



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2729
11 December 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 11 December 1986, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. WALTERS

(United States of America)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Congo
Denmark
France
Ghana
Madagascar
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
Venezuela

Mr. HOGUE
Mr. GARVALOV
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. GAYAMA
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. de KEMOULARIA
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. RABETAFIKA
Mrs. LAOHAPHAN
Mr. ALLEYNE
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. PABON GARCIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS
(S/18491 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Dountas (Greece) and Mr. Turkmen (Turkey) took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to recall that in the course of the Council's consultations, members of the Council agreed that an invitation should be extended to Mr. Ozer Koray in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite Mr. Koray in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the appropriate time I shall invite Mr. Koray to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

(The President)

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period 1 June to 30 November 1986 (S/18491 and Add.1). Members of the Council also have before them a draft resolution, contained in document S/18515, which was prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously, as resolution 593 (1986).

The first speaker is the representative of Cyprus, on whom I now call.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the high office of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December, and to commend you for the leadership and wisdom with which you have conducted the consultations on the resolution just adopted, renewing the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for another period of six months.

It is a source of satisfaction for me that the presidency of this important organ of the United Nations is in the most talented hands of a seasoned and distinguished diplomat of a great country with which we share close and friendly relations. May I add, Sir, that we are fully aware of your country's struggles and great sacrifices to create "one nation indivisible". The preservation of the indivisibility of Cyprus is one of the main causes of our own struggle, and its negation is one of the reasons for the perpetuation of our problem and for its being once more before this body.

Our congratulations go also to the President of the Security Council for the month of November, Ambassador Sir John Thomson, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for the impeccable manner in which he conducted the consultations of the Council on a number of important world issues brought before it.

I should like at the outset to thank the members of the Security Council for the decision to renew the mandate of UNFICYP, to which my Government had given its prior consent. Considering the critical situation prevailing on the island and the ongoing mission of good offices of the Secretary-General, the peace-keeping functions of UNFICYP, in promoting normalization and maintaining calm, are necessary and complementary to the peace-making efforts of our Secretary-General.

In this respect, I should like to express appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his untiring efforts in seeking a peaceful and just solution to the problem of Cyprus. In congratulating him warmly

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

on his re-election to his high post, I wish to reassure him of our full co-operation and continued support of his Cyprus mission of good offices, whose mandate was just renewed. We wish to state again that our hopes for vindication rest with the United Nations, which we consider the guardian of the freedom of all, especially the small States. The principles of its Charter constitute the corner-stone of our foreign policy and the framework within which a just and lasting solution of our problem can be found.

We commend warmly the valuable contribution of the Secretary-General's close collaborators on the question of Cyprus - the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Marrack Goulding, and Messrs. James Holger, Gustave Peissel and Giandomenico Picco. We value their dedicated efforts to advance the cause of peace in our country. We take this occasion to bid farewell to the Assistant Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, Mr. F. T. Liu, and express appreciation for his long, dedicated service and contribution to the United Nations peace-keeping efforts.

My Government's deep appreciation goes also to Major-General G. Greindl, Commander of UNFICYP, and to his officers and men, for the most efficient manner in which they carry out the duties entrusted to them by the Security Council. In referring to UNFICYP, I should most certainly not fail to express gratitude to the friendly Governments which through voluntary contributions of personnel and funds enable UNFICYP to continue rendering its indispensable peace-keeping services in Cyprus.

For 12 years, the people of Cyprus have been the anguished victims of aggression, military occupation, expulsion, uprooting, attempts at secession and the massive violation of human rights.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

For 12 years we have come before this body and other international forums to seek justice and vindication for the unacceptable injustices and crimes perpetrated against our country and people.

Our recourse to international forums has resulted in the adoption of a host of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and declarations demanding, among other things, the immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus, the return of the refugees to their homes in safety, and respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots. Those resolutions deplore all unilateral actions which aim at changing the demographic structure of the country or promote faits accomplis, and express full support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic. Security Council resolution 541 (1983) deplores the declaration of the purported secession of part of the Republic of Cyprus, considers that declaration legally invalid and calls for its withdrawal, while Security Council resolution 550 (1984) condemns all subsequent secessionist actions - which it declares "illegal and invalid" - and calls for their immediate withdrawal. Of special importance is paragraph 3 of resolution 550 (1984), which calls on all member States "not to recognize the purported State of the 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'" and "not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid secessionist entity".

It is regrettable and unacceptable that this specific and mandatory provision of solemn Security Council resolution 550 (1984) has also been contemptuously violated by Turkey, which, as is known, has not only proceeded with the exchange of so-called Ambassadors but, what is more, even finds it possible to circulate among the United Nations membership numerous letters from this secessionist and illegal entity at the expense of a critically overburdened United Nations budget.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

As to all the other numerous resolutions on Cyprus, the Government of Turkey not only has done nothing to implement any of their provisions but is outrightly violating them by consolidating further its grip on the occupied territories of the Republic. Very recent reports - verified by none other than Major-General G. Greindl, Commander of UNFICYP - confirm, as stated in paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's last report (S/18491) of 2 December 1986, that the numbers of the Turkish army of occupation have been increased and that extensive qualitative changes have also been made to its armaments, especially tanks with greater fire power and mobility. That prompted the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps and, as stated in paragraph 56 of his report, the mission of Messrs. Goulding and Feissel proceeded after Nicosia to Ankara in order, inter alia, "to take up the question of Turkish forces in Cyprus" (S/18491, para 56).

We would have liked to see more emphasis in the report on this crucial matter of the withdrawal of all Turkish troops, including reference to the tremendous increase in Turkish occupation troop strength, which now, according to United Nations sources, numbers 28,000. Although we estimate the number of Turkish troops to be more than 32,000, it remains an undisputed fact that Turkish occupation troop strength was alarmingly increased by 13 per cent in recent months. This increase is apparently the Turkish reply to the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and decisions of the past 12 years calling for the immediate withdrawal of the occupation troops from the Republic of Cyprus.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

In view of this serious development I express my Government's deep concern. We believe that the members of the Security Council should be alerted and take all necessary steps within their power so that Turkey complies with the provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Of course, the increase of Turkey's war machine in the occupied part of Cyprus is not all, for Ankara is continuously upping the ante through "Turkification" by the importation of thousands of illegal settlers into the occupied areas of the Republic of Cyprus, thus demonstrating its utter disregard for this Organization and the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.

In his report, the Secretary-General warns:

"It is obviously important that nothing should be done to change the demographic composition of the island, as such action could prejudice efforts to help the parties to negotiate an overall solution." (S/18491, para. 33)

I should add that the importation of settlers has recently acquired alarming proportions, their numbers having reached some 60,000, according to the Turkish Cypriot press. That is another gross violation of international law and Cyprus' centuries-old demographic structure. It is a matter that could prejudice negotiations, but it goes far beyond that and we believe it should have been stressed in the report in a manner revealing its proper dimension.

As things stand now, for every Turkish Cypriot there is either one Turkish soldier or one Turkish colonist-settler from Turkey in the occupied areas. The Turkish Cypriot community, segregated against its will in an apartheid-like manner from the bulk of our people, is submerged by the vocal colonist element. "Its voice", our President has stated, "is lost in the rattle of the chains of the hundreds of Turkish tanks used to invade Cyprus." The implantation of colonist-settlers from Turkey - a ruthless attempt to change the demographic

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

character of Cyprus - was condemned as recently as September of this year by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries in Harare.

It should be stressed that the settlers' party, organized and guided by Turkey, participates in the so-called government of the pseudo-State, thus enabling Turkey to have, in addition to its military control, continuing political control of the Turkish Cypriot community. Furthermore, in the worst possible irony and contempt for the democratic process, so-called elections are conducted and so-called governments are formed in the occupied areas in which these colonists have a decisive say, thus adulterating the will of the Turkish Cypriot community.

That assessment is reflected in and confirmed also by Turkish Cypriot newspaper reports and by statements of Turkish Cypriot leaders. "We are unable to be masters of our own home", stated Mr. Ozgur, a prominent Turkish Cypriot leader; and Mr. Kuchuk, the late Vice-President of Cyprus, had bitterly complained in the past: "... these settlers have turned a paradise island into an island of hell." All this points up the necessity for the discussion as a matter of priority of the three important items: the withdrawal of the Turkish troops and settlers, effective guarantees, and the three freedoms.

Since the Turkish invasion of the Republic of Cyprus in 1974 and the continuing military occupation of nearly 40 per cent of its territory, the Turkish invaders have pursued a premeditated and systematic policy of destruction of the tradition of the occupied areas. A manifestation of this policy is, among other things, the illegal changing of the place-names of towns, villages and localities which had remained unaltered for hundreds, if not thousands, of years as symbols of the historic continuity of Cyprus' culture.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has over the years strongly protested those illegalities as they recall the darker ages of mankind. This climax of

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

illegalities - the importation of Turkish colonist-settlers, the desecration of hundreds of churches, and the changing of the names of various localities in the occupied areas - is confirmed in paragraphs 33, 34, 35 and 36 of the Secretary-General's report and should be viewed with the utmost concern by the Security Council.

Such acts constitute a violation of international law, United Nations resolutions on Cyprus, and the relevant resolutions on national standardization adopted at the Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names.

Parallel to the deliberate destruction of tradition, the "Turkification", the importation of colonist-settlers and the faits accomplis, the issue of negotiations is another sad and striking example of diktat and the deceitful policy pursued by Ankara. Obviously paying only lip service to the long-drawn-out negotiations held over the years, it uses them as a smokescreen for mollifying the international community, which is anxiously awaiting progress on the question of Cyprus and its final solution.

As long as Turkey persists in its occupation of Cypriot territory, any so-called intercommunal negotiations will in fact be conducted at gun-point and offer Turkey an additional means of exerting pressure on the Greek Cypriot side in order to make it surrender to Turkish demands and force it to capitulate unconditionally and accept that the whole of Cyprus be placed under Turkey's political and military control.

Regrettably, the same means have been used in respect of the humanitarian endeavours to trace and account for the fate of the missing.

For the past 12 years not only have we been negotiating at gun-point but also through Turkish actions of faits accomplis we are now faced with a situation where

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

nothing will be left to negotiate about short of asking the Government of Cyprus to surrender and to accept the partition, dismemberment and disintegration of the Republic of Cyprus.

We would have liked to see in the report a clear condemnation of the illegal visit of Mr. Ozal to the occupied territory of Cyprus and concern for the living conditions of the enclaved Greek Cypriots. We also believe that violations of Cyprus' airspace and the forward movement of Turkish troops at Ayios Kassianos should have been castigated.

At this point I should like once again to call the Security Council's attention to Turkey's construction of a vast military airport in Lefkoniko which is now illegally operated as a "civilian airport". It is situated only few miles from another illegal airport at Tymbou, and its construction ignores not only international law but also specific demands contained in United Nations resolutions and Non-Aligned Movement declarations on the complete demilitarization of the Republic of Cyprus.

The tragedy of Cyprus which commenced with the inhuman invasion of July 1974 has thus developed into a grave threefold crisis: first, the continuing Turkish aggression and occupation and the importation of thousands of colonist-settlers into the Republic of Cyprus; secondly, Turkey's refusal to implement solemn, mandatory resolutions and decisions of this body; and, thirdly, the dilatory tactics applied by Ankara aimed at buying time to consolidate partition while the Secretary-General strives to carry out his mission of good offices.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

For our part, we have tried, within the framework of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General, to contribute to a peaceful and just solution to the problem of Cyprus. As the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, said last September at the Eighth Summit Conference of the Heads of State of the non-aligned countries, in Harare:

"We made painful concessions of the kind that no other Government in similar circumstances would have made. We made them in the hope that we would, in this way, ensure the withdrawal of foreign troops and settlers and secure effective international guarantees for the security of Cyprus as well as respect for the fundamental freedoms and human rights of all Cypriots. We have been discussing for 12 years the constitutional aspect of the problem of Cyprus and, despite our efforts, no serious discussion has yet taken place regarding the withdrawal of the occupation troops and settlers, the cessation of the foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cyprus, the international guarantees and the fundamental freedoms and human rights.

"The time has come to tackle the Cyprus problem at its root, which is the invasion, the occupation and the violation of human rights. This can no longer be postponed".

President Kyprianou continued:

"At the same time, we welcome any effort from any direction for the solution of our problem as long as it conforms with the United Nations Charter and resolutions".

We are in agreement with the Secretary-General, who states in his report that he cannot

"allow my mission of good offices to be frozen either because one side found a particular suggestion unacceptable, or because the other side, having accepted

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

a suggestion, insisted that my effort could not proceed until the other side had done the same". (S/18491, para. 54)

In the course of our discussions in Nicosia with Mr. Goulding and Mr. Feissel we welcomed the content of that position, having also considered the nature of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. It is clear from the foregoing as well as from our discussions that the Secretary-General is not a mediator or an arbitrator, and therefore any ideas or suggestions he may have are for discussion and cannot be submitted as formal proposals for acceptance or rejection. We believe that documents can be submitted only if there is prior approval by both sides. By our reply of 10 June 1986 to the suggestions of March 1986, we tried to adopt the most positive response possible in the circumstances. As regards the April 1985 documents, the Turkish Cypriot side having rejected them, no one can legitimately expect us to remain bound by them. The acceptance was made under specific assurances on many issues which subsequent Turkish actions and positions completely negated. It was also clearly and repeatedly stated that we would not be bound by those documents if the Turkish Cypriot side raised any new items in subsequent discussions. Furthermore, subsequent oral and written statements by the Turkish Cypriots on the most important issues in the documents have completely frustrated their very *raison d'être*.

The joint application of the nature of the "mission of good offices" and the concept of "integrated whole", inter alia - exemplified again recently as meaning "nothing is binding until everything is agreed" - fully supports our demand for priority treatment of the outstanding issues of the withdrawal of the troops and the settlers, guarantees and the three freedoms, as set out in President Kyprianou's letters to the Secretary-General of 20 April 1986 and 10 June 1986. That would also redress the negotiating balance amongst the various

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

elements of the Cyprus problem. It must also be stressed that the specific provisions of the United Nations resolutions for the withdrawal of the troops and settlers, the question of guarantees and the application of basic freedoms indicate the importance of those questions and the necessity of giving them priority.

In our effort to reach a just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem, we have made many proposals incorporating many painful concessions. Whilst these proposals cannot be regarded as binding, they are a measure of our good faith and good will. We are confident that resolution of the problem of troop and settler withdrawals, guarantees and the application of the three freedoms will enable us to refer once again to the other issues that have been discussed over more than a decade.

We therefore believe that the procedure suggested in President Kyprianou's letter of 10 June 1986 offers the only way out of the present situation.

At this point, I should say that we have noted in the Secretary-General's report the reference to the proposal for the convening of an international conference. We firmly believe that the Secretary-General should pursue this matter further as the specific proposal is in accord with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. We express the hope that the Secretary-General will share the view that his perserverance in pursuing this matter will pave the way to the achievement of the goal.

Since the problem of Cyprus is one of invasion and occupation, the total withdrawal of all foreign troops forms the backbone of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the crux of the interest of the world community. We consider the implementation of this provision to be a sine qua non for a just solution. It is unthinkable for foreign troops to stay in Cyprus after an agreed solution is

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

reached. The two ideas are incompatible, absolutely unacceptable not only to the Government of Cyprus but also to the international community in general, as demonstrated by its stand on other world issues. It is because of this internationally accepted position on foreign troops that this Organization, through its solemn resolutions, and the non-aligned and Commonwealth countries, through their declarations, demand the withdrawal of the Turkish troops absolutely and unequivocally.

A demilitarized Republic, united and territorially integral, without armies of occupation and barbed wires, will bring forth again, even stronger and warmer, the age-old peaceful and amicable coexistence of the people of Cyprus, separated now by artificial barriers.

We are ready for a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus. We look forward to rebuilding with the Turkish Cypriot community the bridges of co-operation which are temporarily out of use because they have been blown up by foreign interference, invasion, division and occupation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Cyprus for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Greece, on whom I now call.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I should like at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I am certain that with your wide experience you will guide the Council in the best possible manner. Allow me to mention on this occasion that it gives me particular pleasure to see this body presided over by the representative of a country with which Greece maintains a long-standing and strong friendship, successfully tested even in times of adversity. Our common and traditional commitment to the cause of democracy and human dignity is an unbreakable link between the peoples of the United States and of Greece.

I should like also to congratulate the President of the Security Council for November, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, on the highly competent manner in which, as usual, he carried out his duties.

The Security Council has further renewed the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for six months. My Government has concurred with the consent of the Government of Cyprus to that renewal. We believe that in view of the existing situation in Cyprus the Force still has a highly significant role to play in maintaining peace in the island. I should like on this occasion to express our sincere thanks to all the countries that, by contributing manpower and equipment, have made possible the mission of UNFICYP despite the severe financial problems the Force has been facing for a number of years. We are all aware of the burden those countries have had to bear, and, therefore, we are grateful to them.

In that context it should be mentioned that we have read with deep concern in the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of the extent to which UNFICYP is facing financial difficulties. Greece has, within its possibilities, contributed substantially to the financing of the Force, with a contribution of \$800,000 per year. There is no doubt that UNFICYP is facing grave difficulties. In that connection, we have observed with interest the suggestion

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

contained in paragraph 65 of the report that it might be appropriate to change the system of financing UNFICYP so that in the future its expenditure might be covered through assessed contributions. My Government would respond positively to any suggestion aimed at putting the finances of UNFICYP on a sound footing, thereby guaranteeing its existence so long as the Security Council deems its presence in Cyprus necessary.

The Permanent Representative of Cyprus, Ambassador Moushoutas, spoke in detail, and lucidly, of the various aspects of the problem of Cyprus. Therefore I shall limit my remarks only to certain aspects which have a particular importance for my Government.

My delegation has studied with great attention the aforementioned report of the Secretary-General. We were indeed deeply disturbed by the contents of paragraph 22, regarding the quantitative and qualitative increase in the Turkish occupation forces in Cyprus. We stress the fact that the Turkish authorities could not deny the qualitative improvement in their armoured forces in the occupied territories, although, for obvious reasons, they attempted to deny that manpower increases had taken place as well. It is, however, well known to all those with even a minimal opportunity to gather information regarding the occupied territories that such an increase has actually taken place.

My Government has on many occasions underlined the cardinal importance of the question of the withdrawal of the Turkish army from Cyprus. It is because of the paramount significance of that issue that the Government of Cyprus has firmly maintained that the question of the withdrawal of all the Turkish troops should be fully discussed at the negotiating table as a matter of absolute priority, before any further consideration is given to the constitutional and other aspects of the problem. That is all the more necessary because the latter aspects have been abundantly dealt with in the 12 years that have elapsed since the Turkish invasion

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

of the island. The Greek Government strongly supports this fundamental position of President Kyprianou, which is clearly and unambiguously set out in his letters to the Secretary-General of 20 April and 10 June 1986.

In this context I wish to invite the particular attention of the Council to the position stated by the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, with regard to the withdrawal of the Turkish army, in his letter of 21 April 1986, the relevant paragraph of which reads in part:

"As for the withdrawal of non-Cypriot troops excluding those that are to remain on the island, there can be no withdrawal ... "

(S/18102/Add.1, annex V).

It is obvious from that letter and from several similar statements by Turkish leaders that Turkey has the intention of leaving at least part of its army in the island indefinitely. The above statement by Mr. Denktash and the aforementioned increase of the Turkish army in Cyprus intensify our concern and further justify our basic position that the question of the withdrawal of the Turkish army should be discussed as a matter of absolute priority. Unfortunately, we see in the report of the Secretary-General no indication that the Turkish side envisages any change in its position on this question. Nor do we see in the report the matter of the Turkish occupation force given the prominence due it because of its cardinal importance.

It has been universally recognized that in all international problems involving armed occupation and currently under discussion in this Organization the crucial element is the withdrawal of the troops. No negotiations towards a solution can succeed unless they tackle from the very outset the crux of the matter, which is the withdrawal of the occupation troops. What is valid for other crisis areas is obviously valid also so far as Cyprus is concerned.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

The situation in Cyprus and the relevant options, as described in the report of the Secretary-General, do not, unfortunately, leave grounds for optimism regarding future prospects. As I have had the opportunity to mention in the past, the possibilities for progress on the Cyprus question can be correctly assessed only by dealing as a matter of priority with the main outstanding issues which constitute the crux of the question, namely, the withdrawal of the Turkish troops, eventual guarantees, and the question which is known as the three freedoms.

The presence of the Turkish army in Cyprus remains the stumbling-block for progress towards a solution in the island. It is therefore high time, we submit, that the United Nations tackled the problem of the occupation of Cyprus as a matter of priority, in a direct and bold manner, in accordance with the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations. If those efforts meet with success, the road to a negotiated settlement will open.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

The picture I have is not a rosy one, but truth is preferable to self-delusion. However, despite the negative attitude of the Turkish side towards a really fair solution and the adverse realities stemming from that, the Greek Government continues to lend its support to the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. I take this opportunity to express to Mr. Perez de Cuellar my Government's appreciation of his untiring attachment to the cause of Cyprus. We also greatly value the strenuous efforts to this effect of his most able staff. Particular thanks go to General Greindl and the officers and men of UNFICYP for their dedication to a highly delicate peace-keeping mission on the island.

My Government stands firmly at the side of the Government of Cyprus in its genuine struggle for a peaceful and just solution to a problem in which the very principles of this Organization are at stake. We fervently hope that a solution will be found for the benefit of the people of Cyprus as a whole and of peace in the region. We lend our full support to all genuine efforts towards this goal.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Greece for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Ozer Koray, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KORAY: Allow me to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the other members of the Council, for giving me the opportunity to address the Council on this matter, which is of direct concern to the Turkish Cypriot people. We value these opportunities to convey to the Council the views of the Turkish Cypriot side, as one of the directly interested parties in Cyprus.

As all representatives know, Cyprus has been on the agenda of United Nations organs for almost 23 years. In fact, to be exact, in another 10 days, the calendar

(Mr. Koray)

will show 21 December, the fateful day in 1963 on which the violent dismantling of the bi-national Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot wing commenced, in accordance with what is called the Akritas Plan - the dastardly plan of mass murder and destruction - prepared by the Greek Cypriot leadership.

It will also soon be 23 years since the day the Security Council established the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and sent it to the island. By then the Turkish people of Cyprus were already enduring, in the words of the then Secretary-General, a "veritable siege" in the enclaves into which they had been pushed by force of arms.

For the past 22 years we have been meeting every three or six months in this Chamber to extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for further periods. But a negotiated settlement of the problems created by the Greek Cypriots has remained as elusive as ever, despite the efforts exerted in this regard over many, many years.

It is time correctly and honestly to answer the question why a just and lasting, negotiated solution in Cyprus has eluded us for 23 years, in spite of many rounds of negotiations between the two sides in Cyprus - the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. In trying to diagnose correctly the cause of this failure, we have to take into account that since 1963 the two communities have lived physically apart and that the Greek Cypriots, who terminated the partnership of 1960 through the use of force, have never been genuinely interested, either before or since 1974, in re-establishing a joint Government with the Turkish Cypriots.

Our sincere reply to this question is that the recognition of an illegal, unconstitutional, usurper régime as the Government of Cyprus is the main stumbling-block in the way of a negotiated solution in Cyprus. The cause of the

(Mr. Koray)

failure, for so long, to reach a settlement in Cyprus is this unjust situation. This injustice has to be redressed.

The political equality of the two sides in Cyprus, which was embodied even in the 1960 Constitution, must be renognized, and equal treatment must be accorded to both sides if the chances of a negotiated settlement in Cyprus are to be enhanced. It is up to those who wish to see a negotiated solution in Cyprus to adjust their individual courses accordingly.

Having pointed out the primary cause of the failure to reach a negotiated settlement in Cyprus, despite the strenuous efforts of the last 23 years, I wish to point out the importance in this regard of the conclusion reached by the Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council six months ago, on 11 June 1986. It will be recalled that the report was submitted to the Security Council following the non-acceptance by the Greek Cypriot side of the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986. In paragraph 18 of that report the Secretary-General said:

"I remain convinced that, if accepted by each of the two sides, this document will provide the right framework for negotiating a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem." (S/18102/Add.1, para. 18)

Furthermore, in paragraph 19 of the same report the Secretary-General stated:

"I regret that, since one side is not yet in a position to accept the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986, the way is not yet open to proceed with the negotiations I have proposed for an overall solution." (S/18102/Add.1, para. 19)

The Turkish Cypriot side, having accepted the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986, both in substance and in procedure, continues to be in full agreement with the Secretary-General that the draft framework agreement is the right framework for a negotiated solution in Cyprus. President Denktas has since

(Mr. Koray)

reiterated on many occasions that our acceptance of it is still valid and that the draft framework agreement remains on the table.

Moreover, the Turkish Cypriot side concurs with the Secretary-General that the draft framework agreement, if accepted in substance and in procedure by the Greek Cypriot side as well, is still the right and best framework for proceeding to "negotiating a just and lasting solution", particularly because, as the Secretary-General states in paragraph 51 of his present report, of 2 December 1986, the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986

"... preserved all the points on which agreement has been reached over the past two years ...". (S/18491, para. 51)

In view of the above, the Turkish Cypriot side again concurs with and supports the Secretary-General's decision not

"to revise the document of 29 March 1986 or to present a new one ...",
(S/18491, para. 52)

for we believe, as the Secretary-General states in paragraph 54 of his report of 2 December 1986, that it is essential to

"... [preserve] all that had been achieved so far and [build] on it for further progress ...". (S/18491, para. 54)

The only factor blocking the way to progress and to a negotiated overall solution is the lack of political will on the part of the Greek Cypriot side. The Secretary-General in paragraph 61 of his latest report reiterates the aim of

"the establishment of a bi-communal, bi-zonal federal republic and recalls that

"Over the years, the two sides have reached agreement on basic principles and objectives of such a solution". (S/18491, para. 61)

The present Greek Cypriot position is in contradiction of these facts.

(Mr. Koray)

The Greek Cypriot non-acceptance of the draft framework agreement becomes all the more significant when considered in the light of the following excerpt from the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council of 11 June 1986 as regards the procedure envisaged in the draft framework agreement:

"... I proposed negotiating procedures which would give each side an ample opportunity in the negotiations that lie ahead to assure itself of the good intentions of the other. These procedures included the convening of high-level meetings whose agenda would include from the outset the questions of troop withdrawal, guarantees and the three freedoms. I also proposed the concept of an integrated whole, that is that neither side would be ultimately committed to an overall solution until all issues had been resolved to its satisfaction." (S/18102/Add.1, para. 17)

In view of the above excerpt, the magnitude of the insincerity marking the Greek Cypriot attitude and approach becomes abundantly clear.

The Turkish people of Cyprus have learned from years of experience that the Greek Cypriot leadership, which takes pride in its meek subordination to Greek Prime Minister, Mr. Papandreu, cannot and will not accept any document that embodies the principle of equal political status of both sides in Cyprus and envisages a bi-communal, bi-zonal republic. It is because of the presence of these elements in the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986 that the Greek Cypriot side has shrunk from accepting it. Their acceptance of it would have meant accepting the Turkish people as their equal in the body politic of Cyprus. This they cannot do because their oath in the Akritas Plan haunts them. They do not hide the fact that they consider the present state of affairs in Cyprus with regard to their status within the world community as the nearest thing to enosis.

And, as I stressed at the beginning of my statement, the unwarranted and unconstitutional recognition accorded to this group of usurpers as the only

(Mr. Koray)

legitimate government of Cyprus is the biggest factor encouraging and enhancing their intransigence.

A more flexible approach in the treatment of the two sides in Cyprus is the only leverage the international community has in affecting a positive change in the attitude and approach of the Greek Cypriot side.

I have no intention of dwelling upon the worthless Greek Cypriot diatribe, for such a performance of "sobbing and wailing", to which we have been subjected so many times, does not warrant wasting the Council's valuable time. However, in view of the accelerated disinformation campaign of the Greek Cypriot side on the non-issue of "settlers", I must beg the Council's indulgence to dispel the confusion that may arise in this regard.

As members all know, the island of Cyprus had been part of the Ottoman Empire for over 300 years. It therefore requires minimal logic and historical knowledge to grant that the demographic structure of the island was composed, at least from 1571 onwards, of Turkish and Greek peoples.

It is again common knowledge that the demographic structure of any country, in numerical terms, is not a static phenomenon. It is a function of various factors like birth and death rates, the rate of immigration and emigration. We can assume, therefore, that relative ratios of the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots did not remain constant over the centuries but differed according to the factors at play at a given time.

It is again a documented fact that this ratio had started to change in favour of the Greek Cypriots with the island coming under British domination in 1878. Turkish Cypriots then emigrated to Turkey, literally in their thousands. There is not a single Turkish Cypriot household that does not have a few members of its extended family living in Turkey today. This was an emigration that lasted throughout the 82 years of British rule in Cyprus.

(Mr. Koray)

The second stage of large Turkish Cypriot emigration came with the advent of EOKA terrorism in Cyprus in the 1950s. Turkish Cypriots escaping Greek Cypriot terrorism and seeking secure living conditions elsewhere emigrated in large numbers to countries like the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and, in smaller numbers, the United States of America. This movement was accelerated from 1963 onwards, when the Greek Cypriots began their cruel attack on the Turkish Cypriots, massacring them en masse and dislocating the community. Throughout the 1960s the Greek Cypriots did their utmost to encourage the Turkish Cypriots to leave the island. They issued one-way passports out of the island, but they refused passports to students studying abroad who wished to return back to their land, which resulted in many of them settling elsewhere. Many of them were physically prevented from returning back to their country during the 1960s. As a case in point, I should like to remind members of the Council that President Denktash was barred from Cyprus and had to live in exile for five years, between 1964 and 1968. Turkish Cypriots born during those dark years were not registered as citizens.

All these documented facts show that, despite their higher birth rate, the ratio of the Turkish Cypriot population of Cyprus continued to be pushed down all through these years, while at the same time the Greek Cypriot population was being augmented by importation of large numbers of people from Greece and by settling in Cyprus, after their discharge, of the mainland Greek soldiers who were in Cyprus clandestinely.

Today there are an estimated 70,000 to 80,000 Turkish Cypriots living in the United Kingdom, 20,000 in Australia, 10,000 in Canada, and so on. But by far the biggest number of Turkish Cypriots and their direct descendants live in Turkey. It is clear, therefore, that there are today more Turkish Cypriots and their descendants living elsewhere than in Cyprus itself.

(Mr. Koray)

The above records should amply prove the fact that the ratio of the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot populations, which the Greek Cypriot side is so proud of quoting, is an arbitrary ratio that is the product of extremely adverse circumstances that forced the Turkish Cypriots to emigrate over many years.

The fact that some of the people of Turkish Cypriot origin living in the above-mentioned countries have indeed opted to return to their original country - the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus - and reunite with their families, in exercise of their most natural right of citizenship - which according to our citizenship laws they could never lose unless they themselves renounce it - after conditions of peace, security and stability had returned to the island in 1974, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be interpreted as an attempt to change the demographic structure of the island by implanting "settlers".

Let me state once and for all that there is no problem of "settlers" in Cyprus the way the Greek Cypriot side portrays it. Those who return are our kith and kin coming back to their lost homeland with excitement. We encourage them to come back to where their roots are and help us with their expertise and know-how to rebuild the land from which they were forced to emigrate over many years by ruthless suppression and discrimination.

The Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is the sole legitimate authority conducting the affairs of the State, including control of its borders and of the crossing points to and from its territory. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which is the embodiment of the right to self-determination of the Turkish people of Cyprus, is as legal and constitutional as the Greek Cypriot administration masquerading as the legitimate "Government of Cyprus" is illegal and unconstitutional. The legitimate authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will continue to rebuff all attempts at interfering in the country's internal affairs.

(Mr. Koray)

Turning now to the resolution just adopted by the Council, I cannot but state that the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus rejects it, firmly and unequivocally, for the following reasons:

The Turkish people of Cyprus and its Government cannot acquiesce to the reference in the third preambular paragraph to a "Government of Cyprus" as if such an entity existed today, or ever existed since 1963. The portrayal of such an illegal, unconstitutional entity as the legitimate "Government of Cyprus" is, was, and will always be abhorrent to our people and its democratically elected, legitimate representatives. It is references such as this that encourage the Greek Cypriot Administration in its intransigence.

Similarly, the reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to "other relevant resolutions" is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side, since the Turkish Cypriot side has either rejected in toto, or accepted subject to reservations, the resolutions in question.

As regards the reference in paragraph 2 to the "mission of good offices" of the Secretary-General, the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus would like to state that it understands that mission to be emanating from Security Council resolution 367 (1975), in which case, my Government pledges it its full support.

In paragraph 3 a reference is made to the "present mandate". We have to stress that the mandate in question is not compatible with the radically changed conditions.

Despite its unavoidable rejection, in toto, of the present resolution, for reasons stated above, the Turkish-Cypriot side is nevertheless favourably disposed to accept the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) on the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the same

(Mr. Korum)

basis as that stated in June 1986. Thus, our position continues to be that, the principle, the scope, the modalities and the procedures of co-operation between the authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and UNPICY shall be based only on decisions which shall be taken solely by the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Before concluding, I should like to take this opportunity to convey to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, the Secretary-General, our heartfelt congratulations on his re-election for a second term, and to extend to him our profound appreciation and thanks for his efforts within his mission of good offices. The Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus hopes that his efforts will one day be given a chance to succeed.

I should like to convey our thanks and appreciation to Mr. James Holger, Acting Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to Major-General Gunther Greindl, the Force Commander, and to the military and civilian staff under his command.

Our thanks and appreciation go also to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Goulding, and to Mr. Peissel and Mr. Picco for their untiring efforts in pursuance of their duties.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, on whom I now call.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Security Council for this opportunity to participate once again in this biannual discussion of the situation in Cyprus.

First of all, may I extend to you, Sir, my warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I do so with particular pleasure, not only because of the very close and fruitful

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

relations existing between our two countries, but also because we are confident that your wealth of experience, your knowledge and your negotiating abilities will enable you to guide the work of the Council productively and effectively.

I also take pleasure in paying a tribute to Sir John Thomson, who presided over the Council in November with great skill and diligence.

In the previous meetings of the Security Council devoted to the matter under consideration, I had the opportunity to state our views on the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) which has been on the island since 1964. I had explained our perception of UNFICYP's role, a role which has inevitably undergone a tremendous change in so many years.

Six months ago, I had stated that if the peace process continues to be hampered by Greek Cypriot intransigence, the need for the continued presence of the Force would become more and more questionable. Let me underline that fact on this occasion as well.

The position of my Government on the resolution which has been adopted today by the Council does not need much elaboration. Because of the unacceptable elements it contains, we cannot consent to any extension of UNFICYP's mandate on the basis of the present resolution. Therefore, it lacks our support as a directly interested party. Mr. Koray has just reaffirmed the position of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the modalities of UNFICYP's presence in Northern Cyprus. I wish to confirm my Government's full agreement with that position.

We are thankful to the Secretary-General for his present report which outlines his contacts with the two sides since June in the context of his mission of good offices. Our support for his efforts in search of a federal solution in Cyprus was reiterated by the Turkish Foreign Minister in the General Assembly on 2 October 1986, when he stated the following:

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

"We continue to support the mission of good offices with regard to Cyprus of the United Nations Secretary-General and appreciate his recent efforts. We note with satisfaction the prompt acceptance by the Turkish Cypriot side of the draft framework agreement submitted on 29 March 1986 by Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar after intensive contacts over several months with both sides. We regret, however, that the Greek Cypriot side has turned down that document, which represents the cumulative outcome of a process that started more than two years ago, in August 1984, in Vienna.

"The draft framework agreement contains the principles and parameters which should guide the negotiations between the two sides in Cyprus. That framework is the result of two years of effort by the Secretary-General to reconcile the views of the two parties. It did not come as a surprise to either party since it was discussed with them in a detailed manner before it was formally presented by the Secretary-General. It is normal that neither of the parties is entirely happy with it, but the Turkish Cypriot side has accepted it in a spirit of conciliation and compromise and without any illusions as to the difficulties which will emerge during the negotiations. It has accepted it because the draft agreement reflects a reasonable balance between opposing views and delicately interconnected problems.

"The Turkish Cypriot side has proved its goodwill and its desire for the final resolution of the Cyprus problem. The Greek Cypriot side should seize this opportunity. It should realize that, in view of the evolution of the Cyprus problem, acceptance of the draft framework agreement is a sine qua non of meaningful negotiation." (A/41/PV.21, p. 78)

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

This is in essence the perspective through which we continue to view the present situation. There has been a standstill since last April owing to the attitude of the Greek Cypriots, who have continued to act according to the advice given to them from Athens. The Greek and Greek Cypriot leaderships have had, during the past six months, many new occasions to declare their identity of views in handling the Cyprus question. This collaboration can hardly be welcomed since it seems to serve only to diminish the prospects of a comprehensive settlement between the two sides. Six months ago, we heard certain unconvincing arguments from the Greek and Greek Cypriot side belittling the efforts of the Secretary-General. Since then they have further drifted away from political realism.

The Greek Cypriot demands and preconditions which are advanced to evade the draft framework agreement are illogical and unreasonable. Their sole purpose is to discard the legitimate interests of the Turkish Cypriot side. Such an attitude amounts to a denial of the history of the relations between the two communities of Cyprus for the past 23 years. In the meantime, the Greek Prime Minister continues to refer to Cyprus as "Greek national space" and military measures are stressed in the south of the island on a growing scale while there is less and less reference to an agreed solution.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

We have noted that Greece and the Greek Cypriot side have continued to manufacture allegations regarding the Turkish military presence in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus with a view to misleading world public opinion.

As stated by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 9 October 1986, Turkey has not reinforced its forces in northern Cyprus, in either personnel or equipment. Turkey has no aggressive intentions anywhere, including in Cyprus. Turkey is encouraging peace and negotiations in Cyprus and supporting, in this context, the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General and the document of 29 March 1986 that he has put forward within the framework of that mission.

The development which poses a real danger in Cyprus is the rearmament efforts on the Greek Cypriot side and Greece's contribution to and support of those efforts. The groundless claims put forward by the Greek Cypriot side are at the same time designed to cover up those dangerous efforts. The Turkish side has drawn the attention of the United Nations Secretary-General to this disquieting situation, and will continue to do so. We note from the Secretary-General's report that the Greek side has in fact considered that there has been an increase in the troop strengths and armoured vehicles in southern Cyprus.

With regard to troop strengths and level of armaments in southern Cyprus, there are mainly the following three elements to be taken into account: the Greek Cypriot "National Guard", Greek support for that force, and Greek mainland troops in Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriot "National Guard" is an unconstitutional army in terms of the 1960 bicomunal system; it was established after the destruction of the partnership in 1963 and constantly used against the Turkish Cypriot community during the dark years before 1974. So it is a force created and used by one of the partners of the bicomunal Republic against the other partner at a time when there were no Turkish

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

forces in Cyprus, apart from the Turkish contingent under the Treaty of Alliance. The Greek Cypriot "National Guard" was and still is under the command of a Greek mainland General, and Greek mainland officers staff the higher ranks. Therefore, it is a combined Greek and Greek Cypriot force. The estimated strength of that army is now around 25,000. It counts on a much larger reserve force which can readily be mobilized. According to official Greek Cypriot figures which were recently revealed, that force can reach a strength of 70,000 men within 24 hours.

The Greek Cypriot "National Guard" has been reorganized and heavily armed in recent years through direct military purchases from various countries and military assistance from Greece. Those purchases have been financed from funds which correspond to a sizable percentage of the Greek Cypriot gross national product. There is close collaboration between Greece and the Greek Cypriot administration to increase dramatically armaments and military capabilities in southern Cyprus.

At present there are 26 infantry battalions in southern Cyprus. In case of a general mobilization 27 additional infantry battalions can be formed. Furthermore, there are on the Greek Cypriot side 27 other battalions of various types, including mechanized infantry, tank, armoured carrier, commando, artillery, anti-aircraft and antitank battalions. In general there has been an increase of eight battalions in recent years. The most significant development with regard to both military equipment and reorganization has been in the mechanized infantry and the armoured carrier battalions, which reveals the importance placed on increasing armoured power. There have been notable corresponding increases in armaments in southern Cyprus: for example, the number of armoured personnel carriers has been increased by 96 in the past few years bringing the total to 140; the number of armoured reconnaissance vehicles has been increased by 112, making a total of 213. The

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Greek Cypriot arsenal further includes nearly 200 pieces of artillery, a total of nearly 200 anti-tank weapons of various sophisticated types, in addition to gunboats and light reconnaissance aircraft.

The strength of the Greek mainland troops in Cyprus at present is about one third of the Greek Cypriot "National Guard", that is, about 7,000 to 8,000. Those forces comprise the Greek military contingent, whose strength should not exceed 950 men and a Greek commando unit.

It will be recalled that after 1964 the Greek Government clandestinely sent to Cyprus an army of 20,000 men which took part in the military operations against the Turkish Cypriot enclaves. Under international pressure, Greece was forced to withdraw a part of that force in 1967; but those who remained behind were responsible for staging the coup of 15 July 1974 with the aim of annexing the island to Greece. It was those Greek forces that Archbishop Makarios, here in the Security Council, asked to be withdrawn from the island on 19 July 1974.

Apart from the regular Greek and Greek Cypriot forces, there are several private armies which in the past have engaged in some large-scale terrorist attacks against both Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots belonging to different camps.

That is the other side of the picture, which Greece and the Greek Cypriots wish to conceal.

I wish now to make some remarks about statements we have heard.

Ambassador Moushoutas stated that the crisis of Cyprus started 12 years ago. The attempt to start the history of the crisis of Cyprus only in 1974 is itself a deep cause of the conflict. The tragedy of Cyprus dates not from 1974 but from December 1963, when the Greek Cypriot forces and paramilitary units launched a vicious attack on defenceless Turkish Cypriots. That was the beginning of the division of the island; that was the beginning of the tragedy. Unless this amnesia is treated it will be difficult to resolve the issue.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The Greek Cypriot representative also lamented the fate of the Turkish Cypriots. He said that their voice was drowned by the settlers coming from Turkey and units of the Turkish Army. Mr. Kocay has given a reply to that assertion. I am sure that all Turkish Cypriots would be very amused by that touching solicitude of the Greek Cypriot Administration for their freedom and well-being. But if the Greek Cypriot Administration wishes to rescue the Turkish Cypriots from this terrible ordeal, why do they not accept the draft agreement proposed by the Secretary-General and thus permit the reunification of the island?

Commenting on the Secretary-General's proposals, the Greek Cypriot representative was again very generous today: he asked the Turkish Cypriots to accept everything which, in their view, is important, beginning with the withdrawal of the Turkish forces; after that, they promise they will take into consideration the concerns of the Turkish Cypriots for their future, including security, freedom and political equality.

The Permanent Representative of Greece has made the same point: he wants absolute priority for the withdrawal of the Turkish forces. Well, what is a priority for the Greek side is not a priority for the Turkish side. In the view of the Turkish Cypriots and in our view, all issues are interrelated and have the same priority. That is why the Secretary-General's draft agreement constitutes an integrated whole.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

In the diplomatic field, the Greek Cypriots try to mislead the world by pretending that they object to only a specific part of the draft agreement. But if one reads the letter sent by Mr. Kyprianou to the Secretary-General on 10 June 1986, one can see that the Greek Cypriot leader rejects a long list of items, including the territorial and the constitutional arrangements and safeguards which were worked out in negotiations in which he personally took part. Beside this frivolous position on questions of substance, the Greek Cypriot leader has made equally superficial suggestions of procedure which are in conflict with the procedure foreseen in the draft framework agreement and are not viable.

As we have seen many times in the past, whenever the efforts for a comprehensive solution take a more defined shape the Greek Cypriots direct their energies to frustrating that effort. In this process they feel free to create pre-conditions, go back on their words, deny previous agreements and understandings and let vehemence run loose. The Greek Cypriot side is consistent in one respect: not to accept anything. We face the same situation now.

In conclusion, I repeat our thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General; I express our appreciation to Major-General Greindl, Commander of the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force in Cyprus and his staff; I also thank Mr. James Holger, Acting Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus, as well as the members of the Secretariat dealing with the issue here in New York.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

The representative of Cyprus wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): The very fact that the President has just called on me as the representative of Cyprus to speak in exercise of the right of reply is a sufficient response to the Turkish side in regard to who represents Cyprus.

We have heard here an individual who was brought in as a "competent person" to give information. Instead, he exerted all his efforts towards giving misinformation, to diverting attention from the true identity of the culprit - Turkey, and to straying from the subject-matter before the members of the Security Council: the renewal of the mandate, made necessary because of the ongoing Turkish aggression against Cyprus and the non-implementation of United Nations resolutions. The Permanent Representative of Turkey - not I - is best suited to tell whether that person executed his instructions from Ankara well. I can say that, if anything, he demonstrated the charisma of being a chip off the old block - I mean his superior, Mr. Denktash, who stated this recently: "Whether I like it or not, whether I believe it or not, I do whatever Turkey says".

I shall address my remarks to Turkey.

The issue of settlers should deeply concern this body and the United Nations in general, not only because of the illegality and immorality involved in this discredited policy, but also because it will be presented later as a reality which Turkey will claim cannot be reversed.

On this action of importing settlers, Turkey over the years has given, and is still giving, changing and contradictory answers to the serious charges against it. First it described these settlers as "seasonal farm workers" - and I believe they are so described in the Secretary-General's report. When confronted with the question of how a region with 25-per-cent unemployment could be importing labour - when the Turkish Cypriot community was employed mainly in the agricultural sector -

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Turkey changed its version and added another lie: that the settlers were Turkish Cypriots returning to the island.

But when Turkey was once again confronted with the cold facts - the migration statistics which were kept by the United Kingdom during the colonial years, a period of almost 100 years, and which proved the Turkish answer utterly false (unless, of course, we were dealing with rabbits) - Turkey, like a snail, withdrew into its shell, brushing away any question on this subject with the ridiculous reply that the question of settlers was an internal matter of its puppet régime.

Now we have a reversion to the returning Turkish Cypriots and the seasonal workers. Unfortunately for Turkey, the ghost of the Turkish settler Colonel Tezer demolishes its attempt to conceal the truth. Colonel Tezer, in a press conference, said that the settlers had come to Cyprus with the approval of Turkey, that they had been represented as being agricultural workers and that almost all of them had been made Cypriot citizens.

The classic answer of the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Ozgur, to Mr. Gurler, when the latter was hiding the truth about the presence of settlers in Cyprus, is I believe to the point. "Mr. Gurler," asked Mr. Ozgur, "do you think we come from the moon? Are you trying to deceive us too by saying things you say to the foreigners?". And Mr. Ozgur went on: "Be a little bit serious when you are talking". That I address to the Turkish side.

And here are some quotations on the subject.

First, this is what Senator Edward Kennedy said:

"The 'colonization' policy of Ankara, which brings mainland Turkish nationals to Cyprus, has been an open secret for many months - and, in fact, was confirmed to me in a recent exchange of correspondence with the Foreign Minister of Turkey".

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Le Monde had this to say:

"The Turkish Cypriot population begins to find unbearable the presence of the occupants; military forces on the one hand and settlers on the other. About 30,000 were transplanted from the deprived areas of Turkey".

I quote the following from The Guardian:

"Migration of Turks to the northern Turkish-occupied part of Cyprus is taking place on a scale that will soon radically alter the racial balance on the island and could seriously affect the chances of a political solution".

And now we come to this quotation from Aydinlik - a Turkish newspaper:

"At this moment the number of settlers exceeds 50,000. The colonization policy still continues and every day new Turkish mainland settlers are being settled in the Turkish part of Cyprus".

Reference was made to discrimination by the Government of Cyprus. That is another ludicrous attempt to mislead the world. When 18 per cent of the population is given 30 per cent of the government posts, when that 18 per cent has 40 per cent of the police and security posts - as the Turkish community had under the 1960 Constitution - it is really strange to brand the Government of Cyprus as having discriminated against or suppressed the Turkish Cypriot community.

The Turkish representatives refer to the 1954 and 1974 eras. The history of Cyprus is centuries-old. But, like all merchants of hate, they single out 20 years of some intermittent, staged and scattered intercommunal incidents and discard four centuries of continuous peaceful, friendly relations between the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities. Why do they do that? Because they cannot justify their actions of segregation, partition and division in the enlightened world of the twentieth century.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

The Turkish representative spoke about Turkey's favourite subject, and I would like to make this reply: Yes, there were some staged, intermittent clashes. Yes, lives were lost - some Greek Cypriots, some Turkish Cypriots. Yes, that occurred during the colonial years and again in 1964 and in 1967, when Cyprus was independent. These clashes were instigated and orchestrated by Turkey - a tactic reminiscent of the methods of those who intentionally set fire to someone else's home in order to have a pretext for entering the home and stealing the owner's belongings.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

From the history of your own country, Mr. President, you know better than anyone that one does not partition a country and that one does not forcibly segregate its people on ethnic criteria just because in the past - 20 or 30 years before - disturbances occurred. One does not promulgate apartheid solutions on the pretext of maintaining security. Instead, one strives to keep unity in a country created as one and indivisible. One strives for co-operation and justice for all, with a common country and destiny. That is the position of my Government.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Greece has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I call upon him now.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I am indeed reluctant to exercise my right of reply at this late hour, but I am afraid I have to say a few words in reply to what Ambassador Turkmen has just stated. In the first place, I should like to address his statement that Greece is demanding the withdrawal of the Turkish troops as a matter of absolute priority, with the consequence that the Turkish community would be left unprotected. But that is not what I said. The position that the Turkish troops should be withdrawn as a first priority stems from the very fact that those troops are illegally in Cyprus and that they are the by-product of an invasion that has been condemned by this Organization.

No matter what that basic position may be, what I said was that

"the question of the withdrawal of all the Turkish troops should be fully discussed at the negotiating table as a matter of absolute priority, before any further consideration is given to the constitutional and other aspects".

I explained the reasons for calling for that absolute priority: I went on to say that

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

"That is all the more necessary because the latter [constitutional and territorial] aspects have been abundantly dealt with in the 12 years that have elapsed since the Turkish invasion". (supra, p. 22)

I just wanted to set the record straight as to what I actually said.

Allow me now to comment on two or three other remarks made by the Permanent Representative of Turkey. It seems to me that there is something of a discrepancy between certain sensitivities and certain insensitivities of Ambassador Turkmen. He felt obliged to state his shock because the Greek Government is closely co-operating with the Government of Cyprus - which is true. But at the same time he not only appeared insensitive to the fact that the Turkish community in Cyprus is co-operating closely with Ankara, but also tended to ignore that the northern part of Cyprus is ruled by Ankara, and that the instrument of that rule is the Turkish army of occupation.

There is another discrepancy of the same nature: the Turkish Ambassador felt obliged to say that the Government of Cyprus is preparing its army for defence and increasing its strength. Also, he maintains that there are a number of Greek troops in Cyprus. In the first place, I should like categorically to deny his assertion that we have 8,000 Greek soldiers and officers in Cyprus; that is totally inaccurate. But even if for argument's sake we were to accept that there are certain Greek military elements in Cyprus, it strikes me that the representative of Turkey was shocked that a number of Greek officers and men are supposedly in Cyprus, while totally ignoring the fact that there are, illegally, 27,000 Turkish troops in Cyprus. That is the discrepancy between sensitivity and insensitivity to which I pointed.

There is a very serious aspect to what Ambassador Turkmen said, a very important contribution to the Security Council's discussion. The situation

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

Ambassador Turkmen has described completely justifies our position that the question of the armies in Cyprus is of paramount importance indeed. That is why my Government has consistently and persistently asked that the Turkish troops - and all foreign troops - be withdrawn from Cyprus: because what Ambassador Turkmen said corroborates our position that the question of Cyprus is one of international dimensions and importance. It is a question that involves - apart from the other fundamental aspects of the question, such as the question of the exercise by Cyprus of its sovereignty over the island - the direct confrontation in the island between the army of Turkey and parts of the Greek army. That is the very point on the basis of which my Government has been asking for years that the question of the withdrawal of all armies be discussed as a matter of absolute priority.

I beg the Security Council to attach particular importance to that aspect, because it is an aspect that pertains to the maintenance of peace in the region.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Turkey, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I should like first to address two points made by Ambassador Dountas. He says that because there are Turkish forces in northern Cyprus we are dominating the northern part of the island and imposing our will on the Turkish Cypriot government there. Well, I do not think that the presence of forces in any country means that the political will of that country is also dominated. For instance, there are many United States troops in the Federal Republic of Germany; does that mean that the United States Government rules the Federal Republic of Germany? Similarly, there are Soviet troops in some Eastern European countries; does that mean that the Soviet Union rules those countries? The principle cannot be accepted.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

There are Turkish forces in northern Cyprus because the Government of the Republic of Northern Cyprus wishes those forces to remain there until there is a solution.

Ambassador Dountas also said that what he meant was that priority should be given not to the actual withdrawal of forces, but rather to the discussion of the issue. But the question will be discussed, according to the draft agreement proposed by the Secretary-General; it is one of the many points to be discussed by the two sides when negotiations start. The objection we have is that it is not a priority problem because if it is a very important issue for the Greek side, political equality is more important for the Turkish side. So the two issues have to be discussed and negotiated together.

According to the representative of Greece, I said I was shocked by the presence of the Greek forces in southern Cyprus. How can I be shocked when we knew of it all along? I must say that we tried very hard to have at least part of those forces removed in 1967, and we know that a number of them remained there. Thus, we were not "shocked"; I do not think I used that word.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

I wish to make one brief remark to the representative of the Greek Cypriot administration, who made a very good point. He said that for four centuries the Turks and Greeks on the island had lived together in peace and in partnership. That is true, but it was during the time of the Ottoman Empire, when the Turks had the greater political power on the island. When matters were reversed and the Greeks had the upper hand, things deteriorated.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cyprus, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I wish, in fact, to make a historical point, Mr. President. Cyprus became independent in 1960. Since 1878 it had been under the United Kingdom. So the statement of the representative of Turkey should be considered bearing that in mind.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: Since many delegations may not be represented by their permanent representatives at additional meetings that may take place later in December, I should be remiss if I did not take this occasion to thank the outgoing members of the Council for their outstanding co-operation during my presidency.

FAREWELL TRIBUTE TO MR. VIACHESLAV A. USTINOV, UNDER-SECRETARY-GENERAL FOR POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS

The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to say a few words of farewell to Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Viacheslav A. Ustinov. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing to Mr. Ustinov our recognition of his many efforts on behalf of the Council and its members. As he leaves to assume new responsibilities on

(The President)

behalf of his Government, I extend to him on behalf of the Council very best wishes in his future endeavours. We wish him and his family happiness.

(spoke in Russian)

I wish to thank Under-Secretary-General Ustinov for his excellent work in the Security Council. We all wish him great success and health in the future.

(continued in English)

I call on Under-Secretary-General Ustinov.

Mr. USTINOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): I should like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to you, Mr. President, for your very kind words addressed to me on behalf of the members of the Council and on your own behalf.

It has been a great honour for me to have been deeply involved in the work of this main organ of the United Nations system, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. I have tried to fulfil my duties in the best way possible, to the best of my ability, during the more than five years that I have been with the Organization.

I am particularly grateful to Mr. Perez de Cuellar, our Secretary-General, for his wise guidance and co-operation, which I always felt. My thanks go also to all my colleagues in the Secretariat, and especially to the staff of the Security Council and Political Committees Division, ably headed by Mr. Ortner, who helped me a lot.

May I express once again to you, Mr. President, and all members my sincere gratitude for your kind co-operation and understanding and my wish for the further promotion of the noble goals and principles of the United Nations Charter, in the interests of international peace and security.

(Mr. Ustinov)

I take this opportunity to extend to all of you here best wishes for the coming year.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Under-Secretary-General Ustinov for his kind words addressed to all of us.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): I should like to associate myself and my delegation with the farewell tribute which you, Mr. President, on your own behalf and on behalf of the Council, extended to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Viacheslav Aleksandrovich Ustinov.

My delegation would like to extend its deepest gratitude to the Under-Secretary-General for his very important contribution to the Security Council's work as a senior member of the Secretariat. We are very well aware and indeed appreciative of the way in which the Under-Secretary-General has discharged his duties, manifesting throughout his rich erudition, wisdom and wide experience as a diplomat. He has accomplished various assignments with distinction and excellence.

In bidding farewell to the Under-Secretary-General the Bulgarian delegation wishes him good health and success in the new post to which his Government will assign him.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to associate myself, Mr. President, with the kind words you expressed to the outgoing Under-Secretary-General, Viacheslav Aleksandrovich Ustinov.

The Soviet delegation wishes to extend to him its deepest gratitude for his great contribution to the Council's work and for his excellent leadership of his Department. Thanks to the great diplomatic skill, experience and organizational talents he has displayed in his high post, he has successfully carried out a

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

variety of complicated political tasks and diplomatic functions. The Soviet delegation wishes Viacheslav Aleksandrovich Ustinov further fruitful work in the diplomatic field, good health and all success and happiness.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

