

CYPRUS CASE BEFORE COMMONWEALTH

**SPEECH BY
HIS BEATITUDE THE PRESIDENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS
ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS
AT THE COMMONWEALTH HEADS
OF GOVERNMENT MEETING
IN LONDON, 9 JUNE 1977**

PUBLISHED BY THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE

PRINTED AT THE PRINTING OFFICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



KIBRISTA SOSYALIST
GERÇEK LONDRA BÜROSU
FEB
SOCIALIST TRUTH IN CYPRUS

FEB 2012

**SPEECH BY HIS BEATITUDE THE PRESIDENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS
ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS
AT THE COMMONWEALTH HEADS
OF GOVERNMENT MEETING IN LONDON, 9 JUNE 1977**

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to join previous speakers in expressing, on behalf of the people of Cyprus, warmest congratulations to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Head of the Commonwealth, on Her Silver Jubilee, and wishing Her health, personal happiness and a long reign.

Her Majesty stands today as a symbol both of the old and the new deep-seated ties, which link together peoples of different ethnic, racial, cultural and economic backgrounds within the Commonwealth. By the high respect that the Queen enjoys in the world and particularly within the Commonwealth Her Majesty has greatly contributed to the maintenance and evolution of the Commonwealth institution despite the many and varied strains that it has undergone during the last twenty-five years.

It is gratifying that this meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government in London coincided with the Jubilee celebrations and thus we had the pleasure and privilege to participate in the general rejoicing at this happy event. At the same time, I wish to thank Prime Minister Callaghan and his Government for the generous hospitality which they are extending to us.

Mr. Chairman,

The two years since our last meeting in Kingston, Jamaica, have been a period of significant developments in the political

and economic fields both within the Commonwealth and in the world at large. The Kingston conclusions were hailed as a very useful guideline for the proper approach to some of the thorny problems facing the world and for concerted efforts for their solution. However, major international issues and problems which occupied our attention at the time appear today to have been aggravated, involving a serious risk of conflagration and endangering world peace. Some of them have already been dealt with, and previous speakers have expressed very constructive views as to their solution. Despite the gravity of these problems I believe I shall have your indulgence if I concentrate mainly on the Cyprus problem, which was discussed at the Kingston meeting and is once more on our agenda.

Before I proceed with a short analysis of the present position of the Cyprus problem, I wish to express deep appreciation for the interest and understanding being shown by the Commonwealth member-states for my country's problem. This interest has been demonstrated by the decision taken at the Kingston meeting to set up a Special Commonwealth Committee for the purpose of following developments in the Cyprus problem and assisting towards the implementation of the relevant U.N. resolutions. In July, 1976, the Commonwealth Secretary-General, Mr. Ramphal, to whose energy and vision the Commonwealth owes much, paid a visit to Cyprus after which he submitted a very constructive report covering both the political and humanitarian aspects of the situation in the island. Additional tangible evidence of the Commonwealth interest in Cyprus was the recent good-will mission to our island by members of the Special Commonwealth Committee on Cyprus.

NO PROGRESS

It is most unfortunate that since our meeting at Kingston and despite our continuous efforts no progress has been made towards a settlement of the grave crisis created in the island by the Turkish invasion three years ago. Protracted talks between representatives of the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot side under the personal auspices and direction of the U.N. Secretary-General, Dr. Waldheim, did not lead to a positive

(2)

result and for a long time they remained deadlocked. Last February a climate of some optimism was created following two meetings which I had with the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Rauf Denktash, the second in the presence of the U.N. Secretary-General. Those meetings were a breakthrough in the deadlocked talks and it was decided to resume them. But the new round of negotiations both in Vienna last April and in Nicosia a few days ago have not made any headway and have shown clearly that the Turkish side aims at the consolidation of the *de facto* situation created by the use of military force and ultimately at a solution amounting to partition, if not something worse.

During my meetings with Mr. Denktash we agreed on certain guidelines for the interlocutors. We agreed that a Federal State should be established and that the powers and functions of the Central Federal Government should be such as to safeguard the unity of the country. Despite this, the Turkish Cypriot side presented proposals providing not for a Federation but for the establishment of two separate states linked together in a loose Confederation. The proposals of the Turkish Cypriot side safeguard neither the independence nor the unity of the state. The obvious aim is that the northern part of Cyprus, now under the occupation of the Turkish troops, so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus, remains a Turkish protectorate, eventually, becoming part of Turkey.

I do not wish to take your time by going into the details of the tactics followed by the Turkish side at the intercommunal talks. I confine myself to saying that Ankara, which dictates the Turkish Cypriot stand in these talks, uses the negotiating process as a smokescreen to mislead world opinion, exploiting the intervening time for the consolidation of the *de facto* situation and even the creation of further *faits accomplis*. The United Nations repeatedly dealt with the Cyprus problem and adopted resolutions providing the framework within which the solution of the problem should be sought. I regret to say that Turkey has not shown even the slightest intention to implement these resolutions. Many countries have tried, individually or collectively, to persuade Turkey to adopt a moderate stand so as

(3)

to make it possible to find a fair compromise on the Cyprus problem. Turkey has maintained its intransigent attitude and all these efforts have proved fruitless.

MISREPRESENTATION

The Cyprus problem is at times misrepresented as a difference between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. This is not the case. The nature and character of the Cyprus problem is quite different. It is a problem of aggression, which is continuing through the occupation of a large part of Cyprus by Turkish troops and the violation of its independence and sovereignty. As such it should concern each and every country because involved in it are fundamental principles and human rights of universal validity. When such universal principles and rights are violated in one country it is the duty of all countries to stand for them and defend them. In pursuance of this conviction, Cyprus joins in the condemnation of the violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa and in urging the adoption of measures for the elimination of these anachronistic policies.

Turkey, and in consequence, the Turkish Cypriot leadership, in order to justify their intransigence and unreasonable attitude, claim that for eleven years before the invasion the Turkish Cypriot community had been oppressed by the Greek Cypriot majority and that this experience of the past makes it necessary for them to insist on the segregation of the two communities to the point of establishing two states with a separate international legal identity.

This oft-repeated story about oppression of the Turkish community is completely unfounded. It is true that after the 1963 troubles part of the Turkish Cypriot population lived in enclaves isolated from the rest of the population. This, however, was not due to any oppression by the Greek Cypriots but to a deliberate self-segregation policy pursued by the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Repeated references to this policy are contained in successive reports on Cyprus submitted to the U.N.

Security Council by the late U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, during this period. I quote characteristic extracts from some of the Secretary-General's reports.

In his report dated June 15, 1964, U Thant states, and I quote : " The lack of movement of Turkish Cypriots outside of their areas is also believed to be dictated by a political purpose, namely to reinforce the claim that the two main communities of Cyprus cannot live peacefully together in the island without some sort of geographical separation."

In his report on June 10, 1965, the Secretary-General observes, and I quote : " The Turkish Cypriot leaders have adhered to a rigid stand against any measures which might involve having members of the two communities live and work together or which might place Turkish Cypriots in situations where they would have to acknowledge the authority of Government agents."

The attitude of the Turkish Cypriot leadership in denying freedom of movement even to the members of its own community persisted through all these years and this is reflected in a report by the U.N. Secretary-General of May 20, 1971, which said, and I quote : " The Turkish Cypriot leadership has made it clear that its position on the question of freedom of movement remains unchanged. . . ."

Thus it becomes evident from the U.N. Secretary-General's reports that if this eleven-year experience, so much invoked by the Turkish side, proves something this is that the Turkish separatist policies go far back into the past.

ALLEGATIONS REFUTED

Turkish allegations about oppression do not refer only to the eleven-year period immediately before the Turkish invasion but also to the present. The Turkish Cypriot leadership has recently invented the argument about economic warfare against the Turkish Cypriot community. What is the nature of this

so-called economic warfare It is simply this : The occupation forces and the Turkish Cypriot leadership want to exploit freely and unrestrictedly the properties of Greek Cypriots in the occupied area. It was natural for the Government and the owners of these properties to resist their exploitation by the usurpers. Nobody can seriously argue that the effort to prevent a usurper from enjoying the fruit of his usurpation amounts to economic oppression. Generally speaking, I may say that it has been the Turkish policy for the past fourteen years to present the Turkish Cypriots as victims of oppression, whereas in reality the Turkish aim has been the creation of conditions favourable to the eventual promotion of their separatist plans.

The Turkish side argues that, since the Turkish invasion, new realities have been created in the island. One such new reality is the Turkish occupation of a large part of the island and the uprooting of some 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes and properties in which Turkish Cypriots transferred from the South and Turks brought from Turkey have been settled. This new reality is expressed by the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus. It is argued, therefore, by the Turkish side that in Cyprus there are two autonomous administrations, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot. Of course, the truth is quite different. There are not two administrations but one Cyprus Government, internationally recognised, and one puppet Turkish Cypriot administration in the part of the island under the occupation of the Turkish forces. I should add in this connection that this "Turkish Cypriot Administration", which also poses as Government, does not exercise control in the occupied area. It is a mere organ of Turkey receiving instructions from Ankara. The real control is exercised by the Turkish occupation forces.

It is true that no Turkish Cypriots are participating in the Cyprus Government, but this is not due to our fault. They do not want participation in the Government on the basis of the 1960 Constitution because they believe that non-participation promotes the Turkish partitionist plans. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has repeatedly formally and cate-

gorically stated that "it does not recognise the administration established under the name of 'Turkish Federated State of Cyprus' as the *de jure* Government of any part of Cyprus" nor does it recognise it as *de facto* state. The British Foreign Office has also stated that, pending a new agreement, it recognised only the 1960 Constitution. The same attitude is taken by all U.N. member-states despite the fact that Turkey is trying to inject falsely into the Cyprus problem even a religious factor in an attempt to mislead Islamic countries.

Mr. Chairman,

The situation in Cyprus is very critical and fraught with grave dangers for peace in the whole region. Despite the negative stand of the Turkish side so far, the Cyprus Government will continue its efforts for the finding of a peaceful solution. I wish, however, to stress that on no account shall we accept the faits accomplis created by force. To accept them would lead to the dissolution of the Republic of Cyprus as an independent state. We are prepared for a compromise, but this should be such as not to endanger the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus.

The Cyprus problem has many aspects, but the most tragic ones are those of the refugees and the missing persons. I wish to refer in particular to the question of missing persons because the Turkish Cypriot leadership has rejected a proposal by the Greek Cypriot side for the establishment of an International Red Cross Committee to search for missing persons and provide information to their relatives. I do not see any justification for the Turkish side's opposition to the establishment of the proposed Committee, the report of which may give an answer to the anguishing questions tormenting, for three years now, the relatives of missing persons.

It has been claimed that at the recent intercommunal talks in Vienna and the subsequent meetings in Nicosia it was not possible for the Turkish side to present moderate proposals on

the eve of general elections in Turkey. This argument has been used also by some friendly countries, which have shown an interest in assisting in the settlement of the Cyprus crisis. I express the hope that now, when the elections are over, the new Turkish Government will approach the Cyprus problem in a constructive spirit to make it possible to reach an agreed solution. The Greek Cypriot side will go to the negotiating table with goodwill and in a spirit of good faith. If a similar spirit is displayed also by the other side it will not be difficult to find a solution which would put an end to the ordeals of the Cypriot people, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots alike. I refer to the Turkish Cypriots because they too are suffering from the occupation troops and the influx of settlers from Turkey. I would say in this connection that the new Turkish Government in shaping its policy on Cyprus cannot but take into serious consideration the attitude of other countries on the problem and world opinion in general. A large section of world opinion is represented at this Conference. Therefore, we place great hopes on the support of the member-states of the Commonwealth family, as well as on the support and solidarity of peoples and Governments throughout the world, which believe that in international affairs morality should take precedence over expediencies and that the moral code should not be applied partially but universally.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.