



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1989/83
9 March 1989

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-fifth session
Agenda item 12 (a)

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL
FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR
REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND
TERRITORIES

QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CYPRUS

Letter dated 6 March 1989 from the Permanent Representative
of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed
to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights

I have the honour to enclose herewith a message addressed to you on behalf of one of the two main parties to the Cyprus dispute, i.e. the Turkish Cypriot Community, by H.E. Mr. Kenan Atakol, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence.

As will be recalled, a debate was initiated in the Commission on Human Rights on the question of Cyprus, unfortunately in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot Community, one of the two main parties to the conflict. Under these circumstances, the Turkish Cypriot Community has been left with no alternative but to submit its views in writing, so that its views can at least appear on the records.

It would be appreciated if the present letter and the attachment thereto could be issued, in accordance with previous practice, as a document of the Commission on Human Rights under agenda item 12.

(Signed) Ercüment YAVUZALP
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

LETTER FROM MR. KENAN ATAKOL TO THE CHAIRMAN OF
THE COMMISSION AT ITS FORTY-FIFTY SESSION

With reference to the all too familiar, groundless allegations made by the Greek Cypriot representative, under agenda item 12 (a), during the forty-fifth session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, I have thought it pertinent to respond to some of the most glaring distortions attempted by the Greek Cypriot representative.

As you are aware, the negotiations aimed at a bi-communal, bi-zonal federal solution of the Cyprus question have resumed with the Geneva Accord of 24 August 1988, between the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot peoples. It should not be doubted that the intercommunal negotiations, in which the two sides of the Cyprus question participate on an equal footing, is the only viable medium for a sustained and fruitful discussion of the question. A debate of the question, therefore, by the Commission on Human Rights or, for that matter, by any other international body, in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot side, which is one of the two sides to the Cyprus conflict, is certain to have a negative effect on the negotiating process, and to impede the efforts exerted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations within the framework of his mission of good offices, towards finding a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

Needless to say, the Greek Cypriot attempts in past sessions of the Commission, under agenda item 12 (a), aimed at distorting the facts relating to Cyprus and discrediting the Turkish Cypriot side, in addition to the one-sided, unrealistic resolutions adopted by the Commission, the most recent being in 1987, in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot side, may have been responsible for the increased intransigence of the Greek Cypriot side.

The question of human rights is foremost among the topics exploited by the Greek Cypriots.

We believe that the Greek Cypriot leadership is least qualified to speak on human rights for it has violated practically every single human right of the Turkish people of Cyprus in their attempt to unite Cyprus with Greece (Enosis), in accordance with the notorious Akritas plan prepared by them in collaboration with Greece. In pursuit of Enosis they brought terrorism to Cyprus as far back as the late 1950s and as of 1963 have launched an all-out armed onslaught against the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner of the bi-national Republic of 1960, killing, oppressing and persecuting the Turkish Cypriot population in the process. This bloody onslaught on the Turkish Cypriots, which resulted, inter alia, in the rejection of the Turkish Cypriot wing of the then bi-national Republic from all organs of the State, and in the usurpation by the Greek Cypriots of the entire State machinery, put an end to the legitimacy of that partnership Republic emanating from its bi-national character.

The fait accompli thus created by the usurper, dictatorial Greek Cypriot régime and the violations of the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the constitutional, legal and economic rights, of the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner in the process, profoundly demonstrate that the Cyprus question started in 1963 and is not, as alleged by the Greek Cypriots here and elsewhere, a problem of "occupation" which began in 1974.

The rhetoric, therefore, that the rightful and justified Turkish intervention was a violation of international law is totally baseless. The Turkish intervention in Cyprus in 1974, five days after the Greek-engineered coup, was carried out in accordance with international law, namely the Treaty of Guarantee, in order to prevent the annexation of Cyprus by Greece. The Greek-engineered coup of 15 July 1974 was a final step to the union of Cyprus with Greece, as stated by Makarios in his statement to the Security Council of 19 July 1974 (United Nations document SPV 1780).

Another matter which the Greek Cypriot side has been exploiting, in total disregard of all norms of ethics, is the matter of displaced persons.

The Greek Cypriot side prefers to ignore, or at best misinterpret the Population Exchange Agreement of 1975, concluded in Vienna between the leaders of the two peoples, as a result of which the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot peoples were regrouped, on a voluntary basis, and under the supervision of the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), in the north and in the south, respectively. In fact, with the above mutually agreed arrangement, the way was paved for a solution of the Cyprus question on a bi-communal, bi-zonal federal basis, the aim which the Secretary-General of the United Nations through his mission of good offices, is trying to foster.

The degree of Greek Cypriot insincerity and lack of concern for human rights in Cyprus, however, can most alarmingly be seen from the existence of mass graves all over the island where, in some cities, the entire population of villages had been massacred. What is equally terrifying is that all this was done in the name of Enosis.

Against this background, it is indeed ironic that the Greek Cypriots, as the authors of the Akritas plan - and extermination plan for the Turkish Cypriots - should raise the issue of "human rights in Cyprus" before this esteemed body.

Having stated the above, and in view of the peace and calm that has prevailed in the island of Cyprus for a decade and a half now, which is unprecedented in its recent history, we think it imperative that credence is not given to the false propaganda of the Greek Cypriot representative and that inflammatory, one-sided resolutions on Cyprus are avoided.

This is clearly essential for the success of the talks, since a one-sided resolution on Cyprus, in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot side, can only impede the Secretary-General's efforts towards finding a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

(Signed) Kenan ATAKOL
Minister of Foreign
Affairs and Defence
