



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.: General
12 September 2022

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-sixth session
Agenda items 44 and 78

Security Council
Seventy-seventh year

Question of Cyprus

Oceans and the law of the sea

Letter dated 9 September 2022 from the Permanent Representative of Türkiye to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 8 September 2022 (see annex), addressed to you by Mehmet Dâna, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I would be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 44 and 78, and of the Security Council, and published on the website of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, as well as in the next edition of the *Law of the Sea Bulletin*.

(Signed) Feridun H. Sinirlioğlu
Permanent Representative



Annex to the letter dated 9 September 2022 from the Permanent Representative of Türkiye to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I am writing in response to the letter dated 3 August 2022 addressed to Your Excellency by the Greek Cypriot Representative in New York that was circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council ([A/76/915-S/2022/599](#)), which, yet again, distorts the realities in Cyprus. As a matter of fact, the Greek Cypriot side has long been exploiting the absence of the Turkish Cypriot side on international platforms by misleading the international community about the Cyprus problem. Therefore, I am compelled to respond in writing in order to set the record straight.

At the outset, I would like to remind the Greek Cypriot representative that the Republic of Cyprus was founded in 1960 in accordance with the international Cyprus treaties, namely, the treaties of establishment, alliance and guarantee, by the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot peoples when the British Government relinquished the sovereignty of Cyprus to the partnership Republic composed of the aforesaid politically equal partners, “acting conjointly and in partnership”. The legitimacy of the 1960 Republic lay in the joint presence and effective participation of both peoples in all organs of the State. Neither party had the right to rule the other or be the Government of the island as a whole in the absence of the other in all organs of the State and its Government.

Contrary to what the Greek Cypriot representative is trying to portray, the 1960 Republic of Cyprus was destroyed following the Greek Cypriot onslaught on the Turkish Cypriot people in December 1963, when all Turkish Cypriot elements in all State organs were forcefully ejected at gunpoint. The Turkish Cypriot partner did not accept this attempted takeover of the binational partnership State by the Greek Cypriot side and, through its national resistance, prevented the Greek Cypriot side from extending its authority over the Turkish Cypriot people. Since the deliberate destruction, in 1963, of the binational Republic, there has not been a single constitutional Government or republic capable of representing both peoples of the island. Each side has since ruled itself, while the Greek Cypriot administration continued to claim that it is the “Government of the Republic of Cyprus”.

The Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus, therefore, has no legal or moral right to claim to represent anyone other than the Greek Cypriot people, and said administration, under the pretentious and self-assumed title of the “Government of Cyprus” and has no legal or moral right nor the jurisdiction to represent or act on behalf of the Turkish Cypriot people, whose sole legitimate representatives are those elected under and by virtue of the Constitution of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is a fully functioning democratic State, and only its elected/appointed representatives have the competence to act on behalf of and represent the Turkish Cypriot people and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Greek Cypriot representatives have long been disinforming the international community by portraying the Cyprus problem as one of “occupation”. In fact, none of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus describes the legitimate and justified Turkish presence in the island, in accordance with the 1959 international Cyprus treaties, as an “occupation”. As a matter of fact, guarantor Turkey had to intervene after 11 years of Turkish Cypriot ordeal at the hands of the Greek Cypriots, which culminated into the coup attempt organized by the military junta in Athens and its Greek Cypriot collaborators, aiming to annex the entire island to Greece (enosis) and for total annihilation of Turkish Cypriot people. It should be underlined that the

Cyprus problem commenced in 1963, not in 1974, when the Greek Cypriot side forcibly usurped the title of the partnership Republic of Cyprus and expelled the Turkish Cypriot partner from all State organs. During the years from 1963 to 1974, the Greek Cypriots, aided and encouraged by Greece, took part in an ethnic cleansing campaign against Turkish Cypriots, known as the Akritas Plan, with the ultimate aim of achieving enosis. This large-scale violence and the ensuing gross human rights violations necessitated the deployment by the Security Council of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus in 1964 in order to stop the bloodshed and atrocities perpetrated against the Turkish Cypriot people. Given that there is a plethora of United Nations documents attesting to these crimes against humanity, the remarks of the Greek Cypriot representative are not fact-based, but another episode of the well-known Greek Cypriot propaganda machinery.

With regard to the reference made by the Greek Cypriot representative concerning a settlement in Cyprus, it should be reminded that there is no consensus between the two sides on a “bi-zonal, bi-communal federation” model after 50 years of failed negotiating processes which, unfortunately, served no purpose other than perpetuating the status quo on the island. Instead of this exhausted model, a cooperative relationship between the two States on the basis of their inherent sovereign equality and the equal international status is the only framework which would mutually benefit the two peoples of the island while contributing to the much-needed security, stability and cooperation in the eastern Mediterranean region. It is also interesting to see in said letter how far the Greek Cypriot side is ready to go in distorting not only the facts pertaining to the history of Cyprus, but the recent past as well. As a matter of fact, each and every member of the international community is well aware that the Greek Cypriot side bears the sole responsibility for the failure of the Annan Plan as well as the Conference on Cyprus in Crans-Montana and the fact that both of these settlement attempts received full support from Türkiye. Moreover, the Greek Cypriot portrayal of settlement efforts as an attempt by Türkiye “to turn the Turkish Cypriot community into a strategic tool to control decision-making in a reunited Cyprus under the guise of accusations of a lack of readiness to share power and wealth” is yet another proof of the mentality that prevented a solution on the island. It also represents utter disrespect for the Turkish Cypriot people, with whom the Greek Cypriot side claims to envisage a common future on the island as two equals.

With regard to the comments made by the Greek Cypriot representative about hydrocarbons, he conveniently fails to mention that the natural resources in and around the island belong to both the Turkish Cypriot people and the Greek Cypriot people. Reducing the tension is only possible through dialogue and cooperation between the two sides on the island, and it is the insistence of the Greek Cypriot side to take unilateral steps in the region that escalates tension and results in instability. Accordingly, we concur with Your Excellency’s assessment ([S/2022/534](#), para. 45) in relation to the matter, where you underlined your concern regarding the tensions in and around Cyprus, reiterated the importance of avoiding “unilateral actions” and called upon the parties to “urgently seek mutually acceptable and durable solutions to disagreements related to natural resources and ongoing or planned energy cooperation projects in the region, for the benefit of all relevant stakeholders”.

With a view to reaching this goal and cognizant of the importance of cooperation for bridging trust between the two sides in Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot side made constructive proposals to the Greek Cypriot side in 2011, 2012 and 2019. Moreover, on 1 July 2022, the Turkish Cypriot side made an alternative proposal as a fresh attempt to enable cooperation on hydrocarbons, which also included, inter alia, specific proposals for cooperation on other energy related issues. We are ready to work with the Greek Cypriot side in good faith on ideas that will enhance the daily

lives of all Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots as long as they are mutually agreed and beneficial to the two sides, respect their equality and do not involve or imply the extension of one side's authority over the other.

In concluding, I would like to remind, once again, the Greek Cypriot representative that the counterpart of the Greek Cypriot side is the Turkish Cypriot side, not Türkiye.

I would be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 44 and 78, and of the Security Council, and published on the website of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, as well as in the next edition of the *Law of the Sea Bulletin*.

(Signed) Mehmet **Dânâ**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
