



UNITED NATIONS  
SECURITY  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

S/6279  
9 April 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

THE QUESTION OF CYPRUS

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the members of the Security Council, for their information, a letter dated 3 April 1965 from Dr. Fazil Kuchuk, Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus, enclosing a statement by the Turkish Cypriot leadership on the Report of the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus (S/6253 and Corr.1). This report was transmitted by the Secretary-General to Dr. Kuchuk on 26 March 1965.

Letter dated 3 April 1965 from Dr. Fazil Kuchuk  
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 26 March 1965, transmitting to me a report which the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus, Mr. Galo Plaza, has submitted to you in accordance with his terms of reference.

The report has been very carefully studied by me and by my advisers. While we are grateful to the Mediator for all the efforts he has exerted and in particular for the very objective and most impartial way in which he recorded in his report the actual facts and the situation prevailing in Cyprus as well as his findings of fact, we were grieved to note that he has deemed fit to go out of his way and to suggest as his personal views a certain solution which is clearly incompatible with what he has found. Furthermore, despite his own finding that "the protection of the Turkish-Cypriot community is one of the most important aspects of the Cyprus problem and that everything possible must be done to ensure it, including safeguards of an exceptional kind", it is surprising, and indeed heart-breaking, that the report contains no suggestions for any safeguard or guarantee which could be considered to be adequate or effective. What is suggested, instead, is, in effect, merely a procedure for complaint which anybody familiar with the situation in Cyprus would not hesitate to pronounce as falling far short of what is required in Cyprus. Moreover, the fact that the report does not rule out Enosis completely but makes suggestions how it could be materialized at a future date, has very much disappointed us and gave the impression to us that the Greek-Cypriots are being urged to agree to an interim solution which could be used as yet another stepping-stone in their march towards their final goal, viz., Enosis.

The report does not give due weight to the historical background of the problem which can never be viewed in its true perspective unless it is considered within the wider context of Turco-Greek relations. There is no doubt whatsoever that what is happening in Cyprus is not simply a conflict between two communities but yet another manifestation of the age-old policy of territorial aggrandizement pursued by Greece at the expense of Turkey and the Turkish nation and involving the whole balance of power between the two countries in the eastern Mediterranean basin.

That is why this is a problem mainly between Turkey and Greece and why no lasting solution could be found unless it is sought and found within this context.

Prompted mainly by the above considerations the Turkish-Cypriot leadership has issued a statement of which I enclose a copy and I shall be grateful if you will kindly have it circulated to the honourable members of the Security Council together with a copy of this letter.

(Signed) Fazil KUCHUK  
Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus

Statement by the Turkish-Cypriot leadership on the  
report of the United Nations Mediator

The Turkish-Cypriot leadership has studied carefully the report submitted by the Mediator, Mr. Galo Plaza, about his efforts to find a solution to the Cyprus problem. The larger part of the report is devoted to a factual review of the positions of the various parties to the dispute, but the Turkish leadership was surprised to see with regret that in the latter part of his report the Mediator transgressed the limits of his mandate which was to promote "a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting Cyprus", by making suggestions which committed him to a certain stand on a final political settlement which could not carry the agreement of the parties to the dispute as required by the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964. Surely this could not be the task of any mediator in any dispute. There is no doubt that Mr. Plaza's suggestions, being his personal suggestions, can in no way be attributed to him in his legal capacity as the Mediator in the Cyprus dispute and cannot have any legal effect as a mediation function. Therefore, these suggestions cannot form the basis of any negotiations on the dispute. In fact, the Turkish leadership has been unable to understand how the Mediator could reach the personal conclusions that he did on the basis of the actual situation and findings of fact as he himself described correctly in the factual section of his report.

One important point about the report is that it has laid itself wide open to serious misinterpretation by those who have no respect for the rule of law in international relations and who spurn international agreements for their own selfish ends. Surely, it could not have been the intention of the Mediator to advocate the idea that situations created through a use of brute force by two of the signatories of the 1960 Treaties (i.e., Greece and the Greek-Cypriot community) with a view to robbing two of the other signatories (i.e., Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot community) of their rights and interests under these Treaties, and not the Treaties themselves, should be taken as a basis of discussions for new agreements to replace those Treaties. There is no doubt that the whole world of international relations would be thrown into chaos and anarchy, and it would be the end of any rule of law in such relations, if this idea were to be accepted and if a precedent were to be created in Cyprus for the United Nations to condone such totally unacceptable attitudes and

actions in international relations. The point that we want to make has been amply demonstrated by the fact that Mr. Plaza's personal suggestions in the report have already been interpreted by "political circles in Athens", to amount to a "rejection" of the Zurich and London Agreements by the Mediator - an action which, of course, being outside his terms of reference could not possibly have been taken by him.

The Turkish-Cypriot leadership wish to point out that the impression one would get was that the report (which does not seem to attach due importance to the fact that this problem, apart from being the concern of the two communities in Cyprus, is essentially the concern of Turkey and Greece) aimed not at finding the ways and means of bringing about agreement in a serious dispute, but at indicating the course that two of the parties to the dispute (namely, Greece and the Greek-Cypriot community, which were responsible for creating the dispute in the first place) could take towards the materialization of their objectives without causing an international upheaval. The reason that led the Turkish leadership to make this observation is that the report does not take into consideration the legal rights of the Turkish-Cypriot community and Turkey and is open to the interpretation that the Mediator is recommending, in so many words, to the Greeks to shelve their demand for Enosis only for so long as the "risk" of opposition from the Turkish-Cypriot community and Turkey persists, i.e., until such time as the Turkish-Cypriot community would not be in a position to oppose it - and its suggestions for an arrangement of inter-communal relations within Cyprus would inevitably place the Turkish community in such a position - and also until Turkey's objections to the annexation of Cyprus as a whole to Greece are somehow overcome.

The Mediator in paragraph 156 of his report has stated "the Turkish-Cypriot community must be protected and protected adequately. I fully support that principle. I feel strongly that the protection of the Turkish-Cypriot community is one of the most important aspects of the Cyprus problem and that everything possible must be done to ensure it, including safeguards of an exceptional kind". Nevertheless the report disregards the need for physical guarantees for the existence and the rights of the Turkish-Cypriot community by ignoring various vital factors which form the basis of the Turks' just cause in Cyprus and suggests transitory safeguards for the Turks and makes certain promises of self-administration in some communal matters that, we know from bitter experience,

would have no value in practice whenever the Greeks chose to go against them and which would only serve to pave the way to the domination or elimination of the Turkish community. It is interesting to note in this respect that the personal suggestions put forward in the report bear striking resemblance to, if not being entirely identical with, the views of the Greek-Cypriot leadership and Greece.

What is important for us is the need to establish an order in Cyprus, on the basis of the validity of the 1960 Treaties, in order to provide possibilities for the Turkish community to preserve its existence and to continue to live in peace and security without ever being subjected to threats and dangers that have been rampant under the conditions created by the Greeks since they launched their onslaught on the Turkish community in December 1963. It should be pointed out in connexion that what the report seems to present to world public opinion as a generous offer by Archbishop Makarios - the offer to respect the human rights of the Turkish community - would in fact be nothing more than the restoration to the Turks of some of the rights which they already possessed under the Constitution until the Greeks decided to launch an onslaught on the Turkish community, and which human beings everywhere must possess in any case. Besides, the Turks have absolutely no confidence left in the Greek leadership as regards its goodwill to respect any such rights under guarantees of the type suggested in the report, which in fact are not guarantees at all but merely a procedure for complaint, and it is obvious that unless physical guarantees of the type necessitated by the incurable anti-Turkish obsession and past conduct of the Greeks are provided, there would be no Turkish community left to enjoy these rights. One must exist and must have the possibility to continue to exist, before one can enjoy any rights and liberties.

We would like to point out once again that the Turkish community, as one of the two partners in the sovereignty of the Cyprus Republic and as the owner of no less than one third of the entire territory of the Republic, aim at securing conditions that would make it physically impossible for the Greeks to destroy the independence of our Republic, now or at any time in the future (with the object of satisfying Greek policy of territorial aggrandizement) or to eliminate, dominate or subjugate the Turks or the Turkish community as a whole, with or without Enosis.

There are certain vital factors that can never be ignored in this whole problem if one is to work for an equitable solution. Cyprus is not a "country" in any ethnic sense; it is just a small island which is populated by two distinct national

and juridical communities. The fact that one community (Greek) is numerically bigger than the other (Turkish) does not make this island in its entirety a property of the Greeks and does not entitle the bigger community to rob the smaller one of all its basic rights including the right of self-determination and the right to enjoy full security of life and property. It is with this legitimate aim in view that the Turkish community feels that nothing short of federation on the lines proposed by them could give them adequate guarantees for the future. That the so-called "guarantees" suggested in the report fall far short of meeting this universally accepted requirement is obvious and needs no comment. Whilst on the subject of federation we wish to point out that the Turkish federation proposal would not in any way entail the partitioning of the island but would only serve to pave the way for peaceful coexistence and co-operation between the two communities within the framework of a totally independent and sovereign State. The Turkish leadership is convinced that its federation plan is the most equitable and feasible of all possible solutions of the Cyprus problem and does not include anything objectionable to world public opinion such as any compulsory exchange of population. It is very strange that the report, while objecting to a voluntary regrouping of a limited number of people within Cyprus, involving a voluntary movement of persons over negligible distances, should advocate voluntary resettlement of Turks in Turkey, involving a much more complicated and costly movement of people and a total change of conditions of life and employment.

We would like to point out also that both the Turkish community and Turkey have always expressed their willingness to take part in negotiations, provided these negotiations are conducted with a spirit conducive to agreement between all the interested parties.

Before concluding, we would like to stress that while the report of the Mediator, and reports submitted by the Secretary-General to the Security Council, acknowledge the sufferings endured and hardships encountered by the Turkish community owing to inhuman actions and measures taken by the Greeks (such as economic blockade, besieging of Turkish-inhabited areas and, in the words of the report, displacing "thousands of Turkish-Cypriots by force or fear from their farms, jobs and homes"), practically nothing effective is being done to alleviate these hardships and sufferings in the period pending a final settlement, owing to a

serious gap in the powers of the Mediator on the one hand and the UNFICYP on the other. It is regrettable that the Turkish community should be urged to accept this position, which is still doubly aggravated by the fact that our island has been placed under military occupation by Greece, as a possible basis of negotiations with their oppressors.

-----