



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/6040  
11 October 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twentieth session  
Agenda item 93

QUESTION OF CYPRUS

Letter dated 8 October 1965 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey  
to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to forward herewith a letter addressed to Your Excellency on the question of Cyprus by Mr. Rauf R. Denktas and Mr. Osman Orek, representatives of Dr. Fazıl Küçük, Vice-President of Cyprus, and the Turkish community.

I shall be grateful if Your Excellency would kindly have this letter distributed as an Assembly document.

(Signed) Orhan ERALP  
Permanent Representative of Turkey  
to the United Nations

New York, 11 October 1965

Your Excellency,

The references to the question of Cyprus contained in some of the statements made by distinguished heads of delegations in the course of the general debate have made it quite clear that some misapprehension continues to exist in the minds of certain delegates as to the real causes of trouble and unrest in Cyprus. We have no doubt at all that the representatives who have stated and will state their Governments' views on Cyprus have one aim in view: the restoration of peace in Cyprus and a return to normality at the earliest possible time. This aim, however, cannot be realized if the real causes of trouble and conflict in Cyprus continue to be hidden behind a thick curtain of highly coloured Greek propaganda. The true position must be known; the guilty identified and condemned. Otherwise, the Greek Cypriot authorities will use any statement which tends to support their unjust case as a further mandate to them for completing the total annihilation of the Turkish community - a process which they put into effect on 21 December 1963 and which is continuing unabated, in several forms, contrary to the 4 March 1964 resolution of the Security Council and in defiance of the United Nations authorities in Cyprus.

#### Misconceived facts

The following appear to be the misconceptions on Cyprus. Such preconceived notions must be put right if justice is to be done in Cyprus:

(1) that the Greek Cypriots are struggling for the application of the right of self-determination or for the protection and preservation of the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus.

(2) that the sovereignty and independence of Cyprus are in jeopardy, and, in the alternative, that they are not complete.

(3) that the Constitution of Cyprus has been imposed upon it from outside and that the Treaty of Guarantee gives the right of intervention to foreign Powers in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

His Excellency U Thant  
Secretary-General of the United Nations  
New York

/...

(4) that there exists a Cypriot nation, or a Cypriot people, represented by the Greek Cypriots and that the Turkish Cypriots are a minority within this "nation", demanding inconsiderate or excessive rights.

#### Greek Cypriots are struggling for Enosis

The struggle of the Greek Cypriots in Cyprus IS NOT for the application of the right of self-determination, nor is it a struggle for independence or for the protection of the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus. They merely pay lip service to these words and principles as a cloak for their real intentions and with a view to hoodwinking the General Assembly into supporting their unjust case.

The Greek Cypriot struggle in Cyprus is for the destruction of the independent Republic of Cyprus, the elimination of the freedom and liberty of the Turkish community, and the union of Cyprus with Greece. In other words, under the pretext of applying the principle of self-determination over and over again, they will defeat the very purposes of this principle by recolonizing Cyprus by Greece.

The Greek and Turkish Cypriots exercised their right of self-determination in 1959-1960 through various stages and in accordance with Articles 73 (b) and 1 (2) of the Charter and chose independence in partnership as their goal, which they got on 16 August 1960.

It is common knowledge that the Cyprus question had come before the General Assembly during the years of 1954-1958 on five occasions. Greece sponsored the Greek Cypriot case during those years and claimed for them, as they themselves do now, the application of the principle of self-determination in such a way as would lead to the union of Cyprus with Greece contrary to the will and wishes of the Turkish community in Cyprus. This attempt at neo-colonization and expansionism on the part of Greece was rejected by the General Assembly at each occasion and at last, in 1958, the General Assembly recommended the finding of a peaceful and just solution by negotiation amongst the parties concerned. The main parties concerned were the two communities in Cyprus which were fighting between themselves for different political settlements and their respective motherlands, Turkey and Greece. These parties reached a compromise solution which was accepted by Great Britain as the Power which would relinquish her rights over Cyprus to the two communities in Cyprus. The result of all this was the birth of the Republic of Cyprus; its

admission to the United Nations as a full Member on the basis of the international agreements which gave it its independence and under which it undertook certain internal and international obligations, all compatible with the Charter of the United Nations.

Public statements by Archbishop Makarios and other Greek leaders, both in Greece and Cyprus, since the birth of the Republic until today prove abundantly clearly that the Greek Cypriot leadership was signing the agreements which gave independence to Cyprus mala fide and with the intention of using the Republic as a "spring-board" for Enosis. These people who have by fraud and deceit misused the rights and liberties, the freedom and honour, the independence and its ensuing responsibilities which were given to them as a result of the resolution of the General Assembly in 1958, are now back before the General Assembly demanding further rights, again by resorting to deceit and fraud, in order to destroy the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus and with a view to eliminating a partner community which has acquired its independence with them.

Agreements and the Constitution  
were not imposed on Cyprus

The allegation that the solution found at Zurich as a result of the recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly in 1958 was an imposed one is utterly untrue. This agreement was reached between Greece and Turkey, the respective motherlands of the two communities. As stated above, Great Britain, which was the sovereign Power in Cyprus then, had nothing to do with this agreement. Greece was in full consultation with Archbishop Makarios, the avowed leader of the Greek Cypriots. Turkey, on the other hand, consulted the Turkish Cypriot leadership at every step of the negotiations. That the agreements, the solution, were not imposed on the Cypriot Greek and Turkish communities is clear from the following statement of Mr. Averoff, the then Foreign Minister of Greece, who was sponsoring the case of the Greek Cypriots before the United Nations:

"We signed these agreements because we felt that they cover relatively and absolutely satisfactorily the interests of the people of Cyprus as a whole. We also signed these agreements because Archbishop Makarios at the head of the Greek community in Cyprus and whom we considered in all our deliberations as representing the will of the Greeks of Cyprus, having been informed by us, said that he was in agreement.... I want to add that we took into consideration his opinion for the fundamental reason that we had declared during our discussions that we will not impose these decisions by force or by other ways on the Greek Cypriots."

After the London Conference, at which Mr. Averoff had made the above statement in the presence of Archbishop Makarios and the Turkish Cypriot representatives, Greek and Turkish Cypriot community representatives worked together for eighteen months and drafted the Constitution of Cyprus, which was put before the peoples at the polls and the Republic was born on 16 August 1960. A month later, Cyprus applied and was admitted as a full Member of the United Nations. No complaint at all was made about the imposition or unfairness of the agreements, but on the contrary everyone, including the representative of the Cyprus Government to the United Nations, and in Cyprus Archbishop Makarios, eulogized the birth of the Republic, which, needless to say, still enjoys full membership on the basis of these agreements.

#### Complete independence and sovereignty

It will be seen from the foregoing that the Republic of Cyprus was created with the free will and consent of the two autonomous national communities in Cyprus which had coexisted for four centuries retaining and enjoying their respective religion, language, culture, customs and national political aspirations. It was obviously impossible to treat Cyprus and its inhabitants as a nation. There is not, and there never has been, a Cypriot people as such, but only Greeks of Cyprus who identified themselves with the Greek nation proper, and the Turks of Cyprus who likewise identified themselves with the Turkish nation proper. The problem was in 1959 and is now the finding of a solution which would make it possible for these two distinct national entities to coexist under a form of government enjoying full independence and sovereignty in such a way as would protect and preserve the historic rights and status of each of them. The other alternatives were (a) Enosis, which would have meant war as it implied the expansion of Greece to the detriment of Turkey, upsetting the balance of power brought about by the Treaty of Lausanne under which Cyprus was ceded to Great Britain; (b) partition of the island as an alternative to one-sided annexation to Greece, so as to maintain the balance of power and to protect the Turkish community from becoming colonial subjects under Greek rule. As the Greeks did not agree to this, the remaining alternative was the creation of an independent State on the basis of partnership between the two national entities.

As stated by Mr. Averoff, the then Foreign Minister of Greece, at the London Conference in 1959:

"During the political struggle over the Cyprus question it was revealed that there were a lot of difficulties, objective political difficulties, internal political difficulties, and psychological and emotional difficulties in many countries and in many people... which revealed that... it was necessary to arrive at a compromise.... After long talks, after long negotiations... we have arrived at a solution, an agreement in which the principles of democracy and of modern humanity are upheld and also the fundamental principles of everyone."

The agreements were not expected to create and did not have as an immediate aim the creation of a Cypriot nation or a Cypriot conscience. They merely provided the basis for the two communities - which were fully conscious of their respective national identities as such - to live and work together in partnership, on the basis of justice and equality, as they had done during the centuries, one never dominating the other. It was hoped, however, that given time this partnership would develop into a common Cypriot conscience by a process of evolution. Unfortunately, the Greek leadership could not afford to give Cyprus this chance because, as stated above, their agreement to create the Republic carried with it a mental reservation for destroying the Republic and uniting Cyprus with Greece. In order to prevent the appearance of any tendency towards the creation of Cypriotism, which would have meant the ruling out of Enosis for good, Archbishop Makarios and other Greek leaders thought it necessary to declare to the Greek Cypriots that these agreements were a stepping-stone for achieving Enosis and that (Cyprus Mail, 28 March 1963) "Any Greek who knows me (Makarios) will never believe that I will work for the creation of a Cypriot conscience. The agreements created a state but not a nation. Greeks shall for ever be Greeks."

The real problem, therefore, before the General Assembly is not whether the principle of self-determination should be applied anew to Cyprus, or whether the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus need to be overhauled, but in its simplest form it is whether the Turkish community should be deprived of its rights which it acquired under the Republic by use of the principle of self-determination.

These are the facts in Cyprus which leave no room for argument - at this stage - as to whether the Turkish community can be treated as a minority in Cyprus. We have long passed that stage. An independent, autonomous community, partners in

the creation of an independent Republic, cannot be converted into a minority group by argument and chicanery. It should be appreciated that in human societies when a certain advanced stage in freedom and national conscienceness are reached it is neither just nor proper, if not impossible, to force that particular society or community to forgo its rights, privileges or freedom. The inherent rights of the Turkish community in Cyprus are entrenched in international agreements. The Greek massacre of Turks and inhuman methods employed in order to eliminate this community or abrogate its rights is no reason for asking the Turks to forgo their rights which will, undoubtedly, mean the total extinction of the Turks from Cyprus, more so, when it is realized that these crimes against the Turkish community have been committed merely for the sake of paving the way to the annexation of Cyprus to Greece. The present Greek agitation at the General Assembly also has got this particular view in mind. It is relevant to quote here the most recent statement by the self-appointed Commander of Greek Forces in Cyprus, General Grivas, which he made on 22 September 1965 at the time when the General Assembly was in progress:

"The entire Greece is now engaged in a fight in Cyprus. This fight is a continuation of the past struggles of the nation. Struggles are won not only with arms but with the strength of faith. It was with this strength that we had won the EOKA struggle. We want to unite with the national body of Greece and live in freedom. Our present slogan is: Freedom or death. The meaning of this is: Enosis or death.... We have no aim other than Enosis. At this very moment Greece is fighting in Cyprus. She has sent her sons to Cyprus. She has sent the arms you hold in your hands. We must understand clearly the aim of our struggle. This aim is Enosis. Anything other than this is false. Our duty is to fight for and win Enosis. We shall deserve Enosis when we win. Long Live Enosis, Long Live Greece." (See semi-official Greek paper Philelefteros of 23 September 1965.)

#### Conclusion

The Greek Cypriot attempt is concentrated on doing away with all those international agreements which prevent the realization of Enosis. That is the reason behind their attack against the Treaty of Guarantee. This Treaty does not give the right to any State to intervene or interfere with the internal affairs of Cyprus. It empowers the two motherlands of the two communities to stop anyone, within or without Cyprus, from attempting to destroy the independence and sovereignty of the Republic. Anyone who values this independence should welcome such a right in an avowed motherland. The destruction of the Republic and the

enslavement of the Turkish community by force of arms is not an internal matter; by its very nature it immediately assumes an international character for the reasons explained above. The insincerity of Greek Cypriot complaints on this score is obvious when one sees the island occupied by 10,000 Greek soldiers in contravention of the international agreements and of the 4 March 1964 resolution of the Security Council.

We hope that this short exposé on the real causes of the Cyprus problem will suffice to help the distinguished representatives to come to a proper and just conclusion and thus do justice to the Turks of Cyprus and honour the 1958 resolution of the General Assembly as well as the 4 March 1964 resolution of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman OREK  
Minister of Defence of Cyprus

(Signed) Rauf R. DENKTAS  
President, Turkish Communal Chamber  
of Cyprus

New York,  
18 October 1965

-----