



**General Assembly
Security Council**

Distr.: General
1 December 2014

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-ninth session
Agenda item 42
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Sixty-ninth year

**Letter dated 18 November 2014 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 17 November 2014 addressed to you by Mehmet Dâna, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 42, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Y. Halit Çevik
Permanent Representative



Annex to the letter dated 18 November 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith a copy of the letter addressed to you by Derviş Eroğlu, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see enclosure).

I should be most grateful if you would have the text of the present letter and its enclosure circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 42, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mehmet **Dânâ**
Representative

Enclosure

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot leader, Nicos Anastasiades, during one of the last plenary meetings that the General Assembly held in September 2014, and to bring to your kind attention the following.

It is unfortunate that each year, during the opening of the General Assembly, the Greek Cypriot side, which purports to be the “Government of the Republic of Cyprus”, prefers to continue with its practice of exploiting its usurped title in order to distort the legal and historical facts pertaining to the Cyprus problem. I, therefore, deem it necessary to set the record straight regarding the realities that have been prevailing in Cyprus for more than half a century, even before the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) set foot on the island.

The partnership Republic of Cyprus, which was founded by the London and Zurich Agreements in 1960, was destroyed in 1963 by the Greek Cypriot partner’s onslaught on the Turkish Cypriot partner and its ejection of the latter from the entire State mechanism. There has not been a joint central administration on the island capable of representing both sides or the whole island ever since. While the Greek Cypriot side continued to claim that it was the sole “Government of the Republic of Cyprus”, each side has since ruled itself. In other words, since 21 December 1963, there has been no entity or authority capable of representing the “Republic of Cyprus”, as one of the partners, namely the Turkish Cypriot partner, had been ousted by force of arms from all organs of the State. Ample evidence of this exists in the relevant reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council covering that period.

Mr. Anastasiades’s reference to the Turkish intervention in 1974, which had been necessitated by the treaty rights and obligations of Turkey and the ethnic cleansing policies unleashed against Turkish Cypriots, as an “invasion”, and to the presence of Turkish troops on the island as an “occupation” reflects neither the legal nor the historical realities of the island. As is well known, the Turkish intervention of 1974 was fully legitimate under international law since it was conducted in accordance with Turkey’s rights and obligations emanating from the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960. The presence of the Turkish Peace Force in the North, on the other hand, is the only deterrent and effective guarantee against the repetition of the aggression against the Turkish Cypriots.

If there is an occupation in Cyprus, however, it is the continued occupation of the seat of Government by the Greek Cypriot side to the detriment of the Turkish Cypriot side and the efforts for the settlement of the Cyprus problem. The Greek Cypriot side uses its usurped title to serve its own interests, keeping the Turkish Cypriot people, their former and purportedly future partners, in international isolation and subject to inhuman restrictions, aggravating the lack of trust and confidence between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. Instead of paying lip service to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, therefore, Mr. Anastasiades would do well to refrain from any rhetoric and activity that widens the gap between the two sides, making a solution all the more difficult.

As regards the issue of natural resources, the newly discovered energy resources around the island of Cyprus can and should indeed serve as a catalyst for a comprehensive settlement. However, the Greek Cypriot insistence to take unilateral steps at the expense of the equal and inherent rights of the Turkish Cypriot people

over the natural resources of the island is bound to create the opposite outcome. Had Mr. Anastasiades been sincere in this respect, he would have long ago accepted my proposals of September 2011 and September 2012, which envisage the establishment of an ad hoc committee for the joint exploration, exploitation and exportation of those resources.

It is interesting that Mr. Anastasiades, who, in his statement before the General Assembly, professed support for constructive dialogue for a comprehensive settlement, unilaterally withdrew from the negotiations only a few weeks later, at a time when the leaders had already agreed to move on to the next phase of the negotiations involving a give-and-take exercise. This development, on its own, is a stark example of the clear inconsistency that exists between the words and deeds of the Greek Cypriot leader. In these circumstances, one cannot help but arrive at the conclusion that the prospect of results-oriented negotiations involving a give-and-take exercise was the actual reason behind the decision of Mr. Anastasiades to withdraw from the talks. It is clear that he found it more convenient to suspend the talks rather than showing the necessary political will, as well as leadership, to focus on building on the agreements and progress achieved so far between the two sides and on finalizing a comprehensive settlement in Cyprus.

Mr. Anastasiades has also adopted a very selective and misleading approach to the joint declaration of 11 February 2014 by underlining only those elements that he favours and not saying anything about the equally important principles he has himself endorsed in the very same document, such as the fact that there will be two constituent States of equal status, that there will be constituent State citizenship and that sovereignty emanates equally from the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. Similarly, while he refers to the section of the declaration regarding the principles of the European Union, he conveniently omits the part that reads: “the bi-zonal, bi-communal nature of the federation ... will be safeguarded and respected throughout the island”. As a result, by consistently cherry-picking from a compromise document and not respecting the other parts that made a balanced declaration possible, the Greek Cypriot leader is demonstrating a lack of commitment and is aiming to mislead.

Mr. Anastasiades, in his address, pointed out the fact that the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus had marked its fiftieth year. However, earlier in his speech, he had claimed that the Cyprus problem had entered its fortieth year. This evident contradiction demonstrates the extent of the misleading nature of the speech he delivered to the General Assembly.

I have also observed with regret that Mr. Anastasiades continued the long-standing practice of exploiting a humanitarian issue that affects both peoples in Cyprus, namely the issue of missing persons. Such attempts do not help alleviate the pain of their relatives and also misrepresent the excellent work that the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus has been doing in line with its mandate. As the Turkish Cypriot side, we have always believed that this humanitarian issue should not be exploited for political propaganda purposes and we expect a similar sensitivity from the Greek Cypriot side.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate our call to the Greek Cypriot side to return, without any preconditions, to the negotiating table, the only platform where every issue can be addressed through dialogue and mutual understanding.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 42, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Derviş **Erođlu**
President
