

7. THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

Decision of 14 June 1985 (2591st meeting): resolution 565 (1985)

Before the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was due to expire, on 31 May 1985, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report¹ on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 13 December 1984 to 31 May 1985. The Secretary-General recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months² but expressed concern over the worsening financial situation of the Force and reiterated his earlier appeals to all Member States to make voluntary contributions to UNFICYP.

Reporting on his mission of good offices,³ the Secretary-General noted that while the joint high-level meeting held at United Nations Headquarters from 17 to 20 January 1985 had failed to produce an agreement,⁴ the positions on substance of the two sides had appeared closer than ever before. Having appealed to both sides to avoid any action which might interfere with the achievement of a final settlement, the Secretary-General had refined the draft agreement and had pursued his contacts with the parties.

In April, Mr. Denktash had informed the Secretary-General that the Turkish Cypriot side could not engage in substantive discussions until after the referendum and elections which the Turkish Cypriot community would be holding in May and June 1985. In that connection, the representative of Cyprus had addressed letters⁵ to the Secretary-General stating, among other things, that the referendum and elections were in violation of decisions of the Council. The Turkish Cypriot side had responded with a letter⁶ maintaining that it had a right to engage in such a process which would not hinder prospects for a federal solution, to which it remained committed. In the same connection, the spokesman of the Secretary-General, on 6 May 1985, had stated that the Secretary-General could not condone any development or action at variance with the position of the United Nations, which recognized no Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus.

The Secretary-General observed that, since January, he had assumed that the Turkish Cypriot side continued to accept the documentation that had been prepared for the January meeting, and his efforts had been geared towards gaining the acceptance of the Greek Cypriot side. The outcome of those efforts had been positive and he was now waiting for the response of the Turkish Cypriot side to developments since January.

The Secretary-General appealed to both sides to refrain from making public statements which were at variance

with the positions they had taken in the context of his mission of good offices. He concluded that, provided both sides manifested the necessary good will and cooperation, an agreement could be reached without further delay and he intended, therefore, to intensify his diplomatic action in the coming weeks. He would welcome the support of all those who were interested in arriving at an agreement.

The Council considered the Secretary-General's report under the agenda item "Situation in Cyprus" at its 2591st meeting, on 14 June 1985. At the outset of the meeting, the President, with the consent of the Council, invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council. The President invited Mr. Ozer Koray to participate in the meeting under the terms of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, as agreed by the members of the Council during consultations.⁷

The President put to the vote a draft resolution⁸ prepared in the course of the Council's consultations which the Council adopted unanimously as resolution 565 (1985). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 31 May and 14 June and of 11 June 1985,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus had agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1985,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 December 1985;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1985;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

The first speaker following the vote was the representative of Cyprus, who thanked the Council for its decision to renew the mandate of UNFICYP and expressed his Government's appreciation and support for the efforts of the Secretary-General. He explained that the Greek Cypriot side had gone to the high-level meeting of January 1985 expecting to negotiate on the document presented by the Secretary-General. The meeting had failed to produce progress because the Turkish Cypriot leader had insisted that the document should either be signed or not, without further negotiation.

The representative of Cyprus maintained that the elections and referendum held in northern Cyprus could not be upheld as internal democratic processes of the Turkish Cypriot community because they had taken place in an area

¹S/17227.

²The Secretary-General subsequently informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had concurred in the proposed extension, whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept the text of draft resolution S/17266 and would convey their views at the anticipated meeting of the Security Council (S/17227/Add.2).

³S/17227/Add.1.

⁴The Secretary-General had informed the Council of the outcome of that meeting in an addendum to his report of 12 December 1984, dated 2 February 1985 (S/16858/Add.1)

⁵S/17170 and S/17241.

⁶S/17198.

⁷S/PV.2591, p. 2.

⁸S/17266, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 565(1985).

under Turkish occupation; moreover, the results had been skewed by the votes of settlers brought in from Turkey. For the same reasons, it could not be argued that the elections and referendum represented the exercise by the Turkish Cypriots of the right to self-determination embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. In any case, the right to self-determination was meant to be exercised by a people as a whole, and not on the basis of factional, religious, communal or ethnic criteria.

Turkey, he claimed, by not implementing the mandatory resolutions of the Council and by undermining the negotiating process through faits accomplis, was continuing, unchecked, to consolidate its occupation of Cyprus. Cyprus reserved the right to demand that the Council take effective measures under the Charter for the implementation of its resolutions. Cyprus would continue to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and remained dedicated to the achievement of a negotiated settlement on the basis of United Nations decisions and the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979.⁹

The representative of Greece, *inter alia*, expressed his Government's acceptance of resolution 565 (1985), its appreciation for UNFICYP and its support for the Secretary-General and his mission.¹⁰

Mr. Ozer Koray stated that the January meeting had failed because the Greek Cypriot leader had rejected the draft agreement prepared by the Secretary-General. He asserted that elections had always been held separately by the two communities on Cyprus and denied the allegation that settlers from Turkey had been implanted within the Turkish Cypriot community.

In commenting on the Secretary-General's report he stated that the draft agreement as revised since January differed substantially from the original document in terms of both substance and procedures to be followed. The revisions had been carried out through contacts with the Greek Cypriot side only. He regretted that the Secretary-General's report included comments of the spokesman of the Secretary-General,¹¹ which cast a shadow on the basis of the mission of good offices. In that connection, he declared that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was at least as legitimate an entity as the Greek Cypriot administration in the south, and nobody had the right to pass judgement on its peaceful and democratic internal developments.

Mr. Koray stated that the resolution just adopted contained elements that were unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side: references to the "Government of Cyprus", which they considered an illegal entity that was usurping the position of the legitimate bi-communal Government of Cyprus that had been destroyed in 1963; a reference to the "other relevant resolutions" on Cyprus, which included resolutions that the Turkish Cypriots had rejected or accepted with reservations; and a reference to the "present mandate" of the Force, which was no longer compatible with the changed conditions in Cyprus. Nevertheless, the Turkish Cypriots would accept the presence of UNFICYP and would continue to support the good offices of the Secretary-General.¹²

The representative of Turkey stated that since the Greek Cypriots could not legally, constitutionally or legitimately claim to represent the Turkish Cypriots, and in the absence of a joint federal government, the Turkish Cypriots should be represented by organs and authorities elected freely by the Turkish Cypriots themselves.¹³

The representative of Australia expressed his Government's support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and for UNFICYP, in which Australia maintained a contingent of civilian police. He pointed out that the international community had renewed the mandate of UNFICYP time and again, yet the costs borne by the troop-contributing countries had been met only until June 1978. He called for an increase both in voluntary contributions and in the number of countries making contributions to the UNFICYP Special Account.¹⁴

The representatives of Cyprus and Greece made further statements.¹⁵

Decision of 20 September 1985 (2607th meeting): President's statement

At the 2607th meeting of the Council¹⁶ on 20 September 1985, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:¹⁷

The Security Council has been seized with the Cyprus question since 1964. The members of the Council have been kept informed of the efforts begun by the Secretary-General in August 1984 as part of the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Council.

On 20 September 1985, the members of the Council heard an oral report from the Secretary-General, in the course of which he conveyed his assessment that his initiative had brought the positions of the two sides closer than ever before and expressed his conviction that what had been achieved so far should lead to an early agreement on the framework for a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus question in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Recalling their support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus, members of the Council expressed strong support for the mission of the Secretary-General under his mandate from the Council.

The members of the Security Council, therefore, called upon all parties to make a special effort in cooperation with the Secretary-General to reach an early agreement.

Decision of 12 December 1985 (2635th meeting): resolution 578 (1985)

On 30 November 1985, the Secretary-General submitted his report¹⁸ on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1985, recommending that the mandate of UNFICYP be extended for a further period of six months.¹⁹

The Secretary-General reported²⁰ that during the period under review he had met with the leaders of both commu-

¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 44-49.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 53-58 and 58, respectively.

¹⁶The agenda item of the meeting was entitled "Complaint by Angola against South Africa".

¹⁷S/17486.

¹⁸S/17657.

¹⁹In an addendum dated 11 December 1985, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had agreed to the proposed extension, whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept draft resolution S/17680 and would convey their views at the anticipated meeting of the Security Council (S/17657/Add.2).

²⁰S/17657/Add.1.

⁹S/PV.2591, pp. 4-17.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

¹¹S/17227/Add.1 (containing comments of the Secretary-General on the elections and referendum).

¹²S/PV.2591, pp. 26-40.

nities. With their agreement, he had conducted with each side lower-level discussions that would be continued in January 1986. He believed that the two sides were within reach of agreement on a framework for an overall solution, within which the details of a number of elements could be negotiated. If the two sides agreed to accept the framework and then worked determinedly in cooperation with the Secretary-General, it would be possible to resolve the few remaining issues.

The Council considered the Secretary-General's report at its 2635th meeting, on 12 December 1985. At the outset of the meeting the President invited, at their request, the representatives of Austria, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council; he also invited, as agreed by the members of the Council in prior consultations, Mr. Ozer Koray to participate under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council.²¹ The Council began its consideration by voting on a draft resolution²² which had been prepared in consultations. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 578 (1985), which reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 30 November and 11 December and of 9 December 1985,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1985,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolutions 186 (1964) for a further period, ending on 15 June 1986;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1986;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

Following the vote, the representative of Austria, addressing the Council on behalf of all the troop-contributing countries, expressed concern at the financial situation of UNFICYP and appealed to all Member States to increase their contributions.²³

The representative of Cyprus affirmed that the renewal of UNFICYP was imperative. Regarding a final settlement, he claimed that a basic precondition for a solution on Cyprus was the withdrawal of Turkish troops. The dominant presence of the Turkish army prevented the Turkish Cypriot community from negotiating freely and posed an insurmountable obstacle to genuine negotiations.

The Greek Cypriot side had accepted the documentation arrived at in separate meetings with the Secretary-General the previous April; all that was needed was for the Turkish Cypriots also to agree, paving the way to substantial negotiations and a speedy resolution of the problem. Cyprus believed that the members of the Council and of the United

Nations could greatly assist the Secretary-General in obtaining the agreement of the Turkish Cypriots.²⁴

The representative of Greece insisted upon the withdrawal of all Turkish troops from Cyprus before any transitional period or interim Government could be established and declared that Greece would not participate in any agreement that included Turkey among the guarantors. He reiterated the Greek proposal that an eventual agreement should include the presence of UNFICYP under a new mandate for a substantial period of time.²⁵

Mr. Ozer Koray maintained that a Turkish guarantee was indispensable to any effective and lasting settlement. He claimed that successful negotiations could only take place between parties enjoying equal status and suggested that the existence of the Turkish Cypriot State could provide a basis for a return to legality on Cyprus.

He protested against Greek Cypriot initiatives in international forums where the Turkish Cypriots were not represented and said that such initiatives threatened the efforts of the Secretary-General and ran counter to the various agreements that had been concluded.

Mr. Koray reacted to the current resolution in the same terms as those declared on similar past occasions and commented that he hoped the troop-contributing countries would maintain their neutrality.²⁶

The representative of Turkey reaffirmed his Government's agreement with the positions that had been presented by Mr. Koray.²⁷

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey made further statements.²⁸

Decision of 13 June 1986 (2688th meeting): resolution 585 (1986)

In his report²⁹ on the Cyprus operation for the period from 1 December 1985 to 31 May 1986, submitted on 31 May 1986, the Secretary-General recommended that the mandate of UNFICYP should be extended for another six months³⁰ and expressed his profound concern over the further deterioration of the financial situation of the Force.

Regarding his mission of good offices, the Secretary-General reported³¹ that on 29 March 1986 he had presented to both sides a draft framework agreement which, if accepted, would allow all outstanding issues to be tackled as an integrated whole for the first time.³²

The Secretary-General further reported that the Greek Cypriot response had been that it could not express its views on the draft framework agreement before the ques-

²⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 9-23.

²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 26-28.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 29-42.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 49-59.

²⁹S/18102.

³⁰In an addendum dated 12 June 1986, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had concurred in the proposed extension whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept the text of draft resolution S/18151 and would set forth their positions at the anticipated meeting of the Council (S/18102/Add.2).

³¹S/18102/Add.1.

³²The Secretary-General had provided copies of the draft agreement and covering letter to the Council and to the representatives of Greece and Turkey, and he had briefed the Council on the status of his latest effort at an informal meeting, on 24 April.

²¹S/PV.2635, pp. 2-6.

²²S/17680, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 578 (1985).

²³S/PV.2635, pp. 7-8.

tions of the withdrawal of Turkish forces and settlers, of effective international guarantees and of the application of freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and the right to property had been settled, preferably at an international conference or high-level meeting convened by the Secretary-General. The Turkish Cypriot side had indicated that it accepted the draft framework agreement, but it would not accept any procedure for negotiation other than that contained therein.

The Secretary-General concluded that, since one side was not yet in a position to accept the draft framework agreement, the way was not yet open to proceed with the negotiations he had proposed for an overall solution. He expressed concern at the dangers inherent in the current situation and cautioned that the way forward would require careful reflection by all sides.

At its 2688th meeting, on 13 June 1986, the Council invited the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, at their request, under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, and Mr. Ozer Koray, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council, to participate without the right to vote in the Council's consideration of the report of the Secretary-General.³³ The Council considered the matter at its 2688th and 2689th meetings, on 13 June 1986.

At its 2688th meeting, the Council proceeded to vote on a draft resolution³⁴ that had been prepared in consultations. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 585 (1986), which reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 31 May and 11 and 12 June 1986,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1986,

Reaffirming the provisions of its resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 December 1986;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1986;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

Following the vote, the representative of Cyprus expressed approval for the resolution just adopted and discussed the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. He said that, following the low-level meetings held by the Secretary-General at the end of 1985, the Greek Cypriots had summarized their concerns on various issues in writing³⁵ and had proposed further negotiations to bridge the apparent gap between the positions of the two sides. Instead, the Secretary-General had produced a draft framework agreement that did not reflect their concerns and did not satisfy previous undertakings. Because of the latter, the

Greek Cypriots did not consider the integrated whole concept to be sufficient protection for their position.

There were three crucial issues that the Greek Cypriots had consistently demanded should be discussed as a matter of priority and at the appropriate high level: the three freedoms (freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and the right to property); the question of guarantees; and the withdrawal of Turkish settlers and troops. The Turkish Cypriot side had refused to enter into meaningful discussions on these issues, whereas the Greek Cypriots, because of their conciliatory attitude and willingness to cooperate with the Secretary-General, had discussed constitutional issues for several years and had made many painful concessions.

If the Greek Cypriot proposal for negotiation of the three issues was not viable because the Turkish Cypriots had rejected it, then in effect the Greek Cypriots were being advised to accept a victor's peace. Turkey was the aggressor and Turkey must account to the Council for its act of aggression and its noncompliance with decisions of the Council. The situation in Cyprus persisted because the Council had not taken decisive steps to force Turkey to comply with its resolutions. The credibility and usefulness of the United Nations depended upon its ability to master the means to implement its decisions and take effective action when the situation warranted.³⁶

The representative of Greece expressed views similar to those expressed by the representative of Cyprus. He stated that in accepting the draft statement and draft agreement of April 1985, the Cypriot Government had made painful concessions, on the clear understanding that this would open the way for the withdrawal of the Turkish army. However, both the content of the agreement and the environment in which the negotiations took place had since changed. He charged that the current draft framework agreement addressed the issues that concerned the Turkish Cypriots but did not address the issues that concerned the Greek Cypriots, and he suggested that if the integrated whole approach provided an adequate safeguard, then the Turkish side should agree to modalities for the withdrawal of Turkish troops subject to an integrated whole approach. He stressed that the question of the withdrawal of the Turkish army from Cyprus was not simply an aspect of a bi-communal dispute; rather, it concerned the military invasion and occupation of a Member State and should be dealt with in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.³⁷

Mr. Ozer Koray expressed resentment at both the content and the tone of the Greek Cypriot statement. He reminded the Council that the Turkish Cypriot side had unreservedly accepted the draft framework agreement prepared by the Secretary-General. The Turkish Cypriots believed that, if concluded and adhered to in good faith, the draft agreement could lead to a bi-communal and bi-zonal federal settlement based on the equal political status of the two sides.

Mr. Koray cited a statement made by the spokesman of the Secretary-General on 31 March 1986 to the effect that the two sides were in agreement on the manner in which the questions of the withdrawal of non-Cypriot troops,

³³S/PV.2688, pp. 2-3.

³⁴S/18151, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 585 (1986).

³⁵See S/18149.

³⁶S/PV.2688, pp. 6-26.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 28-37.

guarantees and the three freedoms should be dealt with and that the text presented by the Secretary-General remained absolutely faithful to what the two sides had agreed. Mr. Koray stated that the failure of the Greek Cypriots to accept the draft framework agreement proved once again that the constructive approach and political will of only one of the parties to a question was not enough to resolve the issue. He claimed that the Greek Cypriot side had rejected the draft agreement only after consulting with the Prime Minister of Greece and he accused them of creating confusion for tactical reasons.

Finally, he stated that the Turkish Cypriots rejected the resolution just adopted by the Council for the same reasons expressed on similar past occasions, but nevertheless accepted the presence of UNFICYP on Turkish Cypriot territory on the basis stated in December 1985.³⁸

The President then adjourned the meeting.³⁹

When the Council resumed its consideration of the item at its 2689th meeting, on 13 June 1986, the representative of Turkey affirmed that the positions expressed by his Government on similar past occasions with respect to Council resolutions on Cyprus and the presence of UNFICYP remained valid. His Government's views on UNFICYP, like those of the Turkish Cypriots, were based on the expectation that there would be a concrete peacemaking process within an agreed framework, which UNFICYP would be called upon to support by performing specific functions. However, if the peace process continued to be hampered by Greek Cypriot intransigence, the need for the continued presence of the Force would become increasingly questionable.

The representative of Turkey claimed that after consulting with the Greek Prime Minister, the Greek Cypriots had reneged on every point to which they had previously agreed. He concluded that there could be no negotiated solution to the Cyprus problem as long as the Prime Minister of Greece was in a position to dictate policies to the Greek Cypriots.⁴⁰

The representatives of Greece and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.⁴¹

Decision of 11 December 1986 (2729th meeting): resolution 593 (1986)

The Secretary-General on 2 December 1986 submitted his report⁴² on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1986, recommending once again that the mandate of UNFICYP should be extended for a further period of six months.⁴³ The Secretary-General expressed concern at the gap between the costs of UNFICYP and the level of voluntary contributions, and he suggested that the Council might wish to consider changing the system of financing so that the costs would in future be financed by means of assessed contributions.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 38-47.

³⁹Ibid., p. 48.

⁴⁰S/PV.2689, pp. 3-10.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 11-12.

⁴²S/18491 and Add.1.

⁴³In an addendum to his report the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension, while the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept draft resolution S/18515 and would expound their stands at the forthcoming meeting of the Council (S/18491/Add.1).

The Secretary-General reported that he had met in New York with the leaders of the two communities in September 1986. In November, he had dispatched a mission of Secretariat officials to Cyprus, where they had held follow-up discussions with both sides. The mission had recalled to each side that, under the mandate entrusted to him by the Council, the Secretary-General could not impose anything on either side, nor could he allow his mission of good offices to be frozen because one side found a particular suggestion unacceptable, or because the other side, having accepted a suggestion, insisted that the Secretary-General's effort could not proceed until the other side had done the same. In response, both parties had maintained the positions they had expressed following the submission of the draft framework agreement in March 1986, but each of the parties had reiterated its support for the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, its continuing commitment to the search for a solution leading to the establishment of a federal republic of Cyprus and its understanding that the Secretary-General would have to continue to search for a way out of the current impasse.

The mission had visited Greece and Turkey before returning to New York in order to inform representatives of the respective Governments of its discussions in Cyprus.

The Secretary-General concluded that, although his efforts had not yet yielded the results he had hoped for, he remained convinced that earlier progress continued to provide a foundation upon which a solution could be built.

The Security Council considered the Secretary-General's report at its 2729th meeting, on 11 December 1986. The Council invited the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, at their request, to participate in the discussion under rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure and, as agreed in consultations, invited Mr. Ozer Koray to participate under rule 39. The Council voted upon a draft resolution⁴⁴ prepared in consultations, which it adopted unanimously as resolution 593 (1986). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 2 and 10 December 1986,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1986,

Reaffirming the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 June 1987,
2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1987;
3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

Following the vote, the representative of Cyprus noted that his Government would have liked to see the report of the Secretary-General place more emphasis on the crucial

⁴⁴S/18585, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 593 (1986).

matter of the withdrawal of Turkish troops and on the increases in Turkish troop strength and importation of settlers which had led to there now being one Turkish soldier or settler for every Turkish Cypriot. It would also have liked the report to have condemned the visit of the Turkish Prime Minister to the occupied part of Cyprus, the Turkish violations of Cypriot airspace and the forward movement of Turkish troops at Ayios Kassianos.

The representative of Cyprus claimed that for the past 12 years his Government had been negotiating at gunpoint; he concluded that as a result of Turkish faits accomplis there would soon be nothing left to negotiate except its acceptance of the partition, dismemberment and disintegration of the Republic. The Cypriot Government would like to see the Secretary-General pursue the convening of an international conference as a way out of the current situation.

With regard to the good offices of the Secretary-General, the representative of Cyprus observed that the Secretary-General was neither a mediator nor an arbitrator; therefore, any ideas or suggestions he might have were open to discussion and could not be submitted as formal proposals for acceptance or rejection except with the prior approval of both sides. His Government had welcomed the content of the Secretary-General's position and had tried to adopt the most positive response possible in the circumstances. But it could not be expected to remain bound by the April 1985 documents when the Turkish Cypriot side had rejected them; moreover, its acceptance of those documents had been made under specific assurances on many issues which subsequent Turkish actions and positions had negated. It had also made it clear that it would not be bound by those documents if the Turkish Cypriot side raised any new items in subsequent discussions. Subsequent oral and written statements by the Turkish Cypriots on the most important issues in the documents had completely frustrated the *raison d'être* of the documents.⁴⁵

The representative of Greece expressed his Government's agreement with the positions held by the Government of Cyprus.⁴⁶

Mr. Ozer Koray stated that the draft framework agreement presented by the Secretary-General was the correct and the best framework for a negotiated solution to the problem of Cyprus. He claimed that the primary reason a settlement had not been achieved in the past 23 years was that the Greek Cypriot regime had been recognized as the legitimate Government of Cyprus and was unwilling to accept the Turkish people as equal in the body politic of Cyprus. Thus, the Greek Cypriots lacked the political will to arrive at a settlement. The only leverage the international community had in effecting a positive change in the attitude and the approach of the Greek Cypriots was to adopt a more flexible approach in the treatment of the two sides.

Regarding the question of settlers, he noted that throughout the 82 years of British rule in Cyprus thousands of Turkish Cypriots had emigrated to Turkey, while during the 1950s and 1960s Greek Cypriot terrorism and visa policies had caused a second stage of large-scale Turkish Cypriot emigration. At the same time, the Greek Cypriot population had been augmented by the importation of large numbers of people from Greece and by the settlement of

Greek soldiers in Cyprus following their discharge. Thus, the ratio of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot populations frequently cited by the Greek Cypriots was an arbitrary ratio resulting from adverse circumstances that had forced the Turkish Cypriots to emigrate over many years. The so-called Turkish settlers were people of Turkish Cypriot origin who had opted to return to their original country, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and reunite with their families now that conditions of peace, security and stability had been restored.

Mr. Koray responded to the adoption of resolution 593 (1986) in the same terms as those expressed on similar past occasions.⁴⁷

The representative of Turkey denied Greek and Greek Cypriot allegations concerning the Turkish military presence in the island. He declared that Turkey had not reinforced its forces in either personnel or equipment and had no aggressive intentions anywhere. The Greek Cypriot allegations were designed to cover the rearmament efforts of the Greek Cypriot side and the support for and contribution to those efforts by Greece. In order to present the other side of the picture, he analysed the nature and composition of the forces in southern Cyprus, which he said included both Greek mainland and combined Greek and Greek Cypriot forces as well as several private armies. Finally, he argued that the Greek Cypriots pretended to object to only part of the draft agreement when in fact they had consistently refused to accept anything.⁴⁸

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey made further statements in exercise of the right of reply.⁴⁹

Decision of 12 June 1987 (2749th meeting): resolution 597 (1987)

In his report for the period from 1 December 1986 to 29 May 1987,⁵⁰ the Secretary-General noted that it had been argued that UNFICYP had become part of the problem in Cyprus by keeping the two sides from suffering the consequences of their failure to agree on a political solution. The Secretary-General forcefully denied that claim, pointing out that a basic principle of the United Nations was settlement by peaceful means versus the threat or use of force. He warned that the withdrawal of UNFICYP could quickly lead to a resumption of hostilities and therefore recommended that the Council renew the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months.

The Secretary-General once again drew attention to the grave discrepancy between expected expenditures for UNFICYP and the amounts contributed or pledged by Member States. He hoped that the necessary agreement would be forthcoming to make the change to assessed contributions.

The Secretary-General related that he had sent another mission to Cyprus in February 1987 with the suggestion that the two sides begin informal discussions with his aides on a strictly confidential and non-binding basis. The discussions would not be aimed at renegotiating any document the Secretary-General had presented since August 1984; their sole purpose would be to help the Secretary-General find a means to pursue his good offices.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 26-37.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 37-46.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 47-51 and 53-56, respectively.

⁵⁰S/18880.

⁴⁵S/PV.2729, pp. 7-20.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 21-26.

The Greek Cypriots had accepted this suggestion, but the Turkish Cypriots had refused, insisting that no discussions could take place unless the Greek Cypriot side accepted the document of 29 March 1986. Meanwhile, the Greek Cypriots continued to press the Secretary-General to promote their proposal for an international conference; however, the Secretary-General's soundings had revealed that the Turkish Cypriot side and the Government of Turkey were against that proposal, while the members of the Council were divided on it.

Despite the current impasse, the Secretary-General continued to believe that a settlement could be concluded on the basis of the 1977 and 1979 agreements, to which each side maintained its commitment. However, the conditions upon which each side currently insisted made it impossible for negotiations to take place. If the parties continued to insist upon those conditions, there would be no realistic prospect of negotiating a settlement. He noted that the deepening distrust between the two sides was one of the major causes of the current difficulties and appealed to Turkey to make a start towards improving the climate by reducing its forces on the island, since the strengthening of Turkish forces in the north had heightened the level of distrust in recent months. To reverse the current trend of build-up of military forces, he commended to the Council a proposal⁵¹ whereby UNFICYP would undertake regular inspections to verify the level of forces on both sides.⁵²

The Security Council considered the Secretary-General's report at its 2749th meeting, on 12 June 1987. The Council invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate in the discussion under rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure and, as agreed in consultations, Mr. Ozer Koray, under rule 39.⁵³

The Council voted upon a draft resolution⁵⁴ that had been prepared in consultations, which it adopted unanimously as resolution 597 (1987).⁵⁵ The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 29 May 1987,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1987,

Reaffirming the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

⁵¹The Secretary-General first presented this proposal in 1983; see S/15812, para. 23.

⁵²In an addendum to his report, dated 11 June 1987, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension of UNFICYP, while the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community had indicated that they could not accept the text of draft resolution S/18909 and would expound their stands at the forthcoming meeting of the Council.

The Secretary-General also indicated that, unfortunately, his consultations had revealed that the necessary agreement did not currently exist for the Council to approve a change in the system of financing UNFICYP.

⁵³S/PV.2749, p. 3.

⁵⁴S/18909, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 597 (1987).

⁵⁵S/PV.2749, pp. 4-6.

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 December 1987;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1987;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

The first speaker following the vote was the representative of Cyprus, who declared that the renewal of UNFICYP was imperative and stated that the Government of Cyprus was prepared to maintain its current high levels of moral and material support for the Force should a process of assessed contributions be agreed upon.

The representative of Cyprus referred to recent increases in Turkish troop strength and a concomitant influx of Turkish settlers. He pointed out that the Security Council and the General Assembly had decreed that a solution to the problem of Cyprus must include the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the island and the cessation of all foreign interference in its internal affairs. Any suggestion, particularly from within the United Nations, that the cardinal principles laid down in United Nations resolutions should be abandoned in order to achieve a quick solution by meeting the demands of the aggressor must be considered both shocking and inconceivable.

He proposed that the way to advance a swift solution to the problem of Cyprus was for the Council to adopt appropriate measures while those in a position to influence Turkey brought strong pressure to bear. The Council should therefore support the proposal for an international conference to consider the external aspects of the problem of Cyprus, i.e., the questions of troop and settler withdrawals and of international guarantees.

The Government of Cyprus remained committed to a negotiated solution to the problem of Cyprus, as demonstrated most recently by its acceptance in March of the Secretary-General's proposal for parallel talks, which the Turkish side had unfortunately rejected. The Greek Cypriot side would continue to support and cooperate with the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices.⁵⁶

The representative of Greece stated that the Government of Cyprus was being asked to commit itself on the constitutional aspect of the problem without knowing Turkey's intentions with regard to the three fundamental issues that had never been discussed: the presence of the Turkish army and settlers in Cyprus and the matter of international guarantees. Indications from the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot side suggested that Turkey meant to keep part of its forces in Cyprus indefinitely and the Greek Cypriot side could not possibly negotiate further without being formally apprised of Turkey's intentions regarding those crucial questions.

Turning to the proposal for a verification system and confidence-building measures contained in the Secretary-General's report, the representative of Greece called for an extremely cautious approach. He expressed concern lest a verification system consolidate the existing situation and legitimize the presence of occupation forces on the island. He argued that the only way to build confidence among the Greek Cypriots and at the same time promote a solution of the problem was for Turkey to withdraw its occupation

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 7-19.

army. Verification by UNFICYP would be useful for monitoring the withdrawal of Turkish forces, and at the same time UNFICYP, perhaps under a new mandate and for an intermediate period, could meet any legitimate concern of the Turkish Cypriots regarding their security.⁵⁷

Mr. Koray claimed that the Turkish forces in Cyprus were there to protect the Turkish Cypriot people, who faced increasingly hostile Greek and Greek Cypriot forces of overwhelming superiority in numbers and armaments. The Turkish Cypriot side had repeatedly called attention to the Greek military build-up, which had started in 1982 and had since gained momentum, and he regretted that the Secretary-General had omitted any reference to the Greek mainland forces in his report. He warned against measuring the two sides by different yardsticks and took strong exception to paragraph 70 of the Secretary-General's report,⁵⁸ in which the source of heightened mistrust in the island was grossly misidentified; as the Secretary-General was well aware, the cause of increased distrust was the intransigent attitude of the Greek and Greek Cypriot side towards the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.

Mr. Koray responded to the adoption of resolution 597 (1987) by affirming the positions he had indicated on similar past occasions.⁵⁹

The representative of Turkey insisted once again that Turkish troops had come to Cyprus in 1974 to protect the Turkish Cypriot people and that they remained on the island solely for that purpose. He denied any build-up of Turkish forces and explained the reasons for normal fluctuations in the numbers of men and equipment. By contrast, he enumerated in detail a build-up of Greek forces in the island and expressed particular concern at contacts the Greek Cypriots had established with a number of countries in order to procure sophisticated military equipment and armaments.

With regard to negotiations, he declared that the Secretary-General's mission of good offices could not be salvaged by procedural devices and subtleties: it was time for direct negotiations on the only basis which existed, the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986. Further discussions could have no meaning or purpose so long as the parties did not proceed from the basis to which they had agreed during the talks leading to the submission of the draft framework agreement. By refusing to sign the draft framework agreement the Greek Cypriots were reneging on their prior consent, with the avowed intention of discarding the draft framework agreement and replacing it with an agenda of their own choosing.

Finally, the representative of Turkey warned against exaggerating the situation on the island. He pointed out that tourists continued to flock to Cyprus without fear of being engulfed in a military crisis, belying any impressions that the Secretary-General's report might inadvertently convey that a dangerous situation prevailed.⁶⁰

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of their right of reply.⁶¹

Decision of 14 December 1987 (2771st meeting): resolution 604 (1987)

On 30 November 1987, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council his report⁶² for the period 1 June to 30 November 1987, in which he informed the Council that he had met with the leaders of both parties in October 1987 in New York. Notwithstanding the efforts of the Secretary-General, each side continued to uphold its basic positions and the situation remained deadlocked.

The Secretary-General had continued to appeal to the Government of Turkey to reduce its forces on the island. He warned that the military build-up by Turkey and recent measures by the Government of Cyprus to improve its own defences, combined with each side's perceptions of the other's intentions, had created a serious situation that needed to be redressed. He continued to believe that the verification scheme referred to in his last report⁶³ would be a useful way of reducing tension between the parties and he hoped they would give the suggestion further thought.

The Secretary-General concluded that, given the precarious situation in Cyprus, the presence of UNFICYP remained indispensable and he therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months. He again drew attention to the worsening financial situation of the Force and reiterated his views regarding a more equitable means of financing.⁶⁴

The Council considered the Secretary-General's report at its 2771st meeting, on 14 December 1987. The Council invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate in the discussion under rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure and, as agreed in consultations, Mr. Ozer Koray, under rule 39.⁶⁵

The Council voted upon a draft resolution⁶⁶ prepared in consultations, which it adopted unanimously as resolution 604 (1987).⁶⁷ The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 30 November 1987,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1987,

Reaffirming the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 June 1988;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made

⁶²S/19304.

⁶³S/18880; see note 50 above.

⁶⁴In an addendum to his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension of the Force, whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot side had indicated that they could not accept draft resolution S/19338 as a basis for extending the Force and would expound their stands at the meeting of the Security Council (S/19304/Add.1).

⁶⁵S/PV.2771, pp. 2-5.

⁶⁶S/19338, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 604 (1987).

⁶⁷S/PV.2771, p. 6.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 21-27.

⁵⁸S/18880. In paragraph 70 the Secretary-General stated that distrust in recent months had in particular been heightened by the strengthening of the Turkish forces in the northern part of the island.

⁵⁹S/PV.2794, pp. 28-41.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 42-52.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, pp. 52-66.

and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1988;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

Following the adoption of resolution 604 (1987), the representative of Cyprus discussed several proposals put forth by his Government. Cyprus proposed: (a) the appointment of an independent committee of legal experts to investigate the question of mainland Turkish settlers; (b) the convening of an international conference under United Nations auspices, which would strengthen the hand of the Secretary-General in dealing with issues such as the withdrawal of Turkish troops and the questions of settlers and of guarantees; and (c) the withdrawal of Turkish settlers and complete demilitarization of the island, with the exception of a small, mixed police force and an international force under United Nations auspices to strengthen the sense of security internally, which would allow the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to settle their internal problems without foreign interference.

He dismissed Turkish allegations that Turkish troops had invaded and remained in Cyprus in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee. The Treaty contained no provision justifying the use of force and the presence of foreign troops. Moreover, had the treaty provided for the use of force, it would have been in violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, and *ipso facto* null and void under Article 103.⁶⁸

Also false was the Turkish pretext that the increase in occupation troops was in response to the strengthening of the Greek Cypriot National Guard. Turkey was 110 times the size of Cyprus, and its forces on the island were 4 times larger in number. The Cypriot forces were for defence purposes only; however, the number of Turkish forces, and the establishment of a military airport at Lefkoniko and a military port at Kyrenia, signalled malicious Turkish intentions.

The representative of Cyprus noted that his Government was committed to a peaceful settlement and remained determined to seek justice through the United Nations. At the same time, he respectfully submitted that the time was long overdue for the Council to consider taking effective remedial action.⁶⁹

The representative of Greece expressed agreement with the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP.⁷⁰

Mr. Ozer Koray emphasized that there were two politically and geographically separate entities in Cyprus. In the north, exit and entry policies and procedures were administered according to the laws and regulations of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which reserved the right to citizenship to those who possessed that right under the 1960 Treaty of Establishment, i.e., persons who on 5 November 1914 were Ottoman subjects ordinarily resident on the island of Cyprus and their descendants in the male line. Mr. Koray believed that similar laws and regulations applied in the south. He claimed, moreover, that it was the

Greek Cypriots who had in the past attempted to change the demographics of the island. The Greek Cypriots had refused birth certificates to Turkish Cypriot children between 1963 and 1974, had issued Turkish Cypriots one-way passports out of the island and had not allowed them to return, had imported large numbers of people from Greece and had settled discharged mainland Greek soldiers on the island.

Mr. Koray asserted that huge sums of money were being spent in South Cyprus on the purchase of sophisticated weaponry. Past experience proved that the Greek Cypriot military build-up could not be intended for defensive purposes, and if the Greek Cypriot preparations led to undesirable consequences, then those who had helped the Greek Cypriots would bear heavy responsibilities.

Finally, Mr. Koray confirmed the Turkish Cypriots' rejection of resolution 604 (1987) for the reasons put forward on similar past occasions; however, he reiterated their support for the good offices of the Secretary-General and their commitment to the 29 March 1986 "Draft Framework Agreement".⁷¹

The representative of Turkey declared his Government's support for the position expressed by Mr. Koray regarding resolution 604 (1987). He denied the existence of any aggressive intentions on the part of the Turkish forces in northern Cyprus, which were present to protect the Turkish Cypriot people and would withdraw from the island only in the event of a negotiated settlement. The level and composition of those forces fluctuated from time to time in correlation with the military threat directed from the South.

Regarding the question of settlers, he asserted that the population ratio between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots had not changed, testifying to the falsehood of Greek Cypriot allegations.⁷²

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.⁷³

Decision of 13 June 1988 (2816th meeting): resolution 614 (1988)

The Secretary-General on 31 May 1988 submitted his report⁷⁴ on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 December 1987 to 31 May 1988. He informed the Council that consultations were currently under way on procedural proposals that had been presented to the two sides by his Special Representative. Despite difficulties which could not be underestimated, he hoped to break the impasse soon and resume negotiations between the two sides for an overall settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The Secretary-General again drew the attention of the Council to the worsening financial situation of UNFICYP and his proposal that the Force should be funded from assessed contributions. He recommended that the mandate of the Force be extended for a further period of six months.⁷⁵

⁷¹*Ibid.*, pp. 37-50.

⁷²*Ibid.*, pp. 48-63.

⁷³*Ibid.*, pp. 63-68, 69-70 and 71, respectively.

⁷⁴S/19927.

⁷⁵In an addendum to his report (S/19927/Add.1, dated 14 June 1988), the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Governments of Cyprus, Greece and the United Kingdom had agreed to the proposed extension of the Force, whereas the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot side had indicated that they could not accept draft resolution S/19936 as a basis for extending the Force and would expound their stands at the meeting of the Security Council.

⁶⁸Article 2, para. 4, of the Charter of the United Nations states, in part: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force . . .". Article 103 states: "In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail."

⁶⁹S/PV.2771, pp. 7-28.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 28-36.

The Security Council considered the Secretary-General's report at its 2816th meeting, on 15 June 1988, and invited, at their request, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to participate, under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure. The Council further invited, under rule 39, Mr. Ozer Koray, as agreed in prior consultations.⁷⁶ The Council voted upon a draft resolution,⁷⁷ prepared in consultations, which it adopted unanimously as resolution 614 (1988). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 31 May 1988,

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 June 1988,

Reaffirming the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 December 1988;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 30 November 1988;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

Following the vote, the representative of Cyprus referred to the decision by the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus to require persons entering the Turkish-occupied territory to produce passports to be stamped by the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which was in violation of United Nations decisions, including the mandatory decisions of the Council. Nevertheless, believing that improvement in the international climate offered an opportunity for progress, the President of the Republic of Cyprus had offered to meet without preconditions with Mr. Ozal, the Turkish Prime Minister, and with Mr. Denktash, the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, provided that suitable preparations and a reasonable timetable were envisaged for the completion of the negotiation process.⁷⁸

The representative of Greece emphasized the need for the withdrawal of all Turkish forces from Cyprus. He stressed that the solution of a regional problem arising out of a conflict caused by military intervention in and occupation of a sovereign State could not be envisaged without the withdrawal of all foreign troops. He cited with approval the suggestion presented to the two sides following the appointment of the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General that the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979 should form the basis of an overall settlement and added that the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly formed equally the basis of such a settlement.⁷⁹

Mr. Ozer Koray stated that, regardless of the attitudes of third parties, there were in Cyprus two separate and independent States. His President, Mr. Denktash, had invited

the newly elected Greek Cypriot leader, Mr. Vassiliou, to meet with him; however, Mr. Vassiliou had insisted that he could only meet Mr. Denktash as the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community and had proposed to negotiate with the Prime Minister of Turkey instead. The Greek Cypriot side had also rejected Turkish Cypriot proposals for goodwill measures.⁸⁰

Regarding proposals for the demilitarization of Cyprus, Mr. Koray stated that the Greek Cypriot side was not entitled to decide how much security the Turkish Cypriots should enjoy. He claimed that the bi-communal republic established in 1960 had been, for all practical purposes, a demilitarized State but that the Greek Cypriots and Greece had unilaterally militarized Cyprus and, from 1963 on, used their forces against the Turkish Cypriots. Although UNFICYP had been sent to the island in 1964, the security problem of the Turkish Cypriots had not been resolved until 1974, when Greece had engineered a coup in Cyprus in order to annex the island, and Turkey, after years of restraint, had had no alternative but to react.

Mr. Koray stated that two recent fatal accidents involving Turkish Cypriots in the neutral zone had raised questions about the impartial conduct of UNFICYP and he expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would take all necessary measures to prevent the recurrence of such incidents. Regarding the resolution just adopted, he reiterated the points he had made on similar past occasions. In conclusion, he affirmed the support of the Turkish Cypriots for the establishment of a final settlement on the basis of the Secretary-General's 29 March 1986 draft framework agreement.⁸¹

With regard to negotiations, the representative of Turkey stated that the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1986, which had been accepted by the Turkish Cypriot side and rejected by the Greek Cypriot side, was the basis for final negotiations. He further stated that since 1974 it had been assumed that the non-Cypriot forces would be withdrawn if the two sides could agree on a settlement, but at no time had a prior withdrawal of forces been contemplated or negotiated. Turkey could not in any circumstances agree to jeopardize the security of the Turkish Cypriots by a premature reduction or withdrawal of its forces.⁸²

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of their rights of reply.⁸³

Decisions of 15 December 1988 (2833rd meeting): resolution 625 (1988) and statement by the President

In accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution 614 (1988), the Secretary-General submitted a report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 June to 30 November 1988.⁸⁴ He noted that the leaders of the two communities had met with him in Geneva on 24 August 1988 and had resumed talks, without preconditions, on 16 September 1988 in an agreed attempt to reach a negotiated settlement of all aspects of the Cyprus problem by 1 June 1989. The two leaders had agreed to begin a second round of talks on 19 December 1988, which they would review, together with the Secretary-General, in March 1989.

⁷⁶S/PV.2816, p. 2.

⁷⁷S/19936, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 614 (1988).

⁷⁸S/PV.2816, pp. 6-16.

⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 18-21.

⁸⁰S/19578.

⁸¹S/PV.2816, pp. 22-32.

⁸²Ibid., pp. 33-45.

⁸³Ibid., pp. 46-48 and 53, 48-51 and 52, and 51-52 and 52-53, respectively.

⁸⁴S/20310.

The discussions held to date had revealed that the parties remained far apart on important issues and would have to be willing to break free from long-held positions if they were to arrive at solutions reconciling the interests, concerns, hopes and fears of each community.

The Secretary-General stated that the presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus remained indispensable and he recommended that the mandate of the Force be extended for a further period of six months. Once again, he pointed out UNFICYP's worsening financial situation and expressed hope that in due course the members of the Council would agree to a long-overdue reform of its funding.

At its 2833rd meeting, on 15 December 1988, the Council considered the report of the Secretary-General. The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were invited, at their requests, to participate in the meeting under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, and, as agreed in prior consultations, Mr. Ozer Koray was invited to participate under rule 39. At the same meeting, the Council voted upon a draft resolution prepared in consultations, which was adopted unanimously as resolution 625 (1988). The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus of 30 November 1988 (S/20310),

Noting the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council should extend the stationing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting also that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1988,

Reaffirming the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and other relevant resolutions,

1. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force established under resolution 186 (1964) for a further period ending on 15 June 1989;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the present resolution by 31 May 1989;

3. *Calls upon* all the parties concerned to continue to cooperate with the Force on the basis of the present mandate.

At the same meeting, the representative of Cyprus stated that although the situation in the past six months had in general remained the same, expectations had risen cautiously owing to the beginning of a sustained high-level dialogue under the auspices of the Secretary-General. He stressed that, in line with United Nations resolutions and the high-level agreements, a solution to the Cyprus problem must result in a single free, independent, sovereign, demilitarized and non-aligned federal republic with one international personality. It must have no foreign troops, no settlers and no unilateral interventions and it must provide a place in which all people could live and work wherever they wished and where human rights and fundamental freedoms were guaranteed.⁸⁵

The representative of Greece reaffirmed his country's commitment to a solution of the problem of Cyprus which would ensure the independence, unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus in accordance

with the relevant United Nations resolutions. They therefore supported any proposal which would contribute to the withdrawal of foreign troops and settlers and to the resolution of the question of guarantees and the question of the three freedoms.⁸⁶

Mr. Ozer Koray drew the attention of the Council to a recent incident in which a Turkish Cypriot soldier operating within Turkish Cypriot territory had been fatally shot by Greek Cypriot soldiers. In addition, he claimed that the Greek Cypriots had been organizing border disturbances in order to upset the current peaceful conditions in the island which belied the Greek Cypriot argument that the Cyprus problem had been created by the events of 1974.

Mr. Koray cited the fundamental principles which the Turkish Cypriot side considered indispensable to a possible future federal settlement, including political equality, bi-zonality, security and the continuation of Turkey's effective guarantee. He reminded all concerned that the only alternative to the establishment of a bi-zonal federal republic based on the equal political status of the two peoples on Cyprus would be a continuing consolidation of the two independent states in Cyprus.

The success of the next round of talks would largely depend on the readiness of the Greek Cypriots to respect the "integrated whole" approach as agreed upon by the two sides, and before addressing the issues in detail the Greek Cypriots would be required to respond to two questions: Were they willing to work towards the establishment of a partnership state with the Turkish Cypriot side based on the fundamental principle of equality? And were they prepared to share, on an equal basis, the governmental authority in a bi-zonal federal framework?

Regarding the resolution just adopted, Mr. Koray repeated in essence the views he had expressed on similar past occasions.⁸⁷

The representative of Turkey noted that it was important for third parties to refrain from taking positions and adopting postures that might disturb the delicate ongoing negotiations. Turkey was convinced that a solution could only be obtained by the two Cypriot communities, negotiating on an equal footing. It was important, moreover, for the parties to show respect for each other's concerns and discuss with goodwill how those concerns could be met.⁸⁸

The representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey spoke in exercise of the right of reply.⁸⁹

Before adjourning the meeting, the President made the following statement⁹⁰ on behalf of the members of the Council:

The members of the Security Council expressed their support for the effort launched on 24 August 1988 by the Secretary-General in the context of the mission of good offices in Cyprus. They welcomed the readiness of the two parties to seek a negotiated settlement of all aspects of the Cyprus problem by 1 June 1989.

They called upon all parties for full cooperation with the Secretary-General in ensuring the success of the process currently under way.

⁸⁶*ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

⁸⁷*ibid.*, pp. 16-27.

⁸⁸*ibid.*, p. 29.

⁸⁹*ibid.*, pp. 35-37 and 41; 37-38 and 41-42; and 38 and 41, respectively.

⁹⁰S/20330.

⁸⁵S/PV.2833, p. 11.