



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

JUN 15 1987

UN/SC COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2749
12 June 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 12 June 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

Members: Argentina
Bulgaria
China
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Ghana
Italy
Japan
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Venezuela
Zambia

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. TSVETKOV
Mr. HUANG Jiahua
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. DANОВI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir Crispin TICKELL
Ms. BYRNE
Mr. AGUILAR
Mr. NGO

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 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME TO THE NEW PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): At the beginning of our meeting, I should like, on behalf of the Council, to extend a warm welcome to Sir Crispin Charles Cervantes Tickell, the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations. We look forward to co-operating closely with him in the work of the Council.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): It is an honour, Sir, for me to take part, as Permanent Representative of my country, in this Council of such importance to the world, and the more so under your wise and experienced presidency. I speak today with all the more pleasure on the day following the new mandate given to my Government by the British people. I look forward to co-operating with you and the other members of the Council in this debate and in all your future work.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Since the Security Council is holding its first meeting for the month of June, I should like, on behalf of the Council, to pay a tribute to Mr. Li Luye, Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations, who presided over the Council during the month of May. I am sure that, in thanking Ambassador Li for his diplomatic tact and the courtesy with which he conducted the proceedings in the Council last month, I am expressing the feelings of all members of the Council.

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/18880 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): 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 invited.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): 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 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 December 1986 to 29 May 1987 (S/18880 and Add.1). Members of the council also have before them a draft resolution contained in document S/18909, which was prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to 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: Argentina, Bulgaria, China, Congo, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Italy, Japan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zambia

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 597 (1987).

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

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Allow me to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for the month of June, and to commend you on the skilful manner in which you conducted the consultations on the draft resolution just adopted, renewing the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for another period of six months.

We are happy that the presidency of the Security Council is in the talented hands of a distinguished representative of the Congo, a fellow non-aligned country to which we are united by strong bonds of friendship and mutual solidarity. I am particularly happy that the Permanent Representative of the Congo to the United Nations, Ambassador Martin Adouki, a dear colleague and friend, is presiding over this meeting of the Council, which is important for my country.

Our warm congratulations are also extended to the President of the Security Council for the month of May, Ambassador Li Luye of China, a distinguished representative of another friendly country, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council in May.

The renewal of the peace-keeping mandate of UNFICYP, to which my Government has given its consent, is, under the circumstances, imperative, owing to the situation prevailing in our island as a result of continuing Turkish aggression and occupation.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Members of the Council are aware that because of the 1974 Turkish invasion almost 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus remains under occupation; 200,000 Cypriots have been uprooted from their homes and lands and rendered refugees in their own country; and 1,619 Cypriots are still missing, which causes untold human suffering to their families and poses at the same time a moral challenge to the world community to ascertain their fate. Our people, who lived intermingled for centuries, have been segregated by the Turkish army of occupation through blood and iron on the basis of ethnic criteria, in an attempt to destroy the age-old peaceful and amicable co-existence of the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots.

A Turkification programme aimed at changing everything that bears a Greek name is being pursued by Ankara through the expulsion of the Greek inhabitants of the occupied areas, the importation of 65,000 settlers to usurp the homes of those expelled, the desecration of religious shrines, and the destruction of the religious and cultural heritage of our people.

United Nations resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus, the return of the refugees to their homes and lands in safety, respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus, as well as respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms - including the cardinal resolutions 365 (1974), 541 (1983) and 550 (1984) - continue to be contemptuously disregarded by Turkey. Ankara chose to turn its back on their solemn provisions, for, to date, no troops have been withdrawn and not a single refugee has been allowed to return to his home. As a matter of fact, the contrary is true, since there have been considerable increases, qualitative and quantitative, in the Turkish army. Furthermore, considering that over 20,000 Greek Cypriots remained in

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

the occupied areas right after the Turkish onslaught, those people were forced by the Turkish troops to abandon their places of ancestry and seek safety in Government controlled areas, so that today not even 1,000 remain in the occupied part of Cyprus.

The Turkish army in Cyprus has absolute control of the occupied areas; it intervenes whenever and wherever it chooses, specializing in the seizure of property and suppressing the Turkish Cypriot community. There are now 35,000 Turkish soldiers there; and, if one adds the 65,000 settlers brought from Anatolia, it is clear that for every Turkish Cypriot there is a mainland Turk.

This state of affairs frustrates any independent action by the Turkish Cypriot community and renders the latter a virtual prisoner. As the Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Ozgur said on 23 April 1987 in Yeniduzen,

"Democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms are all displayed in the show window in the TRNC, and the passer-by gets the impression that those things are sold in the shop. The back of the shop is, however, a butchery, where the citizens are forced to toe the line. There are repression, threats, blackmail and subduing mechanisms behind the counter."

To this repression by the Turkish army so cogently referred to by a Turkish Cypriot leader is attributed the lack of freedom in the occupied areas of my country; it explains the negative position taken by Mr. Denktash on United Nations resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the occupation troops. Here, for example, is the gist of a letter dated 21 April 1986 from Mr. Denktash addressed to the Secretary-General:

"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)

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

That was his cynical reply to United Nations resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the Turkish troops from Cyprus.

The "repression and subduing mechanisms" also explain similar statements of Mr. Denktash, prompted always by Ankara, to the effect that even after an agreement is reached on the question of Cyprus Turkish troops must remain in the island to provide "effective protection for the Turkish Cypriot community". It should be stressed in that respect that the Security Council resolutions call for the immediate withdrawal of the Turkish troops. No qualifications exist as to their withdrawal, other than that it has to be immediate. Thus, on Turkish insistence, the international community is being asked to accept something which is contrary to the provisions of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. As stated before, Mr. Denktash rejects also the three freedoms of movement, settlement and ownership of land - that is, the right of the people of Cyprus, irrespective of ethnic background, to move about freely in their own country.

Segregation of our people and division of our territory have always been and still are the policy of Turkey in Cyprus. They do not deny it. They offer instead the untenable argument that separation is necessary for the security of the Turkish Cypriot community. Here is an island with 650,000 inhabitants, 80 per cent Greek Cypriots, 18 per cent Turkish Cypriot, and 2 per cent of other ethnic backgrounds, having on its soil a United Nations peace-keeping Force; here is a proposal put forward by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, for complete demilitarization of the island and for the establishment of a mixed police force composed of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. And, on the other hand, here is Ankara still alleging that segregation of our people is necessary for the security of the Turkish Cypriot community. One might ask, what about the security of the 82 per cent of the people? Does anyone expect them to feel secure when a

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

fully equipped army of 35,000 Turkish troops is on the island? If Turkey is to argue about the security considerations of the Turkish Cypriots, what about the security considerations of all the population of Cyprus, which is continuously suffering and which, as the Secretary-General states, feels threatened by the Turkish occupation forces? That, I believe, is a reasonable question to be addressed to Ankara.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

That the Turkish policy in Cyprus calls for the physical separation of the two communities is evidenced by the purported declaration of the attempted unilateral declaration of independence in November of 1983 and by Mr. Ozal's most recent statement, which was reported by Bayrak on 23 April 1987, in which he said that

"in Cyprus, the coexistence of two communities with different language and religion has no meaning."

In order to promote Ankara's separatist scheme, those communities are referred to by Turkey as "peoples." Yet even if one assumes, for the sake of argument, that there is more than one people in Cyprus - which is not the case - what is the moral or legal justification for keeping these people apart? Is there any meaningful reason for segregating our people? I submit that there is none excepting the policy of partition, which aims at the annexation of the occupied part of Cyprus contrary to international law, the principles of the Charter and United Nations resolutions.

Furthermore, such Turkish separatist doctrines flagrantly violate the letter and the spirit of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Cyprus, which specifically demand the return of all refugees, whether Greek Cypriots or Turkish Cypriots, to their homes, where, as is well known, they lived for centuries intermingled in safety.

The Turkish position, on the other hand, that Turkey, in spite of the aggression it has committed against Cyprus, is to remain there after an agreement is reached as one of the guarantor Powers with a right to intervene, and that any solution must envisage the permanent stationing of Turkish troops in Cyprus, is like forcing the victim of an assault to employ the protective services of the attacker or, more plainly, it is placing the wolf to watch over the young lamb.

During the past six months under consideration the Turkish attempts to colonize Varosha further have intensified, contrary to the specific provisions of Security Council resolution 550 (1984), which states that the Security Council

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

"Considers attempts to settle any part of Varosha by people other than its inhabitants as inadmissible and calls for the transfer of that area to the administration of the United Nations".

The President of the Republic of Cyprus, drawing the attention of the Secretary-General to this new contemptuous act by Turkey, wrote, in a letter dated 11 May 1987:

"It is obvious that the Turkish side is resorting once again to its familiar tactics of creating faits accomplis and trying then to find ways and means to justify them.

"Therefore, no pretexts, of whatever kind, should be entertained that would nullify the express undertaking of completely vacating all three premises by a specific date without any further postponement and delay."

(S/18903, annex III, p. 4)

My President continued:

"the decisions of the Security Council are of a mandatory nature on the Members of the United Nations,"

and he requested that the Secretary-General

"formally call upon Turkey to surrender the town to [United Nations] jurisdiction." (S/18903, annex III, pp. 4-5)

In this regard the Secretary-General - correctly, we feel - states in paragraph 28 of his report that he considers the Government of Turkey responsible for the situation in Varosha.

As to the recent tremendous increases in strength, both quantitative and qualitative, of the Turkish army of occupation, which are fully confirmed in the last two reports of the Secretary-General - S/18491, paragraph 22; and S/18880 of 29 May 1987 - Mr. Halefoglu, the Foreign Minister of Turkey, stoically considers

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

the military build-up to fall within the rights of his country to defend its interests, thus alleging that the interests of Ankara cover Cyprus and obviously forgetting that there is a host of Security Council resolutions demanding the withdrawal of those Turkish troops from the island. Mr. Halefoglu's arrogance, however, apparently has no limits. His statement to journalists in Ankara on 6 June 1987 while commenting on the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council, S/18880, in which he said that:

"Turkey does not have to answer to anyone on the number of troops and military equipment it has in Cyprus,"

constitutes a provocation to this body, especially in view of its numerous resolutions and decisions demanding the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus. As my President stated in his letter to the Secretary-General dated 21 May 1987, the recent vast increases in Turkish troops and tanks, now reliably estimated to be 35,000 troops and 300 heavy tanks,

"should be viewed in conjunction with information regarding the military airport in Lefkoniko and the naval port at Kyrenia and vast stores of equipment brought into the occupied part of Cyprus by Turkey to enable it to bring additional forces which are known to have been earmarked for this purpose." (S/18903, annex V, p. 9)

In this regard, verification should not equate the aggressor with the legal and legitimate defence forces of the Republic of Cyprus.

Parallel to the increase in troop strength, the influx of Turkish settlers in the occupied areas of Cyprus continues unabated. So high is the level of the increase of the alien element in those areas - now estimated at 65,000 - that Mr. Durduran, another Turkish Cypriot leader, is reported to have stated on 15 May 1987 in Yeniduzen, that

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

"the aim of Ankara is to turn the Turkish Cypriot community in the occupied areas into a minority and change the demographic structure of Cyprus."

It is our earnest hope that the Secretary-General and the members of the Security Council will in their wisdom grasp the gravity of the situation created and the ominous implications it entails. The magnitude of the problem could not be washed away by the lame attempt at justification offered by the Foreign Minister, Mr. Halefoglu, before the Council of Europe or the most recent statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey.

The President of the Republic of Cyprus, His Excellency Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, in another letter, dated 3 June 1987, addressed to the Secretary-General, characterized the influx of the colonist settlers as one of the most alarming factors negatively affecting and seriously threatening the prospects of solution of the Cyprus problem, and he therefore called upon the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps and use all available means at his disposal in order to ensure compliance by Turkey with the rule of law by withdrawing all the colonist settlers from Cyprus. He stressed that

"This matter is a glaring example of the need to settle the basic issues of the Cyprus problem as a matter of urgency and priority." (S/18907, annex, p. 3)

I venture to hope that effective action will be promoted by the Secretary-General and the Security Council to arrest and reverse this process of adulteration of the demographic character of Cyprus.

For the past 13 years we have been coming before this body and other international forums seeking vindication for the injustices perpetrated against our country and people.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

The United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Commonwealth and other forums have vindicated our cause and adopted numerous resolutions and declarations condemning the Turkish actions and demanding implementation of Security Council resolutions.

The Security Council is therefore warranted to take measures provided in the Charter to ensure compliance with its decisions. This can be done, and it must be done, not only for the sake of peace in Cyprus but for the sake of the United Nations itself, whose reason for existence is at stake and whose prestige is being tested.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

We know of the United Nations shortcomings. We have experienced its inability to act effectively and promptly in checking aggression throughout the world by implementing its system of international security as provided by the United Nations Charter. We have, however, never underestimated or doubted our Organization's vast moral power, which we believe can be channelled into practical power and specific measures. We are hopeful, and still expect, that the United Nations torrent of moral power will be used effectively for the good of all the people of Cyprus and mankind in general. We believe that the tragic situation in Cyprus, as well as in other parts of the world, cries out for remedial action by the Council and that, even with the Council's present state of affairs, it has the means for effective measures that will prevent the violation of Charter provisions.

The Security Council can stop the unending chain of illegalities in Cyprus and, most importantly, can ensure that any solution is in accordance with the United Nations resolutions. We therefore believe that the members of the Security Council should give primary weight to the long overdue need for implementation of its resolutions on Cyprus.

The Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations have solidly defined the parameters within which a just and lasting solution of the Cyprus problem must be sought. Their resolutions unequivocally demand that such a solution must of necessity entail the unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus, the immediate cessation of all foreign interference in its internal affairs, the return of the refugees to their ancestral homes and lands, and the safeguarding of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of all Cypriots in an undivided Cyprus.

Understandably, we would consider inconceivable any suggestion from without the United Nations, or more shockingly from within the United Nations, that we succumb to the diktat of the aggressor and in the name of pseudo-realism agree to a

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

solution falling outside the above parameters, which are consecrated by the Charter of the United Nations and the basic norms of international law.

Indeed any suggestion that a quick "solution" of the Cyprus problem be patched up by abandoning the cardinal premises laid down in the aforementioned United Nations resolutions merely in order to meet the demands of the aggressor would constitute an affront to this august body, to international law and to the world community at large.

As President Kyprianou has stated on numerous occasions, the Government and people of Cyprus are anxious for a speedy solution, but at the same time under no circumstances are they prepared to compromise the sacred premise of a just and viable solution for what the invader would dictate to us to accept.

We are confident that this position meets with the fullest support and understanding of the Security Council and the General Assembly and, of course, of our Secretary-General. It is our view that in order rapidly to advance a solution of the Cyprus problem appropriate measures by the Security Council are warranted, coupled with strong pressure by those who are in a position to influence Turkey.

The members should therefore give full support to the proposal for the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to consider the external aspects of the problem of Cyprus - that is, the question of troop and settler withdrawal and international guarantees. We have allowed almost 1 year for the consideration of the internal, constitutional aspects of the problem. My Government feels it is high time that we dealt with the cardinal issues, and it fully supports such a conference, which it considers in accord with the Charter. On this subject, on 10 March 1987 the President of the Republic of

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Cyprus addressed a letter to the Secretary-General stressing the need and reiterating his view that the Secretary-General should

"endorse this proposal [for the convening of an international conference] and proceed with a determined effort to convince those members of the Security Council who appear to be unfavourable of the necessity for the convening of [it]". (S/18880, para. 61)

In another, the most recent, letter dated 19 May 1987, the President again strongly urged the Secretary-General to endorse the proposal for an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Such a step definitely falls within the Secretary-General's specific and general mandate of good offices in his search for a just and lasting solution.

As we have stated repeatedly, the Government of Cyprus is committed to a negotiated settlement. That commitment has again been demonstrated by our acceptance, in March last, of the Secretary-General's procedural ideas for parallel talks. It is regrettable, as the Secretary-General states in his report (S/18880), that the Turkish side has not found it possible to accept them. We believe that the people of Cyprus as a whole stands to benefit from a just and lasting solution that will bring an end to the 13 years of military occupation and allow unimpeded freedom for all our people to move and reside all over the island, whether they are Greek Cypriots or Turkish Cypriots.

These aspirations of all our people and their yearning for peace and co-operation in a federal republic are in accord with the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Declarations of the Non-Aligned and of the Commonwealth and the High Level Agreements.

In this respect I should like to express deep appreciation of the Secretary-General's untiring efforts and to state once again our full co-operation with and continued support for his mission of good offices. We remain determined

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

to seek justice through the United Nations, the Organization whose principles constitute the corner-stone of our foreign policy and the framework within which a just and lasting settlement of our problem can be found.

We commend the significant contribution of Under Secretary-General Mr. Marrack Goulding and his able colleagues Messrs. Gustave Feissel, James Holger and Giandomenico Picco and their continuous efforts to advance the cause of peace in our country.

My Government's deep appreciation goes also to Major-General G. Greindl, Commander of UNFICYP, and to his officers and men for the dedicated manner in which they continue to carry out their duties against many adversities. We express warm feelings of gratitude and appreciation to all the friendly Governments which, through voluntary contributions of personnel and funds, have enabled UNFICYP to continue rendering its indispensable peace-keeping services in Cyprus.

We believe that the stationing of the Force is absolutely necessary. We also believe that UNFICYP needs and should have at its disposal all means to carry out its lofty mission. All methods guaranteeing this are welcomed by the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. We are all too aware that the financial burden of supporting UNFICYP has fallen on a number of countries only, and that there are concerns about the large deficit that has been accumulated. Cyprus, the victim of a cruel act of aggression, has unfailingly supported the Force. In the event that a process of assessed contributions is agreed upon, we shall, as always, be forthcoming in moral and material support at the present high levels of contribution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): 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 warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I am certain that you will guide the Council's deliberations in the best possible manner inspired by your experience and skill.

I should also like to congratulate the President of the Security Council for the month of May, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, Ambassador Li Luye, for the highly competent manner in which he carried out his duties.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus as the sole spokesman of the Republic's sovereignty has accepted the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further six months. My Government, a party interested in this international dispute, has concurred.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the officers and men of UNFICYP who, under the able leadership of General Greindl, carry out successfully a difficult and delicate task. Our sincere thanks are also addressed to the countries which, by contributing men and material, have made possible UNFICYP'S continuing existence. The Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, who pursues his mission indeed with remarkable stamina and dedication against many adversities, certainly deserves our genuine appreciation and recognition. My Government continues to lend its full support to his mission of good offices.

The Greek Government has on many occasions stated its conviction that UNFICYP is a highly significant factor of stability and peace, not only in the Republic of Cyprus, but also in the wider area. In particular, under the prevailing circumstances the Force constitutes a neutral element with great moral authority whose presence somewhat prevents the deterioration of the situation created by the continuing illegal military occupation of part of Cyprus.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

Consequently, the financial difficulties confronting UNFICYP are a cause of deep concern to us. The Secretary-General has for a number of years pointed out that the actual system places an undue burden on the troop-contributing countries. My Government shares this concern and has repeatedly - most recently on 29 May 1987 - stressed that it is ready to support any initiative which would put the Force's finances on a sound footing, thus facilitating its maintenance at today's strength.

With regard to the actual situation in Cyprus, the Secretary-General's report of 29 May 1987 presents a gloomy picture indeed. Through its careful language we see the occupying Power, in close co-operation with its collaborators in the occupied areas, promoting its policy of gradual annexation. The Turkish military forces in the Republic of Cyprus are being reinforced. Turkish settlers, a direct byproduct of the invasion, increase in number and are used as a determining political factor in the occupied area. Places of worship are being destroyed. Centuries-old place names are being altered, in an attempt to rewrite history. Varosha is now the object of expanding settlement. In this connection I should like to refer to paragraph 28 of the Secretary-General's report, in which he states that the United Nations considers the Government of Turkey responsible for the fenced area of Varosha. This official recognition of one of the repercussions of the Turkish military invasion and occupation should also by the same token apply to the entire territory of Cyprus occupied by Turkish armed forces. In our view, there is no conceptual distinction between Varosha and the rest of the area under Turkish military control.

The contents of the Secretary-General's report regarding the negotiating process are equally disturbing. Pessimism prevails, and the Secretary-General states: "We are thus at an impasse." (S/18880, para. 66)

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

The Permanent Representative of Cyprus has already addressed in detail the whole spectrum of the problem as it stands today. I fully share his ascertainments and assessments. I shall focus my brief intervention in this debate on the main aspects of the question of the Turkish military occupation of the northern part of Cyprus.

The invasion of the Island by Turkish troops in July 1974 and their increasing presence ever since in part of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus are, of course, a major and flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of international law in general. This continuing aggression, apart from infringing upon the sovereignty of Cyprus and running counter to international law, constitutes a danger for international peace in a region which, unfortunately, is already overloaded with simmering or open crises. But beyond its international dimension, the presence of the Turkish army in Cyprus has also affected negatively the 12-year-old intercommunal talks held under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

It is indeed extraordinary that, throughout the 12 years of negotiations, discussion remained concentrated exclusively on the constitutional aspects of the problem. The fundamental issues of the Turkish army in Cyprus and of the international guarantees have for all practical purposes never been addressed. Through a series of pretexts and over-sophisticated formulas those questions have been consistently and conscientiously bypassed and deferred for future discussion. The net result is that the Government of Cyprus has always been asked to commit itself on the constitutional aspect without even knowing what Turkey's intentions are with regard to its army in Cyprus, its settlers in Cyprus, and the international guarantees. But this is a paradox, since it is indeed unrealistic to expect the Government of Cyprus to continue negotiating on the constitutional

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

aspects before Turkey clearly states its intentions with regard to the
aforementioned three major items. It is inconceivable to ask a party to a dispute,
while being unaware of fundamental elements of a problem, to negotiate, let alone
commit itself, to only one of its aspects. This is particularly so since on many
occasions, but never at the negotiating table, we have heard that part of the
Turkish army will stay in Cyprus indefinitely. I am referring particularly to
Mr. Denktash's letter of 21 April 1986 addressed to the Secretary-General, in which
Turkey's intentions to leave indefinitely in Cyprus part of its army are quite
evident. To the same effect is a recent statement of the Foreign Minister of
Turkey, Mr. Halefoglu, who reportedly said on 6 June 1987:

"Turkey does not have to answer to anyone on the number of troops and military
equipment it has in Cyprus."

Turkey does not have to answer to anyone about its illegal troops in Cyprus.

Thus we are at a deadlock. As the President of the Republic of Cyprus has
pointed out in his letter to the Secretary-General of 10 June 1986, it is
impossible for him to negotiate further without, at long last, being formally
informed at the negotiating table of Turkey's intentions with regard to these three
major items. It should be recalled at this point that President Kyprianou on
several occasions has formally proposed various alternatives - among them an
international conference - as to the forum where the major issues of the Cyprus
question could be discussed. But that letter has remained without any result.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

Turning now to another point in this report by the Secretary-General, we have also noticed that reference is made to the idea of promoting in Cyprus confidence-building measures and a verification system. These concepts, in principle, though interesting in themselves, seem to require clarification.

Very often in the history of the Cyprus question confidence-building measures have been proposed, not out of the conviction that they could effectively contribute towards a solution but rather as a means to cover up failure. In other words, these ideas have served as a disguise for inertia in times when progress on the substance has proved unattainable. Furthermore, such a practice might result in the consolidation of the conqueror's position, since it entails the risk of shifting the focus away from the very substance of the problem.

I believe it is fair and realistic to say that the stagnation of the situation in Cyprus should be attributed mainly to the fact that Turkey insists on maintaining a large and threatening occupation force in the island, thus creating an ominous prospect as far as its future intentions are concerned. The only way to build confidence among Greek Cypriots as to Turkey's intentions while at the same time promoting the solution of the problem is for Ankara to withdraw its occupation army, which is in Cyprus against all norms of international law. At the same time, the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), under perhaps a new mandate and for an intermediate period, could meet any legitimate concern of the Turkish Cypriots regarding their security. This is an idea that has been put forward on many occasions by both President Kyprianou and the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Papandreou.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

Let me now touch briefly upon the question of verification. If this technique is to be applied within the framework of legality and present realities in Cyprus, it should not in any way entail equal treatment of the illegal forces of occupation and those of the Government. Nor should a verification system lead to a freeze of existing military forces and therefore to the consolidation of a situation placing the Republic of Cyprus under the threat of the occupation forces. Verification would be meaningful and useful as an instrument for monitoring the orderly and timely withdrawal of the occupying forces, in conjunction of course with measures such as those I have already mentioned, to allay the concerns of the Turkish Cypriots with regard to their security. Consequently, it seems to me that major caution should be exercised as regards verification, lest it result in sanctifying the presence of the occupation troops in the island.

Through numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the United Nations has set out the parameters within which a solution should be sought. If the Turkish side continues its present attitude of systematically evading a substantive and serious discussion of the question of its army and settlers in Cyprus, as well as that of guarantees, it will be for the United Nations to consider appropriate ways and measures for proceeding further.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Greece for the kind words he 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: Mr. President, I should like to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for inviting me to present the views of my Government, as one of the directly interested parties, on the matter before the Council.

The Cyprus issue has been on the agenda of the United Nations for 24 years now. The Turkish Cypriot side has always welcomed each and every opportunity to inform world public opinion on the factual aspects of the Cyprus question. In the light of the report in document S/18880, it is necessary for my Government to continue to fulfil this tradition and to clarify once more its views and positions on the matter.

Cyprus is an issue to which there have always been and still are two parties most directly concerned: the Turkish Cypriot people and the Greek Cypriot people. In all the phases of the Cyprus problem nothing has happened to change that basic fact.

In 1960 these two peoples became partners in a bicomunal republic with equal political status, each of them exercising separately its inherent right to self-determination in favour of the bicomunal partnership republic.

From 1963 to 1974 - the tragic phase of Cyprus - the joint Government and the entire State machinery disintegrated as the Greek Cypriots became the armed usurpers of political power in Cyprus and proceeded, with no trace of humanity or any qualms, to hunt and persecute the Turkish Cypriot people. Their reasons for doing so are only too well known and documented to warrant any detailed exposition here.

(Mr. Koray)

As of 1974 the dynamics of the issue have created in Cyprus two separate entities, each exercising jurisdiction and control over its own territory, air space and territorial waters. The most basic fact of the situation in Cyprus is that there is no single political authority in the island which can represent and speak on behalf of both the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. On the contrary, there is a Greek Cypriot Government and State in South Cyprus, elected only by the Greek Cypriots, and there is a Turkish Cypriot Government and State in Northern Cyprus, elected by the Turkish Cypriots. In that context the existence of two States on the island is an objective fact, which does not depend on the individual predilections or the viewpoints of third parties.

If, therefore, the present situation is going to be changed in any way, it has to be in the direction of a bicommunal, bizonal, federal republic, voluntarily entered into by the now existing two separate States, on the basis of absolute political equality. Recognition and acceptance of the present realities must be, and will be, the only basis for any future effort, exerted by whomever, towards a settlement in Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriot people will not deviate and will not tolerate any sign of deviation from this base.

The latest report of the Secretary-General raises the question of whether "a settlement can still be concluded on the basis of the 1977 and 1979 high-level agreements". (S/18880, para. 68)

(Mr. Koray)

In order to be able to give a positive answer to this question we must first be in a position to ascertain that the Greek Cypriot side's answers are all in the affirmative to the following questions: is it seeking a federal settlement in Cyprus; is bicommunality an imperative characteristic of this federation; does it accept bizonality as an essential characteristic of this federation; and above all, does it accept that the equal political status of the two sides is an absolute must for this federation, as in fact it is for all federations? In short, does it want to establish a new joint State with us, not on its own terms, but on terms agreed between the two sides?

This is the essence of the whole question, and the rest is peripheral and subsidiary. After all, is not the purpose of the entire efforts and initiatives undertaken by the Secretary-General within the context of his mission of good offices to seek the re-establishment of the partnership between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot sides in a bizonal, bicommunal, federal form on the basis of political equality?

Unless the answers to all those questions are in the affirmative it will be impossible to hold much hope for a settlement on the basis of the 1977 and 1979 agreements, for there must be no ambiguity on these core issues. It should by now be obvious that until and unless we have an identity of purpose as regards what is being sought, and hold the same view as to its basic characteristics, there is little chance that we will achieve it. Hence, what is the sense in talking about its details or about extraneous issues which have to be considered once an identity of purpose is arrived at?

Do the attitude, actions and inclinations of the Greek and Greek Cypriot camp allow us a little optimism for the future? By rejecting the draft framework

(Mr. Koray)

agreement of 29 March 1986 and subsequently by proceeding, in the words of Mr. Iacovou, to celebrate the

"anniversary of the demise of the draft framework agreement", as reported by the Greek Cypriot daily Phileleftheros of 24 March 1987, the Greek Cypriot side effectively brought to a halt the initiative of the Secretary-General towards a settlement. Then the Greek Cypriot side exerted all its energies and efforts to create an atmosphere in which the fundamental questions would be obscured. Those diversionary tactics will, it is obviously hoped, help it in effectively removing the draft framework agreement from the agenda and ultimately administering fatal wounds to the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General. That would leave it with its favourite pet project - the internationalization of the Cyprus issue, which to our mind is tantamount to the perpetuation of the issue. It was our awareness of this scenario that led us to urge all concerned to defend the draft framework agreement in the face of Greek Cypriot intransigence. It is thus that we have come to an "impasse", to which the Secretary-General refers in paragraph 66 of his report.

The way out of this situation may be an uphill path, but the situation is by no means insurmountable. It is still the considered and sincere view of the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus that the draft framework agreement, which contains important concessions on our part, and which was not at all easy for us to accept, but nevertheless was accepted by us as a compromise framework, is still the best - indeed, the only - medium by which direct and substantive negotiations, as the document itself envisages, can be carried out between the two sides to reach a comprehensive settlement. By accepting the draft agreement the Greek Cypriot side would also be providing the answers to the central questions that I have mentioned.

(Mr. Koray)

We immensely value the security of our people, for that is the basis of our freedom, and we have lived the horror of the years when we had no security. We know very well that if we ever compromise our security we shall be placing our lives and freedoms in danger. We, as a people, rely on Turkey in order never to live again the trauma of Greek and Greek Cypriot brutality. Turkey acted to preserve the bicomunal independence of Cyprus and to protect the very lives of the Turkish Cypriot people and their legal and constitutional interest in the independence of Cyprus within its responsibilities and obligations under the Treaty of Guarantee. We, the Turkish Cypriot people, will always be grateful to it for this exemplary behaviour. To this day, the nature of Turkey's involvement in the affair has not changed.

Turkish forces are stationed within the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in accordance with Turkey's commitment to the security and well-being of the Turkish Cypriot people, who face increasingly hostile Greek and Greek Cypriot forces, overwhelmingly superior both in numbers and armaments, whose offensive capability is constantly being increased by an ongoing programme of purchases of sophisticated tanks and missiles from several countries, in addition to those delivered by Greece.

The Greek military build-up started as far back as 1982, as the Secretary-General also stated in his report, and it has gathered an ever-increasing momentum in the following years. We have repeatedly brought this situation to the attention of the Secretary-General. We cannot accept the tendency to overlook, or to create unjustified excuses for, the persisting military build-up in south Cyprus. We regret that the Secretary-General's report fails to give concrete information with regard to the Greek Cypriot and Greek forces in the south, and in fact omits any reference to the Greek mainland troops in the island. We believe it

(Mr. Koray)

is both inadvisable and unfair to attempt to use different yardsticks for each side on this particular question.

We take strong exception to paragraph 70 of the report, where the source of the heightened distrust in the island is grossly misidentified. As the Secretary-General is well aware, the cause of the increased distrust is the intransigent attitude of Greece and the Greek Cypriot side towards the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, their rejection of his proposals of 1985 and 1986 and the historical background of the relations between the two parties, as well as the continued determination of the Greek Cypriots to dominate the Turkish Cypriots and to turn the island into a solely Greek land.

Let me now turn to a matter on which conceptual and factual confusion seems to be pervasive. The Secretary-General's latest report dwells upon Varosha extensively. As my President has already stated in his letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 11 May 1987, Varosha is part of the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and its status is no different from that of any other area thereof. The fact that no common understanding exists between the Turkish Cypriot side and UNFICYP regarding the status quo in Varosha does not mean, as might be implied from paragraph 28 of the report, that the Turkish Cypriot side does not have full and exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over Varosha. The Greek Cypriot side would do well to remember that causing an artificial storm over insignificant matters will not be sufficient either to change the status of Varosha or to extricate it from the package deal envisaged by the Secretary-General's initiative.

We have also observed that the report deals at some length with various topics which are non-issues so far as the Cyprus problem is concerned and which are

(Mr. Koray)

mere pet projects created artificially by the Greek Cypriot propaganda machine. These concern, for example, the alleged influx of settlers from Turkey, the alleged destruction of the cultural heritage of Cyprus, the alleged changing of place names and the alleged expropriation of Greek Cypriot-owned land. Without prejudice to our position on those matters, I wish briefly to place on record the facts and our views on some of them.

(Mr. Koray)

One Greek Cypriot allegation which has found its way into the report is the question of the so-called settlers. The Turkish Cypriot side objects to the unwarranted use of this misleading term which can only have the aim of covering up Greek Cypriots' own longstanding campaign to alter the demographic character of the island by having it colonized under Greece. This is done in the archaic belief that the Greek Cypriots are exclusively entitled to decide who should travel in, out of or within Cyprus and who should settle or even live in the island.

Migration of labour and immigration in general, as international phenomena affecting all democratic countries, including Northern Cyprus, are not under any limitations other than the relevant laws and regulations of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. This is, evidently, also the case for south Cyprus. In this context, we naturally have labour entry and exit according to economic needs, and a limited number of immigrants not only from Turkey but also from the Middle East and Pakistan.

The Greek Cypriot figures themselves reveal how grossly absurd is their claim of an influx of settlers. We know that the Greek Cypriots have this irresistible urge to present the Turkish Cypriot people as a minority instead of their equals in the body politic of Cyprus. But creating an issue of settlers to satisfy this urge is stretching it somewhat too far.

I had stated our position regarding this non-issue in very clear terms in my address to the Council on 11 December 1986 (S/PV.2729). As I stressed then, there are today more Turkish Cypriots and their descendants living elsewhere than in Northern Cyprus itself. These people were forced to leave the island as a result of Greek Cypriot pressures and intimidations. We maintain our natural bonds with these people and they are welcome to return to their homeland whenever they wish to do so. Their return cannot, by any means, be interpreted as an attempt to change the demographic structure of the island.

(Mr. Koray)

At this point, I should like to add the following: the Greek Cypriot representative in his statement argued that there were 65,000 male insurgents in Northern Cyprus and that their ratio to the Turkish Cypriots was 1 to 1. Mr. Moushoutas also stated that the total population of the island was 650,000 and that 18 per cent of that figure consisted of Turkish Cypriots, approximately 120,000. The contradiction in these two points made by the Greek Cypriot representative is self-evident, and other points he tried to make were not better founded.

With regard to the Greek Cypriot allegation about the alleged destruction of the cultural and religious heritage of the island, I should like to point out that in spite of the Greek Cypriot fanaticism with which they have treated the Turkish cultural heritage of Cyprus between 1963 and 1974, the Turkish Cypriots never acted in a spirit of vengeance against any Greek cultural heritage of the island. With the exception of the inevitable deluge suffered by some archeological and cultural monuments regardless of their origin during the Greek coup and the ensuing events of 1974, the cultural monuments in the North have since been well preserved and protected, with no deliberate damage to them whatsoever. These facts have been confirmed by visiting United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) experts and other impartial observers.

On the question of standardization of the geographical names referred to in paragraph 33 of the Secretary-General's report, it should be recalled that Cyprus has been a bicommunal, bilingual island, and a great number of villages enjoyed either Turkish or Greek names, depending on the people who lived in them. Some places enjoyed dual names, one in Turkish and one in Greek, reflecting the unique, binational nature of the heritage of Cyprus. Deliberate and ill-motivated changing of village and street names, if they happened to be Turkish, was a common practice

(Mr. Koray)

employed by the Greek Cypriot Administration during the troubled years of 1963 and 1974. In many instances, the places themselves were eliminated along with their names with a view to eradicating all traces of Turkish culture in the island. A case which comes to mind is the historical Bayraktar Square in Nicosia, which was renamed "Heroes' Square" after its mosque was bombed several times over.

The incidents in Pyla, a unique mixed village in the buffer zone, to which the Secretary-General refers in paragraph 30 of his report, should be explained here so that the Greek Cypriot spite and vindictiveness against the Turkish Cypriots is better understood. It shows that the Greek Cypriot side will do its utmost to deny the Turkish Cypriots the right to go about their daily lives earning their livelihood even in a village which is, luckily, not under their control or jurisdiction. Their shameful behaviour in Pyla is a grim testimony to the fact that the Greek Cypriot leadership is not ready or willing to share, amicably, with the Turkish Cypriots even a simple village. Preventing a few Turkish Cypriot shopkeepers from selling their goods and trying to intimidate their would-be customers, among them UNFICYP soldiers, does not enhance our confidence in Greek Cypriot intentions. And, above all, the incidents in Pyla demonstrate very clearly how well-founded our fear is as to what the Greek Cypriot leadership would do should they regain the upper hand all over the island.

As we understand it, the status quo in Pyla is that of "live and let live". As is our tradition, we always adhere to this motto. It is the Greek Cypriot leadership which, throughout the recent history of Cyprus, found it hard to abide by this motto.

The Turkish Cypriot side's position regarding what the Secretary-General in paragraph 65 of his report refers to as "draft agreement and draft statement" of

(Mr. Koray)

April 1985 is well known. We do not agree with the validity of the Secretary-General's preference to treat this document at par with the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986 or with the January 1985 document, for, unlike these two, the April document was prepared with no knowledge of and with no consultation with the Turkish Cypriot side. This position notwithstanding, we find it hard to understand how it can still be argued in the report that the Greek Cypriot side had accepted the April document when at the last meeting of the Security Council on UNFICYP on 11 December 1986, the Greek Cypriot representative, Mr. Moushoutas, said:

"As regards the April 1985 document, 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." (S/PV.2729, p. 17)

One has to stretch it in order to be able to conclude that that was a bona fide acceptance.

Let me now turn to the resolution which has just been adopted by the Council. The Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus rejects this resolution in toto for the same valid reasons which prompted its rejections of previous such resolutions of the Council. These reasons are well-documented and therefore need not be repeated here again. Suffice it to say that the entity to which this resolution refers as the "Government of Cyprus" is an anathema to the Turkish Cypriot people. The names which we reserve for it are "usurpers" and "masqueraders".

Despite its unavoidable rejection in toto of the present resolution, the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is nevertheless disposed to accept the presence of UNFICYP on the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern

(Mr. Koray)

Cyprus on the same basis as that stated in December 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 UNFICYP shall be based only on decisions which shall be taken solely by the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

(Mr. Koray)

It is, however, imperative that the troop-contributing countries display a neutral stance in the dispute between the two peoples of the island and respect the principle which lies at the core of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, and his initiatives. After all, that is the foundation on which a bicomunal, bizonal federal structure is sought to be built, and it is the only foundation that can support such a structure. By doing this, they will most certainly be helping the efforts towards a negotiated settlement.

The Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus takes this opportunity to reaffirm its appreciation and support for the good offices mission of the Secretary-General, the goal of which, as he notes in his report, remains an overall agreement that he continues to conceive of as an integrated whole. That is exactly what the 29 March draft framework agreement is all about.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, on whom I now call.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to take part in this discussion of the situation in Cyprus. May I extend to you my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. You take over the presidency at a time when in the coming days the attention of the Council will probably be focused on some extremely important issues, and I am sure that your great experience and negotiating skills will be invaluable in guiding the Council's work to successful results.

I take pleasure also in paying a tribute to Ambassador Li Luye, who guided the Council in the month of May, as usual with great skill, diligence and wisdom.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The Security Council is familiar with the views of my Government on the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). There is no doubt that the Force has played a useful role on the island for a very long time. But now, the role of UNFICYP requires serious examination in the light of profound modifications in the circumstances surrounding the Cyprus issue today. Increasingly, some contributing countries have doubts about the continuing validity of the original concept underlying the creation of the Force. On the other hand, some countries forget that their status as troop-contributing countries requires them to act with great impartiality towards the two parties, and that any biased approach can only disturb and jeopardize co-operation between the Force and the party offended by the lack of impartiality. I wish equally to repeat, as I said six months ago, that if the peace process continues to be hampered by Greek Cypriot intransigence the need for the continued presence of the Force will become more and more questionable.

The Council is aware that my Government cannot consent to an extension of UNFICYP's mandate on the basis of the present resolution. We have fundamental objections to a number of elements it contains. As a directly interested party, therefore, we cannot accept the resolution. Mr. Koray has just outlined the position of his Government on the modalities of UNFICYP's presence in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. That position has the full support of the Turkish Government.

The addendum to the report of the Secretary-General informs us that the Swedish Government has decided to withdraw its contingent from UNFICYP by 1 January 1988. I wish on this occasion to say how much we have appreciated the contribution of the Swedish contingent to efforts to maintain peace in the island and to prevent bloodshed. In particular, in 1964, the first year of UNFICYP, when

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

a ferocious onslaught against the Turkish community was undertaken by the Greek Cypriot military forces and private armies, the Swedish contingent distinguished itself by its courageous stand and its determination to check, as much as possible, Greek Cypriot aggressiveness and cruelty.

I should like to remind the Council that the Turkish Government has consistently supported the good offices mission of the Secretary-General. We hope the Secretary-General agrees with us that we have done our utmost to facilitate his task and that we have always extended to him our full confidence. We have great respect for his dedication and his tireless efforts in the search for a negotiated settlement in Cyprus. I trust, therefore, that he will understand the need we regrettably feel to direct certain serious criticisms to his latest report, contained in document S/18880.

Let me refer first to section III (B), entitled "Maintenance of the status quo", where the Secretary-General analyses the military situation in the island. Members of the Council will recall that six months ago I drew attention to the military build-up in south Cyprus and gave detailed information on the reinforcement, with particular emphasis on increasing armoured power, of the Greek Cypriot national guard and the Greek military forces in the island. Since then, Greek and Greek Cypriot military activities in Cyprus have continued to increase. The Greek Cypriot administration of south Cyprus has persisted, with the encouragement and support of Greece, in pursuing its plan to create a military option. We must note that this is not the first attempt to create such an option. In fact, throughout the recent history of the Cyprus problem the Greek and Greek Cypriot camp has prepared many military plans, including extermination plans, and has used force against the Turkish Cypriot side.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

In that context, I was intrigued when Ambassador Moushoutas insisted again that Turkish and Greek Cypriots had lived peacefully intermingled for centuries, and that only through the interference of Turkey was that harmony disturbed. He had made the same point during the last Security Council meetings on this subject, in December. I have, therefore, to repeat my reply: It is true that the Turks and the Greeks in Cyprus lived peacefully intermingled for centuries - since the sixteenth century. But that harmonious coexistence was a fact only so long as the political power was in the hands of the Ottoman Empire or the British Empire. As soon as the Greek Cypriots obtained first supremacy then a monopoly of power, Cyprus became a hell for Turkish Cypriots, and it was to save them from that hell that the Turkish Army had to intervene.

To return to the build-up in the south, there have been increases in the following areas: Eight new battalions have been introduced, bringing the total to 53 battalions; armoured personnel carriers have been increased by 156, bringing the total to 200 as of March 1987; and the number of armoured reconnaissance vehicles has been increased by 112, making a total of 213. Other increases include new artillery, anti-tank weapons, gun-boats, reconnaissance aircraft and, most recently, helicopters. Furthermore, new M-63 rocket-launchers and SA-7 missiles have been included in the Greek Cypriot arsenal.

We do not doubt for a moment that if Northern Cyprus were left without adequate defences, the Greek Cypriot side would not hesitate to use military force against the Turkish Cypriot side, as it has done before. The Greek Cypriot mentality and misperceptions which created the Cyprus question 23 years ago have not changed.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

We were therefore astonished to read the elaborate paragraphs of the Secretary-General's report regarding the Turkish forces in Northern Cyprus. We take particular exception to paragraph 70, in which the Secretary-General states that:

"Distrust in recent months has in particular been heightened by the strengthening of the Turkish forces in the northern part of the island. On this issue, I have repeatedly explained to the Government of Turkey that the Greek Cypriot side feels threatened and in these circumstances feels obliged to strengthen its own defences." (S/18880, para. 70)

That conclusion is not only unjustified but also blatantly contradicts another statement in the same report. Indeed, in paragraph 23 of the report the Secretary-General states that he informed the Security Council as early as December 1982 that the National Guard in the south was pursuing a programme of modernization. That means that the distrust had already been heightened by that move and the subsequent intensive build-up in the south. It should also be pointed out that the Secretary-General's report, while containing a reported estimate of the number of Turkish forces in the north of the island, is devoid of any information regarding the strength and armament level of the Greek Cypriot forces in the south, and it equally omits to mention the presence of substantial mainland Greek forces in Cyprus.

I wish to add that, in considering the build-up in the south, the contacts the Greek Cypriot side has established with a number of countries to procure sophisticated military equipment and armaments, including tanks, are of particular concern to us. I will not elaborate further on this topic, except to say that we have information about those contacts and have relayed it to the Secretary-General.

I wish to make our position very clear regarding the presence of Turkish forces in Northern Cyprus. The Turkish forces that were sent to Cyprus in 1974 to

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

prevent Greece's annexation of Cyprus by force have remained there in part to safeguard the security of the Turkish Cypriots until a negotiated solution is achieved. The level and composition of those forces are in correlation to the military threat directed against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. As long as a peaceful settlement is thwarted by the Greek Cypriots, Turkey will have no option but to maintain whatever forces are necessary to provide adequate protection to the Turkish Cypriots.

Turkey is not, therefore, committed to any level of forces. It has nevertheless indicated to the Secretary-General that there is no intention at the present time to increase the level of forces in Northern Cyprus and has explained the reasons for the fluctuations in the number of men and amount of equipment. It should not be forgotten, on the other hand, that the draft framework agreement of 29 March, which the Turkish Cypriots have accepted, foresees the negotiation of a time-table for the withdrawal of non-Cypriot forces. The Greek Cypriots have only themselves to blame for having rejected that draft agreement out of hand. Several references have been made by previous speakers to a reported statement by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Halefoglu. The points I have just made must have elucidated what the Turkish Foreign Minister had meant to say.

With regard to paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's report, it is not possible to understand the reason for the concern expressed on Varosha and the effort to create an issue over the so-called status quo in that area. It will be recalled that the Turkish Cypriot side has up to now made numerous proposals on Varosha. In the latest, on 17 November 1983 and 2 January 1984, it proposed the establishment of a United Nations administration in Varosha. Those proposals were then rejected by the Greek Cypriot side. In the context of the initiative undertaken by the Secretary-General in August 1984 the question of Varosha was treated as part of the prospective territorial arrangements based on the Turkish

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Cypriot proposals of 5 August 1981, and it was included as such in the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986, which envisages a comprehensive solution. Article 10.1 of the draft framework agreement states that the Varosha area will be placed under United Nations interim administration as part of the UNFICYP buffer zone for resettlement, at a date to be mutually agreed.

This was accepted by the Turkish Cypriot side but was again rejected by the Greek Cypriots. It is difficult to reconcile these Greek Cypriot rejections with the sudden uproar over the status of Varosha. Since none of the Turkish Cypriot proposals nor the proposal of the Secretary-General have been accepted, it is very clear what the status of Varosha today is: Varosha is part of the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and there can be no other status for the area until and unless agreement is reached between the two sides on a comprehensive settlement. The Turkish side will no doubt continue to act with restraint and to refrain from any action which would render more difficult the beginning of the negotiations on the basis of the draft framework agreement proposed by the Secretary-General on 29 March 1986, if and when the Greek Cypriots accept it.

With regard to the peace process in Cyprus, we are dismayed to see that the Greek Cypriot side has not yet accepted the draft framework agreement submitted by the Secretary-General on 29 March 1986. We support the view of the Turkish Cypriots that in the absence of a formal and unequivocal acceptance by the Greek Cypriots of that document it is very difficult to see the usefulness of informal discussions as suggested by the Secretary-General in February 1987, in particular if we bear in mind the fact that the avowed aim of the Greek Cypriot administration is to discard the framework contained in the 29 March proposals and to replace it with an agenda of its own choosing.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The draft framework agreement is not a document that the Secretary-General elaborated by himself. It is the result of a series of discussions between the Secretary-General and the two parties to the dispute. It is a document which was first officially communicated to the permanent members of the Security Council, an initiative that can no doubt only enhance its importance and significance. It is a balanced, constructive and realistic document.

I hasten to add that I do not like to appear to be plus royaliste que le roi in extolling the draft framework agreement, and I admit that no one can underline its nature, significance and importance better than the Secretary-General. I would therefore like to ask the indulgence of the Council and to read from the letter of presentation the Secretary-General addressed to President Denktash and Mr. Kyprianou on 29 March 1986. He said:

"I wrote to you on 24 January with my assessment of the point we had then reached and my proposals about how we should proceed. I have now carefully studied reports on the discussions that took place with each side during the lower-level meetings. It is evident that both sides have made a real effort to overcome the remaining differences. I would like to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for the constructive approach taken by your representatives.

"The talks that took place with each side in Geneva and in Nicosia proved most useful in bringing into clearer focus their respective concerns and indicated points of convergence on the substance of the issues which remained to be resolved. This has made it possible to draft a framework agreement which preserves all that has been achieved since August 1984 and endeavours to reconcile the outstanding differences in a manner that protects the interests of both communities.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

"I am pleased to present to you herewith the draft framework agreement as it has emerged from our joint efforts." -

I repeat: "joint efforts".

"When considering this text, I would urge both sides to keep the following in mind:

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

"This framework agreement is an indispensable step" - I repeat, indispensable step - "in an ongoing process. Both sides have agreed on the matters that will be negotiated after the framework agreement is accepted, and to do so in good faith and with a willingness to consider each other's concerns.

"These negotiations will provide each side with ample opportunities to assure itself of the good intentions of the other. While the text commits the two parties to proceed towards an overall solution within an agreed framework, its ultimate implementation will depend on both sides being able to negotiate to their mutual satisfaction the matters on which agreement has yet to be achieved.

"Acceptance of the draft framework agreement will allow, for the very first time, all the outstanding issues to be tackled in earnest and in a decisive manner as an integrated whole". (S/18102/Add.1, annex III)

I think this letter speaks for itself. Any further discussions, direct or indirect, informal or formal, can have no purpose and no meaning as long as the parties do not proceed from the basis to which, thanks to the efforts of the Secretary-General, they have in fact agreed during the talks leading to the submission of the draft framework agreement. It is clear from the letter of the Secretary-General that the refusal of the Greek Cypriots to sign the draft framework agreement is not a rejection of a proposal by the Secretary-General but in reality a reneging on a prior consent. The time is over for discussions and clarifications. The mission of the Secretary-General cannot be salvaged by procedural devices and subtleties. It is the time for negotiations, for direct negotiations between the parties on the only basis that exists: the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

I wish to make one final point. A reading of the report of the Secretary-General, in particular the section "Observations", gives the impression that a crisis situation exists in Cyprus. An inadvertent reader might be induced to believe that the situation in Cyprus is almost as dangerous as that in the Gulf area a few days ago. We know that that is not so. Since the Greek Cypriot administration was deprived of the means of oppressing the Turkish Cypriots in 1974, Cyprus has become one of the most peaceful places in the world. As we discuss the problem of Cyprus here, tens of thousands of tourists are bathing in the sun on the beaches of the island, mainly in the south. In the relaxing atmosphere they enjoy, it would be very difficult to persuade them that they confront the danger of being engulfed precipitously in a military conflict.

I believe that it is entirely appropriate for the Secretary-General to insist on the need for and urgency of a negotiated settlement. But in evaluating the present situation in the absence of a solution, a sense of proportion has to be maintained. A contrived crisis will not promote the search for a solution but exacerbate distrust and increase recourse to unproductive rhetoric, as is evidenced by the reported decision of the Greek Cypriots to request a debate at the forty-second session of the General Assembly - a debate which, in the light of numerous precedents, we know can only hamper progress towards a settlement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): 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. I call on him.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): The person who addressed the Council under rule 39, for the supply of information, resides in Cyprus, not in Ankara. He is a member of a precious Cypriot community which constitutes an inseparable part of our people. Listening to him, a countryman of mine, abusing his role here by

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

presenting himself as a representative of a fictitious entity and by playing the tune of the occupiers of our common country, I felt bad. I considered for a moment the great sacrifices that a man has at times to go through. I thought how cruel man can be to man by assigning such a mission to a member of a proud community.

I can only say that he and the Turkish Cypriot community in general is as much under occupation as all Cypriots, and that his statement should be seen in the right perspective - that is, as a statement under duress.

We heard again that the Turkish troops are in Cyprus with the consent of the so-called TRNC. But the TRNC has been declared by United Nations resolutions to be an illegal entity. As such, it can invite no one into a territory which is under the full jurisdiction of a Member State, the Republic of Cyprus, and which is recognized by the United Nations and the whole world. The puppet created by Ankara is now here to say that the Turkish troops must stay for the security of the Turkish Cypriot community. The General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, however, and the world community, solemnly state otherwise - that is, they say they must go, and the sooner they leave totally the sooner a solution will be found to the problem of Cyprus.

We were told that there is peace in the occupied areas of Cyprus. With occupation, suppression and threats, with repressive mechanisms going on in the occupied areas, what else can anyone expect? It is the peace that one finds in gaols, in concentration camps and in graveyards.

They accused us of arming ourselves. We are one hundredth the size of Turkey, and we have been smashed under occupation, and they are worried that the little victim may buy arms to defend itself against a bigger onslaught.

The argument advanced that we cannot buy arms to build up our defences against further clear and present dangers emanating from the continuing Turkish aggression is ludicrous and audacious. We fully reject it. The right to self-defence and

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

the protection of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of a country is in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the general principles of international law.

The Turkish side referred again to their allegations of persecution of the Turkish Cypriots by their compatriots the Greek Cypriots. I will not attempt to prove those allegations wrong because their falsity is evident from a mere glance at the historical facts. What cannot leave me silent is the Turkish audacity to come to this august body and talk of human-rights violations and extermination. The entire history of the Ottoman Empire and contemporary Turkey is one of continuous violation of the human rights of the people who have had the misfortune of being conquered by the Turks or of being minorities in that country.

I said before that for four centuries we have lived amicably with the Turkish Cypriots. The distinguished representative of Turkey made no reference to the almost-100-year British rule, when the relationship and coexistence of the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots were brotherly and amicable. Furthermore, many were the occasions when, during the Ottoman rule, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots joined forces to fight unjust rulers of their common land.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

We have heard that there are two peoples in Cyprus, just because some of us go to mosques and others to churches, just because some of us speak Greek and others Turkish. We cannot accept that. There is only one people in Cyprus, one Cyprus, indivisible - if I may quote the preamble to the Constitution - "with liberty and justice for all". It shall be so for eternity.

We also heard, again, denials of the undeniable. The settlers, we are told, are returning Cypriots or seasonal workers. Ankara probably feels that the bigger the lie and frequency of its use the greater are the chances that it will stick and brush away this twentieth-century stigma. Here is what Mr. Durduran, a Turkish Cypriot, a so-called Deputy of the House of Representatives, has stated:

"The real aim is to turn the Turkish Cypriots into a minority" - that is, in the occupied areas. "Cypriots out, Turks in... Today the number of those who have been granted 'citizenship' has increased from 10,000 to 38,000." Why the granting of citizenship if they are seasonal workers?

"The Cypriots have fallen from 120,000 to 100,000. What will happen tomorrow? They will increase over 100,000 and we will take our passports and look for another country."

The aforementioned agonizing statement of Mr. Durduran was seconded in an article in Yeniduzen, of 12 May 1987, in which the following appears:

"Cyprus is gradually becoming a place which does not belong to the Cypriots. With every passing day we see that we are becoming estranged and pushed into becoming a minority as Cypriots..."

Furthermore, the same Turkish Cypriot daily Yeniduzen, in an article titled "Immigrants Party", refers to the Turkish settlers Party and says:

"By its actions this Party has proved within a short time that it takes directives from Ankara, that it is the supporter of Denktash, who is in the

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

service of Ankara, and that it has had an adverse effect on the Turkish Cypriots' exercise of their authority... Cyprus is being speedily Turkified in every aspect and the solution of the Cyprus problem is being taken away from the hands of the Turkish Cypriots."

Referring sarcastically to the Turkish settlers, the article which is written by Kultu Adali concludes as follows:

"It seems that what they understand by the word 'unity' is to own the whole of Cyprus, turn the Turkish Cypriots into a minority community and administer the Turkish Cypriots as third-class citizens."

The aforementioned are only some of the natural reactions of our Turkish Cypriot compatriots to the Turkish occupation and give a silencing reply to Mr. Halefoglou's and the Turkish side's allegation that the occupation forces are on the island to protect the interests of the Turkish Cypriots.

We have heard that there was no destruction of religious and cultural monuments. Mehmet Yasin, a Turkish Cypriot compatriot of mine, in a series of articles entitled "Perishing Cyprus" published in the Turkish daily Olay in April 1982, describes extensively the destruction and pillage of the cultural heritage in the occupied areas of Cyprus. Mr. Yasin says:

"We have abandoned our historical masterpieces - with their Greek columns, Gothic ornaments, yellow-stoned arches and Seljukian domes - to destruction and pillage.

"Do not ask any questions about the condition of the first-century city of Lamboussa, which is now a military zone.

"Haven't you heard that the 2000-year-old Christian St. Barnabas Church has been robbed? Haven't you heard that 35 icons were stolen, that 11 of them

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

were found in Kythrea, that 11 were retrieved at Ankara airport while being smuggled out, and that the rest are lost?

"Haven't you heard what's happening in Varosha? Haven't you heard that figurines belonging to the Catholic period and kept in the Archaeological Museum have been stolen and smuggled to London?

"What about the icons in the other churches, the mosaics, the private collections, the illegal digs? Haven't you heard of these?"

And I ask my colleagues on the Turkish side: Haven't they heard of these?

Mr. Koray met with a mathematical difficulty. Let me say that I can help, if I may be allowed, to solve his problem. We do not accept the 65,000 settlers as Cypriots, and we shall never do so.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Greece to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I shall make only a very brief statement to various assertions made by the Turkish representatives, since several aspects of the problem have already been answered by the representative of Cyprus. I shall limit myself to a categorical denial that any increase whatsoever has occurred in the Greek forces in Cyprus. I can assure the Council most categorically and formally that Greece, as is well known, maintains in Cyprus a very small military force, which has legal status for various reasons and is there with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, the sovereign authority in the island. This small Greek contingent, which has been there for many, many years without any change whatsoever so far as its level is concerned, cannot of course compare in any way with the powerful Turkish military force of 35,000 troops on the island, which has been there illegally, is the product of an invasion, and is enjoying the support of Turkish military might.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

Hence I reiterate my categorical denial of any increase whatsoever in the small Greek contingent in Cyprus.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Turkey to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): Ambassador Moushoutas said that I forgot the British rule in Cyprus. I have not: I think I paid due respect to the British Empire when I said that it was under the Ottoman Empire and the British Empire that harmonious coexistence obtained in Cyprus. I made that comment because Ambassador Moushoutas himself said that for centuries - thus including the Ottoman Empire, because he did not say "century" but "centuries" - there was peaceful intermingling between the two communities. I therefore confirmed that what he said was correct, namely, that there was peaceful intermingling between the two communities - so long as the Greek Cypriots did not have the political power. That is a fact. The whole problem of Cyprus started when they were given supremacy of power.

Ambassador Moushoutas said, I think initially, that there is a totalitarian administration in the north for the simple reason that Turkish forces are there. I think he contradicted himself slightly when he read out some very vituperative statements by some Turkish politicians against Turkey. If they can make such statements without going to gaol, there must be some kind of democracy in northern Cyprus. He quoted Mr. Durduran extensively - apparently the new hero of the Greek Cypriots - who was violent in his accusations against Turkey; he is a Member of Parliament and will continue to be such. Therefore I do not see anything wrong with democracy in northern Cyprus if politicians can make such statements, despite the presence there of a large number - according to the Greek Cypriots and the Greek Ambassador - of Turkish forces in northern Cyprus.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

I turn now to what was said by the Permanent Representative of Greece. I just want to remind him of something. He has apparently forgotten the history of Cyprus since 1963. I do not know what the level of Greek forces in the island is at present. Our estimate is that the number is much larger than claimed by the Permanent Representative of Greece. But, certainly, there was in Cyprus until 1967 a very large Greek army - something like 15,000 troops - and it was withdrawn after the crisis in 1967. So when the Permanent Representative of Greece says that there never was an increase in the Greek forces above the legal limit, he is not saying exactly what happened in Cyprus.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I understand that the representative of Greece wishes to speak again, and I call on him.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I am sorry to speak again, but I wish to make a point of clarification.

Ambassador Turkmen has said that in 1967 - that is, about seven years before the Turkish invasion - Greece withdrew its increased contingent, which had been there because of the permanent threat of invasion from Turkey since December 1963. Greece had to send that contingent to prevent the invasion. Unfortunately, we had to withdraw the contingent - and the invasion came. That is a good lesson for the future. Perhaps we shall try to increase the contingent again, in order to deal with the forces of invasion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Turkey.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I wish to make just a very small point. The Turkish forces did not intervene in 1967, immediately after the large Greek forces

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

were withdrawn from the island: they intervened in 1974, because there was an attempt by Greece to annex Cyprus. That is very clear.

I have to remind the Council each time of something said by the late Archbishop Makarios in the Council in 1974. He said that Cyprus was facing a Greek invasion - he did not say a Turkish invasion, he said a Greek invasion - and that that was why the Turkish forces had to intervene.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representatives of Cyprus and Greece wish to speak, and I shall certainly call on them, but I should like to maintain some calm in this debate.

I call now on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I shall be very, very brief.

Again the representative of Turkey has told only half the story about what Archbishop Makarios said. At the same meeting, and thereafter, Archbishop Makarios repeatedly accused Turkey of aggression. Being a great leader, he saw injustice and he acted against injustice, no matter from where it came. But Makarios did accuse Turkey of aggression, of invasion, of occupation.

While I am speaking, I want to say that it is the "intermingling" of Turkey that brought about this unrest between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus. It is not necessarily the Governments that rule Cyprus.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I assure you, Mr. President, that calm will prevail.

(spoke in English)

I would merely point out that the very fact that the Turks did not invade in 1967 is not something for which we should be grateful. As the Council knows, for a

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

country to organize an invasion, it is necessary in the first place to prepare it and in the second place to find the pretext for it. It took them seven years. That does not change the reality. Fortunately, we had the Greek army there; unfortunately - as was amply proved by the Turkish invasion - we had to withdraw it.

I shall not speak again today. I rest at what I have said.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I do wish to make an appeal to the parties. We have a time table to adhere to. The parties have the possibility of expressing their views; indeed, they have done so exhaustively. I do hope that we can keep to our time table, about which I did consult the parties.

I now call on the representative of Turkey.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I am sorry to have to take up the Council's time, but I have to reply to two representatives.

I never said that Archbishop Makarios had approved of the Turkish military intervention. We did not expect him to do so. All I wanted to say was that he stigmatized the Greek invasion.

Regarding what Ambassador Dountas, the Permanent Representative of Greece, has said, I want to pay a tribute to Greece: Greece has a wonderful legal system; it has very good courts in Athens - which was, after all, the birthplace of democracy. This is from a verdict rendered by a court in Athens on 21 March 1979 in regard to the Turkish military intervention:

"The Turkish military intervention in Cyprus, which was carried out in accordance with the Zurich and London Accords, was legal. Turkey, as one of the Guarantor Powers, had the right to fulfil her obligations. The real culprits are the Greek officers who engineered and staged a coup and prepared the conditions for this intervention".

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

That is a Greek judge speaking. So we have a Greek judge plus Archbishop Makarios. We have to trust them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall go around the table one more time -- and I hope it will be agreed that it should be the last time.

I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Cyprus has the verdict of this body, the Security Council, that what Turkey did in Cyprus in 1974 was an act of aggression. As a matter of fact, Turkey voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX). The same resolution was later endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 365 (1974). The resolution stated that the aggression against Cyprus was unacceptable and that it should be ended and all troops should be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I am astonished. We heard on a previous occasion this argument about a decision by a Greek court with the content that has just been read out. We investigated but failed to find such wording in the relevant decision by a Greek court. I shall try to find the decision to which Ambassador Turkmen is referring, and to provide members of the Council with an accurate, certified copy of it. They too will be surprised to see that the content is slightly different. Perhaps there was a rather unfortunate translation from Greek into Turkish.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The last speaker is the representative of Turkey, and I shall call on him.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): We shall be very happy to give Ambassador Dountas the number of the decision of the Greek court. I hope that my respect for the Greek courts will not be diminished. It is unlikely that he will find any discrepancies between the Turkish and Greek texts, because the English is very good English.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers on my list for this meeting. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE THIRTY-SEVENTH, THIRTY-EIGHTH, THIRTY-NINTH, FORTIETH AND FORTY-FIRST SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As we approach the end of the period covered in the annual report of the Security Council submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter, that is, from 16 June 1986 to 15 June 1987, the Council has agreed that I should place on record that since 16 June 1986 the members of the Security Council have been engaged in consultations of the whole in connection with the issues raised in the annual reports of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization presented to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth, thirty-ninth, fortieth and forty-first sessions, during which members have explored possible ways and means of enhancing the effectiveness of the Council in accordance with the powers entrusted to it under the Charter.

These consultations are being pursued informally.

The Council having thus disposed of the matters before it, I shall now adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.