuchuk's message of 27 April 1965 (S/6307). It will be recalled that the Turkish Cypriots had never raised any objection to UNFICYP inspection on the green line. They could not, however, allow the occupation of certain premises on their side of the green line by Greek Cypriots because this would have meant an unjustified extension of the illegal authority of an unconstitutional administration. When the Greek Cypriots abandoned their demand for the occupation of these premises, the grounds for the Turkish Cypriots' objections ceased to exist and the UNFICYP inspection took place without delay. It will perhaps be appropriate to note that the inspection, which was carried out by UNFICYP upon the removal of Greek Cypriot demands extraneous to the inspection as such, was not confined to the Turkish side of the line alone but was conducted on both the Greek and Turkish sides consecutively. It is obvious that the Greek Cypriots decided to lift their siege under pressure from the United Nations and other parties, and when it became clear that in the face of the indefatigable will of the Turkish Cypriots to resist aggression, any further continuance of it would have worked against Greek Cypriot interests by inflaming world public opinion to the point of outright condemnation of this nefarious act of aggression.

Dr. Kuchuk, in his above-mentioned communication, had also made it clear that the Turkish Cypriots not only did not have any objection to UNFICYP inspection of the green line but that they were ready to discuss the whole green line agreement with a view to ensuring its implementation in full.

In conclusion, Excellency, I would like to say that saner counsel is indeed necessary in order to create a climate of calm in which a peaceful solution to the problem may be expected to be found. But I cannot help wondering whether a mentality which advocates illegality as "saner counsel" can be conducive to the establishment of such a climate.

I would like to request that Your Excellency kindly have this letter circulated as a Security Council document.

Please accept, etc.

(Signed) Vahap ASIRGÖLU
Deputy Permanent Representative of Turkey
to the United Nations
