

# Αιματηρή αλήθεια



# Bloody truth

***To all those who sacrificed their life,  
for the sake of the rest of us...***

Part Two

# **Bloody truth**

# CONTENTS

<b>Prologue</b>	203
<b>Foreword</b>	
1945 – British Policy of Denial	205
2004 – Turkish Policy of Total Denial	206
<b>Chapter A: Until 1955</b>	
A1: 1950 – Exploitation of the Minority	208
A2: 1954 – Turkish Incitement	210
<b>Chapter B: 1955-1962</b>	
B1: 1955 – London and September Events	214
B2: 1955 – Dr Fazil Kutchuk and AKEL	215
B3: 1955 – Nazim Hikmet and Aziz Nessin	217
B4: 1955 – British Funding	220
B5: 1955 – Menderes and Zorlou	222
The details	224
Barbarians	225
B6: 1955 – Turkish Cypriot and British association	227
B7: 1957 – Denktash and TMT (Turk Mukavemet Teskilati)	229
B8: 1956 – Nihat Erim’s Reports	231
B9: 1958 – TMT Army	232
B10: 1958 – KIP Plan (Kibris Istirdat Planı)	233
B11: 1958 – TMT Headquarters	234
B12: 1960 – 10.000 TMT Guns	235
B13: 1959 – Athens knew	239
B14: TMT Army Structure	240
B15: TMT Military Training	240

B16: TMT Weapons Transportation by Sea	241
B17: 1959 – Boat “DENIZ”	242
Evidence of arms to the Turkish Cypriots, as derived from British official documents	243
“Marmara” ship	245
Chief of Intelligence accuses Rauf Denktash of arms smuggling	246
B18: TMT Action	247
B19: 1956 – First Partition	248
B20: 1955, 1958, 1962 – Self-bombing	251
B21: 1958 – “Useful Dead”	252
B22: 1963 – “The Bathtub”	252
B23: 1958 – TMT Murders of Consolidation	255
B24: 1958 – Slaughter of Kontemeniotes	258
B25: TMT 10.000 arms – EOKA 663 arms	267
B26: 27 May 1960 – Coup in Turkey	268
B27: 1959-1963 – Post Zurich TMT	271
B28: 1960 – Handover from Menderes	275
B29: 1959 – Fazil Kutchuk or Rauf Denktash?	276
B30: 1958 – Turks “migrate” to the North	277
B31: Turkey finances the “migration”	280
B32: “Separate self determination only when both communities agree to it”	282
B33: Left wing Turkish Cypriots and the 27 May 1960 Junta	284
B34: 1962 – Ambassador Dirvana	287
B35: Kavazoglou and 27 May 1960	287
B36: 1962 – Bairaktari Bombing and the killing of Turkish Cypriot Journalists’	289

## **Chapter C: 1963 – July 1974**

C1: 1963 – Turkish Rebellion	293
C2: 1964 – Turkish response to the Turkish Propaganda	294
C3: 1965 – Ihsan Ali and “genocide”	297
C4: Return of Propaganda as a result of the Annan Plan	299
C5: 1961-1963 – “AKRITAS Organization”	300
C5-1: Authentic Evidence	301
C5-2: Claire Palley	305
C5-3: Stella Soulioti	307
“Greek Cypriot Secret Document: The Akritas Plan”	307
- Objectives	308
- International Tactics	308
- Internal Front	309
- Tactics	310
- Evaluation of the “Akritas Plan”	312
- Who Prepared the Document	315
- Exploitation of the Document by the Turks	316
- Conclusion	316
C5-4: Authentic Evidence	317
C5-5: Christodoulos Christodoulou	319
C6: “The 13 points”	326
C7: August 1964 – Turkish bombardment of Tylleria	330
C7-1: 1967 – The Clandestine Return of the Planted Terrorist	332
C8: 1964 – British Plan “The Future of Cyprus”	333
C9: British Military cooperation with the Turkish Cypriots	334
C9-1: The Facts	334
C9-2: British Military Personnel against Greek Cypriots	336

C9-3: The “disappearance” of Major E.F.L. Macey and his driver L. Platt	339
C9-4: “Get them all out of Cyprus for reasons of national policy	340
C9-5: Martin Packard and the myth of Ethnic cleansing	341

**Chapter D: The Turkish Invasion of Cyprus,  
July & August 1974**

D1: “Co-patriots pay attention”	344
D2: Newspaper THE SUN “BARBARIANS – Shame on them”	345
D3: The rapes of Greek Cypriot young girls, mothers and grandmothers	350
D4: “Turk atrocities: What secret report reveals”	351
The terrible secrets of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus	351
1. Killing	352
2. Rape	354
3. Torture	356
4. Looting	359
D5: “The last church standing in occupied Cyprus”	360

<b>Epilogue</b>	365
-----------------	-----



## Prologue

If we take into account Cyprus's recent history the bloodshed on the island began long before the Turkish invasion of 1974. It can be argued that this bloodshed began when the British denied the Cypriot people their right to self-determination. This denial provoked the EOKA armed liberation struggle prompting the British to enforce their bloody policy of DIVIDE & RULE.

This policy was pre-planned, to be imposed in Cyprus before 1955 and its implementation started during the liberation struggle of 1955-59: The British separated the Cypriots into Greek-Cypriots (G/C) and Turkish-Cypriots (T/C). As a consequence of this *1<sup>st</sup> Separation* between Cypriots the blood of the EOKA heroes was forged with the bloodshed.

The British, having persuaded the Americans too, retained the fire of separation alive through the whole of the period up to 1974. The bloodshed was to take place in stages; the Turkish insurgence in 1963, the armed conflict between G/C and T/C in 1964 and 1967, the protection of the unlawful EOKA B' for the misconceived UNION of Cyprus with Greece (*2<sup>nd</sup> Separation* between the civilian Greeks of Cyprus), closing the cycle of this period with the provocative treason of Cyprus by the Athens Junta. The latter acted as a pretext to the barbaric and illegal Turkish Invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The *3<sup>rd</sup> Separation* was twofold: the T/C's move and self-imposed isolation in the North of the island with full territorial separation, and the G/C are isolated by the force of arms to the South, further separating them into refugees and non-refugees.

Furthermore, the British then masterminded (with some

known collaborators from Greece and Cyprus along with the Americans and Turks as allies) the 4<sup>th</sup> *Separation* of the Greeks of Cyprus with the attempted Annan Plan (in 2002-2004). This plan was “postponed” by the Referendum of the 24<sup>th</sup> April 2004, when 76% of the Greeks of Cyprus rejected this notorious plan.

The major consequence of the implementation of the Annan Plan would have been the final separation of the Greeks of Cyprus “in Refugees who would return to their occupied Cypriot land and those Refugees who would not return”, with the danger of civil conflict and abandonment so vivid...

At the time of this book going to print, the policy followed regarding the Cyprus problem is predicted to again prove catastrophic for the Greeks of Cyprus, with a repetition of an “Annan type solution”.

This process is encouraged by the world-wide Turkish Propaganda Machine, aiming to prove that “for all the island’s problems those to be blamed are the Greeks, who threatened the T/C with genocide, hence Turkey’s ‘peace operation’ in Cyprus”, as the Turks call the barbaric Invasion of 1974. This invasion resulted in the illegal occupation of 37% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, which today forms part of the EU’s territory.

The epicenter of Turkish propaganda is the period between 1955-1967, during which Britain put into action the method of DIVIDE & RULE, demonstrating a clearly pro-Turkish and implacable anti-Greek attitude.

This book refers specifically to these years of bloodshed, in order to document the truth...

Movement for FREEDOM & JUSTICE IN CYPRUS

## Foreword

### 1945 – British Policy of Denial

The British very quickly forgot the promises they were so generously giving the Cypriots.

In 1940 they were calling upon them to join the British Army, to fight “for Greece and Freedom” against Hitler and Mussolini, but after defeating Nazism and Fascism, the British did not bother to afford to Cyprus its freedom and its union with Greece.

From the very first day in 1878 when the British set foot in Cyprus as her new master, replacing the Ottomans, Cypriots never ceased demanding from them Union with Greece.

For many years, Cypriots had the belief that “the polite, liberal and civilized English nation” as they regarded the English, would give Cyprus to Greece, just like they had offered the Ionian Islands.

However, even the statements of gratitude towards Greek heroism and the warmest promises of the Prime Minister of England Winston Churchill in Nicosia during the war (1943), when he said-

“When the war ends, the name of Cyprus will be referred to with respect, not only among the people of England and their co-warriors of the United Nations, but in all future generations”,<sup>1</sup>

were not just empty promises and words, but were transformed into a persistent rejection by London.

---

1. Panayiotis Mhoulouzarides “Cyprus 1940-1960 Calendar of Developments”, 1985

A rejection, which, even before the end of the Second World War was demonstrated through the mouth of guns of the British colonial police in Cyprus. Murderous bullets against unarmed people drowned in blood the peaceful national celebration of 25<sup>th</sup> March 1945, at the decorated with the white/blue Greek flags Lefkonico Social Associations.<sup>2</sup>

### **2004 – Turkish Policy of Total Denial**

Due to the negligible absence of a factual and prompt response by the Greek Cypriot side, the Turkish propaganda machine, in its effort to cover up Turkey's crimes and intrigues and in order to achieve its long term expansionist ambitions over Cyprus, managed to manipulate successfully (to some extent) the truth and the real facts over the Cyprus issue.

Following the 24<sup>th</sup> of April 2004 rejection of the Annan Plan by the majority of the Greek Cypriots (76%) the Turks and Turkish-Cypriots alike, encouraged by the governing British Labour Party pro-Turkish policy embarked on an international campaign of total denial.

Evidently, the Turks pay full obedience to the racist Article 301 of the Turkish Constitution, which forbids any Turkish citizen to refer to Turkish atrocities, the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, the Turkish crimes, the Armenian and Greek genocides and anything that puts any blame on the Turkish government.

Even worse, they have now embarked on a full scale international campaign of full denial an effort to impose the provisions of this Article on all Greek Cypriots, as well as anyone who dares to speak of Turkish atrocities and a Turkish invasion in Cyprus.

---

2. Fifis Ioannou "THI IS HOW THE CYPRUS ISSUE BEGUN", 2005.

What they claim happened to the T/C in December 1963 and early 1964, was in fact their own doing, their own preparation to impose partition in Cyprus. Their allegations of Greek Cypriots uprooting Turkish Cypriots from their villages and of “ethnic cleansing” was part of their own plan which started in 1957...

The intention of this book is to expose the true plight of the Greek Cypriots through undisputed documents...

## Chapter A: Until 1955

### A1: 1950 – Exploitation of the Minority

As a counter measure to the escalating progress of the peaceful and unarmed movement of the Cypriot people (82% Greek) for Union with Greece, the British rushed to mobilize and utilize, the well preserved from 1878 by themselves for this purpose, indigenous Ottoman and later Turkish minority.

On 8 June 1949, the “Halkin Sesi” newspaper of the Turkish minority reported that the British Acting Governor R.E. Turnbull issued a circular, instructing the replacement of the term “Muslims of Cyprus” (the term used by the British Administration till then), with the term “Turkish Cypriots”.

On 15 January 1950, during the Unionist Referendum organized by the Church of Cyprus 97% of the Greek Cypriots voted in favour of union of Cyprus with Greece. Furthermore, the British objective turned towards “how best to use the Turks”, in favour of continuing colonial rule and against the anti-colonial movement of the Cypriots:

On 19 January 1950, the British Ambassador in Athens noted in a report to the Foreign Office:

“The Turkish element is not easy to handle, but useful in the difficult situation we are in”.<sup>3</sup>

In an interview on 23 January 1950, the Turkish Foreign

---

3. Robert Holland (Professor of Imperial and Commonwealth History, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London) “Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus 1954-1959” - 1998, also Foreign Office document FO371/87719, RG 1081/104.

Minister Netzmetin Santak stated:

“There is not such an issue, called Cyprus Issue. The British Government is not going to abandon the island of Cyprus to any other country”.<sup>4</sup>

On 20 June 1950, the then new Foreign Minister of Turkey Ali Fouat Kuprulu also stated:

“For Turkey there does not exist any Cyprus issue”.<sup>5</sup>

British efforts to mobilize the Turkish minority and through them Turkey against the Greeks, as a counter attack to the peaceful struggle of Cyprus for Self-Determination-Union, reached its peak in 1954. In this year the Athens Government was persuaded by Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus to inscribe the Cyprus issue at the United Nations.

“Even when the British began to press the Turks for Cyprus, the result was not the immediate reaction they were hoping for: ‘Strangely reluctant’ and ‘strangely ambiguous replies’ were the usual reactions, which demonstrated the British uneasiness on the subject, according to the official reports in the Archive of the Foreign Office, 31<sup>st</sup> March and 6<sup>th</sup> July 1954”.<sup>6</sup>

“It is worth noting that it was originally the British who tried to generate Turkish interest over Cyprus and not the other way round”.<sup>7</sup>

---

4. Fahir Armaoglu “The Cyprus Problem 1954-1959: The Turkish Government and the attitudes of Public Opinion” - Ankara 1963.

5. Fahir Armaoglu “The Cyprus Problem 1954-1959: The Turkish Government and the attitudes of Public Opinion” - Ankara 1963.

6. Robert Holland “Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus 1954-1959” - 1998

7. Robert Holland “Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus 1954-1959” - 1998

## **A2: 1954 – Turkish Incitement**

The incitement of the Turks by the British is also confirmed by the Turkish-Cypriot writer Arif Hasan Tahsin<sup>8</sup>, who makes reference to the then leader of the Turkish Cypriots, Dr. Fazil Kuchuk:

“Turkey had said ‘we do not have a Cyprus problem’ and Kuchuk, together with his friends, had to try for many years for Turkey to accept the Turkish-Cypriots.

As the leader of the Turkish-Cypriots, he was trying to find ways of stopping the Union of Cyprus with Greece. And of course, he chose Turkey as a protector. Turkey, however, did not easily accept this role. It was not easy to undertake the headache called Cyprus.

Faik Kaymak (chairman of the Turkish-Cypriot Associations Federation) always used to say:

“We went at the time together with Perperoglou to Adnan Menderes (The Prime Minister of Turkey). Menderes said to us ‘go to England and say you want the continuation of the status quo in Cyprus’.

The English Foreign Secretary replied: ‘It is shameful, at this age, to ask for the continuation of colonial rule’.

When we asked him ‘what to do’ he said: ‘You ask for Cyprus to be returned to its former owner (Turkey). But do not ask us. Demand this from the Americans.’

---

8. “The uprising of Denktash to the top” - 2001, Publication “Archio”.

When we asked him 'how that would be possible', he said that we had to go to America. We told him that we had no money and no visas. He replied that they would secure both money and visas for us. When we asked him to whom we were to say all these in America, he said he would arrange that too.

So we went to America. The journalists were waiting for us at the airport. They asked questions. And we said that Cyprus must be returned to its former owner.

Then we met the English Ambassador, who said to us: 'Go to the Turkish Ambassador and ask him tomorrow to make a speech at the United Nations and to say that Cyprus must be returned to its former owner.'

We went to the Ambassador and conveyed to him what it was asked from us. At the time the Ambassador was Selim Sarber. 'I cannot do such a thing', he said, 'I do not have such an order from the Turkish Government'.

We went back to the English Ambassador and we explained the situation. 'Let me talk to him for once' he said.

After meeting with the English Ambassador, Selim Sarber called us back to give him details. He prepared himself and the next day he spoke at the United Nations and said:

'If England withdraws from Cyprus, then the island must be returned to its former owner [...].'

In a discussion regarding England's attempts prompt Turkey to involve herself in the Cyprus issue, Pourchan Nalpandoglou states the following:

“The [English] Governor had called Dr. Kuchuk and asked him whether Turkey wanted Cyprus. The Doctor said he did not know. Then the Governor told him to go to Ankara and ask them. Upon his return Kuchuk told the Governor that Turkey did not want Cyprus.

Then the Governor said: ‘You go back and tell them to want it’. The doctor went back to Ankara, but the answer he came back with was still the same: ‘Turkey does not want Cyprus’.”

After that, the English Ambassador in Ankara took charge and Turkey changed its mind. Thus the problem was solved”.<sup>9</sup>

The leftist Turkish-Cypriots Imbrahim Hasan Aziz (agriculturist) and Nuretin Mehmet Seferoglou (trade unionist), following the murder of their comrade Dervish Ali Kavazoglou, in one of their editions in 1965 which they signed “on behalf of the

---

9. The events Arif Hasan Tahsin refers to, are confirmed by the reference signed by Faik Kaimak, Mithat Permpieroglou and Ahmet Zaim, who formed the delegation sent by the English to America in 1954 and who also went to Ankara for discussions with Prime Minister Menderes and President Jeman Bayar. Their report was published in the “Memoirs” of F. Kaimak and as “Annex” in Tahsin’s book.

The same events, are also confirmed by telegram NO.338, 22 June 1955, sent by British Ambassador in Ankara to the Foreign Office in London under title “Representations to the Greek Government over Cyprus”, and which read: “[...] The Turkish Prime Minister at the end of April asked ‘whether it would be helpful if the Turkish Government made representations to Athens regarding the latest developments in Cyprus’. We said ‘we believe it would be helpful if the Turkish Government expressed a general interest to the Greek Government, with special reference to the security of the Turkish minority in Cyprus’. So far they did not make any representations [...]”. Foreign Office document FO 286/1279.

Patriotic Association of Turkish Cypriots” and under the title “Victims of Fascist Terrorism”, said:

“The imperialistic dogma of “divide and rule” is the basis of the colonial policy of the English everywhere, at all times.

When, after the end of the war, the anti-colonial struggle of the Cypriot people began to organize systematically and to demonstrate all the more vigor and to influence the progressive elements of the Turkish working people, the British colonialists embraced the Turkish Cypriot chauvinist leadership, with the intention of strengthening its position within the Turkish Cypriot people, to promote it as the counter strength to the Greek Cypriot side and to use it as their opponent to the struggle for Self-Determination.

Systematically and methodically they cultivated within our community the divisive element, encouraged the chauvinistic passions, the fanatical hatred and the racial oppositions and so they managed, at the appropriate moment, to inflict deep ruptures within the Cypriot people, Greeks and Turks.

During the decades of 1950-1960 the chauvinistic Turkish-Cypriot leadership, in collaboration with the reactionary Menderes Government, faithfully servant of the British colonialists, tries to enslave our community and to break the unity of the Cypriot people.

In 1958, with its terrorists groups and with the ingenuity and assistance from the colonialists, organizes vandalisms and attacks against the Greeks and paves the way for today’s tragedy of the Cypriot people [...]”.

## **Chapter B: 1955-1962**

### **B1: 1955 – London and September Events**

Nevertheless, the intense British efforts to prompt the Turkish minority of Cyprus and Turkey itself against the liberation struggle of Cyprus, commenced fruitfully before the beginning of the anti-colonial armed struggle of EOKA (on 1<sup>st</sup> April 1955).

The mobilization of the Turks was not the result of any attacks by EOKA, as it was claimed later. Chronologically the “Turkish excitement” preceded EOKA.

However, London in her attempts to prompt the interest of Ankara over Cyprus was not merely satisfied with the utilization of the Turks of Cyprus or her direct contacts with the Turkish Government. London also used “pressure groups” (opinion leaders) inside Turkey, which stirred up and managed to incite to the maximum, the hot-blooded interest of Turkish Public Opinion.

Two of the protagonists, responsible for inciting Turkish Public Opinion’s and anti-Greek sentiments, were the association “Cyprus is Turkish”, which was established in August 1954 (i.e. eight months prior to the inauguration of the EOKA struggle), having as president the lawyer and journalist of “Hurriet” newspaper Hikmet Bill, as well as the Turkish Press in general, with “Hurriet” in the forefront.

## **B2: 1955 – Dr Fazil Kutchuk and AKEL**

The undisputed cooperation between the Turkish Cypriot leader Fazil Kutchuk and Hikmet Bill of the association “Cyprus is Turkish”, played a very important role in this orgy of anti-Greek sentiment in Turkey.

In June 1955, Kutchuk renamed his association to “Turkish National Union of Cyprus”, in line with Hikmet Bills’s association.

On 13 August 1955, Kutchuk sent a letter to Hikmet Bill in Constantinople, alleging that “the Greek-Cypriots were preparing a rally for the 28 August, aiming to unleash a genocidal attack upon the Turkish-Cypriots”.<sup>10</sup>

Kutchuk’s letter immediately became headline news in the Turkish propaganda Press. Despite being totally unfounded, the fabricated news “for imminent slaughter” was officially adopted by the Turkish Prime Minister Menderes, and used in explosive statements in Constantinople on 24 August 1955.

The rally of 28 August 1955, which according to Kutchuk was to constitute the start of “a genocide against the Turkish-Cypriots”, was in fact announced by AKEL, in response to the Tripartite Conference (between Britain-Greece-Turkey), which was to take place during that time in London.

“Even the English Services in Cyprus, which were fighting EOKA, did not present any evidence whatsoever

---

10. Neoklis Sarris “The Other Side” and Ahmet An “How the Cyprus Issue became a Turkish National Issue”.

towards such a plan, or even the idea for such an intention. Even more so, such an attack against the Turkish-Cypriots did not tally at all with the policy of EOKA of that period. Because the rumours for such an attack started spreading on 13 August, that is five weeks after EOKA distributed a declaration, stating its good intentions towards the Turkish-Cypriot community.

EOKA leader Digenis Grivas, in his declaration made it clear that the Turkish-Cypriot community had nothing to fear and that the protection of the Turkish-Cypriot community was an order for the EOKA fighters, as well as a matter of military honour.

Indeed, during the summer and autumn 1955, EOKA kept its promise and did not attack the Turkish-Cypriot community. Therefore, the claims for an EOKA genocide attack against the Turkish-Cypriots were totally unfounded [...].

There were no anti-Turkish references in AKEL's invitation for the 28 August rally. On the contrary, AKEL supported the cooperation between Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots [...]. The rumours that an attack against the Turkish-Cypriots was to take place on 28 August were totally groundless [...]. On Sunday 28 August [1955] the Greek Communists demonstrated in Cyprus and the day concluded without the slightest injury to any Turkish-Cypriot. The only act of violence that took place that day by EOKA was the murder of a Greek-Cypriot policeman working for the [British] 'Special Forces'<sup>11</sup>.

---

11. From the study of Turkish writer Ahmet An, titled "How the Cyprus issue was turned into a 'national case' of Turkey – September events and Cyprus" – 5 September 2001.

Following the overthrow of the Menderes government by the military coup of 27 May 1960 in Turkey, the democratic Turkish-Cypriots Ihsan Ali, Aihan Hikmet, Ahmet Mouzafer Giourkan and others, who opposed Kutchuk and Denktash, demanded that together with Menderes, Kutchuk should also be made accountable for the September 1955 atrocities in Constantinople, due to his letter of August 1955.

Additional references on the same subject will follow. Nevertheless, the fact remains that August 1955 was the first time that Turkish propaganda created the myth of “Greek intentions to unleash genocide and send to oblivion the Turkish-Cypriot minority of Cyprus”.

The same propaganda and myth made a come back the following decade, after the armed Turkish-Cypriot insurgence in 1963-64 against the Republic of Cyprus.

It became a central myth during the whole of Raouf Denktash’s career in the decades that followed, “the slaughter of the Turkish-Cypriots by the Greeks of bloodthirsty Makarios”.

### **B3: 1955 – Nazim Hikmet and Aziz Nessin**

Moreover, Fazil Kutchuk intention to fabricate in August 1955 the events, the so called “planning of genocide against the Turkish-Cypriots by the Communist Party AKEL and AKEL’s rally of 28<sup>th</sup> August 1955 being the inauguration of that slaughter”, is quite interesting from another point of view as well:

In April 1955, following the commencement of the anti-colonial-liberation struggle of EOKA, Kutchuk’s fabrication was preceded by the public appeal of the Turkish Communist poet Nazim Hikmet towards the Turks of Cyprus, asking them

“to join the struggle against the British colonialism”:<sup>12</sup>

“The voices of the progressive people of the world in favour of the right for Self-determination for Cyprus and its Union with Greece were yesterday joined by the voice -the only one to this moment from the Turkish side- of the great Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet. Hikmet addressed a message to the Turks of Cyprus, in which he notes that ‘Cyprus was always Greek and this is undisputable. The majority of its people are Greeks and their struggle for Union of the island with Greece is justified”.

Addressing especially the Turkish minority of Cyprus, the Turkish poet underlines that “they must cooperate with the Greek-Cypriots to rid themselves of English imperialism”:

“Only when the island is rid of the English imperialists, its Turkish inhabitants will live in real freedom. This can only be achieved with the unity of the Cypriot people, with the cooperation between Turkish and Greek Cypriots in the struggle against the foreign ruler [...] Those that try to turn the Turks against the Greeks, only serve the interests of the foreign conqueror”.

Nazim Hikmet had sent this message from Moscow where he had taken refuge. It was used for the arrest of “guilty leftists”, following the anti-Greek atrocities, which the Menderes Government had organized and unleashed, utilizing specially transported Turkish mobs against the Greeks of Constantinople.

The Turkish Government claimed that a communist conspiracy was to be blamed for the orgy of destruction. The Turkish Police rushed to arrest all known leftist Turks they could

---

12. Newspaper of the Left “AVGI”, Athens 17 April 1955.

find at the time, with the false accusation of “organizing the atrocities of the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September 1955”. One of those arrested was the leftist Aziz Nesin, who in later years achieved world-wide fame as a great Turkish comedy writer.

“As evidence for the implication of Comintern [Communist International] to the Pogrom, the Turkish authorities used mainly two letters of the ‘Communist’ poet Nazim Hikmet, who had escaped to the Soviet Union, through which he had addressed the Turkish workers in Cyprus, urging them to act in common with the Greek workers against the imperialist oppressors on the island”.<sup>13</sup>

Turkish writer Aziz Nesin wrote about the September 1955 events:

“The night of 6/7 September Constantinople was burnt and destroyed and the damages exceeded bimillion, and it was then that the Government [Menderes] was lost and tried to find some one to shift the blame to. At the end and because nobody undertook the protection of the Communists, they blamed sixty leftists who had no idea of the events and locked them up one by one in military prison cells in Harbiye. At the time, I was one of those so called accused, who was locked up in a single cell with the accusation that we burnt and

---

13. Dilek Guven (Professor of History, Sambagi University in Constantinople) “Nationalism, social developments and minorities - The incidents against the non Muslims of Turkey 6/7 September 1955”, according to the official Turkish Archives and the official Archives of the American Consul in Constantinople.

ransacked Constantinople".<sup>14</sup>

Menderes Government's eagerness "to trace the communist conspiracy" was, of course, related with what was expected from their great ally the United States of America, in the time of the Cold War between USA-USSR:

"Our Greek citizens had been victims of attacks solely for specific objectives of the Cominform and Comintern. With the pretext of national uprising, they aimed at sabotaging the Greek-Turkish friendship, the Balkan Treaty and the NATO Alliance".<sup>15</sup>

#### **B4: 1955 – British Funding**

"British pressure upon the Turkish Government to adopt an aggressive policy over the Cyprus issue had already produced results, and indeed there is the suspicion that the Turkish Press, in particular 'Vatan' and 'Hurriet' (the circulation of which has suddenly hit the roof) were financed by the British. Hikmet Bill and Ahmet Emin Yialman [journalists and leading members of the association 'Cyprus is Turkish'] started traveling to London and Cyprus, whilst Bill also helped in the staging of a rally in London attended by 5,000 Turks

---

14. Aziz Nesin's evidence can be found, together with the evidence of other Leftist Turkish writers, in the book of University Professor from Constantinople and specialist in Turkish Affairs Neoclis Sarris "The Other Side" (Volume 2, book A-1).

15. Report by the Turkish Police who arrested the sixty Leftists for the atrocities in September 1955, as it is included in the book "Nationalism, social development and minorities – The incidents against the non Muslims of Turkey 6/7 September 1955", by the Turkish historian Dilek Guven.

who lived there [...]”<sup>16</sup>

“Lastly, the British Government’s involvement in the planning of the ‘September atrocities’ can be reported as an amazing result of research. The all the more frequent demands by the Greek Orthodox majority in Cyprus for Union with mother Greece (Enosis) prompted the British colonial power to call a Conference in London on 27 August through 7 September 1955, in which have been invited to participate the Governments of Turkey and Greece. The prime objective of the London Government was to make it obvious to the Greeks that the Turkish demand over Cyprus was also there. To that effect, a British diplomat indeed expressed the wish that ‘incidents against the Greek minority in Turkey might prove quite useful’. Thus, in August 1954, the British Embassy in Athens predicted deterioration in the Greek-Turkish relations due to a single incident in Salonica, at the house where Atatürk was born [where surprisingly a year later, on 5 September 1955, indeed an orchestrated explosion occurred, giving ‘the green light’ for the September Pogrom]. In every case, in the Archives one finds a number of references that document the collaboration of the British in the planning of those incidents [...]”<sup>17</sup>

On the same subject the British Historian Robert Holland adds:

---

16. From the supremely documented book of the Greek-American Byzantologist Spyros Vriouis “The Mechanism of Destruction – The Turkish Pogrom of 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> September 1955 and the Extermination of the Greek community of Constantinople”.

17. From the book “Nationalism, social development and minorities – The incidents against the non Muslims of Turkey 6/7 September 1955”, by the Turkish historian Dilek Guven.

“Another element here is the increasing involvement of MI5 (British Intelligence) in the Cyprus issue”.<sup>18</sup>

Reuters Press Agency transmitted the following comment:

“It is a fact, that when the Ankara Government was not interested in Cyprus and the then Foreign Minister Kuprulu stated that ‘for Turkey there does not exist any Cyprus problem’, the British Intelligence Service in Constantinople, as a counter attack to the reactions of the Greek activities, incited the Turkish-Cypriot students and, through them, the Students Union, using the Turkish-Cypriot Professor of the Medical School of the University of Constantinople Dervish Manisali, to demonstrate over Cyprus in promoting Turkish demands”.<sup>19</sup>

### **B5: 1955 – Menderes and Zorlou**

The British success to achieve the involvement of Turkey over the Cyprus issue was underpinned by the decision of the Turkish Prime Minister to replace the Foreign Minister Fouat Kuprulu in July 1955. Kuprulu was replaced by Minister Fatin Rustu Zorlu whom Ankara regarded as a bold and hardline diplomat, with an extraordinary sense of anticipation and quick in decision making.

Zorlu’s first act was to put together a special Committee, for the study and specification of Turkish Strategy and tactics over the Cyprus issue. It should be noted, that during that time relations between the Military and the Politicians in

---

18. Robert Holland “Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus 1954-1959” - 1998

19. Information from Greek KYP (Government Information Service), dated 19 July 1960.

Turkey had not as yet reached the point when the latter were completely taken under the control of the General Staff. That was established after the military coup of 27<sup>th</sup> May 1960 and the establishment of the National Security Council of Turkey.

However, the Committee members were:

- The Deputy Commander of the General Staff of the Turkish Armed Forces, General Rustu Erndelhun,
- The General Secretary of the Foreign Ministry Mucharem Nuri Birgi,
- The Ambassador in Athens Sedar Ikel,
- The general manager of the Foreign Ministry Orhan Erulp and
- Diplomat Mahmout Dekertem.

Chaired by Zorlu, the Committee undertook two major tasks:

1. To document and make believe that Turkey had rights over Cyprus, at least as much as Greece had, and make this known world-wide.
2. To dispatch as much assistance to the Turkish-Cypriots as needed so to strengthen their power of resistance to pressures.

Zorlu's first triumph signalling a new Turkish policy regarding Cyprus was the extraordinary and highly productive cooperation between Turkey and the British Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan (of the Sir Anthony Eden's Government) in organizing the Tripartite Conference in London 27 August-7 September 1955. This Conference was a triumph because Britain dragged and trapped the Greek Government to recognize Turkey as

a legally interested party in the Cyprus issue.

Zorlu was the brain behind the planning and execution of the September 1955 anti-Greek Pogrom against the Greeks of Constantinople. This was to produce strong and convincing evidence to the rest of the world of 'how dangerously passionate the Turkish nation is over Cyprus'.

This was the first superficial objective. The second and most important was related to deeper Kemalist nationalism for uniform Turkification, against minorities in their country.

#### The details:

It is an established historical fact that, with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey had surrendered all rights over Cyprus, thus Cyprus became officially a British colony.

Therefore, for the British government (Foreign and Colonial offices) to proceed in 1955 with their vindictive partition plans against the Greek Cypriots, they had to bring back Turkey into the equation. In order to do that, the then Foreign Secretary of Britain Harold Macmillan and Prime Minister Anthony Eden secretly collaborated with the Turkish Prime Minister Ali Adnan Menderes and instigated the attacks of the 6 and 7 of September 1955 against the Greeks in Constantinople.

The Turkish and British governments financed mobs of bloodthirsty Turkish gangsters and looters, as well as the "Cyprus is Turkish Association", who attacked the Greek community in Constantinople. In a matter of 9 hours 45 Greek communities were attacked by those mobs.

These attacks coincided purposely with the Tripartite Conference in London (27 August – 7 September 1955) where Turkey and Greece were to participate.

Originally that conference was to have nothing to do with Cyprus. However, in order to achieve the prerequisite, the

Foreign Office pro-Turkish official Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick manipulated the procedures, with the sole intention of bringing Turkey back to the negotiating table, hence Turkey returned as an interested party.<sup>20</sup>

On the 9 September 1955, the then British Prime Minister had noted in an internal memo:

“Let the medicine work [...]”.<sup>21</sup>

A year after, on 28 June 1956, the “Reporter” magazine wrote about the Tripartite Conference:

[...] Sir Anthony Eden did not bring Turkey in intentionally, in an issue that was strictly between Greece and Gt. Britain [...] neither the Turks nor anyone else had ever alleged that the Turkish minority would suffer in a Greek-governed Cyprus [...].

“The New York Times” on 29 June 1956, referring to the riots of 9 September 1955 in Constantinople wrote:

“[...] Those riots, for which Gt. Britain must bear part of the blame, have damaged the Balkan Alliance”.

### Barbarians

This is how the British Chancery in Constantinople reported to London the extent of the atrocities:

“[...] The Turks in Constantinople and Smyrna were already excited about the uncompromising statements made by the Turkish Foreign Minister vis-à-vis Cyprus

---

20. Sir Ivone Augustine Kirkpatrick: Member of the British Secret Service. He planned the Tripartite Conference in August 1955 and his last mission was “the return of Turkey as an interested party in the future of Cyprus and finalising the partition plans for Cyprus”. He retired in 1957.

21. Foreign Office Document FO 800/674.

during the London Conference and, after weeks of anti-Hellenic reports in the Turkish Press [...] they were looking for a way to express with a strangely barbaric and unnecessary way their hatred towards the Greeks [...] The attacks on shops, the destruction of goods and property and to a much more limited extent the looting, then began. This was done with a method and determination which would have done credit to any thorough-going barbarian [...].<sup>22</sup>

It is worth mentioning that in a British Foreign Office document dated 14 September 1954, it was suggested that:

“[...] some atrocities in Ankara would help us [...]”.<sup>23</sup>

According to Professor Neoclis Sarris,<sup>24</sup> later Turkey took advantage of the outcome of the riots and claimed huge sums of money in aid from World Funds. That significant economic aid was not distributed to the Greeks whose properties were destroyed but was absorbed by the Turkish Government itself.<sup>25</sup>

These references demonstrate the extent of ruthlessness and barbarism the Turks are capable of using in order to further their long term ambitions and create the pre-conditions for the achievement of their goals. They also demonstrated the extent of British and Turkish collaboration over the years, against the Greeks in Cyprus.

---

22. Foreign Office Document FO 286/1291.

23. Savvas Iacovides, newspaper “SIMERINI”, Nicosia 7 September 2008.

24. Athens University.

25. Fanoula Argyrou “Conspiracy or Blunder” - Nicosia 2000.

## **B6: 1955 – Turkish Cypriots and British association**

In Cyprus 1955, the British Governor Sir Robert Armitage, in order to control the armed struggle of EOKA, to suppress by force the combatant anti-British demonstrations of the youth and to inflict ruptures to the relations between Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish minority, he formed the “Mobile Reserve” composed solely by Turkish-Cypriots.

At the same time, with Fazil Kutchuk’s incitement (encouraged by the British Governor), the Turkish-Cypriot secret organisation VOLKAN (volcano) was created. VOLKAN was a Turkish-Cypriot secret organization, most of its members were simultaneously members of the British “Mobile Reserve” Police Force.

VOLKAN’s major objective was to turn the Turkish-Cypriot people against the Greek-Cypriots. In its proclamations<sup>26</sup> VOLKAN was issuing restriction orders to “our brother Turks to not enter the Greek-Cypriot neighborhoods and not to attend cinemas and other amusement areas of the Greeks”. Those who did were threatened with the following, “all those who do not obey will be accused as traitors of the Motherland and we will not have it in our conscience if anything happens to them during our attacks against these areas”.

According to details published by the Turkish-Cypriot Press in 1997, those who served as members of VOLKAN stated that, by the end of 1956 the organisation managed to have in its possession 18-29 revolvers, some “Sten” automatic weapons and bombs.

Parts of VOLKAN’s duties were the mobilization of the Turkish-Cypriot youth to rallies, which progressed into blind

---

26. Newspaper “BOZKURT”, 5.9.1955.

attacks of fierce mobs against the Greeks. It so happened that among the EOKA victims was a Turkish-Cypriot policeman serving under the British.

Besides VOLKAN, a couple of minor organizations existed as well.

VOLKAN's objective was to blame the Greek Cypriots and promote the myth that "the Turkish Cypriots could not possibly live with them". This was an essential prerequisite, for the Turkish Cypriots to get in line with the Turkish and British objectives already under discussion and preparation in London for partition.<sup>27</sup>

Thus very few members of VOLKAN (as with TMT later) were ever tried let alone punished by the British Crown. This is in stark contrast to the numerous supporters of EOKA who were either hanged, tortured or imprisoned in their hundreds.

The British aligned with the Turkish Cypriots against EOKA, trained an exclusive Turkish mobile reserve to combat EOKA and employed many more Turks in the Police and auxiliary forces. Members of these squads were involved with VOLKAN and later with TMT.

"[...] In 1956, British Secretary for the Colonies Alan Lennox-Boyd, told the House of Commons that 'a Greek Cypriot demand for union with Greece, would be met by a British-sponsored plebiscite for Turks only'. If the Turkish Cypriots (18%) voted to join Turkey, the island would be partitioned. Thus, by demanding the whole of Cyprus, the Turks could be assured of getting at least half of it. Whereupon, the Turkish

---

27. The British colonial policy of "Divide & Rule": Well known fact that the British colonialists, before abandoning a colony, had as a rule to divide the people and leave them in conflict.

Cypriot leader Dr Fazil Kutchuk demanded that the island be divided along the 35<sup>th</sup> parallel. The British interest, in helping to stimulate this demand is too obvious to need underlining [...].<sup>28</sup>

### **B7: 1957 – Denktash and TMT (Turk Mukavemet Teskilati)**

The most trusted, dynamic leader of the Turkish-Cypriot minority, lawyer Raouf Denktash was used by the British to remedy the till then “barely sufficient” contribution of the Turkish-Cypriots towards the English attempts to deal with EOKA’s liberation struggle.

Therefore, since 1949, Denktash was at the service of the British Colonial Government of Cyprus and since then Crown prosecutor and Deputy Attorney General.

In 1957 he resigned his position and took over as chairman of the Federation of Turkish-Cypriot Organisations. On 15 November 1957, together with the Turkish Attaché of the Turkish Consul in Nicosia Mustafa Kemal Tanrisevdi and the doctor Bourchan Nalpandoglou, he founded the first version of “Turk Mukavemet Teskilati” [“Turkish Resistance Organisation”] with the initials TMT. Tavisendi wanted TMT to be “an unarmed, a Turkish-Cypriot organization engaged in passive resistance”, more autonomous and far away as possible from British influence, unlike VOLKAN which up to that time was operating under British influence.

The networking and imposition of the 1<sup>st</sup> TMT upon the minority and the upgrading of Raouf Denktash’s in a leadership role, were the basis for the upgrading a year later of the initial

---

28. Christopher Hitchens “Cyprus” - 1984.

TMT to its second phase. The armed 2<sup>nd</sup> TMT, was taken over by the General Staff of the Turkish Armed Forces by decision of the Menderes Government. Moreover, it was under the direct responsibility of the Turkish Foreign Minister Fatin Rustu Zorlu.

Ahmet An in his study *“The Role of TMT over the Cyprus problem”* wrote:

“By the end of 1957 Raouf Denktash resigns his position as Vice-Attorney General of the Colonial Government, with the view of ‘reinforcing the Turkish leadership and undertaking more transparent and constructive duties’<sup>29</sup> and takes over the Chairmanship of the Federation of Turkish-Cypriot Foundations replacing Faiz Kaimak, who had stated that ‘the English are pushing us to clash with the Greeks’<sup>30</sup>.”

Denktash described the establishment of TMT as follows:

“I created TMT together with a couple of other friends, with the intent to organise people who were doing nothing. When TMT took over VOLKAN’s role and issued its first proclamation, Dr. Kutchuk asked ‘who are these fools’? We did not inform him about the creation of TMT as he looked satisfied with the existence of VOLKAN. He never managed to accept the fact that he had been ignored. The next two years he continued to be very annoyed with that situation. Everybody thought that I was the leader of TMT, but they were mistaken. I was its political advisor. As soon as I created TMT I surrendered it to others. This of course, was a good cover since the American and English Intelligence believed I was the one who

---

29. “Denktash in Pictures”, February 1973.

30. “How did Turkish-Cypriots find themselves in this situation?”, 1986.

took the decisions. Nevertheless I was not its leader. The leaders were ex military officers of the Turkish Army".<sup>31</sup>

Following London's incitement for Turkey to get interested over Cyprus, Ankara arranged from the very early stages to set and plan its own strategy, not as an executive instrument of the British any longer, but as an equal co-player who had its own strategic ambitions. By gaining military strength in Cyprus the Turks were to have specific polices and diplomacy regarding the island.

### **B8: 1956 – Nihat Erim's Reports**

In 1956, Prime Minister Menderes appointed as special advisor for the Cyprus issue Professor Nihat Erim. This he did, despite the fact that Erim belonged to the opposition, he was a high ranking member of the Republican Social Party of Ismet Inonu.

In November and December 1956, Professor Erim, overwhelmed with a nationalistic-non-party sense of mission, submitted to the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister his two reports on Cyprus. The contents of these reports have moulded every since the permanently ambitious policy of Ankara over Cyprus. It is the policy that all Turkish Governments have implement in Cyprus in an inflexible manner to this day, under the permanent eye of the Armed Forces' leadership.

On examining the details of the two Nihat Erim reports (dated 24 November and 22 December 1956 respectively) regarding the Cyprus issue up to that time, it laid down the main directives for a long term Turkish policy, aiming to gain

---

31. Interview, newspaper "THE TIMES", 20 January 1978.

the strategic control of the island. Among the aims was also the change of the national character of Cyprus. They were determined to overthrow the Greek majority which they considered as “circumstantial”.

The adoption in the long-term of the “Nihat Erim policy” by the Turkish state, the Government and the Armed Forces, signalled short-term adjustments to the diplomatic handling by Ankara of Cyprus. It also imposed the need for decisive action for the necessary military build-up in Cyprus.

As conditions did not permit an overt dispatch of Turkish Armed Forces to the island, Turkey decided to create it secretly in Cyprus, under the command of the General Staff, enlisting from within the Turkish minority men and women that could carry arms.

This “improvised” Turkish army in Cyprus was named TMT.

### **B9: 1958 – TMT Army**

The decision of Menderes, Zorlu and the General Staff in 1958, to convert TMT into a military organisation of unorthodox warfare, was entrusted for implementation at the then Special War Office (SWO) of the Turkish Military Staff. Acting under the shield of the Council for Enlisting and Control (Seferberlik Tedkik Kurulu - STK), also referred to as Committee for Supervision and Enlisting.

The SWO’s officers, who some years earlier had also served with the Turkish component during the Korean War, had already been trained by US officers in the planning and tactics of unorthodox warfare. This training was in line in the event of conflict with the Soviet Union in areas which the Soviet

Union could seize ie armed resistance.

Therefore, these officers had the authority and the qualifications needed so as to transform TMT into a secret Turkish army in Cyprus.

TMT incited anti-Greek riots and tried to force Turkish Cypriot workers to establish separate trade unions. Murder, arson and intimidation were the means that TMT used in order to prove that “Greek and Turkish Cypriots could not live together”.

Turkish Cypriots were victims too: Trade unionists, journalists and ordinary citizens, who resisted TMT’s call.<sup>32</sup>

### **B10: 1958 – KIP Plan (Kibris Istirdat Plani)**

Leading the SWO was Major-General Danis Karamberlen, with Colonel Eyiup Mater as Chief of Staff and Lieutenant-Colonel Riza Buruskan and Major Ismail Tansu as Staff Officers.

Tansu known as “the brain” undertook to prepare the staff plan for the structure, armament, training, mission and action of TMT, which has ever since been named “Kibris Istirdal Plani” [“Plan for the Repossessing of Cyprus”] under the initials KIP.

In 1958 Buruskan undertook the command of TMT in Cyprus, where he was sent under false identity, as “auditor of the Turkish Labor Bank”. Initially he was in command of 21 officers (2 majors, 5 captains and 14 second lieutenants] all trained in unorthodox warfare, who arrived in Cyprus as teachers, bank employees, Turkish Consul and Press Office staff.

---

32. Republic of Cyprus, Public Information Office “They make a desert and they call it peace”.

### **B11: 1958 – TMT Headquarters**

TMT headquarters were housed in Ankara, in a two-storied building in Tuna Street in the area of Yeni Sehir, and it was referred to as the “Headquarters for the Planning of Repossessing Cyprus”. It was manned by staff officers (operations, training, supplies and personnel) and had wireless communication with the TMT command in Cyprus.

Furthermore, special military camps were created in Turkey, as secret training centres of Turkish-Cypriots, men and women fighters [moutzahint] of TMT, who upon completing their training were returned to Cyprus. The TMT training camps in Turkey were under the sole responsibility of the SWO.

In 1996, the retired Major Ismail Tansu (the brain of TMT since 1958) made public a list with all the names of the officers sent under cover to Cyprus and all those that manned the “Headquarters for the planning and repossessing Cyprus” in Ankara, together with the names of ten more captains who headed the TMT training centres.

Furthermore, he described in detail (as the person directly in charge) the various secret operations of arm shipments, made at fixed time intervals from special Turkish warehouses to Cyprus. For reasons of secrecy, the arms were purposely selected to be of non Turkish manufacture. Most of the arm shipments were made secretly by boats.

Major Tansu’s references to the relationship between the Turkish Army and the Turkish Government are quite revealing. He said that “he had direct, open and continuous personal contact with Foreign Minister Zorlu, who in turn was giving personal orders to other ministers, whenever another Minister’s authority was required for the needs of the TMT Headquarters in Ankara”.

Furthermore, Tansu wrote that “Zorlu authorized him as to

the final aim of TMT, which was the whole of Cyprus”, and that was the reason for the staff plan to be named “Plan for repossessing Cyprus”.

More importantly in relation to unchanged Turkish Policy regarding Cyprus is also what Tansu reports regarding the destiny of TMT and the “Plan for Repossessing Cyprus” following the military coup of 27<sup>th</sup> May 1960, which toppled the Menderes Government and sent both Menderes and Zorlu to the gallows.

Although the 1960 junta withdrew the head of SWO Major-General Karamberlen, it adopted wholeheartedly and reinforced TMT, with the direct involvement of Colonel Alpaslan Turkes himself.<sup>33</sup>

### **B12: 1960 – 10.000 TMT Guns**

The prime objective in the years 1958 and 1959 was to successfully arm, train and organise a force of 5.000 TMT fighters in Cyprus. In 1960, the arm shipments sent clandestinely from Turkey to Cyprus could arm a force of 10.000.

At this point, of tremendous importance bears the evidence revealed 47 years later in the book of Manos Eliades “*The Secret diary of KYP for Cyprus*” in 2007. (KYP: The “Central Intelligence Office” of Greece)

This book includes copies of written official reports, sent by the branch of the Greek KYP in Cyprus to the Greek Prime Minister Constantinos Karamanlis and the Foreign Minister Evangelos Averof in Athens, which confirm with a lot of detail many facts about TMT, as narrated by Turkish protagonists

---

33. Presidential Minister of the junta Government of Turkey, later leader of the far right fascist party “Nationalist Action Party” and the “Grey Wolves”.

and Turkish sources.

On the subject of the secret Turkish arm shipments, it says:

[...] 9. From the information already in hand it is evidenced that, further to the revolvers held by the Turkish-Cypriot policemen and Reservists within the British Administration, at the time the Zurich and London Agreements were concluded, the Turkish-Cypriot Fighters Organisation TMT possessed only 950 pistols and revolvers. These arms TMT acquired in 1957 and 1958 from Turkey and a part of them were sold to the Turkish organisations by the British themselves in Cyprus. In conclusion, at the time of the Agreements for Cyprus, TMT did not possess more than 1.000 pistols and revolvers.

10. Within the first six months between January 1959 and July 1959, 6.000 arms were clandestinely imported into Cyprus by the Turkish-Cypriots, namely heavy machine-guns, light machine-guns, rifles, pistols and revolvers, as well as 2" and 3" mortars, thus by June 1959 the number of arms held by the Turkish community increased to 7.000, together with a considerable quantity of ammunition.

11. As from July 1959 and until 2 September 1960, the clandestine arm and ammunition shipments by the Turkish-Cypriots continued, hence it is believed that today the Turkish-Cypriots possess 10.000 arms [...]."<sup>34</sup>

---

34. From the "Information Report" of Greek KYP to the Greek Foreign Minister Evangelos Averof copied to the Greek Prime Minister Constantinos Karamanlis, dated 21-10-1960, i.e. after the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus.

### Russian revolvers – Tokarev

Within the eighty salvaged reports prepared by the Greek KYP in Cyprus during the period 13 June 1959 and 28 November 1960, as revealed in Manos Eliades book, there are references to TOKAREV pistols of Russian manufacture in 1933, which the Turkish TMT clandestinely imported into Cyprus.

“The four automatic pistols, which together with one light machine-gun Bren [of English manufacture] were discovered in the hands of Turkish-Cypriots by the [British] Police on 17-3-60, according to the opinion of the Special Branch expert Pearson, are TOKAREV of Russian manufacture 1933.<sup>35</sup> The barrels of these guns have been changed in Turkey so that they can use bullets of the Turkish Army”.<sup>36</sup>

The report by the Greek KYP provide details and dates for the discoveries of TOKAREV pistols in the hands of Turkish-Cypriots as from 29 September 1958 “when a murder attempt by Turks against their own co-patriots took place”, together with the findings of Pearson, under reference 76/60 titled “Examination of material exhibits – firearms”.

“According to reports from Cyprus, a large quantity of arms of Russian manufacture was discovered in the possession of Turkish Cypriots in Lara, west of

---

35. The history of the “career” of the Russian TOKAREV to Turkey and thereafter to TMT seems to have started during the 1930s, during the years of good relations between Kemal Ataturk and the USSR, as a continuation of the assistance in money and arms given by Joseph Lenin to the Kemalists between 1920 and 1922, against the Greek Asia Minor Forces. It has been confirmed that, among the TMT guns the Cypriot National Guard found on the 22 July 1974 when they took control of the Turkish-Cypriot stronghold in Lefka, there were Russian revolvers Tokarev.

36. KYP Report, 12 April 1960.

Paphos [...] The arms had been brought to Cyprus by a Turkish caique and grave concern had been caused to the Turkish Government, who had been trying to hush up the matter. A second Turkish caique carrying arms had been expected at the end of March or early April [...] It is quite certain that Turkish Cypriots were being trained in the use of arms".<sup>37</sup>

"From other reports, the supply of Turkish Cypriots with arms of Russian manufacture from Turkish sources is continuing. Greece can not and does not wish to attribute responsibility for this to the Turkish Government, but expects Ankara to investigate the matter and put an end to the activities of those, who are undermining Cypriot unity and the peace of the island".<sup>38</sup>

This evidence regarding the dispatch of Russian revolvers, from the stock piles of the Turkish Army to TMT, also tallies with the evidence given by Hikmet Bill.<sup>39</sup>

With respect to one of his 1955 meetings with Menderes, Hikmet Bill wrote the following:

"What is happening in Cyprus, asked Adnan Menderes. I explained to him the situation in Cyprus. I told him that we needed arms urgently. I cannot give you arms because if one day our arms of Kirikale [Turkish factory in the manufacture of arms] are found in the hands of the other side, we will find ourselves in a very difficult position at the United Nations, said Menderes".<sup>40</sup>

---

37. Greek newspaper "ELEFThERIA", Athens 6 April 1960

38. Greek newspaper "TO VIMA" Athens 7 April 1960

39. Leader of the Turkish organisation "Cyprus is Turkish" lawyer and editor of "Huriet", centre personality in the September 6-7.9.1955 Pogrom in Constantinople, with links with London and close associate of the Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes.

40. Hikmet Bill "The Cyprus issue and its significance" Constantinople 1976.

The “brain” of TMT in Turkey, Major Ismail Tansu notes:

“Under orders of the Defense Minister Ahmet Menderes (brother of the Prime Minister), Turkish Military personnel selected and sent arms to the SWO, which, after special packaging, stocked them in TMT warehouses in Mersin [Mersina], from where they were transported to Anemouri and from there loaded to boats with secret missions to Cyprus”.

### **B13: 1959 – Athens knew**

The confirmed information provided in the book of Manos Eliades is useful in many ways, in determining Turkish aims in Cyprus FOLLOWING the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, at the government administration of which Turkish Cypriots had obtained a privileged participation, according to the London-Zurich Agreements and the 1960 Constitution.

Furthermore, this information is also useful, in evaluating the policy of the Greek Government during that time, which was officially well informed at the time of the war-like strength Turkey was secretly building up in Cyprus.

What is unknown, is the extent of information the president of the Republic of Cyprus Archbishop Makarios and the Greek-Cypriot leadership had during the same period (1959-1960), either direct from the branch of the Greek KYP in Cyprus, or from the Karamanlis government.

Nevertheless, what one can confirm however is that the Greek Government avoided an equal arming of the Greeks in Cyprus. More on this subject is in another reference in another chapter.

### **B14: TMT Army Structure**

The military structure of the TMT organisation in Cyprus, having its overall headquarters in Ankara, was divided into six areas which were called “Santzak” (banners), with “Bairaktar” (signal station) in Nicosia as headquarters. The “Santzaks” were placed in Nicosia, Famagusta, Limassol, Larnaca, Paphos and Lefka.

Every “Santzak” administrated its own structure, which was sub-divided into “Kovans” (beehives), the “Kovans” were sub-divided into “Peteks” (honeycombs) and the “Peteks” in turn into “Oguls” (swarm of bees). Each “Ogul” composed of five “cells”.

This was the structure of this unorthodox warfare under special circumstances, namely “battalion– company–section–groups” with the last composed of five members.

Rules on secrecy did not permit any lower rank member to know more than his group and the group leader. The commander of each “Santzak” was called “Serntar” (military leader), and the commander of “Bairaktar” had the code-title of “Bozkurt” (Grey Wolf).

The “Bozkurt” commander of TMT in Cyprus was accountable only to the headquarters in Ankara and had under his authority all the Turkish minority leaders, first in rank was Denktash as the head of the political branch of TMT.

### **B15: TMT Military Training**

All the Turkish-Cypriots enlisted by TMT were sent under different pretences to Turkey, for training in the secret military camps of the “H.Q. for Planning the Repossession of Cyprus”.

According to relevant Turkish publications,<sup>41</sup> their training included:

Secret operations' tactics, maintenance and concealment of arms, shooting practice, ambushes, attacks, approach to target and safe retreat.

TMT training centres were also created in Cyprus in four "scout-camps". At each "Kovan" level training was done without live ammunition, consisting of using weapons, information gathering, defense and attack tactics and defense planning of villages.

### **B16: TMT Weapons Transportation by Sea**

Shipment of arms, ammunition and explosives from Turkey were mainly achieved with secret missions by boat, from Anemouri to the northern coast of Cyprus.

The first trial mission (16 August 1958) arrived at the sea-shore of the Turkish village of Kokkina. This was followed by bulk shipments, with boats arriving twice a week, planned in such a way as to avoid the British coastal patrol boats. Up to September 1960, a total of around 10.000 weapons had been transported in.

The TMT members were also trained in concealing the weapons, following their receipt and distribution, as well as after each training or operational use.

---

41. Spyros Athanassiades "Files T.M.T." 1998, and Ismail Tansu "IN REALITY NO ONE WAS ASLEEP, a secret underground organization, with State support... TMT" 2007.

### **B17: 1959 – Boat “DENIZ”**

As from January 1959, parallel to the rest of the boats already carrying arm shipments for six months, another ship initialized secret shipments. This was a 25-ton fishing boat, which was to be known historically under the name of “Deniz” and which, in the operational TMT planning, carried the code name of “Elmas”.<sup>42</sup>

On 18<sup>th</sup> October 1959 the “Deniz”, with Resat Yiavus as captain, Oyuz Kontoglou as engineer and the permanent chief sergeant of the Turkish Army Ali Levent as wireless operator, was intercepted by a British patrol ship while carrying 6.000 bombs, 500 rifles and one million bullets. Coincidentally, this was eight months after the signing of the London-Zurich Agreements and whilst Cyprus was still under British administration.

Under orders of the TMT “brain” Major Ismail Tansu (through wireless communication from Ankara), the “Deniz” crew sank the ship, so “to avoid an international scandal that would put the Turkish government into a difficult situation”, said Major Tansu.<sup>43</sup>

The British patrol ship (mine-sweeper HMS Burmaston) however, managed to salvage from the sinking ship’s hold two boxes of ammunition and to arrest the 3-man crew of the “fishing boat”.

---

42. “Elmas” was named after the TMT member, Turkish-Cypriot Asaf Elmas from Kokkina village, who participated in the very first secret sea operation of arms transportation and drowned during his 7<sup>th</sup> personal mission with his co-villager Hikmet Ridvan, during a severe sea storm (9 November 1958). Ismail Tansu “IN REALITY NO ONE WAS ASLEEP, a secret underground organization, with State support... TMT” 2007.

43. Spyros Athanassiades “Files T.M.T.” 1998, and Ismail Tansu “IN REALITY NO ONE WAS ASLEEP, a secret underground organization, with State support... TMT” 2007.

With the intervention of the Turkish Foreign Minister Fatin Rustu Zorlu and his approach to his British counterpart, it was arranged that the three arrested men were to accept the charges against them, as announced by the British Attorney General. After much deliberation by the British Courts in Cyprus they were sentenced to a 9-month imprisonment. They were sent on the same day to Turkey “to carry out their punishment”.

Calming Major Tansu over the “capture” of Deniz”, Minister Zorlu assured him that the “discovery of the arms shipment might encourage the English to be more compromising towards the Turks”.

Evidence of arms to the Turkish Cypriots, as derived from British official documents:

“Possession of arms: At 20:30 hours last night (17.3.1960) a police mobile patrol stopped a motor van being driven by a Turkish Cypriot towards Polis, on the main Ktima-Polis Road, near Akourdalia. The van was searched and found to contain 1 Bren gun with 4 empty magazines, 1 Sten gun with 3 empty magazines and 4 automatic pistols with 8 empty magazines. The driver was arrested and will appear before Paphos District Court later today [...]”<sup>44</sup>

“The case was concluded on 5<sup>th</sup> May. The Turkish Cypriot accused being sentenced to two years imprisonment for possession of arms last March. Expect an appeal. Denktash conducted a vehement defence. He suggested that the accused had found the arms and was taking

---

44. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 18 March 1960 - Foreign Office Document FO 371/152931.

them to Dr. Kutchuk in accordance with the amnesty and appeal for surrender of arms. Expert evidence was given that the weapons found were of Russian origin (they were still in plastic wrapping). Only once before has a similar weapon been found in Cyprus (in February last year when a Turkish Cypriot was arrested with a pistol).

There has been public concern about the fact that the verdict was by majority – the English and Greek Cypriot judges convicting but the Turkish Cypriot judge dissenting. Public comment is that this offers a poor look-out for an impartial judiciary in the future.<sup>45</sup>

“Yesterday [7 February 1960], a Turkish Cypriot police sergeant in Larnaca appealed for special protection for himself and his family and was taken into protective custody. He said that he had good reason to believe that his immediate assassination had been planned by TMT. He explained that he had been concerned in distribution and safeguarding TMT stocks of arms and ammunition in the Larnaca district and that he had been deeply involved in this since August 1957. He believed that his assassination had been planned because the organisers of TMT suspected that he was no longer entirely reliable.

He has documents in his possession, which give details of TMT arms held in the Larnaca district. His papers refer to 400 precision weapons in the Larnaca district alone, including over 200-303 rifles, 7 Bren guns and large numbers of sten guns and pistols. Some of these stocks of arms are said to be hidden in or near Tekke (the ancient mosque near the Larnaca salt lake) and

---

45. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 7 May 1960 - Foreign Office Document FO 371/152931.

the rest are distributed throughout the villages of the district (the exact caches are not known).

We are taking from him fullest information and when we have completed his interrogation we shall arrange to get him and his family out of Cyprus with all speed. I will inform you of these arrangements as soon as possible.

I decided that this was not the time to carry out searches for these arms and I shall take no action to seize the arms for the time being [...] I consulted Mr. Julian Amery and we summoned Dr. Kutchuk to come to Government House [...] emphasised to him the seriousness of the situation, telling him that we were anxious to avoid another public scandal similar to that which followed the sinking of the 'Deniz' [ship].<sup>46</sup>

#### "Marmara" ship

On the 30<sup>th</sup> of March 1960, Sir Hugh Foot informed the Secretary of State for the Colonies that information had reached them, that another Turkish ship, the "Marmara", was approaching Larnaca with arm loads on board for the Turkish Cypriots. But, in view of warning given to Turkish consul-General Turel, they would not expect any arms to be landed. If questioned by press, he would state that their actions were "routine anti smuggling precautions".

The information, given to Sir Hugh Foot by local Turkish Cypriots, indicated that "Marmara" [passenger ship on regular visits to Cyprus] might take arms on board at Haifa from another ship. Sir Hugh Foot informed London that they would make

---

46. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 8 February 1960 – Foreign Office Document FO 371/152931

sure the ship on arrival DID NOT carry arms [...].<sup>47</sup>

### Chief of Intelligence accuses Rauf Denktash of arms smuggling

Contrary to the formal anti-Greek policy of the British government, the Chief of Intelligence in Cyprus J. V. Prendergast on the 26 June 1959 wrote the following in a classified as Top Secret PHANTOM Report to Governor Sir Hugh Foot.

“[...] there has been no fundamental change in Mr. Denktash’s policy since his trip to Turkey. There is no evidence that he received there any directive to alter his long term stratagem of preparing the Turkish Cypriot community to face a situation of extreme pressure once the Cyprus Republic has come into being [...] Instead of making speeches and writing and inspiring press articles of outright belligerence he is now paying lip-service to the doctrine of peaceful coexistence and urging his community to remain united and friendly, and patient in the face of provocation without yielding an inch of ground. Between the lines of his speeches and press writings however, it can be seen that Mr. Denktash has adopted the method of accusing his enemy of the very acts of which his own community is responsible, to wit, arms smuggling, weapon training, economic throat-cutting, manoeuvring behind a smoke screen of top-level benevolence and co-operation [...] and tacitly ordering the community to accept the Zurich and London Agreements as a means of reaching the original goal [...].”<sup>48</sup>

---

47. Foreign Office Document FO 371/152931.

48. Colonial Office Document CO 296/1000.

## **B18: TMT Action**

The Turkish secret organisations, starting from VOLKAN right through and including TMT, under the command of Turkish Army officers, never undertook armed action against EOKA. Having additionally acquired the necessary war power, their main military objective was extended to events following the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus.

Judging from their actions, the tactics they deployed, the proclamations they issued and all that they inflicted from 1955 to 1959 it is abundantly clear that:

Their foremost and permanent objectives were to spread fear, gain advantage over the Turkish-Cypriots, build defence barriers for the Turkish minority and provoke fanaticism against the Greek-Cypriots in general. Another of their objectives was to offer opposition to the Greek-Cypriots against their ongoing liberation/anti-colonial struggle.

The pretext they used was the execution by EOKA of some Turkish-Cypriot Reservist Policemen with the English administration, during the period that EOKA executed Greek-Cypriot policemen and other collaborators of the British.

The execution of Turkish Reservists, offered the opportunity to the Turkish-Cypriot leadership and its organisations to incite passionate Turkish-Cypriot demonstrations and to unleash raging Turkish mobs (with clubs, levers, knives and arson accessories) against innocent Greek-Cypriots and their properties, in the areas neighboring the Turkish areas.

The major and exclusive characteristics of Turkish-Cypriot activities were arson attacks, destruction of houses, shops, churches and association premises, along with killings of unarmed civilians.

Ahmet An notes, that “the on the spot leaders of TMT advised the people to have in their homes knives, pointed tools, axes, big stones, hot water and petrol”.

“Natziak” (axe) was also the name of the newspaper issued by Raouf Denktash, an organ of the TMT. The advertising of this paper carried the incitement “each Turk must buy and keep in his house a natziak”.

The owner of the newspaper was Kutlu Atali. Decades later, he broke away from Denktash and began criticizing the Turkish colonization of the occupied areas of Cyprus, following the 1974 invasion. In 1996, he was murdered outside his own home in the occupied area of Nicosia.

Arif Hasan Tahsin wrote:

“Originally the armed attacks of EOKA were solely against the English. [...] Also it is a fact that the same way EOKA turned its arms against the Greek-Cypriot policemen, it turned them against the Turkish-Cypriot policemen too. It is also a fact, that the Turks, by helping the English Security Services, they fought against the Greek-Cypriots who wanted EOKA and Union [with Greece]” .<sup>49</sup>

### **B19: 1956 – First Partition**

The British, following the very first Turkish mob attacks against the Greek-Cypriots which they had encouraged, imposed the first partition line within the walls of Nicosia.

On 30 May 1956, a group of British soldiers led by Major

---

49. From the book of Arif Hasan Tahsin, who served as Reservist the British and also was a member of TMT.

Taggart, divided the city into two with iron bars and barbed wire, from Paphos Gate to St. Kassianos.<sup>50</sup>

On 1<sup>st</sup> June 1956, Ioannis Clerides<sup>51</sup> criticized in writing the false allegations made to the world by Dr. Kutchuk, leader of the Turkish minority, namely that “the Turkish minority was in danger of being exterminated by the Greeks”. Ioannis Clerides in his letter refuted the Kutchuk allegations and accused the representative of the British administration that “in an absurd way tries to justify in public the Turkish actions or to undermine the importance of the recent crimes committed by the Turkish mob, encouraging them in that way to continue their destructive activities against the lives and properties of innocent Greeks”.

Ioannis Clerides referred to the unjustifiable and criminal actions of looting, arson and murders of innocent people, who were on their way to work, and continued:

“I address this crucial question to Dr. Kutchuk and to the representative of the [colonial] government: Has a Greek group ever attacked the Turkish neighborhoods and bombed shops or the premises even of one Turk or any place of worship? It is disheartening to see the representative of the government and Dr. Kutchuk, instead of trying to stop the actions of irresponsible members of the Turkish community, to try to justify their actions by aiming to shift the responsibility on the shoulders of EOKA, justifying in that way the irresponsible elements of the Turkish minority

---

50. This dividing line was called at the time “Mason-Dixon Line”, taking its name after the dividing line between North and South in the United States of America during the civil war.

51. Lawyer, politician and, up to the time of Makarios’s exile, member of the Executive Council of the English governor. Father of Glafkos Clerides, later to become President of the Republic of Cyprus.

for the destruction of life and property of innocent people”.<sup>52</sup>

It is also worth mentioning the reference by Imbrahim Hasan Aziz and Nurettin Mehmet Seferoglu, for the period up to 1958:

“When, with the encouragement of the British colonialists, the vandalisms, bombing and destruction of Greek property began, instead of arresting the guilty ones and their executive organs, the Turkish-Cypriot leaders and the fanatical and misled young people who followed their orders in total blindness, they arrested those who condemned those actions, the Turkish democrats, the politicians and the leaders of the working people. In a common effort, Turkish-Cypriot leadership and British colonialists organise their elimination...”<sup>53</sup>

The fact that they avoided direct confrontation with EOKA, is witnessed by one of the co-founders of TMT, Mustafa Kemal Tanrisevndi of the Turkish Consul:

“If we had clashed with EOKA that meant that we would have suffered loss of human lives, as EOKA was successful in its campaign even with the English”.

Furthermore, commander of TMT (Lieutenant-Colonel Buruskan) also refers to “the need they had in August 1958 of the cease-fire announced by EOKA, so that TMT would have the time to be organized militarily”.

---

52. Newspaper “Times of Cyprus”, 1 June 1956.

53. Publication of Hasan Aziz and Nurettin Mehmet Seferoglu, 1965.

## **B20: 1955, 1958, 1962 – Self-bombing**

The methods used by the Turkish-Cypriot leadership to fanaticize the Turkish minority, was a carbon copy of the methods used by the mechanisms of the Turkish state headed by Menderes-Zorlu, in the preparation of the anti-Greek pogrom in Constantinople which occurred on 6 and 7 September 1955.

The small dynamite explosion at the Turkish Consul in Salonica on the 5 September 1956, where the house of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was, was the work of Turkish agents and Turkish government officials. The Turkish state-controlled Radio Station and the Turkish Press presented the explosion as the “bombing of the house of ‘our father’ by the Greeks”, thus raging the Turkish mobs against the Greek community in Constantinople.

TMT and Denktash used exactly the same method, bombing the entrance of the Press Office of the Turkish Consul in the Turkish neighborhood of Nicosia, on 7 June 1958. They claimed the bomb was the work of EOKA and provoked the catastrophic attacks by the Turkish mobs against the neighboring Greek areas.

Raouf Denktash himself, 26 years later, publicly confessed to that intentional sabotage as a necessity for the mobilization of the Turkish-Cypriot people against the Greeks”.<sup>54</sup>

TMT used exactly the same method in 1962, when it bombed the Bairaktari Mosque in the Greek neighborhood of Nicosia, blaming the Greeks for the explosion.

---

54. Television interview of Raouf Denktash at the British Channel ITV, 26 June 1984.

### **B21: 1958 – “Useful Dead”**

Evidence by Turkish-Cypriot teacher Sevim Ulfet,<sup>55</sup> who found herself in a clinic during the incidents of 27<sup>th</sup> January 1958, where she accidentally met with Raouf Denktash:

“The clinic was full of injured and dead. At one point I saw Denktash and said to him: ‘For God’s name, give the order to stop these killings’. And he gave me the following answer: ‘These dead, are useful to us. It is with them that we will make our voice heard all over the world’. ‘Then why don’t you and Dr. Kutchuk die? That way our voice will be heard even louder’, I replied”.<sup>56</sup>

### **B22: 1963 – “The Bathtub”**

The evidence provided by Sevim Ulfet is also useful in uncovering the real explanation behind the horrible story of the “bathtub murders” during Christmas 1963:

In order to enrich their propaganda lies all over the world, using the British Press, about “the barbarism of the Greek-Cypriots of bloodthirsty Makarios with actions of genocide against the Turkish-Cypriots”, they used a photograph with a mother and her three children, dead covered in blood in a bathtub.

The person, who in 1963 photographed this horrific crime scene and whose photographs were used in the front line of

---

55. Ulus Ulfet, brother of teacher Sevim Ulfet, was killed in Omorphita on 30 August 1957, together with Mustafa Ertan, Kumpilae Altaili and Ismail Beiglou, by a bomb they were manufacturing.

56. From Arif Hasan Tahsin's book.

Turkish propaganda, was Turkish journalist Ahmet Baran.

In 1985, whilst Baran was head of the Turkish News Agency “Anadolu” in Athens, he revealed the true facts of that case to Greek-Cypriot journalist Costas Gennaris. He said:

“The crime was committed in a state of rage by Turkish Major Nihat Ilhan, who was serving at the time with the Turkish Contingent in Cyprus, and victims were his wife and his children. His house (where the crime was committed) was in the centre of the Turkish neighborhood, an area where no Greek-Cypriot forces ever went”.<sup>57</sup>

The very same Denktash logic as described by TMT member Arif Hasan Tahsinin 1958 in,

“These dead are useful to us”.

Costas Yennaris wrote the following in his book:

“[...] That night, though, he left me speechless. Without warning, without any preparation Ahmet said to me:

‘You know that photograph with the three children and their mother murdered in a bath, I took that picture [...]’

He said he was in Cyprus at the time, to cover the inter-communal conflict of 1963. One evening, as he was having coffee with some friends in a bar in the Turkish quarter of Nicosia, two armed men came in and asked him to accompany them. He was taken by car to the house where the crime was committed. Upon arrival, he saw that the place was already

---

57. Costas Gennaris “From the East” – 2000.

covered with other armed men and officers of the Turkish Contingent in Cyprus, who ordered him to photograph the crime.

He did as ordered, and then one of the armed soldiers asked him to hand over the film and forget what he did and what he saw.

Ahmet wanted to find out what really had happened and he did

The father of the 3 children had gone mad. He executed his children and his wife and then he disappeared. He was taken away by the Turkish military, to appear again in service 24 years later somewhere deep in Anatolia, re-married [...].

Ahmet told Yennaris that the crime did not even take place in Omorphita, as Turkish propaganda claims. It was executed in an area deep in the heart of the Turkish quarter of Nicosia, where no Greek Cypriots could reach [...].

Costas Yennaris adds in his book:

“Researching for my book, I came across many other incidents of similar cover-up that served the Turkish interests and the goals Ankara and TMT had put in motion as their policy in Cyprus [...].”

Ahmet Baran wanted to tell the truth to someone, he did not want to die without uncovering that grave injustice done to the Greek Cypriots. He told Costas Yennaris about it, with the proviso “Yennaris would not say anything as long as Baran was still alive”. Yennaris kept his word. He only revealed the true story after Ahmet Baran’s death.

### **B23: 1958 – TMT Murders of Consolidation**

Returning to 1958, it is evident that the main mission of the TMT's command (by then a secret branch of the Turkish Armed Forces) in Cyprus (under British occupation), was the priority to firmly establish its power over the Turkish minority. The reason for this was to enable the Turks to enlist men and women as fighters (moutzahint) and to impose the bloody separation between Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots, which was predetermined by the British in the first place.

The firm establishment of TMT required the subjugation and militarization of the entire Turkish minority. To this effect, all opposition Turkish voices had to be silenced or made to disappear.

The policy “from Turk to Turk” was imposed, with severe punishment of those Turkish-Cypriots who dared disobey.

Furthermore, there followed the “exemplification” murders by TMT, of all those Turkish-Cypriots who insisted on co-operating with the Greek-Cypriots. These victims, mainly Turkish-Cypriots, belonged to the left wing Trade Union Movement of PEO.

It is an important fact that, the continuing elimination murders of left wing Turkish-Cypriots followed the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 1958 common Trade Union festivity of PEO:

“Hundreds of Turkish workers take part in the May events of the Cyprus working left. In hand with tens of thousands of Greek-Cypriot workers, brothered in the streets of the Cypriot capital, with their national flags, Greek and Turkish, and the red symbols of 1<sup>st</sup>

of May, they demonstrate their decision to fight united for the common causes of the working class".<sup>58</sup>

A number of murders followed. These are examples of the terrorist imposition of TMT upon the Turkish-Cypriots:<sup>59</sup>

22 May 1958: Ahmet Sati Ergut, in charge of the Turkish Office of PEO, and his wife were shot. They survived and, in order to save themselves from TMT, they immigrated to England.

24 May 1958: The 32-year old Fazil Onder was shot dead. He was working for the left wing paper "Inkilapsi" ("Revolutionist") which was closed down in 1955 by the English. Through a proclamation, TMT took the responsibility for the execution of "traitor" Onder and warned the Turkish-Cypriots to abandon publicly their connections with the Greek-Cypriots if they valued their life.

29 May 1958: The 26-year old Barber Ahmet Yiakyia, member of an athletic association, was murdered. The day before his execution, he had given a statement to "Bozkurt" newspaper to the effect that "he was not a member of the Workers Union", that "he was not left wing" and that "he will be faithful to the policy as decided by our leaders and our people". His statement was published the day he was found murdered in his bed.

5 June 1958: Hasan Ali, builder and Trade Union PEO activist, was shot (but survived).

---

58. Publication by Hasan Aziz and Nurettin Mehmet Seferoglou, 1965.

59. The list of those murdered was published in newspaper "Zafer Kibrisli Turkeridir" on 15 October 1965, under the title "Operation of extermination of the Turkish-Cypriot left wingers".

30 June 1958: The 46-year old barber Ahmet Imbrahim was shot dead, because he did not stop his friendly relations with Greek-Cypriots.

3 July 1958: The 29-year old Arif Houlousi Baroudi was shot (but survived), because he continued to work for a Greek company.

A Turkish-Cypriot, who survived the TMT murders of left wing Turkish-Cypriots and saved his life by immigrating to England, Nurettin Mehmet Seferoglou, spoke about the murders.<sup>60</sup>

In 1965, Seferoglou and Ibrahim Hasan Aziz (on behalf of "The Patriotic Organisation of Turkish-Cypriots") signed the special book that was published regarding the TMT murders of left-wing Turkish-Cypriots during the period 1958-1965. This book was titled "*Victims of Fascist Terrorism*".

The TMT's foremost objective was to rule over the Turkish minority as the only unchallenged power. This was achieved. All those opposing, who were not murdered or emmigrated, were neutralized. In actual fact the TMT was the armed extension of Turkish state power over the Turkish minority. Ever since 1958, TMT had consolidated itself as the secret part of the Turkish Armed Forces, in the British held and later "independent" Cyprus.

There has never been the slightest relaxing of the strict military, political and ideological control that the Turkish state exercises over the Turkish Cypriot minority. This control is even stricter in comparison to areas within Turkey itself.

---

60. Interview in newspaper "HARAVGI", 15 April 2007.

## **B24: 1958 – Slaughter of Kontemeniotes**

From the very beginning the objectives of the TMT in full cooperation with the British wanted to simultaneously derange the Cyprus problem. They wanted to convert the problem from an anti-colonial liberation struggle to a problem of bloody bi-communal strife between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots. In order to provoke an unprecedented hatred, much blood needed to be shed.

These efforts reached their peak on 12 June 1958, with the slaughter of Greek-Cypriots from Kontemenos village at Kioneli (Turkish-Cypriot village):

“The most horrid crime executed by the English/Turkish coalition against the Greek-Cypriots, was the collective slaughter of the Kontemeniotes at Kioneli, on Thursday 12 June 1958. The operation was performed by 200 bloodthirsty Turkish-Cypriots, who ambushed the Greek-Cypriots at the Turkish-Cypriot village of Kioneli, fired at them, slaughtered them, cut them in pieces (beheaded) in total murdered 8 unarmed Greek-Cypriots out of a total of 35 Kontemeniotes. Those 35 Kontemeniotes had been originally arrested by the British forces in the village of Skylloura who transported them and delivered them, unprotected victims, in the hands of the waiting Kionelian Turks”.<sup>61</sup>

“Mass slaughter of Greeks by the Turks in Kioneli - Clearly the responsibility of the ‘Security Forces’ (the British military, police and reservists) - The Turkish vandals having butchered the people turned them into shapeless masses - The names of the eight dead:

---

61. Memorial published in newspaper “SIMERINI”, 12 June 2008.

Costakis N. Mourris 34 years old, Evripides Kyriakou 24, Petros Stavrou 21, Georgios Stavrou 17, Sotris Loizou 17, Ioannis Stavrou Parperis 31, Charalambos Stavrou 34 and Christodoulos Stavrou 34. Another nine injured finally survived”.<sup>62</sup>

The slaughter in Kioneli was the most hideous of all the premeditated crimes planned by London and Ankara to use the Turkish minority, in order to suppress the anti-colonial, liberation struggle of EOKA in Cyprus and to transform the Cyprus issue into a “Greco-Turkish problem of bi-communal conflict”.

Without the slightest provocation or attack by EOKA against the Turkish minority and pushed by the British, Turkey organized the terrifying TMT, headed by Turkish Military Officers, so to suck the blood of unarmed, unaware and innocent people and “establish” the demand for partition.

The objective was so that Britain could achieve, and was indeed achieving, “solutions and arrangements” that would provide the permanent presence of BRITISH BASES in Cyprus.

At the same time, Ankara was putting into practice her long term military “Plan for the repossession of Cyprus”, which she follows to the letter to this day. Turkey does this by using as an instrument, the so called “Turkish-Cypriot community” which Turkey has under her full and strict control.

In 1958 and under Ankara’s orders, Turkish terrorist groups intensified their attacks against the Greek Cypriots.

---

62. Newspaper “HARAVGI” (first page coverage), 13 June 1958, with horrific photographs.

This coincided with the British efforts to promote a pro-Turkish solution.<sup>63</sup>

As from 7 June 1958, the “inter-communal feeling” was running very high on the island and there had been many instances of attacks by Turks, particularly in Nicosia against members of the Greek community and against Greek property.

Such was the public outcry and indignation, that Sir Hugh Foot had no choice but to set up a Commission of Inquiry into the incident.

The Commission, under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Sir Paget Bourne, held its first sitting in the hall of the English School, in Nicosia.

The decision was lengthy and its contents revealing. However, the Secretary for the Colonies and the Secretary for War in London, General Darling in Nicosia and others in government and the Army had strong objections to its publication, as they saw it as “damaging to the reputation and morale of the British Army”.

Chief Justice Bourne, if not totally sincere with his findings, at least he had to be seen to be sincere. He courageously quoted in his report:

“[...] I have been invited by Colonel Hamilton, representing the Military, to find not only that everyone acted in good faith, which I have had no difficulty in doing, but also that the order given and action taken upon it were reasonable. I am unable to do so [...] The only conclusion I can reach is that ‘the course adopted

---

63. In January 1958, Sir Hugh Foot (the Colonial Governor) had prepared and tried to put across a trizonal solution for Cyprus, later renamed as the “Macmillan Plan”, which favoured the Turks.

was unimaginative and ill-considered'. It was also, in my opinion, 'unlawful'. I do not say for a moment that 'anything like what did occur was reasonably to be anticipated' [...].<sup>64</sup>

On 7 May 1958 TMT circulated the following leaflet in Cyprus,

"Oh, Turkish Youth! The day is near when you will be called upon to sacrifice your life and blood in the "PARTITION" struggle, the struggle for freedom [...] You are a brave Turk. You are faithful to your country and nation and are entrusted with the task of demonstrating Turkish might. Be ready to break the chains of slavery with your determination and will power and with your love of freedom [...] PARTITION OR DEATH".<sup>65</sup>

Such were the Turkish attacks and atrocities against Greek Cypriots that the Central Committee of AKEL<sup>66</sup> issued, on 28 June 1958, the following Press Release under the title "Bring back Archbishop Makarios and start negotiations with him":

"After a fortnight during which the Turks were literally free to burn, slaughter and loot the Greeks of Cyprus, the British government, announced, in a form of ultimatum, its new plan for Cyprus.

What is this plan and for whose interests? It is a "constitutional" partition which leads tragically to a full

---

64. Colonial Office Document CO 926/907.

65. Republic of Cyprus, Public Information Office, "They make a dessert and they call it peace".

66. The Communist party of Cyprus re-established in 1941 with British consent.

scale territorial partition in seven years. It is against the rights of the Cypriot people for self-determination, destroys the unity of Cyprus and creates a permanent rift and gives reason for war. The plan is based clearly on imperialistic interests and the effort to satisfy Turkey, which is regarded as the strongest ally within the countries of NATO in Eastern Mediterranean. It is the worst of all plans that have been proposed up to now. This is why the whole of the Greek population in Cyprus justly characterised it as unacceptable.

AKEL supports wholeheartedly the reply given by the Archbishop Makarios to the Governor of Cyprus, following his meeting with the Majors of Cyprus and his Ethnarch advisers in Athens, and calls upon the British Government to accept Makarios's reply and act upon this, in order to get the Cyprus issue out of the stalemate.

In the meantime there must be a stop to the criminal orgy and the immunity of the Turkish gangsters. All Turkish auxiliaries must be disarmed immediately. All the guilty ones for the slaughters, the arsonists and looters must be arrested and punished. All victims of the latest vandalisms must be compensated. Constructive measures to be taken for the protection of the lives and properties of all Greek Cypriots. There must be a stop to the anarchy and the immunity of the stooge Turks, who intend through their crimes to show that Greeks and Turks cannot live together. How else can one explain the fact that for hundreds of years Greeks and Turks lived in harmony in this place? Is it not abundantly clear that a foreign element is directing and creating this racial hatred and tragedy? [...].”

## Evidence of Turkish atrocities through the British National Archives

“TMT: You must have seen from recent reports that during the past week the Turkish Resistance organisation (called TMT) has murdered one of its Turkish political opponents and attempted to murder two others. The organisation has publicly boasted of these attacks and threatened more. Two more Turks were wounded in a shooting affray in Nicosia on 27<sup>th</sup> May, in which TMT may well have been involved.

The question arises whether the TMT should be proscribed. If we had to consider the matter solely from the point of view of security in Cyprus, we should not hesitate to do so and, if the TMT continues such murderous attacks, we may have no alternative to doing so soon. Obviously, we are open to damaging criticism if we do not proscribe the Turkish terrorist organisation, when we have proscribed the Greek terrorist organisation.

But, unless Turkish terrorism increases, I should prefer not to proscribe the TMT for the time being. If we do so now, I imagine that there will be a strong adverse reaction in Turkey [...]”<sup>67</sup>

The British authorities could not proceed and proscribe TMT as they themselves admit they ought to have done, simply because they had already used the Turkish minority against the Greek Cypriot majority and had in hand advanced partition plans in favour of Turkey.

“Shooting of Turks in Nicosia Municipal Market: It

---

67. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 29 May 1958, Foreign office Document FO 371/136280.

has not been possible to make any arrests, but all available evidence supports the conclusion that the shooting was carried out by Turks. Of those injured, one is dangerously ill and one seriously ill. Both of these were wanted by the police for ordinary crimes. It is reported that they may have been collecting money ostensibly for TMT which went into their own pockets".<sup>68</sup>

"According to Turkish official communiqué of 16<sup>th</sup> June, on 1<sup>st</sup> June EOKA threatened to massacre Turkish Cypriots. There is no evidence or information whatsoever in the possession of the Cyprus Government to substantiate this suggestion.

There is, as you know, strong circumstantial evidence to show that the disturbances which broke out on the night of the 7<sup>th</sup> June had been pre-arranged by Turks. In the disturbances, which continued for the next few days, two Turkish and twelve Greek Cypriots lost their lives."<sup>69</sup>

"The following information is given in amplification of my last telegram:

- 1) No Turkish houses were set on fire in Famagusta or Paphos and no Turkish shops were looted in Famagusta as alleged.
- 2) Allegation that 6 Turks were killed by EOKA in ambushes, is also untrue. Only recent incidents involving Turkish casualties were:

---

68. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 1 October 1958, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136286.

69. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 22 June 1958, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136337.

- i. On 29th June, at Timi in Paphos district, a Turkish Cypriot was attacked and slightly injured by Greek Cypriots, following rumours that Turkish Cypriots were attacking the village.
  - ii. On 30th June, by roadside near Arminou in Paphos district, a Turkish Cypriot butcher was found shot dead. He had been robbed. Following the discovery of his body, there was an intercommunal clash in which one Greek Cypriot was killed and another serious injured.
- 3) TMT has issued a leaflet, warning the Turkish Cypriots 'not to co-operate with the British plan' [...].<sup>70</sup>

“Turkish Cypriot attacks on Greek Cypriots: Following are principal incidents involving attacks on Greek Cypriots or their property between July 13 and July 17:

- July 13<sup>th</sup>: Two Greek Cypriots were wounded in Kaimakli. One Turkish Cypriot was arrested.
- July 13<sup>th</sup>: Turkish Cypriots stoned Greek Cypriots at Lefka. Two Greek Cypriots were injured.
- July 14<sup>th</sup>: Cases of arson against Greek Cypriot property in Nicosia, Famagusta, Limassol and Lefka.
- July 15<sup>th</sup>: Two cases of arson against Greek Cypriot property in Nicosia, two in Paphos district, one in

---

70. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 5 July 1958, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136338.

Limassol and one in Famagusta district.

- July 16<sup>th</sup>: Greek Cypriot woman was stabbed by 3 youths in Famagusta. One Turkish Cypriot was arrested.
- July 13<sup>th</sup>: Case of attempted arson at Limassol. Two Turkish Cypriots were arrested.”<sup>71</sup>

“Turkish hooligans have been increasingly active over the past week or two and, on Saturday last, they organised demonstrations during which demonstrators tore down English signs. This, following on the TMT murders of left wing Turks and the increase of TMT leaflets in the most violent terms, seems to show that the Turks are prepared for further violence and this may occur before the statement of policy is made in Parliament.

On the 12th June we shall be holding a parade on the occasion of the Queen’s birthday. This parade (which has taken place year by year even in the worst times of the emergency) is traditionally held in the moat. The moat adjoins the Turkish quarter of Nicosia and is the place where Turkish demonstrations normally take place. Kutchuk recently renamed the moat Taksim Square<sup>72</sup>. We think it possible that some attempts may be made by Turks to interfere with the parade by creating some sort of demonstration, but I consider and General Kendrew agrees with me, that there should be no question of cancelling the parade [...]”<sup>73</sup>

---

71. Foreign Office to British Embassy in Ankara 18 July 1958, Ministry of Defence Document DEFE 11/266.

72. “Taksim” in Turkish means “Partition”.

73. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 4 June 1958, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136280.

"[...] TMT has murdered two more left wing Turks. Furthermore, it is now clear that this organisation has been involved in the serious inter-communal violence of the last few days, resulting in the murder of at least five Greeks and two Turks (many more have been seriously injured) and serious damage to Greek property, mostly by arson.

I believe that the time has come when, judged from the point of view of our local situation, this terrorist organisation should be proscribed and a number of its most violent members should be detained [...]."<sup>74</sup>

### **B25: TMT 10.000 arms – EOKA 663 arms**

Between the signing of the London and Zurich Agreements (19 February 1959) and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus (16 August 1960), the armed anti-colonial movement EOKA was dissolved. It had to further surrender its arms to the authorities. Meanwhile, the Turkish TMT continued to exist, upgrading its forces, arms, training and structure.

It is of vital importance to take note of the weapons each side had:

From studies held, it emerges that the weapons held by EOKA, just before its liquidation in 1959, did not exceed 663 in total (revolvers, pistols, automatics and rifles).<sup>75</sup>

---

74. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies 12.6.1958, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136280.

75. "Memoirs" and "EOKA Struggle and Guerrilla War" by George Grivas-Dhigenis (Retired Lieutenant-Colonel and Leader of EOKA). Also "50 Years of Silence" by Andreas Azinas (responsible for the secret arm shipments to EOKA from Athens).

In the same year (up to June 1959) TMT had at its disposal 6.000 weapons, which by September 1960 reached 10.000, including machine-guns, mortars and anti-tank weapons.

### **B26: 27 May 1960 – Coup in Turkey**

During the same period the first military coup took place in Turkey, which toppled the Adnan Menderes government of the Democratic Party.

The trial that followed took nine months to deliver, Prime Minister Menderes was finally hanged. On 16 September 1961 the Foreign Minister Fatin Rustu Zorlu and the Finance Minister Hasan Polatkan. Zemal Bayar, President of Turkey (1950-1960), were also sentenced to death, but the latter's sentence was commuted to life imprisonment due to old age.

In the early morning of 27 May 1960 a bloodless coup was orchestrated by 38 junta Generals and other officers, who acted without the consent of the Chief of Staff of the Turkish Armed Forces. General Rustu Erntelhoon.

Later that morning through a Radio broadcast, Colonel Alpaslan Turkes announced the overthrow of the government. The junta was led by ex Chief of General Staff General Kemal Gursel, who took over as Chief of State, heading the "Revolutionary Committee for National Unity" as the government.

The junta immediately retired 235 out of 260 lieutenant-generals, major-generals and brigadier-generals and almost 5.000 colonels and majors who were judged as being of doubtful devotion. It drafted a new constitution and established for the first time the National Security Council (so to secure the continued control of governments by the Armed Forces)

and planned elections for 15 October 1961.

On 20 November 1961, the retired General Ismet Inonou<sup>76</sup> took over as Prime Minister of Turkey. General Gursel became President of Turkey and Zevtet Sunai<sup>77</sup> took over as Chief of the Armed Forces.

During the trials against the Menderes regime, the junta also included the pogrom against the Greeks of Constantinople of 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September 1955. It took place “because of the Cyprus problem”, the trials made no mention of the “national-non-party” constructive policy of the Menderes government followed in Cyprus. This policy was to see the Turks return to Cyprus legally for the first time since 1878. A return, strengthened by the official presence of the Turkish Armed Forces (650 men) through TOURDIK (Turkish Forces in Cyprus), as well as the rights to guarantee and intervene in the newly formed Republic of Cyprus.

The head of the junta in Turkey was swiftly informed of the achievements of the “Special War Office”, of the “Headquarters for Plans to Repossess Cyprus” and the level of structure and power that TMT had acquired, as a secret branch of the Turkish Armed Forces in Cyprus.

Colonel Turkes and the new regime of Gursel rushed to “warmly embrace” TMT. This is what Major Ismail Tansu (the “brain” of TMT in Ankara) narrates:

“The coup took place on 27 May 1960. At the time we were carrying on our mission in implementing the

---

76. Ismet Inonu was Kemal Ataturk's successor to the presidency of Turkey (1938-1950), as well as his successor to the presidency of the Republican Social Party.

77. Sunai later succeeded Gurel in the presidency of Turkey (1966-1973).

plans we had prepared, and we had indeed made a lot. TMT had been created, we had trained approximately 5.000 fighters and the organisation had a good number of weapons.

[...] Our government was using behind the scenes, as a diplomatic leverage, the power we had created against EOKA, and secured the Zurich and London Agreements. As from now on Turkey, as a guarantor power, could send to the island Armed Forces. Nonetheless, the mission of the TMT headquarters in Ankara was not terminated. We would do all we could to make TMT even more powerful.

However, the coup of 27<sup>th</sup> May hit also our composition. Those in charge of the coup learnt that General Karaberlen and his subordinates belonged to the Democratic Party, and even labeled us as 'the Menderes Gestapo'. They had planned to arrest all officers in our department. I was informed of all these nonsense on the very first day of the coup.

I approached four of my colleagues, who were members of the revolutionary committee. I spoke with lieutenant-colonel Osman Koksal, who was commanding the presidential guards, and with lieutenant-colonel Alpaslan Turkes, who was the Presidential Undersecretary of the Government. I explained to them that the mission of our office was exclusively for Cyprus. Both of them said to me: 'We thank you, we would have done a grave mistake'. Indeed Turkes, who was of Cypriot decent, also told me: 'Whatever you need for Cyprus let me know, and it will be arranged immediately'. Following this, I submitted to him our requirements and he gave immediately the necessary orders.

Notwithstanding this communication, I failed to stop the transfer of the head of our department Major Danis Karabelen. He was brother to Daniel Akbel, a Democratic Party Member of Parliament. His transfer annoyed me. We still had a great deal to do. We intended to increase the number of fighters from 5.000 to 10.000. In Mersina and Anemouri we had our warehouses for hiding the weapons and ammunition. Lieutenant-colonel Farouk Atesntagli became the new head of our department. He was a member of the revolutionary group. We informed him of everything already done being planned. He told me to carry on with my mission as before".<sup>78</sup>

### **B27: 1959-1963 – Post Zurich TMT**

Given the Turkish expansionist ambitions over Cyprus and strategic control of the island, the British threat for imposing partition<sup>79</sup> and the compliance of Athens, the leader of the Cypriot liberation struggle Archbishop Makarios was dragged into signing on 19 February 1959 the Zurich and London Agreements, thus accepting the birth of a still-born state, under a triple sub-sovereignty-guardianship of three "guarantor powers", Britain, Turkey and Greece.

The un-workability and the collapse of the new state were, indeed, secured by the Constitution itself.

The Turkish-Cypriot leadership, an organ of TMT and the

---

78. Spyros Athanassiades "Files TMT" – 1998 (source the Turkish-Cypriot newspaper "Halkin Sesi", May and June 1997). Ismail Tansu "IN REALITY NO ONE WAS ASLEEP, a secret underground organization, with State support... TMT" 2007.

79. Macmillan Plan 1958.

Special War Office of the Turkish General Staff, under the “double military guarantee” of Ankara on the island (TMT and Turkish Contingent) took advantage of the “co-sovereignty” privileges afforded by the Constitution and the entire Zurich and London Agreements. From the onset, steadily and persistently they started pushing the Republic of Cyprus towards paralysis and the Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots into an armed confrontation.

This premeditated and deceitful policy of luring the state into paralysis is clearly demonstrated in the daily Press during the years 1960-1963. Fully documented are the actions and stance of the Turkish-Cypriot leadership as far as the government, the House of Representatives, the Security Forces, the Cypriot Army, the public service and the municipalities are concerned.

Such incompatible demands and objections with the functioning of the state were intentionally raised on every issue, so as to pave the way to pre-planned confrontation on a daily basis.

Furthermore, to this effect, Ankara was preserving and ever increasing the war power of TMT, after the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. This was to implement in stages the “Plan for repossessing Cyprus-KIP 1958”, on the “Nihat Erim Line - 1956”.

In the face of all these political developments, which were created by the Turkish-Cypriot leadership it inevitably forced Archbishop Makarios to proceed with the policy of “revising the Zurich monstrosity”. The secret Turkish Army of 10.000 TMT men were preparing the plans “for the movement of population and building of defenses around enclaves, with governmental structures, administration and command structure, and propaganda mechanisms etc”.

Following the Turkish armed attacks against the Greek-Cypriots in December 1963 all the Turkish-Cypriots abandoned their government offices. In the abandoned safe of the Turkish-Cypriot Minister of Agriculture Fazil Plumer, the Cypriot authorities found two revealing documents of the Turkish-Cypriot leadership, explicit of their objectives and tactics against the Republic of Cyprus.

The first document (October-November 1960) unsigned, the second (dated 14 September 1963) signed by Fazil Kutchuk and Raouf Denktash.<sup>80</sup>

In the documents found in the safe of Minister Plumer,<sup>81</sup> the plans for the preparation of the Turkish-Cypriot attacks of 1963 are vividly revealed. Some extracts:

“When the struggle begins, the Turkish community, which is spread all over the island, will be concentrated by force in one area, which they will be obliged to defend. The choosing of the area will be according to a strategic plan, which will be prepared by specialists. Before the beginning of the struggle, it is necessary that detailed plans are prepared, so to increase the enlisting of the Turkish community, but also with respect to arms, stocks and the supply and reinforcement missions from Turkey”.

There was also a specific plan for the movement of the Turkish-Cypriot people:

“For this purpose and for defining the areas of moving

---

80. Photocopies of the original of those two documents were included in Glafkos Clerides's book "My Deposition", in Stella Souliotis's book "Fettered Independence Cyprus 1878–1964" and in Ahmet An's book "Turk Mukavemet Teskilatinin".

81. See also Chapter C6.

the Turks, the Turkish-Cypriot leadership had prepared studies and the plan had been forwarded to the Turkish Foreign Ministry".<sup>82</sup>

Following a "random" reference in a Police Press Release the night of 21<sup>st</sup> December 1963 (which referred to an incident that took place in an infamous street in Nicosia),<sup>83</sup> the Turkish Cypriots used this as a pretext to instantaneously and extensively enforce the TMT's military planning. This revealed the magnitude of the preparations in the course of the previous three years 1960-1963 from headquarter level and all the way to the most remote village.

The TMT was preparing from 1958 and achieved in 1963 armed confrontation, the securing of armed enclaves and the "Green Line" of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Partition. Furthermore, most significant was the preparation of a bridgehead for the Turkish military forces to invade the island. This was all in addition to the Turkish Contingent which she had already secured through the Zurich and London Agreements.

Moreover, the tactics used during 1960-1964 had already been tested in 1958-1959. The time had now come for them to be developed further.

The central core in both the above periods of time, that guaranteed the continuation and development of the Menderes-Zorlu policy by the Gursel regime, was the Special War Office, which had in both Turkey and Cyprus the supreme power

---

82. Ahmet An in "Turk Mukavemet Teskilatinin".

83. Cyprus Newspapers – Special Issue, 22.12.1963.

with respect to the Cyprus Issue.<sup>84</sup>

### **B28: 1960 – Handover from Menderes**

The strict adherence to the same policy over Cyprus no matter who is in power in Turkey, has to be recognized as an “achievement over the years” of the wider Turkish national policy, right up to this day.

“The creation of the common Turkish-Greek Republic in Cyprus did not pose an obstacle to our determination. No matter what policy over Cyprus was followed by the Republic of Turkey, our unmovable objective was to save the island of Cyprus, which we turned into a Turkish motherland, raising our flag over it for 340 years. In the event that circumstances did not favour something of the sort, at least to put the foundations for Turkish sovereignty over half of the island and secure the creation of a free and independent Turkish state on the land our Cypriot expatriates possessed”.<sup>85</sup>

However, the “specific direction”, was always decided by the Turkish General Staff and the Special War Office. Even as far as “who of the Turkish Cypriot leaders on the political wing would have had priority”.

---

84. To understand the continuation and cohesion of Turkish policy over Cyprus, one must study in detail the main designer-carrier of the Turkish government policy, no matter who is governing the country. Carrier was the SWO and a great deal of military thinking is required, to follow and decipher the Turkish military thinking and practice, as well as to understand completely the Turkish policy, including the way of transferring that policy from the toppled government to its successors.

85. Ismail Tansu “IN REALITY NO ONE WAS ASLEEP, a secret underground organization, with State support... TMT” 2007.

## **B29: 1959 – Fazil Kutchuk or Rauf Denktash?**

In 2002, Kemal Yamak<sup>86</sup> described how Fazil Kutchuk was chosen as the Turkish Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus, the duties of Rauf Denktash and the role of SWO:

“During the discussions on this particular subject, which used to take place in Ankara, two were the names supported. It was necessary to choose between late Dr Fazil Kutchuk and honourable Rauf Denktash. In order to put an end to the dilemma, honourable lieutenant-colonel Sunalp proposed the following, together with his reasoning:

‘Considering the future and our existing worries, we are in need of two persons. One of them will undertake the duties of our official representative, a person involved in the day-to-day affairs and looks as a man of peace, and the other will be a leader that will stay in the background as a shadow, will be more energetic, will be able to talk on behalf of the community, in times of need will be more of a fighter and will be prepared for the future. Considering also their age, and under the circumstances and in consideration of their age, honourable Fazil Kutchuk should be appointed [as Vice-President] whereas for the role

---

86. Lieutenant-colonel of the SWO at the Turkish enclaves under the control of TMT in Cyprus (1966-1968) and later, as brigadier-general, he took over as head of the SWO. He returned as lieutenant-general taking over as commander of the Turkish occupation forces in occupied Cyprus (the 11<sup>th</sup> Turkish Force). Later he took over as commander of the 4<sup>th</sup> “Aegean Force” and later, as general, was appointed Chief of the Turkish land forces. In 1959, as serving officer under lieutenant-colonel Turgut Sunalp, participated in the Turkish representation that negotiated in Athens the details of the establishment of the Greek and Turkish contingents in Cyprus (as provided by the Zurich and London agreements of 19 February 1959).

of future leader we should choose honourable R. Denktash’.

His proposal was accepted. That is what happened. Thereafter and for many years, we would follow that well aimed decision and allocation of duties”.<sup>87</sup>

Kemal Yalpak also mentions that lieutenant-colonel Turgut Sunalp was head of management of the Planning and Operations Office and the Operations Headquarters of the Turkish Chief of Staff. His proposal for “double leadership” followed his return from Athens, where he had gone in October 1959 for the negotiations in establishing the Greek and Turkish Contingents in Cyprus.

Apart from Kemal Yalpak, among the Turkish representation of Athens were the diplomat Adnan Bulak (representing the Turkish Foreign Ministry) and Rauf Denktash on behalf of the Turkish-Cypriots.

### **B30: 1958 – Turks “migrate” to the North**

#### 10 February 1958:

“I have seen Denktash and told him my plan to visit Athens [...] Denktash, who toured Turkish villages in Larnaca District yesterday with Kutchuk, reports that Kutchuk’s line in village meetings has been as follows: ‘We may not get partition immediately. The road to it may be hard, but I have the assurance of the Turkish

---

87. Kemal Yalpak (retired General) “Traces that stayed in the shadow and us who turned into shadows” – 2006.

Government that we shall get it eventually' [...].<sup>88</sup>

21 June 1958:

“It will not be possible fully to assess the extent and permanency of the migration, which has followed the recent intercommunal disorders, for some time. Nevertheless, the following information has been compiled from the reports of the district administrative and welfare staff [...] I am satisfied that they give a reasonable accurate picture of the situation.

- In the walled city of Nicosia, it is estimated that 90 Turkish and 120 Greek families have been involved in the migration.
- 30 Turkish families and 20 Greek families are thought to have moved within the suburban areas.
- Approximately 20 Armenian families appear to have left the Turkish quarter of the old city.
- In Lefka and the nearby Turkish villages of Ambelikou and Mesena, 138 Greek families are known to have moved mainly to the Morphou area.
- 20 Turkish families are believed to have left Morphou and the villages of Phlassou, Xeros and Petra.
- 6 Turkish families have moved from Ayios Epiktitos to Kazaphani (Kyrenia).
- 6 Turkish families have moved from Dhyo Potami (near Kondemenos).

---

88. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136279.

- Movement in other parts of the Nicosia district has been negligible.
- In Famagusta/Varosha, about 100 families are so far estimated to have been involved, in movement into and out of the old city.
- In Ktima 20-25 Turkish families and 50 Greek families have been involved.
- In Limassol 21 Turkish families and 5 Greek families have moved [...].
- Similarly movement in Larnaca [...].

In Lefka and Nicosia, in particular, temporary arrangements have been necessary. Turkish families in Lefka have been billeted in schools [...].<sup>89</sup>

28 July 1958:

“[...] Today we had news that Turkish villagers from two villages in the Paphos district were to be moved to villages in the Nicosia district. A large number of buses and lorries were to be employed for this purpose, and the arrangements were being undertaken by Turkish leaders. The intention was to house the migrating villagers in tents, which have been sent by the Turkish Red Cross.

Information was also received that plans were being made to move Turkish villagers from other villages, in the Paphos and Limassol districts, to the Nicosia and Famagusta districts.

---

89. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136337.

If such large-scale migration started, it would probably be impossible to stop it, and villagers having left their homes and their fields and trees would soon become destitute.

I saw Kutchuk and Denktash this morning with the Deputy Governor [...] We urged them to do everything they could to stop panic and stop the migration [...] I got the impression that they wish to co-operate to the full with the Government, in checking of any further Turkish violence and in providing the fullest protection for Turkish communities, particularly in rural areas, but we cannot exclude the possibility that, while pretending to co-operate, they are in fact working to a plan to force partition.

I took the opportunity of telling Kutchuk of the great harm done by his statements, repeated in this morning's local Press, calling for the intervention of Turkish troops".<sup>90</sup>

### **B31: Turkey finances the "migration"**

7 August 1958:

"[...] It appears that the moves are being financed by the Turkish Government by the Federation of Cyprus Turkish Associations and by EVCAF [...] Recently two Turkish caiques brought foodstuffs and tents from Turkey to Cyprus. The Federation is in charge of supplying transport for the removals, and Kutchuk and Denktash admitted this in discussions with

---

90. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136281.

Government representatives [...] In the long run, they may have their eyes on the fertile Kythrea group of villages to the north which are inhabited by Greeks [...] One hundred and fifty villagers have moved into the Tahtakala quarter inside the walled city of Nicosia. This quarter constitutes a Turkish salient on the Greek side of the Mason-Dixon Line<sup>91</sup>. The villagers have been accommodated [...] by moving into vacated Greek houses. There seems to have been a deliberate intention to pack this quarter with Turks, so as to make sure that, in any readjustment of the Mason-Dixon Line (which is now under examination) this quarter should remain incontrovertibly Turkish [...].<sup>92</sup>

2 September 1958:

“There are indications that families, which have left their villages, are now beginning to feel the strain of living as strangers in their new homes, and in very uncomfortable conditions [...] Families which had moved now wish to return and ask Government for assistance in transport [...] Other families would now be willing to return but are apprehensive of the welcome they would receive [...].<sup>93</sup>

1 September 1958:

[...] Whether or not the Turkish Government have lately been specifically encouraging this idea of

---

91. The “Mason-Dixon Line” was the initial “partition line” imposed in Nicosia by the colonial power in 1958, drawn by British General Peter Young in December 1963, and so called “Green Line” since then. See also Chapter B21.

92. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Foreign Office Document FO 371/136281.

93. Governor Sir Hugh Foot to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Colonial Office Document CO 926/848.

migration, it seems to be a logical outcome of the extremely hard-headed and ruthless tactics, which they have followed in support of an all-out policy of partition, since the announcement in May last of Her Majesty's Government's intention to produce a new plan for Cyprus. These tactics have been, as you know, by whipping up the Turkish Cypriot community, to create a situation between them and the Greek Cypriots of which the only possible solution would be partition [...].<sup>94</sup>

**B32: "Separate self determination only when both communities agree to it"**

On the 12 December 1958, Rauf Denktash and Fazil Kutchuk had a meeting in London with the British Foreign Secretary, at which:

Denktash asked for assurances that there was no substance to the rumours, that the British Government would change its plan and would introduce a solution with one Parliament.

The Secretary said that "there was no change to the 7-year plan", unless that was agreed by the Greeks and the Turks under British management! That was the "Macmillan tridominium plan".<sup>95</sup>

Denktash expressed his fears for the internal security

---

94. British Ambassador in Ankara to Foreign Office, Colonial Office Document CO 926/848.

95. That plan was the so called "partnership plan between Turks and Greeks", which materialised in 2004 under the form of "two constituent states", as envisaged by the "Annan Plan", which was rejected by the 76% of the Greek Cypriots at Referendum on 24 April 2004.

during those 7 years, and asked for arrangements to arm some Turks for the protection of villages. The Secretary said he would inform the Governor.

Denktash also said that 33 Turkish villages had been abandoned and their inhabitants faced economic hardship, asked for a separate hospital (as they did not trust the Greek Cypriots) and told the Secretary that the Turkish Cypriots would not like it if partition was excluded and that “it would result in bloodshed”.

The Foreign Secretary REPEATED their “partition statement of 19 December 1956” for separate self-determination”, but that “this will only happen, when both communities agree to it, although it would be a sad day if partition ever became reality [...]”.<sup>96 97</sup>

So, having first uprooted all those Turkish Cypriots from their villages in the southern parts of Cyprus and moved them by force to the northern parts of the island (which the Turks had in mind to eventually turn into the “Turkish constituent state”), Rauf Denktash claimed (and the Foreign Secretary accepted) that these people (33 Turkish villages) had “abandoned” their villages, indirectly blaming the Greek Cypriots.

The British, however, abandoned their “7-year Macmillan Plan”<sup>98</sup>, after the U.S. State Department rejected their partition plans and favoured a unitary independent state, and cleverly manoeuvred the situation:

In February 1959, the British had solution agreements signed

---

96. Colonial Office Document CO 926/1119.

97. Half a century after, that promise re-surfaced in the form of the “Annan Plan” and the two separate Referendums.

98. Originally “Sir Hugh Foot Plan” of January 1958.

by Greece and Turkey in Zurich, with all the provisions being of their own secret preparation; providing for the creation of a unitary state, the Republic of Cyprus, albeit a dubious “Treaty of Guarantee” (the Guarantors being Great Britain, Turkey and Greece) and an unworkable Constitution.

Coincidentally, in due time, the circumstances would be created for the implementation of their “19 of December 1956 promise to the Turkish Cypriot minority of 18%”, namely the deconstruction of the Republic of Cyprus and the creation of two separate and politically equal entities.<sup>99</sup>

### **B33: Left wing Turkish Cypriots and the 27 May 1960 Junta**

By 1960, the number of democratic Turkish-Cypriots of the left, who refused to bow to Kutchuk-Denktaş-TMT, had decreased significantly. Amongst the most known of them who were regarded as “fascist dictators of the Turkish-Cypriot community” and who were most actively opposing the regime were, Dr. Ihsan Ali, lawyers Aihan Hikmet and Ahmet Muzafer Gurkan and Trade Unionist Ali Dervis Kavazoglou.

On 9 June 1960, Ihsan Ali announced his decision to establish a political party to promote friendship and cooperation between the two communities, as well as for the Turkish Cypriot affairs to become healthy, by safeguarding the freedom of thinking and speech for the Turkish-Cypriots, who were deprived of these by Kutchuk and Denktaş.<sup>100</sup>

---

99. This was attempted in 2004 with the “Annan Plan”, the partitioning provisions of which had been worked out by Sir David Haney.

100. Press Conference, “Hotel Ledra Palace”, Nicosia 9<sup>th</sup> June 1960.

On 11 June 1960, Ihsan Ali visited Ankara accompanied by five of his associates, to report to the new Turkish government of the “Committee of National Security” (that followed the 27 May 1960 coup) and to Ismet Inonu (president of the Kemalist Republican Socialist Party), the “dictatorial pro-Menderes policy of Denktash and Kutchuk”. In Ankara, Ihsan Ali was offered the use of Inonu’s personal car and he also met with the junta’s leader General Gursel.

Within the month, Ihsan Ali announced his decision to publish the new weekly newspaper “Tzumhouriet” and his party’s “Turkish Socialist Party” decision to participate in the parliamentary elections with three candidates, himself, Gurkan and Hikmet.

“Tzumhouriet” in its leading articles supported the peaceful co-existence of Greeks and Turks and condemned the September 1955 pogrom against the Greeks of Constantinople. Furthermore, Ihsan Ali himself published the demand for an investigation, so that those responsible for the bombing of the Press Office at the Turkish Consul in Nicosia on 7 June 1958 to be found.

In October 1960, whilst the trial against Menderes was going on in Turkey, Turkish-Cypriot “Tzumhouriet” published articles revealing that the Turkish-Cypriot leadership of Kutchuk and Denktash were paying propagandists to swear against the Committee of National Unity in Turkey. During the Yiashi-Anta trial Menderes was accused for being responsible for the anti-Greek events of 6-7 September:

“Those Don-Kihots who governed our community with truncheons and rifles, following the 27<sup>th</sup> May military revolution retreated like snails into their shells. But now, that their friends Menderes and Zorlu are being

tried as responsible for the 6-7 September events, they came out again, to insult the Committee of National Security, fearing that they will be uncovered as accomplices of Menderes and Zorlu. The Don-Kihots are afraid, because they know exactly who spread the malicious lies that a general slaughter of the Turkish-Cypriots was to take place on 28 August 1955 by the Greeks in Cyprus. A lie that shaken the Turkish public opinion and incited hatred”.

On 7 November 1960, “Tzumhuriyet” challenged Dr. Fazil Kutchuk to a public apology for his letter with the malicious lies of the so called “imminent slaughter of the Turkish-Cypriots on 28 August 1955”, which was read during the trial of Menderes-Zorlu at the “Island of Dogs” Court.

All these evidence indicates that the few remaining left wing democrats, pro-Greek Turkish-Cypriots,<sup>101</sup> who were oppressed by TMT, Denktash and Kutchuk, had rested their hopes on the “democratic values” they thought the junta of 27 May 1960 and Ismet Inonu possessed. Having no idea whatsoever of the real character of TMT, as an extension of the Turkish Armed Forces in Cyprus, and that the new Turkish government had in fact taken over the same very policy, through the Special War Office and the “Nihat Erim Policy”.

They had also approached Nihat Erim himself in January 1957, when he was sent to Cyprus, detailing to him their opposition against partition, the support of Greek-Turkish friendship and their anti-colonial duty.

---

101. Nihat Erim in his diary classified them as “Turkish Branch of AKEL” and published their letter in his book “The Cyprus problem as I have known it and what I have seen” – 1975. Lengthy references also in the book “The Other Side” by Neoklis Sarris.

### **B34: 1962 – Ambassador Dirvana**

The hopes of Ihsan Ali, Hikmet, Gurkan and others were revived by the first Turkish Ambassador in Cyprus, Mehmet Emin Dirvana,<sup>102</sup> with whom they had contacts.

Later, it became obvious that Dirvana was not included in the “SWO and TMT game”, being aware only of the Turkish government’s camouflaged, official policy aimed for the outside world.

Dirvana challenged Denktash, on 26 September 1962 he was forced to resign his position and left Cyprus. Three years later, he personally attacked Denktash particularly with respect to the 7<sup>th</sup> June 1958 bomb, stating that “the bomb incited the Turkish-Cypriots to overwhelm with rage and indignation and to act similar to the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September 1955 in Constantinople”.<sup>103</sup>

### **B35: Kavazoglou and 27 May 1960**

The following extract from a speech delivered by Dervis Ali Kavazoglou<sup>104</sup> demonstrates clearly how, the ignorant the Turkish-Cypriot left wing democrats were oppressed by TMT and Denktash. They held false hopes and wishful thinking as to the nature and character of the 27 May 1960 coup, the Committee of National Security of General Gursel and Inonu’s government:

“[...] Denktash and the likes of him, in order to satisfy their own political ambitions and to offer significant services

---

102. Retired officer of Cypriot origin.

103. Dirvana’s article in newspaper “MILLIET”, 15 May 1965.

104. Left wing Trade Unionist, member of AKEL.

to their masters-colonialists, lied to the people and with demagogue for 'mass slaughter' and taking advantage of the pure sentiments of the people, uprooted from their homes, from their villages, from their homeland, 30 thousand of our brothers and they damned them in these unbearable conditions [enclaves]. My brothers, I regard it as my national duty and patriotic debt to address in your presence, the democratically thinking and progressive people, learned people, the vigorous forces of motherland. Honourable children of Turkey, our Kemalist brothers, progressive people, children of the 27<sup>th</sup> MAY, democratically thinking individuals, the thoughtless policy of Denktash and the likes of him [...] have led the Turkish-Cypriots to a terrible catastrophe. This man, together with the likes of him in Turkey, tries to set traps to the vigorous forces and to create problems for the Inonu government [...].<sup>105</sup>

The speech was delivered at Dali village, just before Kavazoglou was murdered by TMT on 11 April 1965.

Prior to Kavazoglou's murder, TMT had murdered Aihan Hikmet and Ahmet Muzafer Gurkan (23 April 1962).

Ihsan Ali escaped, took protection in the Greek areas and took up duties as Adviser to President Makarios.

It is evident, that the oppressed by TMT Turkish-Cypriots had not realized that the "brothers of 27 May", the "Kemalist brothers" and the Inonu government had carried on the Menderes policy and continued on that same policy. They failed to understand that the real and superior power over

---

105. The text of his speech was saved thanks to Kavazoglou's friend, Christakis Vanezos, and is included in the book-in memory of Kavazoglou which he published in 2008.

the Turkish-Cypriot minority was indeed TMT. TMT was commissioned and mandated by the Turkish Armed Forces, under the direct orders of the Special War Office, and they missed to understand that Kutchuk and Denktash were designated officials, in charge of the political wing of TMT.

### **B36: 1962 – Bairaktari Bombing and the killing of Turkish Cypriot Journalists**

TMT's planned escalation of the tension in 1962, needed an easy and tested method, in order to provoke once again the hatred and fear of Turks against the Greeks:

On 25 March 1962, the day the Greeks of Cyprus celebrate their national anniversary of the Greek Revolution of 1821 against four hundred years of Ottoman occupation, TMT bombs blew up the two Moslem mosques in Nicosia, Omerie and Bairaktari.

On 23 April 1962, the anti-Denktash journalists Aihan Hikmet and Ahmet Muzafer Gurkan published in their Turkish-Cypriot newspaper "Tzumhuriyet" that the bombing of the mosques was undertaken by those criminal elements within the Turkish community, who were preparing new bi-communal confrontations. They also warned that in their next edition they would name those responsible.

They were both murdered the very same evening (23 April 1962).

Aihan Mustafa Hikmet was murdered whilst sleeping in his own bed (asleep in the bed next to him was his wife and two under-aged children) and Ahmet Muzafer Gurkan on the doorstep of his house just as he was coming out of his car.

The murder was the work of TMT. This is what Aziz and Seferoglou wrote:

“By murdering Hikmet and Gurkan ‘Tzumhuriyet’ was silenced as well, because nobody from their associates dared risk his life in order to continue its publication. There was no security whatsoever for the successors of the journalists. The murderous hand of the fascist clique of Denktash was ready to act against anybody who dared lift his head”.

On 13 April 1965, two days after the murder of Dervis Ali Kavazoglou, Dr Ihsan Ali in a message to the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus said:

“We all know very well, the circumstances under which the Turkish leadership gained power in 1960 [Fazil Kutchuk and Rauf Denktash]. They gained that power through terrorism therefore they do not lawfully represent the Turkish community. There is no doubt that both the Turkish government and the Press are well aware of these facts, and I wonder how they can be misled by these people. They also know that it is the Turkish-Cypriot leadership that murdered Hikmet and Gurkan because they followed a peaceful policy for co-existence between the two communities. Now they repeated the same brutal crime murdering the Turkish Trade Unionist leader Kavazoglou for exactly the same reason. One wonders how the Press and the Turkish government can support such murderers [...]”.

On 12 May 1965, in another message to the Turkish-Cypriot community in England, Dr. Ihsan Ali referred to “paid organs of chief-terrorist Denktash”, adding:

“The Turkish-Cypriot leadership, which as you know has been imposed on us by the colonial power, has spread terrorism all over the community and has imposed a state of police regime, under which nobody can express free speech or criticize its mistakes. Anyone expressing an opinion or criticizes, is either subjected to thrashing or is executed. As a result of this inhuman treatment, our co-patriots have been turned into robots in the hands of their leaders and many have been forced to abandon Cyprus, as many of you have done, to save themselves from terrorism. Those few left to dare cry out their opinion have been murdered, just like Aihan Hikmet and Muzafer Gurkan in 1962. Recently, we have witnessed another brutal murder, that of Kavazoglou, who was murdered simply because he dared criticize the Turkish-Cypriot leadership, which through violence forced a large number of our co-patriots to abandon their homes and properties and because he preached peaceful co-existence between the two communities”.

Aziz and Seferoglou wrote:

“Kavazoglou’s articles, his journalistic interviews to foreign and local Press, his speeches from Radio broadcasts, his television appearances, were all a daily accusation, an open relentless accusation of the terrorist, fascist methods of the sold to imperialism Turkish-Cypriot leadership. In parallel however his messages were of hope, of esteem and courage for the suffering masses of Turkish-Cypriot workers who suffer under the imposition of terrorism [...]”.

As Aziz and Seferoglou reported in their publication, Kavazoglou wrote the following in his own speeches:

“The imperialists, in order to promote their disgusting objectives, created the myth and the lie that it is impossible for the two communities to live in peace in Cyprus. And, with the assistance of their agents, they uprooted almost 20 thousand Turks and fenced them in places that do not differ from concentration camps. Today, thousands of Turks live like nomads in tents in the country side, away from their homes, their villages, their fields, their peaceful working places. Elementary and Secondary schools are closed and thousands of children are deprived of their education. A handful of fascists, assisted by the imperialists and using weapons and fascist methods, took over the Turkish-Cypriot leadership. These are the people responsible for the suffering of the Turkish-Cypriot people. This fascist group does not allow the Turkish people to express their real sentiments and thoughts, which are against imperialism. It is not an exaggeration to compare these concentration camps for the Turkish-Cypriots with those of Hitler, Buchenwald and other. In the darkness of the night they shoot and murder democratic journalists and progressive personalities of our community. They arrest, kidnap and imprison all that dare to speak freely and express their opinion. They subject them to torture, employing instruments of the Middle Ages invented by Hitler [...]”.

Kavazoglou, Ihsan Ali, Aziz and Seferoglou began their denunciations two years after the beginning of the 1963-64 armed Turkish attacks (against the Greeks) and the enforcement of TMT's pre-planned scheme (as described in the documents discovered in “Plumer's safe”) of moving by armed force the Turkish-Cypriots into the enclaves under the armed control of TMT itself.

## **Chapter C: 1963 – July 1974**

### **C1: 1963 – Turkish Rebellion**

The Turkish government and the Turkish-Cypriot leadership, under the supervision of the Council of National Security of the Turkish Generals, were enforcing in stages the military “Plan for the repossession of Cyprus”.

The spear and shield of Turkish superiority in Cyprus was the secret army of TMT, which up and until 1960 had already been armed (as proudly admitted by TMT leaders in Ankara) with 10.000 weapons. Included in this build-up were a number of “undercover” career Turkish officers from Turkey, as well as 650 officers and soldiers of TOURDIK, as provided by the Zurich and London Agreements.

Together they were to prepare for the military, political, material, psychological and with the use of propaganda 1963 Turkish attacks.

The war capabilities they had built up in Cyprus were demonstrated during the confrontation that followed on 21 December 1963.

Although the Greek Cypriots constituted an 82% majority and were economically by far more powerful than the Turkish Cypriots they failed to acquire an equivalent, adequately armed and trained, war capability by December 1963. The Greek-Cypriots were mainly armed with hunting rifles and were mobilized by the “Akritas Organization”, the “Lyssarides group”, the “Sampson group” and others. Nevertheless, the Greek-Cypriots were unable to stop the Turkish attacks and overturn the armed enclaves of TMT on the soil of the

Republic of Cyprus. This was prior to the British intervention as “peacemakers” that cemented the de facto status of partition.

TMT ordered and, by the use of force, imposed a huge Turkish-Cypriot population movement away from their homes and villages of permanent residence, enforcing them to live en mass in misery, in fortified military enclaves.

## **C2: 1964 – Turkish response to the Turkish Propaganda**

The major defensive of Turkish propaganda was the forceful movement of the Turkish-Cypriots as far as they were concerned this was necessary so as “to protect them from the extermination and slaughter that Makarios and the Greek-Cypriots were preparing against them”.

The Turkish propaganda was convincingly opposed by the (Turkish) responses of Dervis Ali Kavazoglou (later murdered), of Dr. Ihsan Ali, of Ibrahim Hasan Aziz and of Nuretin Mehmet Seferoglou.

On 5 November 1964, Dr. Ihsan Ali sent a lengthy letter to the Finish commander of the United Nations peace Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) General Timayia:

“Your Excellency,

With this letter I wish, first of all, to appeal to your human feelings, which I hope will lead you to take more drastic actions in saving the Turkish community from the Turkish terrorists.

I felt the obligation to write this letter, not to express any political comments, but because day in day out

my heart is torn to pieces from the tortures the Turkish terrorists inflict on the Turkish community.

It is indeed very saddening, at times when man aims to conquer space, to watch the Turkish community being tortured, needlessly and for no reason whatsoever, by the Turkish terrorists.

I would like to bring to your attention the following facts:

(a) Many Turks, who have returned to their homes, are being threatened by the terrorists, so to be forced to abandon their homes and properties and return to the terrible tents they had been driven before.

(b) The Turkish terrorists, the Turkish government and some irresponsible newspapers claim from one hand that the Turks have been isolated and are deprived of basic food and from the other the Turkish terrorists do not allow the Turks to buy anything from their Greek co-patriots or to have any dealings with them.

Although the terrorists themselves trade with the Greeks, they do not permit the people to do the same. Two are the reasons: First, because they wrongly believe that, by stopping trade and contact with the Greeks, they will give the impression to the outside world that the two communities cannot live together and second, to take advantage of the situation, by trading themselves with the Greeks and then sell back to their community at exceptionally high prices.

With what principles and ethics do these actions conform? Only if did not have human feelings, just like the terrorists, I would not feel sorry for my Turkish co-patriots, who visit me daily to complain with tears in their eyes.

In my opinion, it is the duty of the Cypriot government to save these innocent and suppressed people from the teeth of the terrorists. The “green line” however, created by the colonialists in furtherance of their dark aims, does not allow the government to do just that. Nobody doubts that it is very easy for the Cypriot government to save the suppressed Turks from the terrorists. But if the government decides to exterminate terrorism and save the Turks, the colonialists and their collaborators, who support the continuation of the anomaly in the land, will use their distorted propaganda to give the international public opinion and especially the Turkish government, which they always mislead, the false impression that the Cypriot government follows an aggressive policy.

Your Excellency, it is for all the above reasons that I regarded it as my duty to appeal to your human feelings. If I tell you that, just in my area, thousands of Turks are suffering in the hands of the terrorists, I believe you should regard it as your determined duty to bring these facts to the attention of the United Nations and the Turkish government.

In view of these undisputable facts, I believe it is your Excellency’s duty to try and convince the Turkish government that the Turkish population is suffering from the actions of the Turkish terrorists and not from their Greek co-patriots.

Civilization and humanity demand that all those who are interested in the Cyprus problem, including the Turkish government, leave aside their political machinations and follow a realistic policy and save the Turkish community from this deplorable situation [...]”<sup>106</sup>

---

106. Memoirs of Ihsan Ali, page 119.

Dr. Ihsan Ali had sent a number of similar lengthy letters to the Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant (16 February 1965, 18 August 1965, 15 September 1965), as well as to the Turkish Prime Minister Suat Uzkul (24 October 1965).

On 8 December 1965, Ihsan Ali cabled to the UN Secretary General the following message:<sup>107</sup>

“Undoubtedly, the Turks of Cyprus are in danger from the Turkish terrorists and not the Greeks as claimed by the Turkish representative at the United Nations. All Turks, except of the terrorists, long for a peaceful co-existence with the Greeks and are anxious to hear that the United Nations support Plaza’s report and that they condemn every foreign intervention. Kindly circulate this message.”<sup>108</sup>

### **C3: 1965 – Ihsan Ali and “genocide”**

During a Radio interview, Ihsan Ali said:<sup>109</sup>

“I will repeat what I said in the past. The Turkish community is a victim of treason by the Turkish government. The Turkish-Cypriots are not victims of the Cypriot government or of the Greek-Cypriots. Everybody should know that partition has been the

---

107. Memoirs of Ihsan Ali, page 148.

108. Galo Plaza served as the Personal Representative of the Secretary General of the United Nations and as mediator in Cyprus, as from May 1964 through the end of 1965, and his mission was surprisingly successful in spite of the extremely serious difficulties he had faced. In his report, Plaza rejected the Turkish demands for a partitionist/federal solution. The Turks vehemently opposed his post and findings, and succeeded in terminating his role over Cyprus. He died on 22 January 1987 in his home country, Ecuador.

109. Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation, 28 September 1965.

desire and proposal of the colonialists, which was promoted by dark powers since 1957, when Zorlu posed the following question to the Turkish-Cypriot representatives who visited him:

‘Don’t you have some volunteers who would be ready to sacrifice their lives in confrontation with the Greek-Cypriots so that to create an anomaly and thus impose de facto partition?’

What followed that, it is well known to all. Zorlu, of course, was found a traitor and been hanged. I am sorry to say, however, that his policy over Cyprus has been adopted by all the governments that followed.

Everybody knows that last year, from Radio Ankara, chief-terrorist Denktash stated that the movement of the Turkish-Cypriots was intentional, so that partition would be achieved. Therefore, it is ridiculous to claim that the Turkish-Cypriots were not moved by the use of force.

The claim that the Turks request geographical separation because they are afraid of the Greeks, is just excuses that were promoted after the events.

Besides, it is abundantly clear that the Turks living with the Greeks are much safer than those who are enclave with their co-patriots.

If we say that those, who promote claims for a supposed threat of genocide by the Greek-Cypriots, should be at least ashamed to face public opinion, it does not serve any purpose, because these people are insensible and fraudulent, and they will never change”.<sup>110</sup>

---

110. Memoirs of Ihsan Ali, page 144.

#### **C4: Return of Propaganda as a result of the Annan Plan**

During the period 2002-2004, almost forty years after the Turkish attacks against the Greek Cypriots (1963-1964) and three decades after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus (1974), an attempt was made to persuade and force the Cypriot people to accept “the solution of the Cyprus problem through the Annan Plan”.<sup>111</sup>

The plan envisioned the deconstruction of the Republic of Cyprus for the sake of establishing a sui generis “Federal creation” no where to be found in the rest of the world, which would consist of two so called “constituent state entities”. What was to be created was a Greek Cypriot entity and a Turkish Cypriot entity under the ultimate co-sovereignty of Turkey and Britain’s guardianship through its British bases on the island. Furthermore, the British bases would be legalized as sovereign British territory with their own air space and sea rights.

At the same time, the Annan Plan would render legal all the violations of the basic Human Rights of the people of Cyprus. Violations such as the serious restriction of the right of the

---

111. The Annan Plan was the ultimate result (11 November 2002) of a “15-year negotiation period”, while Presidents of the Republic of Cyprus were George Vassiliou (1988-1993) and Glafkos Clerides (1993-2003). The Plan had been driven forward by the British, approved by the Americans, endorsed by a number of political leaders in Cyprus and Greece, and signed by the UN Secretary General at the time, Koffi Annan. The Plan was finally promoted for adoption by the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots, at two different referenda on 24 April 2004. The “Turkish Cypriot voters” (the vast majority being Turkish soldiers and illegal Settlers from Turkey) voted in favour by 64%, contrary to the Greek Cypriots, who rejected the Plan by 76%. President of the Republic of Cyprus at the time was Tassos Papadopoulos (2003-2008), who called upon the Greek Cypriots “to reject the Annan Plan”. One week later (1 May 2004), the full accession of the Republic of Cyprus in the European Union was finalized, as an equal Country-member, sovereign on the entire Island of Cyprus.

refugees to return to their lawful properties in the occupied part of Cyprus, the international crime of the import of settlers, the “citizenship” to all those hundreds of thousands of illegal settlers Turkey purposely shipped to the occupied areas after the Turkish invasion of 1974, so to change the demographic character of the Republic of Cyprus, and many more.

All these provisions of the Annan Plan aimed at shrinking and, finally, eliminating the Greek presence in Cyprus in the very near future.

In the process of forcing the Greek Cypriots to accept the Annan Plan, Turkey, with the support of the British and others, exercised strenuous efforts in order to impose sentiments of guilt on the Greeks. Amongst those supposedly “in 1963-1964 the Greek Cypriots attacked and slaughtered the Turkish Cypriots, forced them to move into their enclaves, expelled them from the state and harassed them, so that the Greek Cypriots would monopolize the Republic of Cyprus». Therefore, the Turkish invasion in 1974, the decades long occupation of the 37% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus and the uprooting of the 1/3 of the Greeks constituted a “peaceful operation, for the protection of the Turkish Cypriots” and it did not constitute an unlawful incursion.

In this extended effort of exercising psychological war against the Greeks of Cyprus, one of the central cores of the Turkish propaganda in relation to the 1963-64 events was the so called “AKRITAS Plan”.

### **C5: 1961-1963 – “AKRITAS Organization”**

Due to the particular importance of this subject, as “the major argument of the Turkish propaganda”, all the facts are presented as they appear on the original evidence that

document them, naming only the sources that are already public.

### **C5-1: Authentic Evidence**<sup>112</sup>

From the personal archive of a leading member of the “AKRITAS Organization”:

“Leaders of the Organization were a group of EOKA area leaders and other distinguished fighters of the 1955-1959 liberation struggle, who supported the Republic of Cyprus and the then President Archbishop Makarios.

Following the London and Zurich Agreements, this group of people remained in close contact and, without being “institutional” of any kind, from time to time they met together and communicated with each other.

To realize their ‘involvement’ to the developments, one has to understand the positive climate that existed for the fighters of EOKA right after independence. Especially for the area leaders, who had great influence even outside the areas of their command, all over Cyprus.

It cannot be determined how and when the name ‘AKRITAS’ came about, but surely several months after the creation of the organization, which originally was nameless.

When ‘the Plan to React and Defend in the case of a Possible Turkish attack against the Greek-Cypriots’ was

---

112. Secret, unreleased source.

put together and to which the code name 'Akritas Plan' was given, from that point onwards the Organization was referred to as the 'AKRITAS Organization'.

Throughout the transition period, from the signing of the Agreements right up to the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus [February 1959-August 1960], there had been many and frequent, confirmed reports of continued missions of secret arm shipments to the Turkish-Cypriots from Turkey, who in the meantime had created a strong parastatal organization, with Rauf Denktash as political leader, colonel Buruskan of the Turkish army as general commander and other Turkish officers as area leaders.<sup>113</sup>

One of the many incidents was the capture (by the English) of the 'Deniz' ship near the shores of Karpasia, which was carrying weapons enough to supply almost five companies.<sup>114</sup>

That was the second ship intercepted (the first was covered up by the British). It should be noted that the British colonial government retained full control on matters of security right until August 1960.

Although the Organization was not institutionalized and, originally, all the expenses for a minimum organizational structure were met voluntarily by the members, it had a perfect information network and a good number of secret agents within the Turkish-Cypriot community.

In 1961, in the light of multiple information regarding the systematic arming of the Turkish-Cypriots for the

---

113. See Chapters B6-B18.

114. See Chapter B19.

purpose of creating a strong paramilitary organization composed of official Turkish military officers, leaders of the Organization (like Polykarpos Yiorkatzis, Nicos Koshis, Glafkos Clerides, Tassos Papadopoulos, Christodoulos Christodoulou and others) met President Makarios, whom they informed about the existence of the Organization and asked his consent and support, as well as financial assistance for the acquisition of arms.

At the beginning Archbishop Makarios had reservations, saying characteristically 'we have a state and I do not like parastatal Organizations'.

President Makarios really got worried, upon receiving the same confirmed information, about the arming of the Turkish-Cypriots and their organization with the active involvement of Turkey, also from Greek-Cypriot high ranging officers of the 'joint' Police, as well as from independent branches of KYP.<sup>115</sup>

Knowing that IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE for the official 'mixed' Police force to deal with the matter (since the Police force was equally and in every rang composed also by Turkish-Cypriots), or the 'mixed' Council of Ministers, he gave his consent for the 'preparation' and promised adequate support.<sup>116</sup>

The branching out of the Organization on a pancyprian scale started during 1961, with the participation of ex area-leaders and fighters of EOKA and other citizens,

---

115. KYP: The Government Information Service.

116. The information regarding the military arming of the Turks was also held by the Greek government of ERE (Constantinos Karamanlis), which was kept informed by the branch of the Greek Government Information Service in Cyprus.

who supported the Republic of Cyprus and Makarios, but without any overt governmental involvement.

Greek military officers of ELDIK<sup>117</sup> were also members of the Organization, who were serving as advisers to the area officers and the Headquarters, declaring that 'they were acting on their own free will, without the knowledge and consent of the Greek government'.

<sup>118</sup>

For the purpose of securing arms, Polykarpos Yiorkatzis and Tassos Papadopoulos met twice with Ministers of the Greek government in Athens, who practically 'threw them out'.

Then they had unofficial contacts in Crete and Egypt. Egypt (during President Nasser's times) responded positively and shipped (with small vessels, unofficially and free of any charge) the only significant arm supplies, which however could not possibly match (so much in quantity as much as in quality) the weapons, which according to the information held by the Organization, the Turkish-Cypriots had.

In a very short period of time, the Organization branched out covering the whole of Cyprus, with District and Area officers ex EOKA fighters (and others) and with a Greek officer of ELDIK as adviser to each one of them. At the same time theoretical and practical military training begun.

The 'leader' was Polykarpos Yiorkatzis, the 'head of the Central Operations Office - 3<sup>rd</sup> Office' was the then

---

117. ELDIK: The Greek Contingent stationed in Cyprus, as provided by the Zurich and London Agreements.

118. The "ignorance" of Athens still remains unexplained.

President of the House of Representatives Glafkos Clerides and the person 'in charge of Organizing and Coordinating the Action Groups' was Nicos Koshis.

At that stage and in cooperation with the Greek officers of ELDIK, the 'Plan for Resistance/Defense' with the code name 'AKRITAS', which was to be known as 'AKRITAS Plan', was put together.

The objective of the Organization was: 'IN CASE OF ATTACK by the Turkish-Cypriots or of a military intervention by Turkey in Cyprus, the Organization to react for the defense of the Greek-Cypriots and the Greek-Cypriot villages that might be attacked'.

The objective was clearly DEFENSIVE. In no circumstances, the AKRITAS Plan was 'for the extermination of the Turkish-Cypriots', but only a Defense Plan, which included the neutralization of the Turkish-Cypriot enclaves in MIXED communities and Municipalities, in case of attacks against the Greek-Cypriots."

## **C5-2: Claire Palley<sup>119</sup>**

In her prologue of Stella Soulioti's monograph<sup>120</sup> Claire Palley writes:

"Soulioti does not excuse Greek Cypriots, although explaining 'why they believe it necessary to establish unlawful paramilitary organizations to counter threats

---

119. Adviser to Stella Soulioti in Attorney General's office.

120. "FETTERED INDEPENDENCE Cyprus, 1878-1964" – 2006 (2 volumes, 1450 pages).

from the powerful Turkish Army-officered and armed TMT' (which had, despite the 1959 settlement continued in existence from its establishment in 1957 by Turkey in order to effect partition during the enosis independence struggle).

Soulioti successfully demonstrates that 'there was not a Government of Cyprus policy of overthrowing the Cyprus settlement and forcibly depriving Turkish Cypriots of their rights should it not prove possible to achieve alteration of the 1959 settlement by constitutional means and international pressures'.

Such an accusation is presented to this day by means of wide circulation of a document from a Greek Cypriot paramilitary organization.

That document, ironically named as "the Akritas Plan" by extremist Greek Cypriot political opponents who did want violent overthrow of the settlement, has been the major weapon in the Turkish Cypriot propaganda armory.

Soulioti's deconstruction of that document and analysis of the circumstances in which it was prepared, invalidates Turkish assertions about the existence of a scheme to override the Constitution.

In contrast, not only does she evidence deliberate sabotaging of the governmental system by the Turkish Cypriot leadership from 1960 onwards and their constant direction from Ankara, but she also establishes that 'the Turkish Cypriot leadership was by September 1963 planning to organize action effectively to partition Cyprus should the Government of Cyprus initiates a process leading to constitutional amendments'.

Turkey had similar plans which she ‘retailed’ to British and American diplomats: Turkish Cypriots would withdraw from all State organs; establish separatist Turkish Cypriot institutions; congregate in specific territorial areas as a preliminary to partition; Turks would be infiltrated into Cyprus; and the Turks of Cyprus would declare an independent State and ultimately arrange for its absorption in Turkey. That process commenced on 21 December 1963 [...]”.

### **C5-3: Stella Soulioti**<sup>121</sup>

In her monograph, with a plethora of original references, Stella Soulioti writes:<sup>122</sup>

#### “Greek Cypriot Secret Document: The ‘Akritas Plan’

This document came to light when it was first published with certain omissions on 21 April 1966 in ‘Patris’, a Greek Cypriot pro-Grivas newspaper opposed to Makarios ‘for being too moderate vis-à-vis the Turks’.<sup>123</sup>

Since then it has been used by the Turks and others, to support allegations that ‘Makarios had from the start intended to wreck the 1960 Constitution and even

121. First Minister of Justice (1960-1970) and later Attorney General (1984-1988) of the Republic of Cyprus. As from 1964 onwards, adviser to the presidents of the Republic of Cyprus for the Cyprus problem in general and, in particular, for the efforts and negotiations towards “a federal solution that would reunite Cyprus”, which had been partitioned since 1974 by the Turkish invasion.

122. Stella Soulioti «FETTERED INDEPENDENCE Cyprus, 1878-1964» – 2006, Volume One, pp 275-281.

123. Author’s Personal Records.

‘to knock the Turks out and realize enosis [union of Cyprus with Greece]’.<sup>124</sup>

The full text of the document was published in 1983 under the title ‘Document of Akritas [P. Georkadjis] regarding the Objectives of the Greek Cypriot Side and the Prospects as They Appeared toward the End of 1963’.<sup>125</sup> The following is a summary of the text:

### Objectives

National struggles pass through various stages of development and time limits, for their achievement cannot be fixed. The final objective, the exercise of the right of self-determination of the people, remains unalterable. The strategy must be examined.

### International Tactics

The first step is to convince international public opinion that the Cyprus Question has not really been solved, and that the solution requires revision. Among the arguments in support of this is that revision of the agreements, which are unsatisfactory and unfair, is a question of survival and not an attempt on the part of the Greeks to repudiate their signature. Furthermore, coexistence of the two communities is possible.

After the first step has been achieved to a satisfactory degree, the second would be to demonstrate that the aim of the Greeks is to remove unreasonable and unfair provisions, and not to oppress the Turks. This must be done today as tomorrow will be too late.

---

124. Necati M. Ertekun “The Cyprus Dispute and the Birth of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus”, Nicosia 1984, p. 165.

125. Papageorghiou “Crucial Documents”, p. 250-257.

Since concerted action with the Turks is impossible due to their unreasonable attitude, unilateral action is justified. Revision is an internal affair of the Cypriots, not giving anyone the right of intervention by force or otherwise. The proposed amendments are reasonable and just and safeguard the reasonable rights of the minority.

To secure their right of self-determination, the Greek Cypriots must free themselves of those provisions of the Constitution and the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance, which prevent the unfettered expression of the will of the people and which hold dangers of external intervention.

To implement the above, the following actions are necessary:

Amendment of the negative elements of the agreements and parallel lapse of the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance which would render legally and substantively inapplicable the right of intervention under the Treaty of Guarantee. Once relieved of the restrictions under the agreements, the people will be free to express and implement their desire. Lawful response to any internal or external intervention would be by the forces of the state (police or even friendly military forces).

### Internal Front

Activities in the internal field must be considered in the light of the manner in which they would be interpreted internationally and of their repercussions on the national cause.

The only danger, which could be described as insurmountable, is the possibility of external intervention

by force, mainly because of the possible political consequences. If intervention occurs before the Greek Cypriots free themselves of the restrictions under the agreements, then the legality of such intervention would be debatable and even possibly justifiable.

The lesson that history teaches is that in not one single case of intervention, whether legally justified or not, has either the United Nations or any other power succeeded in evicting the invader without serious concessions detrimental to the victim. Even in the case of the Israeli attack in October 1956 on Suez, which was almost universally condemned, although Israel withdrew, it kept as a concession the port of Eilat. Much graver dangers exist for Cyprus.

In order to avoid intervention, the first objective must be careful selection of the amendments to be proposed; if they are reasonable and justifiable, this would ensure international support needed at the stage of consultations among the guarantor powers, Britain, Greece and Turkey, which, under the Treaty of Guarantee, must take place before intervention.

### Tactics

Reasonable constitutional amendments after efforts for common agreement with the Turks have been exhausted. In order that intervention might be justified, a more serious reason must exist than simple constitutional amendment, such as the immediate declaration of enosis or serious intercommunal conflict which would be presented as a massacre of the Turks.

Since the Greek Cypriots do not intend to attack or kill Turks, there is the possibility that as soon as the Greek Cypriots proceed to the unilateral amendment

of any article of the Constitution, the Turks will react spontaneously, creating incidents and clashes, or intentionally stage attacks on and killings of Turks in order to create the impression that the Greeks have indeed attacked the Turks, in which case intervention would be necessary for their protection.

Action for constitutional amendment will be in the open, the Greek Cypriots always showing themselves ready for peaceful negotiations. Activities will not be provocative or violent in any way. Should incidents occur, they will be dealt with lawfully by the lawful security forces. All actions will be of a lawful nature.

Because, however, it would be naive to believe that it would be possible to proceed to substantive acts of amendment of the Constitution without the Turks attempting to create or to stage violent clashes, the existence and strengthening of the [AKRITAS] Organization is an imperative necessity. The reasons given are:

The counterattacks to any Turkish reaction must be immediate, so as to prevent panic among the Greeks risking the loss of substantial vital areas; suppression of a planned or staged Turkish attack in the shortest possible time giving the Greek Cypriots command of the situation in one or two days, would ensure that no outside intervention would be possible, probable or justified; dynamic and effective response to the Turks would facilitate subsequent action for further amendments, because the Turks would know that any reaction on their part would be either impossible or seriously damaging to their community. In the event of more generalized conflict, all stages, including the immediate declaration of enosis, would be proceeded

with, because then there would be no reason to wait or to engage in diplomatic activity.

The task becomes even more difficult because, of necessity and depending on the prevailing circumstances, even constitutional amendments must be made in stages. Despite this, irresponsible demagoguery, street politics, or a race as to 'who bids higher in the stakes of nationalism' must be avoided. 'Our acts must be our most truthful defenders'. Exemplary self-restraint and sangfroid must be shown.

The rest of the document is devoted to the need for enlightenment, unity and discipline, secrecy and procedures.

#### Evaluation of the "Akritis Plan"

The title, as well as the contents of the document indicates that it was written just before 30 November 1963, the day Makarios submitted his Thirteen-Point Proposals for amendment of the Constitution, and three weeks before the outbreak of intercommunal violence on 21 December 1963.<sup>126</sup>

This can hardly support the theory that the document

---

126. For instance, references to Makarios's "recent public statements" to the fact that certain objectives "have been achieved" and that "the first target of attack has been the Treaty of Guarantee, which was the first to be cited as no longer recognized by the Greek Cypriots" and numerous references to the proposed constitutional amendments.

It should be noted that the first time that the Treaty of Guarantee was "attacked" in clear terms was in an interview given by Archbishop Makarios to the "Contemporary Review" in July 1963, when the Archbishop said that "the Treaty of Guarantee should cease to exist" and that "we do not recognize to the so-called Guaranteeing Powers any rights of interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus and we shall reject and oppose any attempt by any one of them to interfere in any way".

was a plan for the long-term policy of the Greek Cypriots to subvert the status quo and 'knock the Turks out'.

It is obvious that the document was written *ex post facto*, when the preparation of Makarios's proposals for amendment of the Constitution was already well underway. The two-fold purpose of the document, which was addressed to the members of Georkadjis's organization, is transparently clear. On the one hand it sought to reconcile the actual policies of Makarios with the original objective (self-determination/enosis), thereby eliminating adverse criticism that the original objective had been abandoned. On the other hand, it sought to prevent precipitate action by irresponsible or impatient elements of the Organization. It was to this end that the document stressed the following points:

- the need for action by stages of unfixed duration;
- the essentiality of international support, which could only be secured by convincing international public opinion of the rightness of the Greek Cypriot cause that the Zurich/London Agreements were unjust and required revision;
- clarification that the aim was to ensure good government and not to oppress the Turks, whom the Greek Cypriots did not intend to attack or kill, coexistence of the two communities being possible;
- the dangers of external intervention, which were graphically illustrated by instances from recent history, and the need first to eliminate these dangers by the removal of those provisions of the

treaties and the Constitution, which prevented the exercise of the right of self-determination, and by the avoidance of serious intercommunal conflict or the immediate declaration of enosis;

- restraint in proceeding to unilateral revision of the agreements, which was justified if agreement with the Turks was not possible, because of the Turks' unreasonable attitude, implementation taking place only in those cases where this could be done 'passively' without force. Even the crucial unification of municipalities was cited as an example of the kind of unilateral action to be avoided;
- the making of further action conditional, on 'our discretion' and on 'our strength';
- the great importance of lawfulness and the avoidance of provocation or violence, any incidents or intervention being met lawfully by the lawful forces of the state;
- the defensive purpose of the Organization, which was to provide a forceful response in case of violent incidents by the Turks against Turks in order to provoke outside intervention, the rationale for 'a quick and effective response being the prevention of panic among Greek Cypriots and the elimination of the danger of external intervention';
- the admonition that 'immediate declaration of enosis could only be justified in case of generalized conflict'; and
- the need for responsible conduct, self-restraint and sangfroid, and the avoidance of 'emulation of would-be patriots'.

### Who Prepared the Document

The contention that the document was drawn up on the orders of Makarios or with his participation<sup>127</sup> is totally untenable for many reasons:

- The author of the document is known to the writer, and it was not Makarios. The draft was approved by the leaders of the Organization, not by Makarios, who was in all probability ignorant even of its existence.
- The style and language of the document are obviously patterned on the EOKA “Orders of the Day”, in which the draftsman of the document and those who approved it, being ex-members of EOKA, were well versed. Makarios, who prided himself on his distinctive, elegant literary style and language, would have been appalled at the attribution to him of such a document.<sup>128</sup>
- Before its publication in ‘Patris’ on 21 April 1966, the Greek Cypriot ministers were unaware of the document’s existence. Only those involved in the Organization (Georkadjis and one other) were in the know from the beginning.<sup>129</sup>

---

127. Mayes “Makarios”, p. 161-63; Patrick “Political Geography”, p. 35 and 42; John Reddaway “Burdened with Cyprus”, London 1986, p. 133-35 and 147-48; and Ertekun “The Cyprus Dispute”, p. 10 and 165.

128. It is the conjecture of the author that the maximum “involvement” of Makarios (perhaps what prompted the drafting of the document) was Makarios’s constant admonition to the leaders of the Organization, that they must exercise strict control and discipline over their members and not allow them to get out of hand in any way. It must be remembered that Makarios was very uneasy about the possible volatile reactions and impatience of certain Greek Cypriot extremists.

129. Author’s personal knowledge as a Minister in the Makarios Government between 1960 and 1970.

### Exploitation of the Document by the Turks

As soon as it came to light on publication in 'Patris', the document was pounced on by the Turks to support their allegations of Greek Cypriot plans to destroy the Constitution, annihilate the Turks and realize enosis. To support this view, they omitted certain sections of the document summarized above while conveniently ignoring other significant sections [which stand against the Turkish propaganda].

### Conclusion

[...] It was not until 1962, when it was realized that the paramilitary organization of the Turks [TMT], supplied with arms from Turkey was strong and ready for action, that the Greek Cypriots formed the Organization to be used for defense purposes. As for the 'Akritas Plan', it was not a plan for future policy and action, but was written ex post facto to eliminate criticism of the policy already adopted and declared by Makarios, which was no longer the pursuit of the original objective of enosis, and to prevent precipitate action by irresponsible elements.

Unlike the second Turkish Cypriot document, signed by Kutchuk and Denktash,<sup>130</sup> the Greek Cypriot document did not have the blessing of the Greek Cypriot official leadership, Makarios and his ministers."

---

130. See also Chapters B27 and C6.

#### **C5-4: Authentic Evidence**<sup>131</sup>

From the personal archive of a leading member of “AKRITAS Organization”.<sup>117</sup>

“[...] Besides, those who pioneered the creation of the Organization, did not seek permission or consent from anyone [...].”

“[...] Originally Makarios, who at a later stage was informed of its creation said ‘I do not like parastatal Organizations’, although he fully realized that it constituted the only strong DEFENSE for the Greek Cypriots in the event of a Turkish attack. This defense could not be undertaken by the ‘ruptured’ Police Force or the non-existent ‘Cyprus Army’ but ONLY by the Organization.”

“It should be noted that during the same period the Turkish side continued the systematic arming and structuring of the Turkish-Cypriot parastatal Organization, in which there were actively involved Turkish-Cypriot members of the Police Force and of the gendarmerie. Therefore, the Police Force could not respond officially and dynamically. Furthermore, as until December 1963 the Turkish-Cypriots were participating in the Government, the Police Force, the Army, such a matter was impossible to be officially discussed. Two or three times the matter of the arming of the Turkish side was mentioned in the Council of Ministers, but of course the Turkish-Cypriot side categorically denied the existence of a Turkish-Cypriot parastatal Organization and dismissed the information received regarding the arm shipments and related activities”.

---

131. Secret, unreleased source.

“[...] During his personal meetings with the Turkish-Cypriot Vice-President Fazil Kutchuk, Makarios raised the subject strongly and brought to his attention the specific information he was given from time to time by the Organization. Besides refusing everything, Kutchuk naturally asked for ‘evidence’ and, equally naturally, such evidence could not be given.”

“An organization, in which hundreds of fighters were eventually actively involved and further hundreds were in the reserves, could not possibly stay ‘secret’. However, there were no public references and no official recognition.”

“[...] The Turkish side, in the knowledge of at least the English, was the first to begin arming itself and to create its own Organization [...] This is why the Greek-Cypriot community could not remain defenseless.”

“[...] I hope the political fabrication that the confrontations in Cyprus were due to a ‘climate of distrust’ between the two communities and to ‘the suppression of the poor and weak Turkish-Cypriots by the Greek-Cypriot chauvinists’ is not adopted. The Turkish-Cypriots had an organized para-statal army, manned by Turkish permanent officers and soldiers, of well over 10.000 men.”

“The confrontations in Cyprus were the result of a political planning in Turkey for the stage by stage partitioning of Cyprus, with the participation of the then Turkish-Cypriot Vice-President Fazil Kutchuk and of the then President of the Turkish Communal Chamber Rauf Denktash. Relevant document with minutes of a meeting held in Ankara, as well as a document for the strategic partition that bears the signatures of

Turkish Ministers and of the Turkish military, together with those of Kutchuk and Denktash, was found in the safe of a Turkish-Cypriot minister.”<sup>132</sup>

“[...] All those who draw conclusions safely after the events, must take into consideration the situation as it stood at the time, when the very existence of the State was under threat and doubt and the State security forces faced chaos and the danger of liquidation.”

### **C5-5: Christodoulos Christodoulou**<sup>133</sup>

The assistant leader of the “AKRITAS Organization”, Dr. Christodoulos Christodoulou, gives his own original evidence.<sup>134</sup> He will be quoted at length,

“When one refers to historical events, which left their mark and determined the fate of the [Greek] Cypriot people, who have honoured with their struggles the Greek history and the Nation in an exceptional manner, there is no room for falsification, or exaggeration, or subjectivity. Above all, there is no room for counterfeiting history.”

“[...] The Greek-Cypriot leadership side was not deprived of information. As a matter of fact, a special branch at the Central Information Service was assigned to

---

132. It is dated ‘September 1963’ and it was published in whole by ex President of the Republic of Cyprus Glafkos Clerides in his book ‘My deposition’.

133. Dr. Christodoulos Christodoulou served as Minister of Interior Affairs and as Minister of Finance during the presidency of Glafkos Clerides and as Governor of the Central Bank of the Republic of Cyprus during the presidency of Tassos Papadopoulos.

134. Interview by Lazaros Mavros in newspaper “SIMERINI”, 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> October 2008.

watch closely the unlawful activities and efforts made to create, arm, training and action plans of the TMT. There was plenty of information sourcing directly from the Turkish-Cypriot side. The political leader of that situation was Rauf Denktash, who was the hard, the uncompromising, the extremist, and the military leader was a high rank Turkish officer, dedicated to the Turkish Embassy in Nicosia, the so called Bozkurt.”

“The Greek-Cypriot part of the Cypriot government that was privy to this information, was not of course disclosing it to the Turkish ministers. Makarios and equally Clerides, as well as all around them, like Polycarpos Yiorkatzis, Tassos Papadopoulos and other important personalities had adopted, under the persistent exhortation of the Greek government, a policy of tolerance, hoping to overcome the problem without any escalation towards collision, which our side wished to avoid. Archbishop Makarios and the Greek ERE government of Constantinos Karamanlis, were kept informed of the Turkish arm shipments, through the Cyprus branch of the Greek Central Information Office.”

“The basic arms our men in Cyprus had in their possession were hunting rifles. We had some dozens of short distance automatics ‘sten’, ‘marsip’ and ‘sterling’, a few ‘bren’ light machine-guns, a good number of ‘martini’ rifles and four ‘tourtores’ heavy machine-guns, two of which we used during our two large scale counter-attacks in defending against the Turkish attacks, on 24 and 25 December 1963. One of the counter-attacks was led by Tasos Marcou towards the Severi Mills, and the second towards the Omorphita area, under

Christakis Masonides and other officers of the Cypriot Army. We also had two 'bazookas', which were very little used, one in Nicosia and the other in Larnaca. At a later stage we secured two more, one of which was used in Paphos. However, the biggest part of our weapons was composed of hunting rifles."

"We were moving between two self-conflicting objectives: One was 'to avoid engagement at all costs' [...] the other was 'the responsibility of Makarios and all those around him, to protect the Hellenism of Cyprus against a possible attack by the Turks', who were acting methodically, were being trained and armed by the orders of Ankara."

"In relation to the claim that 'the conflict was incited by Polycarpus Yiorkatzis and his men (bombing of the Bairaktari and Omerie mosques, bombing of the Marcos Drakos statue etc), the answer is crystal clear: Beyond the undoubted fact that Makarios and Polycarpus Yiorkatzis (or any other faithful person to Makarios) never wanted to create armed conflict, as they were in good position to estimate the painful consequences of such an action, while weighing out and appraising the situation, we knew that whatever the result of an armed confrontation, we would end up with victims. We also knew, that nobody could predict the political outcome of such an action. These estimates were carried out by experienced people who had the knowledge. The same estimates were also made by the Greek government, which knew in every detail what was happening on our side, as well as on the Turkish-Cypriot side, the TMT etc. We all had and shared the same responsibility. Therefore all

these claims are totally unfounded.”<sup>135</sup>

“Even if we had the intention ‘we to initiate the incidents’, we would be totally stupid, frivolous and irresponsible to order the attacks while being totally unprepared. Even when the attacks indeed started on 21 December 1963, our side was unarmed, weak and unprepared to face the events, a fact that was proved by the developments [...]”

“The Organization was the product of the natural insecurity that was created by the chauvinistic attitude of Turkey and of the Turkish-Cypriot extremists, right after the signing of the Agreements and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. Some people [...] reach one-sided conclusions, without considering all or not the real facts. I am impressed by the fact that even books are written, having as main source of information the US and British national archives. Hence my question: Why not our own archives? Why not our own sources? Why not asking us, who have lived through all the events? And how can the English be trustful, when everybody knows their role at the time and even after? Regarding the Americans, what knowledge did they have of the events in relation to the everyday facts, let alone that they also have demonstrated how much they favour the Turkish interests and policies, because of course of their own interests? I ask again: Why not be us, who lived these events, as from the leader of the Organization, the invisible but real leader, the

---

135. Among other documents, the well known letter by Evangelos Averoff Tositsas to Makarios (November 1963), in which he made the dramatic plea: “I beg you my Despot, to do what you can, whatever is possible, so to avoid a conflict with the other side, which might possibly lead to a catastrophe beyond Cyprus. We also have Hellenism in Constantinople and Smyrna, which will suffer”.

Ethnarch Makarios, through to the last member?”

“Our plans [the AKRITAS Organization] were not aggressive, but defensive. Yes, counter-attacks were indeed included in our plans, but as part of self-defense to recapture possible lost areas. The plans were not aggressive, in the sense of aiming to capture villages or areas in which Turks lived, so to exterminate them. On this I am categorical. There is nowhere, the slightest element to point to such a claims and, regrettably, these claims constitute an unjust and incomprehensible self-whipping and distortion of history, which purposely shifts blame on our side to the point of offering forgiveness to the Turkish invasion [...]”

“Greece was fully aware of the training given to us by Greek officers and officers of ELDIK.”

“The bombing of the mosques and Marcos Drakos statue was the work of the organs of TMT. The same method they used in 1958, bombing the Press Office of the Turkish Consul in the Turkish sector of Nicosia, as an excuse to unleash their anti-Greek attacks, as well as in 1955 against the Turkish Consul in Thessaloniki, which initiated the pogrom events in Constantinople, for which later Prime Minister Menderes was tried, sentenced and hanged. These are historical facts and I am astonished for journalists/article writers pretend to ignore or prefer to use the British and American Archives, in order to justify Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriots.”

“The claim that supposedly ‘Yiorkatzis, under the control of foreign secret services, was more or less a secret associate and collaborator of Rauf Denktash in the

preparation of the armed confrontation between the two communities', is not only a fabrication, a fantasy or a simple distortion of history, but a criminal thinking that aims the character assassination of people, who, irrespective of their possible mistakes, have written with their blood a legendary history during the years 1955-1959. I challenge anyone to produce even one piece of proof that will justify such conclusions and such statements."

"The plans of the Turkish extremists, of TMT and of Denktash were denounced by two important personalities of the Turkish-Cypriot community, the two journalists Aihan Hikmet and Ahmet Gurkan, who dared to challenge publicly Denktash's objectives and armed preparations, which to their minds were leading to the eventually unavoidable, hence they were murdered by Denktash. The information we had on this subject was undisputable. They assassinated them because they opposed Denktash and his preparation to abolish the legitimate State by TMT, in full knowledge of the Turkish Chief of Staff. In my presence, Yiorkatzis repeatedly expressed his admiration and respect for these two persons, revealing that their assassination was the work of Denktash and TMT."

"With the knowledge of Makarios and without doubting the patriotism of the simple followers of the party, AKEL was kept out of the Organization for two reasons: First, because of the prejudice that existed since the time of the EOKA struggle and continued thereafter, because of the policy followed at the time by the then leadership of AKEL vis-à-vis the Liberation Struggle. Second, because the AKEL policy, as always, could not see the insecurity that the Turkish arming was

creating, in view of AKEL's belief that, by having contacts with the equivalent Communist Party of the Turkish-Cypriots, the events could be prevented. I wish it was like that, but it was not."

"The house where the children with their mother were found dead, was situated in an area in the Turkish sector, which no Greek-Cypriot armed forces had ever reached. The Organization's order to all members, which was punishable by execution if not obeyed, was clear: 'Do not touch civilians, but neither a fighter as from the moment he surrenders'. Therefore, I reject as fabrication and rape of history the claim, that supposedly 'it was our policy to exterminate the Turkish-Cypriots.'"

"The Turks were continuously trained by officers of TURDIK at their military camp and at outside areas, even in the house of the Turkish-Cypriot football team 'Tsetikayia'. TMT, controlling at the time the 40% of the Police force and the Turkish-Cypriot Chief of the Gendarmerie, could easily move around their weapons. Most of the Turkish-Cypriot policemen had previously served as reservists for the English police acting against EOKA, under the orders of the secret organization 'VOLKAN', which later amalgamated with and eventually totally absorbed by TMT."

"On 26 December 1963 a truce was declared, followed by the intervention of the English as peacemakers, who managed to impose the Green Line with the signature of Glafkos Clerides, as directed by Makarios. At that point of time, it was decided that all forces should be under one single coordinator. Turkey was threatening to invade Cyprus, we appealed to the United Nations, who issued the resolutions for a UN peace force. At

the same time, it was decided by both governments in Cyprus and Greece, that somebody had to come to Cyprus to put an order and establish a real military force, providing compulsory military service and training, so that the different groups would be liquidated and a real army would be created, hence the establishment of the National Guard in June 1964.”

“In March or April 1964, I visited Athens by orders of Makarios. I was received by an official of the Cypriot Embassy in Athens, I visited General George Grivas-Digenis at his house and I handed him a letter [which Makarios authorized Yiorkatzis to sign], by which the Cypriot leadership was calling upon him to come to Cyprus and put in order the National Guard. So it happened. In parallel, the Greek government of George Papandreou, in agreement with the government of Cyprus, initiated the secret dispatches of Greek troops to Cyprus, to assist in confronting the Turkish threats of invasion.”

### **C6: “The 13 points”**

Another Turkish contention is that “Makarios was to blame for the 1963 events, because of his decision to modify the constitution, hence his 13 point amendments”.

Sir Arthur Clark, the British High Commissioner in Cyprus in 1963, was directly involved with the modifications.

Archbishop Makarios wanted to modify the unworkable Constitution and Sir Arthur Clark was ordered by London to overlook these amendments, in order that they “would affect as little as possible the Turkish interests”.

However, Sir Arthur Clark in different reports and discussions in London regarded Archbishop Makarios's decision to amend the most unworkable points of the Constitution, as totally logical and justified.

On 10 March 1971, Kieran Prendergast<sup>136</sup>, who was working in the Foreign & Commonwealth Office at the time, was asked to prepare the full story around Makarios's 13-point amendment proposal. This request came from the new British High Commissioner in Nicosia Robert Humphrey Edmonds, who was interested in knowing the real facts, after Archbishop Makarios had told him that "he was guided in drafting them by Sir Arthur Clark".

Kieran Prendergast wrote:

"In Y.E.'s letter of 22 February to Mr. Seconde (Foreign Office) below, Y.E. gave the Archbishop's account of Sir Arthur Clark's involvement in the drafting of the thirteen points.

You also said, that you would be interested to know whether FCO records confirmed His Beatitude's version.

I have been through our records of the period. The sequence of events is as follows:

- a) In the Despatch dated 17 October 1963 to HIM, the Ambassador at Ankara, the Foreign Secretary said, that it had become clear that the Greek Cypriot leadership were dissatisfied with some of the basic Articles of the Cyprus constitution.

---

136. Later, Kieran Prendergast was made "Sir" and, during the Annan Plan period, visited Cyprus as Acting Secretary General of the United Nations.

The Archbishop had hinted, that the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance should be denounced as incompatible with the independent status of Cyprus.

Her Majesty's Government was concerned about the serious situation, which would follow failure to settle present difficulties amicably. H.M. the Ambassador at Ankara was instructed to persuade the Turkish Government to agree, that reasonable proposals for a modification of the more unworkable points of the Constitution should be discussed.

Sir Arthur Clark was instructed to warn the Archbishop about the dangers of unilateral action. He was to urge him to proceed by means of discussion and negotiation, and, as a first measure, to formulate proposals in writing, of a kind which would offer the prospect of constructive discussion with the Turks.

He was also to try to ensure that the resulting proposals were reasonable and fair to Turkish interests.

- b) Sir Arthur Clark reported on 31 October 1963, that the Archbishop had received his representations constructively and had agreed 'to formulate proposals for presentation to Dr. Kutchuk'.
- c) Sir Arthur Clark reported separately, that the Archbishop had volunteered 'that the Cyprus Foreign Minister should discuss with him [Sir Arthur Clark] proposals, during drafting to be put to the Turks. This proposal was accepted by the Commonwealth Office.
- d) Sir Arthur Clark also put to the Commonwealth Office his own ideas, about what constituted

‘reasonable proposals to remedy difficulties over the application of the Constitution’.

There are ten of these, eight of which are broadly comparable to proposals made by the Archbishop in the thirteen points.

- e) Sir Arthur Clark was offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the thirteen points, at two stages in their drafting.

On 14 November 1963 he replied to a letter by the Archbishop dated 12 November 1963, enclosing the thirteen points in skeletal form. Sir Arthur Clark offered comments of substance on these points.

On 26 November Sir Arthur Clark sent Mr. Spyros Kyprianou [the Cyprus Foreign Minister] a detailed commentary on a full draft of the thirteen points. Some of the suggested amendments were written into the finalised version of the thirteen points.

It could, therefore, be argued that Sir Arthur Clark (albeit on instructions from H.M. Government) did indeed encourage the President [Archbishop Makarios] to put forward proposals to the Vice-President [Dr. Fazil Kutchuk] for the amendment of the 1960 Constitution [...].”

London’s deepest worry was the status of the British Bases in Cyprus. Any attempt to alter the London and Zurich agreements would automatically affect this status, a possibility the British wanted to avoid, also because it would deprive Turkey of its “right” to intervene [as planned] to impose its partition plans.

Sir Arthur Clark and the British Government were fully aware of the Turkish plans and intentions (as revealed by

the captured document in Minister Plumer's office<sup>137</sup>), long before the December 1963 Turkish attacks.

Sir Arthur Clark had calculated accurately, that the Turkish Cypriots would use the Makarios's proposal for amendments of the unworkable elements of the Constitution, as a pretext to proceed with their long organised plan for partition.<sup>138</sup>

### **C7: August 1964 – Turkish bombardment of Tylleria**

On 27 August 1964, Mr. A. G. Soteriades, of the Cyprus High Commission in London, organised an exhibition of photographs of the Turkish air attacks on Tylleria (Cyprus), in an effort to enlighten the British Media, Politicians and the public of the suffering of the people of Cyprus.

This is what he said in his opening statement:

“The duty I am here to perform this afternoon is a painful but none the less imperative duty. Painful, because it is connected with an exhibition relating to the recent savage and indiscriminate Turkish air attacks on Cyprus; and imperative, because the British public have never had the opportunity of seeing for themselves the tragic consequences of what Turkey has described as a ‘limited police action’.

For almost 48 hours on August 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, waves of Turkish military aircraft carried out continuous attacks on North-West Cyprus, killing and wounding innocent people, among the women and children.

Napalm bombs and rockets were freely used and

---

137. See also Chapter B27

138. Foreign & Commonwealth Office Document FCO 9/1353

schools, churches and hospitals were destroyed.

Photographs of the devastating results of these inhuman attacks have never been published in this country and, as we rightly feel that Cyprus is getting very little from the British Press, we have invited you to the opening of this exhibition. Our object is to fill the gap; it is not our intention to promote hatred or enmity, but to enable as many British people as possible to see for themselves the extent of the Turkish ferocity and the actual suffering of the Cypriot people for whom not even sympathy has been expressed [...].”

This is how the Greek Cypriot, communist affiliated, community newspaper in London, *To Vima*, covered the Turkish attacks:

“Cyprus is attacked. Brutal air bombardment and firing by Turkish Air Force planes [...] Dead and thousands injured [...] Whole villages disappeared. Hell of fire, horror and fear. A NATO airplane with Turkish pilot has been shot down [...]”.<sup>139</sup>

“Blood from the blood veins of hundreds of brother Cypriots has already been despatched to the victims of the barbarians. Last Tuesday people queued to give blood [...]”.<sup>140</sup>

“The bloody scene of the Cyprus tragedy is still open”.<sup>141</sup>

---

139. Newspaper “TO VIMA”, London 10 August 1964.

140. Newspaper “TO VIMA”, London 21 August 1964.

141. Newspaper “TO VIMA”, London 28 August 1964, carrying pictures of charcoaled Greek Cypriots from the Turkish napalm bombs. The newspaper called Tylleria “the Hiroshima of Cyprus”.

### **C7-1: 1967 – The Clandestine Return of the Planted Terrorist**

Press Release by the Cyprus Public Information Office, dated 31 October 1967:

“This morning three unknown persons landed secretly by boat in the area of Ayios Theodoros, Karpas peninsular. After being spotted, they were arrested by joint action of the National Guard and the Police. The arrested persons were later identified as: Raouf Denktash, Osman Edjan Konouk and Errol Ibrahim.

While being interrogated, Denktash said he came to Cyprus on a secret mission to put into effect certain orders and directions of the Turkish Government. As stated by the arrested, the boat was carried by a Turkish vessel up to the territorial waters of Cyprus. Both Denktash and the other two persons arrested were armed. Amongst other things, a valise was seized containing important documents.

According to the High Commissioner at the time Sir N. Costar:

“Denktash, President of the Turkish Cypriot communal Chamber, after visiting Turkey in 1964 he was refused re-entry to Cyprus. He reportedly made a clandestine visit to the North coast during the August 1964 fighting and has since been in Ankara”.<sup>142</sup>

---

142. Foreign & Commonwealth Office Document FCO 9/63.

### **C8: 1964 – British Plan “The Future of Cyprus”**

All British actions were in line with their revised (1964) Plan for the Partition of Cyprus, which was formulated in consideration of all previous plans studied during 1955-59. These plans were in alliance with Turkish interests, plans, proposals and demands.

These plans had been worked on intensively in 1975-76 when the terminology of “two constituent states” was first introduced during discussions and studies for a solution for the Cyprus issue, between the Foreign Office and the State Department.

Finally, these machinations surfaced in full force in the name of “The Annan Plan”, providing for “two consistent states”. The Annan Plan was rejected overwhelmingly by the 76% of the Greek Cypriots, in the referendum of 24<sup>th</sup> April 2004.<sup>143</sup>

That explicit procedural plan of 1964 was carried through step by step, paving the way to the Turkish invasion: By the withdrawal of the Greek Troops [Division] from the Island, by toppling of the democratic government in Greece and installing the Junta, who assisted the plan by instigating the coup against President Makarios on 15 July 1974 and by deciding “not to intervene even if Turkey invaded”<sup>144</sup>, hence the “green light” given to the Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit to invade Cyprus on 20 July 1974.<sup>145</sup>

---

143. Foreign Office Document FO 371/177827 – 1964 Plan “The Future of Cyprus”.

144. This was a decision the British had taken in December 1963 and was carried through, in implementation of their revised “Plan for Partition” of 1964.

145. The “green light” was given on 17 July 1974, by the British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Foreign Secretary James Callaghan.

## **C9: British Military cooperation with the Turkish Cypriots**

### **C9-1: The Facts**

As it has been demonstrated in this book, the British cooperation with the Turkish element against the Greek Cypriots began as early as 1955 and intensified after the beginning of the EOKA 1955-59 struggle for the Union of Cyprus with Greece.

The period as from early 1964 through at least the departure of the Greek Division in 1967, is blackened by incidents of pro-Turkish British involvement. British Intelligence Officers were involved in subversive activities on the island: They manufactured bombs, aiding Turks to bomb Turkish properties (to incriminate Greek Cypriots furthering Turkish objectives), espionage etc.

Their main objective was “to de-stabilise the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, bring chaos and confusion and assist the Turks in the furtherance and execution of their long term plans”.

In February 1964, Archbishop Makarios, President of the Republic of Cyprus, handed a document to the British High Commissioner in Nicosia regarding those activities. An extract reads as follows:

“It is desired to draw attention to certain recent occurrences, which have given rise to public anxiety and an increase of tension and have caused great concern to the Government of the Republic.

The peace-keeping Force was to be composed of the forces of the United Kingdom already stationed

in Cyprus, aiming to assist the Government of the Republic in its effort to secure the preservation of Cease Fire and the restoration of peace.

The original number composing the force was probably considered too small for the duties it had to perform. However, the number of the Force has lately been more than doubled, by reinforcements from outside Cyprus, without the prior consent of the Government of the Republic.

Moreover, the sphere of activities of the Force is being enlarged, to an extent beyond that necessary for the achievement of its purpose and in such a manner as to infringe on Government's functions.

The following are some illustrations of the enlargement of activities of the Force, the assumption by it of Governmental powers and duties, and its interference with the normal functioning of the State:

- a) On the 20<sup>th</sup> January 1964 a British officer named Lieutenant Colonel Thursby went by helicopter to Amiandos and informed Mr. Marcher Henning, the Manager of the Cyprus Asbestos Mines Co. Ltd., that 'on the following morning he would come to collect all the explosives in the stores on the mine'. He further informed the Manager that he was authorised to do that by 'Joint Committee'. On being asked 'whether there was an agreement with the Senior Mines Officer in this respect' he said that 'the Senior Mines Officer had been informed' and then he left. On the following day, 20 British soldiers went to Amiandos and removed from the store

of the company a quantity of explosives.

As a matter of fact, no notification had been given to the Senior Mines Officer and no decision in this respect by any 'Joint Committee' was produced.

- b) Mr. Ewans, General Manager of the Cyprus Sulphur and Copper Co. Ltd (known as Limni Mines) delivered his own explosives [...]"<sup>146</sup>

On 10 April 1964, President Makarios had also written to General Gyani<sup>147</sup>, complaining and listing instances, when British troops who were serving with the United Nations Contingent did nothing to stop Turks from firing and injuring Greek Cypriots.

### **C9-2: British Military Personnel against Greek Cypriots**

"The British have been uncovered totally - They arm the Turkish terrorists - An airman has been arrested, carrying mortars and correspondence to the rebels - He made shocking statements - The British should no longer be part of the UN International Force [...] British planes landed at Akrotiri base, transporting 150 Turks dressed as British officers. They were taken to the Army quarters of the Akrotiri base, but nothing is known of the secret meeting they had with the British [...]"<sup>148</sup>

---

146. Acting High Commissioner in Nicosia to the Commonwealth Relations Officer in London, 26 February 1964 - Ministry of Defence Document DEFE 11/443.

147. At that time in charge of the United Nations Force in Cyprus.

148. Newspaper "PHILELEFTHEROS", Nicosia, 28 May 1964.

The British RAF<sup>149</sup> airman arrested by the Cypriot police was Keith Marley. He was tried and convicted for 15 years imprisonment, for conspiring against the Republic of Cyprus. The British government managed to secure his transfer to London, supposedly to continue his imprisonment in his own country, but according to new evidence “Marley soon went free [...]”<sup>150</sup>.

“Marley case – As reported in more detail in previous telegram, RAF has interrogated two RAF Corporals, Batchelor and Bass, whose names were given by Marley.

The preliminary reports indicate that, all three persons, were not only engaged in gun-running on a large scale, but were deeply implicated in Turkish underground activities, including both spying on Greek Cypriots and actively assisting preparation for bringing in men and arms from Turkey. It is more than likely, that further investigations will reveal implication of more British servicemen.

The Greek Cypriot police have already asked to interrogate Batchelor, whose name was given to them by Marley. They have not yet asked about Bass, whose name we think they do not yet have and whose activities are the most damaging [...]”<sup>151</sup>

The British authorities in Cyprus quickly took Bass under their protection:

“[...] Main reason for wanting Bass away is the

---

149. British Royal Air Force

150. BBC Radio 4, January 2006.

151. British Defence files - British High Commission in Nicosia to Commonwealth Relations Office London, 31 May 1964.

extreme sensitivity of information in his possession about plans for Turkish intervention, which he might disclose if interrogated by Greek Cypriots [...] Almost impossible to remove him, without arousing suspicion [...] An explanation could, of course, be provided for his transfer (e.g. unexpected posting from London, medical grounds, possible threat to his life) [...]”<sup>152</sup>

Bass was involved in designing a raft for the Turks (under construction in Cyprus at the time) to facilitate underwater unloading of stores from submarines. He had details of second arms run known to him by a UN vehicle from Limniti to Nicosia and had in his possession names of additional Turkish Cypriot contacts.

As a frogman, Bass had agreed to assist the Turks to meet Turkish submarines, which were to arrive over a period of 7 days, for the landing of Turkish mainland volunteers at the rate of 200-300 per day. He claimed to know many details of Turkish plans, including scope and method of landing operations, and that the Turkish Cypriots would partition the island. He knew that operations were to commence 20/21 June 1964. He also knew that United Nations personnel (other nationalities as well as British) were involved in assisting TMT and he had personally escorted one UN vehicle carrying arms. Hence, the anxiety of the British Government to get him out of Cyprus no matter what.

Corporal Heron, Sergeant Jones and Senior Aircraftsmen Tuft and Offard were some of the British servicemen involved in assisting the Turks through gun-running, supply of high power wireless receivers, spying for them etc. Some had been spotted by the Cypriot authorities whilst others had not.

---

152. British Defence files - British High Commission in Nicosia to Commonwealth Relations Office London, 3 June 1964.

The British Government in London was anxious to remove them from Cyprus as quickly as possible.<sup>153</sup>

### **C9-3: The “disappearance” of Major E.F.L. Macey and his driver L. Platt**

Major Macey was one of those British officers attached to the United Nations Force in Cyprus as a Liaison Officer, but were paid by the British Government. Macey, an arrogant intelligence officer, was also a liaison officer to the Vice-President Dr. Fazil Kutchuk. Major Macey and his driver were last seen in a Land Rover on 7 June 1964.

Major Macey mastered both the Greek and Turkish language and worked for the Turks. He provided the Turkish Cypriots with arms and ammunition, offered them training and, in general, he headed the preparation for an eventual Turkish invasion.

The British at the time knew very well that Turkey intended to invade Cyprus on the 26 June 1964, the date that the UN Forces mandate would expire. At the same time, Archbishop Makarios intended to ask for the immediate exclusion of the British Contingent from the UN Force, because of the incriminating evidence accumulated against British Military personnel, who collaborated with the Turks against the Republic.

On 4 June 1964, the Government of Cyprus, in the face of massive information of Turkish preparations for an invasion and as an urgent measure of defence, formed the National Guard.

---

153. Ministry of Defence Documents DEFE 11/451 and DEFE 11/457.

The Turkish and the British governments made immediate representations to President Makarios, opposing the creation of the National Guard.

The British were indeed prepared to watch, and not intervene to stop the Turkish invasion [as, indeed, happened in 1974], having actively worked for the creation of the necessary circumstances to facilitate such a policy, according to the Turkish document dated 14 September 1963<sup>154</sup>, as well as the British plan for the “Future of Cyprus” of February 1964<sup>155</sup>.

#### **C9-4: “Get them all out of Cyprus for reasons of national policy”**

Following an urgent teleprinter conference on Wednesday 3 June 1964 (16:45 hours) between the Ministry of Defence in London, the Commander British Forces in Cyprus and the High Commissioner in Nicosia, and after reconsidering the position in Cyprus, the British decided that Corporal Bass (and others, at the discretion of the Commander of the Cyprus British Forces and the High Commissioner) should be sent back to England at once.<sup>156</sup>

In January 2006 the BBC Radio 4 in London, broadcast an investigation into Britain’s role in the 1964 Cyprus conflict and revealed that there was indeed a spy ring working against the Greek Cypriots at the time, referring to the arrest of airman Keith Marley and the disappearance of Major Macey.

---

154. See also Chapter B27

155. See also Chapter C8.

156. Ministry of Defense Document DEFE 11/451.

### **C9-5: Martin Packard and the myth of Ethnic cleansing**

The worst accusation against the Greek Cypriots was that of the “slaughtering 27 Turkish Cypriots in the Nicosia General Hospital in December 1963”, came from British Naval Lt. Commander Martin Packard<sup>157</sup>.

This atrocious accusation was made in an article in “The Guardian” on 2 April 1988, written by the Chief Editor Peter Preston, a very good friend of Packard since 1963/64 when both were in Cyprus.

Martin Packard repeated this accusation on 10 February 1994, in the documentary “Dead or Alive” shown on British Channel 4 TV, which was primarily focused on the fate of the 1619 Greek Cypriots missing since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in July and August 1974. This is what Martin Packard said:

“The largest single element of these missing people, were the Turkish Cypriot patients at the General Hospital. Nothing had been heard, of any of them, it

---

157. Martin Packard was transferred from a NATO intelligence post in Malta to Cyprus in December 1963, to work with British General Peter Young and, later, as “Liaison Officer” with the newly formed United Nations Force. Married to a Greek at the time, he knew the Greek language quite well. He worked next to General Young and under the orders of Foreign and Commonwealth Undersecretary Sir Cyril Pickard, who was transferred and took over as acting High Commissioner in Nicosia immediately after the December 1963 Turkish attacks (replacing the High Commissioner Sir Arthur Clark, who was said to be going through some illness). Cyril Pickard returned to his post in London before Martin Packard, who left Cyprus in June 1964, days after the disappearance of his colleague Ted Macey and his driver (see Chapter C9-3). Throughout his service in Cyprus (also as ‘Liaison Officer’ with the newly formed UN Force) Martin Packard continued to be paid by Her Majesty’s Government, as he did at the NATO intelligence base in Malta. In January 1965, Martin Packard was awarded an OBE (Officer by Order of Chivalry of the British Empire) by the Queen.

was assumed that they were being held in custody somewhere. The outcome of my investigation suggested that they had all of them been killed in the General Hospital. They had been removed at night, the bodies from there had been taken out to outlying farms up in the region of Skilloura and, out there, they had been dismembered and passed through farm dicing machines and they had then been seeded into the plough land”.

As emerged five years later, this British officer Martin Packard was lying in public, feeling free to claim “his own investigation”, which however he has never produced.

Soon after the Channel 4 documentary, Fanoulla Argyrou<sup>158</sup> challenged the authenticity of these allegations and demanded from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office “access to the relevant documents” Packard had referred to during his statement, namely “some official documents” and “a report” he had prepared at the time. These “relevant documents” were no where to be seen.

Argyrou’s correspondence was extended to the Ministry of Defence and, after five years of intense persistence “to see the evidence”, the Foreign Office Minister came up with the answer that “those papers had gone missing”.

On 3 May 1999, however, another article appeared in “The Guardian” (also written by Packard’s good friend and ex Chief Editor Peter Preston) to WITHDRAW those unjust allegations against the Greek Cypriots. The main fact that surfaced after this second article, is that British Lt. Commander Martin Packard had actually no evidence whatsoever for his

---

158. A London based Greek Cypriot journalist and writer, known for her thorough research work.

allegations against the Greek Cypriots.

Evidence, though, as to how much the Turks used the unjustified Packard allegations as a front line tool to support their invasion of 1974, is confirmed by Peter Preston himself in the very same article:

“[...] A few weeks ago, Turkey’s UN ambassador in a letter to Kofi Annan (Secretary General of the United Nations) cited the story of the 27 patients as evidence of Greek Cypriot ethnic cleansing, which made Ankara’s invasion and the dismemberment of Cyprus inescapable [...]”.

Top secret documents titled “Operations in Cyprus, December 1963-February 1964” and classified “For UK Eyes Only”, which were released by the British National Archives well after 30 years, refer to the day by day events of that period. These documents make no mention at all of any such ghastly massacre in the Nicosia General Hospital. They merely report that on 26 December 1963 “[...] at 11:20 hours Turkish Nurses were escorted from General Hospital to Old City by Regiment patrol (evidently after Archbishop Makarios’s personal order)”.<sup>159</sup>

---

159. Ministry of Air Force Document AIR 20/11426.

## Chapter D: The Turkish Invasion of Cyprus, July & August 1974

### D1- “Co-patriots pay attention”<sup>160</sup>

“Co-patriots pay attention: In our special edition of last Tuesday, we published reports about the brutal invading Turkish attacks against the peaceful people of Kyrenia. Vandalisms and criminal attacks that shame the civilised world of the 20<sup>th</sup> century [...].

The sadistic rapes of women of all ages, the brutal mutilations of people whose only ‘crime’ is their Greek descent, the compelling of thousands of peaceful villagers to abandon and totally vacate their villages and towns to save their lives from the barbaric bombardments and the vandalism by the invaders, have been profiled in the British and foreign Press with the darkest colours. These actions have been vigorously condemned by any honest and democratic person.

The Editorial Committee of ‘TO VIMA’ expresses the sincere feelings of the thousands of our readers and supporters [...] and joins its voice with all those sincere people who love Cyprus and its historic people, hate fascism, imperialism and the national suppression and work for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, the restoration of the Republic of Cyprus [...] and for the restoration of the independence, territorial and sovereign integrity of Cyprus, for the salvation of our country [...]”.

---

160. Newspaper “TO VIMA”, London, Thursday 8 August 1974.

## **D2: Newspaper THE SUN “BARBARIANS – Shame on them”<sup>161</sup>**

*“My fiancé and six men were shot dead. The Turkish soldiers laughed at me and then I was raped.” - GREEK CYPRIOT GIRL AGED 20*

*“The Turkish soldiers cut off my father’s hands and legs. Then they shot him while I watched.” - GREEK CYPRIOT WOMAN AGED 32*

*“They shot the men. My friend’s wife said ‘Why should I live without my husband?’ A soldier shot her in the head.” - GREEK CYPRIOT FARMER AGED 51*

A HORRIFYING story of atrocities by the Turkish invaders of Cyprus emerged today. It was told by weeping Greek Cypriot villagers rescued by United Nations soldiers.

THEY TOLD of barbaric rape at gunpoint [...] and threats of instant execution if they struggled.

THEY TOLD of watching their loved ones tortured and shot.

The villagers are from Trimithi, Karmi and Ayios Georgios, three farming communities west of the holiday town of Kyrenia, directly in the path of the Turkish Army.

They had been trapped since the fighting began two weeks ago and were only evacuated to Nicosia by the UN on Saturday. And today, at a Nicosia orphanage they told me their tales, simply and without any prompting.

A 20-year old girl in a pretty yellow and white dress sat under

---

161. Front Page Title, Newspaper “THE SUN”, London, 5 August 1974. Based on a Report from Cyprus of SUN reporter Iain Walker.

a painting of Jesus tending his flock, as she described how she was raped.

She had been visiting her fiancé who worked in a hotel near Kyrenia when the Turks attacked. For the first 24 hours she sheltered with other villagers in a stable until they were discovered by Turkish soldiers. She then watched as her fiancé and six other men were shot dead in cold blood, only a few minutes after they had been promised that they would not be harmed. She said:

*“After the shooting, a Turkish soldier grabbed me and pulled me into a ditch. I struggled and tried to escape but he pushed me to the ground. He tore at my clothes and they were ripped up to my waist. Then he started undressing himself.*

*Another Turkish soldier who was watching us had a nine-month-old baby in his arms and, trying to save myself, I shouted that the baby was mine. But they laughed at me and threw the baby to the ground. I was then raped and I fainted soon after.*

*When I came to my senses, I saw 15 other soldiers standing round watching. The first soldier was taking off my watch and engagement ring. Others were going to rape me, when one of them objected and told them not to be animals.*

*I will never forget him for saving me. He was quite unlike the rest, more like an Englishman with blond hair and blue eyes. He spoke to me in English. He helped me to my feet and said ‘All is OK now’.*

*The others tried to stop him, but he pulled out his gun and pushed his way through and gave me back to the other women.*

*When I had recovered, after a few hours, I went to where the bushes had been burned by the shelling and rubbed charcoal over my face and hands, so I would be ugly and they would not do that to me again.”*

The girl, too ashamed to reveal her name, added:

*“I cannot put into words the horror I feel at what happened to me. I think I would have preferred it if they had shot me.”*

Mrs Elena Mateidou, aged 28, was awakened by Turkish soldiers at Trimithi. She said:

*“My husband and father were told to take off all their clothes and they walked us down a dry river bed. Then the soldiers separated the women and children and ushered us behind some olive trees. I heard a burst of shooting and knew that they had been killed.*

*Later they took us back to the village with our hands tied behind our backs. Two soldiers took me into a room in a deserted house where they raped me. One of them held a gun to my head while it was happening and said ‘if I struggled he would shoot’. Afterwards, a soldier took off my wedding ring and wore it himself.*

*I saw another woman, being pulled into a bathroom where she too was raped.*

*Later, I went back to the olive groves and found the bodies of my husband and father along with five other men. My father had been stabbed and my husband shot in the belly.*

*Later, United Nations soldiers brought the villagers food. The Turks took it away and ate it themselves.”*

Another woman, who had been an intended rape victim, was Miss Frosa Meitani, aged 32. She said:

*“When I saw what was happening, I ran as quickly as I could. I saw the soldiers pointing guns at me, but I was too frightened to care. I hid in the olive groves and tried to get back to where I had been separated from my father. I watched from the bushes as they cut off his hands and legs below the knee with a double-edged cutting knife.*

*At first he screamed, and beat at them with his fists, but then he became quiet and did not utter a word. Then they shot him in the stomach while I watched.”*

Farmer Christos Savva Drakos, aged 51, saw his wife and two sons murdered. He said:

*“I was watering my orchard when the bombs started to explode. With the rest of the village we tried to run away through the groves and river beds but the Turks caught us and we surrendered. They searched us but no one had a gun.*

*Then the shooting started. It was one by one to start with, and I heard my 16-year old boy Georgios saying in a calm voice ‘Daddy, they have shot me’. I pulled him down and we fell behind a rock. He died there in my arms.*

*An officer had been attracted by the shooting and he ran up to see what was going on. He was furious with his men and ordered them to stop.*

*My wife and my other boy Nicos, who was only 13, were dead.*

*My friend’s wife was terribly badly injured and she told*

*the officer 'Why should I live without my husband? Shoot me'.*

*The officer shrugged his shoulders and walked off and a soldier shot her in the head."*

If the Turkish authorities deny these allegations I will remember the drawn face of that old man cowering in a corner, his body racked with tears. This elderly man was no actor, or a man ordered to lie for political propaganda. He was a poor man, who had lost everything he ever possessed or loved in the world.

Hotel manager Vasilios Efthimiou was the only survivor in a party of men seized by the Turks. He said:

*"They separated the men from the women and shot the 12 men. Those killed ranged from a 12-year old boy to an old man in his 90's."*

His brother-in-law was shot dead while holding Efthimiou's four year-old daughter, Estella, in his arms. Today, Estella showed where a bullet had hit her thigh.

Efthimiou saved his own life by snatching his other daughter, Charian, aged two, and running. He said:

*"I ran until my legs would carry me no longer, and I fell. I managed to make my way back later to a village, where all the women were trembling with fear and shock. I handed my daughter to my wife and said I must save myself.*

*I hid in a deep well in my sister's farm for seven days and nights, sitting on a little bar with my feet in the water. When I could not take any more I came up."*

Efthimiou and his 37-year old wife, Helen, run the Mermaid

Hotel at Six Mile Beach, Kyrenia, a popular hotel with British tourists.

PRESIDENT Glafkos Clerides of Cyprus flew into Athens today and accused Turkish troops of mass murders and rape. He also claimed about 20,000 Greeks had been forced out of their homes around Kyrenia.

THE TURKS issued a denial. A spokesman said:

*“The Turkish military authorities deny reports of killings and any other atrocities by Turkish troops in any area under Turkish occupation.”*

### **D3: The rapes of Greek Cypriot young girls, mothers and grandmothers**

As the hospitals of the Republic could not cope with the number of victims of repeated rapes by the Turks, the acting President of the Republic Glafkos Clerides, through the International Red Cross representative, asked the medical officers of the British Bases to help.

After consulting London and enacting appropriate legislation, so to protect the medical officers who became involved with treatment and abortions, on 22 October 1974 medical assistance commenced at the Princess Mary’s hospital in Akrotiri.

On 14 October 1974, the following immediate telegraph was sent from British Bases Cyprus to Foreign and Commonwealth Office London.

“We have been approached by Zuger, head of the International Red Cross Delegation, acting with the approval of both Denktash and Clerides, with

a request for assistance in the treatment of Greek Cypriot women raped by the Turks. The two leaders have agreed that 'the women victims of both sides should be returned with their families to their own communities for examination, treatment and release'. There are only two Turkish Cypriot cases so far, and Denktash is confident that these can be handled discreetly in the North [...]".<sup>162</sup>

The Greek Cypriot women raped by the Turks numbered thousands, and the number of necessary abortions almost one thousand.

#### **D4: "Turk atrocities: What secret report reveals"**<sup>163</sup>

"The Sunday Times" of London, having secured a copy of a secret Council of Europe Report which found Turkey guilty of violating seven articles of the European convention on Human Rights, published a first page massive indictment of the Ankara government for the murders, rapes and looting by the Turkish army in Cyprus, during and after the 1974 Turkish invasion.

With an "Insight Exclusive" titled "Turk atrocities: What secret report reveals" and to the fury of the Turkish government, the newspaper published extracts of that report.

#### **Sub-titled: "The terrible secrets of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus"**

The plight of Cyprus, with 40 per cent of the island still occupied by Turkish troops who invaded in the

---

162. Ministry of Air Force Document AIR 20/12651.

163. Newspaper "THE SUNDAY TIMES", London, 23 January 1977.

summer of 1974, is well known. But never before has the full story been told of what happened during and after the invasion. This article is based on the secret report of the European Commission of Human Rights. For obvious reasons, Insight has withdrawn the names of witnesses who gave evidence to the Commission.

## INSIGHT

### 1. Killing

Relevant Article of Human Rights Convention: “Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law.”

Charge made by Greek Cypriots: The Turkish army embarked on a systematic course of mass killings of civilians unconnected with any war activity.

Turkish Defence: None offered, but jurisdiction challenged [...].

### Evidence given to the commission:

Witness Mrs. K said that “on 21 July 1974, the second day of the Turkish invasion, she and a group of villagers from Elia village were captured when, fleeing from bombardment, they tried to reach a range of mountains. All 12 men arrested were civilians. They were separated from the women and shot in front of the women, under the orders of a Turkish officer. Some of the men were holding children, three of whom were wounded.”

Written statements referred to two more group killings [...] eyewitnesses told of the deaths of five men [...] 30 Greek Cypriot soldiers being held prisoners were killed by their captors [...].

Witness S gave evidence of two other mass killings at Palekythron village. In each case, between 30 and 40 soldiers, who had surrendered to the advancing Turks, were shot. In the second case, the witness said “the soldiers were transferred to the kilns of the village, where they were shot dead and burnt, in order not to leave details of what had happened”.

Witness H, a doctor, reported that “seventeen members of two neighbouring families, including ten women and five children aged between 2 and 9, were murdered in cold blood at Palekythron village”.

Further evidence of the killing is described in the doctor’s notes. They include:

- Execution by Turkish soldiers of eight civilian prisoners in the area of Prastio village, one day after the ceasefire on 16 August 1974.
- Killing by Turkish soldiers of five unarmed Greek Cypriot soldiers, who had sought refuge in a house at Voni village.
- Shooting of four women, one of whom survived by pretending she was dead.

Further evidence, taken in refugee camps in the form of written statements, described killings of civilians in homes, streets or fields, as well as the killing of people under arrest or in detention. Eight statements described the killing of soldiers not in combat; five statements referred to a mass grave found in Dherynia village.

Commission’s verdict: By fourteen votes to one, the commission considered there were “very strong indications of violation of Article 2 and killings committed on a substantial scale”.

## 2. Rape

Relevant Article of Human Rights Convention: “No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

Charge by Greek Cypriots: Turkish troops were responsible for wholesale and repeated rapes of women of all ages from 12 to 71, sometimes to such an extent that the victims suffered haemorrhages or became mental wrecks. In some areas, enforced prostitution was practised, all women and girls of a village being collected and put into separate rooms in empty houses where they were raped repeatedly.

In certain cases, members of the same family were repeatedly raped, some of them in front of their own children. In other cases, women were brutally raped in public.

Rapes were on many occasions accompanied by brutalities, such as violent biting of the victims causing severe wounding, banging their heads on the floor and wringing their throats almost to the point of suffocation.

In some cases, attempts to rape were followed by the stabbing or killing of the victims, including pregnant and mentally-retarded women.

### Evidence given to the commission:

Testimony of doctors C and H, who examined the victims, evidence by eyewitnesses and hearsay witnesses, and written statements from 41 alleged victims.

Doctor H said “he had confirmed rape in 70 cases”, including:

- A mentally-retarded girl of 24 was raped in her house by 20 soldiers. When she started screaming, they threw her from the second-floor window. She fractured her spine and was paralyzed.
- One day after their arrival at Voni village, Turks took girls to a nearby house and raped them.
- One woman from Voni village was raped on three occasions, by four persons each time. She became pregnant.
- One girl from Palekyhthro village, who was held with others in a house, was taken out at gunpoint and raped.
- At Tanvu village, Turkish soldiers tried to rape a 17-year old schoolgirl. She resisted and was shot dead.
- A woman from Gypsou village told Dr H that 25 girls were kept by Turks at Marathouvouno village as prostitutes.

Another witness said that “his wife was raped in front of their children”.

Witness S told of 25 girls, who complained to Turkish officers about being raped and were raped again by the officers.

A man reported that “his wife was stabbed in the neck while resisting rape”. His grand-daughter, aged 6, had been stabbed and killed by Turkish soldiers attempting to rape her.

A Red Cross witness said that “in August 1974, while

the island's telephones were still working, the Red Cross Society received calls [...] reporting rapes”.

The Red Cross also took care of 38 women released from Voni and Gypsou detention camps. All had been raped, some in front of their husbands and children. Others had been raped repeatedly, or put in houses frequented by Turkish soldiers.

These women were taken to Akrotiri hospital, in the British Base Area, where they were treated. Three were found to be pregnant. Reference was also made to several abortions performed at the base.

Commission's verdict: By twelve votes to one, the commission found that “the incidents of rape, described in the cases referred to, constitute ‘inhuman treatment’ in violation of Article 3, for which Turkey is responsible under the convention”.

### 3. Torture

Relevant Article of Human Rights Convention: Same as above under Rape.

Charge by Greek-Cypriots: Hundreds of people, including children, women and pensioners, were victims of systematic torture and savage and humiliating treatment during their detention by the Turkish army. According to the allegations, sometimes they were beaten to the extent of being incapacitated. Many were subjected to whipping, breaking of their teeth, knocking their heads against walls, beating with electrified clubs, stubbing of cigarettes on their skin, jumping and stepping on their chests and hands, pouring dirty liquids on them, piercing with bayonets etc.

Many, it was said, were ill-treated to such an extent that they became mental and physical wrecks. The brutalities complained of reached their climax after the ceasefire agreements; in fact, most of the acts described were committed at a time when Turkish armed forces were not engaged in any war activities.

Evidence given to the commission:

The main witness was a schoolteacher, one of 2,000 Greek Cypriot men deported to Turkey. He stated that he and his fellow detainees were repeatedly beaten after their arrest, on their way to Adana (Turkey), in jail in Adana and in prison camp at Amasia.

On ship to Turkey: “[...] That was another moment of terrible beating again. We were tied all the time. I lost sense of touch. I could not feel anything for about two or three months. Every time we asked for water or spoke we were being beaten”.

Arriving at Adana: “[...] then, one by one, they led us to prisons, through a long corridor [...] Going through that corridor was another terrible experience. There were about 100 soldiers from both sides with sticks, clubs and with their fists beating every one of us while going to the other end of the corridor. I was beaten at least 50 times until I reached the other end”.

In Adana, anyone who said he wanted to see a doctor was beaten. “Beating was on the agenda every day. There were one or two very good, very nice people, but they were afraid to show their kindness, as they told us”.

Witness P spoke of:

- A fellow prisoner who was kicked in the mouth. He lost several teeth “and his lower jaw came off in pieces”.
- A Turkish officer, a karate student, who exercised every day by hitting prisoners.
- Fellow prisoners who were hung by the feet over the hole of a lavatory for hours.
- A Turkish second lieutenant who used to prick all prisoners with a pin when they were taken into a yard.
- Doctor H evidenced that prisoners were in an emaciated condition on their return to Cyprus. On nine occasions he had found signs of wounds.
- The doctor gave a general description of conditions in Adana and in detention camps in Cyprus [...] as reported to him by former detainees:
- Food consisted of one-eighth of a loaf of bread a day, with occasional olives.
- There were two buckets of water and two mugs which were never cleaned, from which about 1,000 people had to drink.
- Toilets were filthy, with faeces rising over the basins.
- Floors were covered with faeces and urine.
- In Adana, prisoners were kept 76 to a cell, with three towels between them and one block of soap per eight persons per month, to wash themselves

and their clothes.

- One man had to amputate his own toes with a razor blade, as a consequence of ill-treatment. Caught in Achna with another man, they had been beaten up with hard objects. When he had asked for a glass of water he was given a glass full of urine. His toes were then stepped on until they became blue, swollen and eventually gangrenous. The other man was said to have been taken to hospital in Nicosia, where he agreed to have his legs amputated. He did not survive the operation.

According to witness S, “hundreds of Greek Cypriots were beaten and dozens were executed. In some cases they have cut off their ears, like in the case in Palekythro and Trahoni [...]”.

Verdict by commission: By twelve votes to one, the commission concluded that prisoners were in a number of cases physically ill-treated by Turkish soldiers. “These acts of ill-treatment have caused considerable injuries and, at least in one case, the death of the victim. By their severity they constitute ‘inhuman treatment’ in the sense of Article 3, for which Turkey is responsible under the convention”.

#### 4. Looting

Relevant Article of Human Rights Convention: “Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions”.

Charge by Greek Cypriots: In all Turkish-occupied areas, the Turkish army systematically looted Greek Cypriot houses and business premises.

Evidence given to the commission:

Witness C described the looting in the town of Kyrenia: “[...] During the first days, the looting of the shops was done by the army and was related to heavy things, like refrigerators, laundry machines, television sets etc. For weeks after the invasion, I watched Turkish naval ships taking on board the looted goods”.

Witness K, a barrister, described the pillage of Famagusta: “[...] organised, systematic, terrifying, shocking, unbelievable looting started [...] we heard the breaking of doors, some of them iron doors, smashing of glass, and we were waiting for them any minute to enter the house. This lasted for about four hours.”

Written statements by eyewitnesses of looting were corroborated in several reports by the secretary-general of the United Nations.

Verdict of the commission: By twelve votes to one, the commission accepted that “looting and robbery by Turkish troops and Turkish Cypriots had taken place on an extensive scale” and established that there had been extensive deprivation of possessions of Greek Cypriots.

**D5: “The last church standing in occupied Cyprus”<sup>164</sup>**

One lone church struggles to survive in a land where hundreds have been damaged or destroyed. But this is no ordinary land; it is the very ground where Apostle Paul took his first

---

164. Based on a reportage by Michelle A. Vu, “THE CHRISTIAN POST”, 28 April 2008.

missionary journey to proclaim salvation through Jesus Christ to the Roman Empire.

Now, 2,000 years later, the small Mediterranean island of Cyprus is divided into two with the northern third occupied by Turkey.

According to The Republic of Cyprus, in the span of three decades under Turkish control, more than 530 churches and monasteries have been pillaged, vandalized, or destroyed in the occupied areas,

“I cannot say that the destruction of churches is encouraged openly by the Turkish government. All I can say is that it is taking place in the area that is under direct control of the Turkish military, and I leave you to make your own conclusions from that”.<sup>165</sup>

Since its 1974 invasion, Turkey has controlled the northern part of Cyprus which it refers to as the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.” It is worth noting that no other state in the world except Turkey recognizes this entity.

Starting in 2003, Greek-Cypriots again were “allowed” to cross the border between the [free] Republic of Cyprus and the area under Turkish occupation control. It was around this time, that scholars and photographers were able to visit occupied Cyprus, to document the destruction of historic churches and artefacts.

St. Mamas Church, in the northwest town of Morphou, is the only notable church that is known to be semi-active in Turkey-controlled Cyprus.<sup>166</sup> The Turkish occupying regime

---

165. Andreas Kakouris, Cyprus Ambassador to the United States, to CHRISTIAN POST.

166. Source of information: The New York-based “HELLENIC TIMES” and the Embassy of The Republic of Cyprus in the United States.

sometimes give permission to the remaining Morphou residents, who since 1974 live as refugees in the free areas of the Republic of Cyprus, to worship in the church.

- According to statistics of the Republic of Cyprus other churches have not fared so well:
- About 133 churches, chapels and monasteries have been converted to military storage facilities, stables and night-clubs.
- A further number of 78 churches have been converted to mosques.
- Agia Anastasia church, in Lapithos, was converted into a casino hotel, while Sourp Magar Armenian monastery, founded in the medieval period, was converted into a cafeteria.
- A Neolithic settlement at the Cape of Apostolos Andreas-Kastros, in the occupied area of Rizokaprasso, a site declared as an ancient monument by the Republic of Cyprus, was bulldozed by the Turkish Army, in order to plant two of its flagpoles on top of the historic hill.

“This is not a Muslim-Christian issue [...] I don’t think the Cyprus problem has ever been a religious issue between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots [...] If the Turkish government hadn’t given the ‘green light’ on the destruction of churches and artefacts, they have not given the ‘red light’ either [...] So it is, either directly taking place or with their blind eye or whatever you want to call it. But they are responsible for what is taking place there”.<sup>167</sup>

---

167. Andreas Kakouris, Cyprus Ambassador to the United States, to CHRISTIAN POST.

Furthermore:

- Over 15.000 portable religious icons were stolen and auctioned off around the world.
- Relics -which include fine icons, mosaics and frescoes from ancient Byzantine era- have turned up at auction houses around the world, including at the prestigious Sotheby's in New York.
- In January 2007, six icons were returned to the Church of Cyprus, after being smuggled out of the country. They were to be put up for auction at Sotheby's.
- Back in 1988, four pieces of an invaluable work of art, dating between 525 and 530 A.D., were recovered when a Turkish art dealer offered to sell it to an American antique dealer for \$1 million. The American dealer contacted the Paul Getty Museum in Malibu to resell the mosaics for \$20 million. The museum then informed the Cypriot Church about the art work.

In the end, the courts of the United States ruled that the Cypriot Church was the legitimate owner of the pieces, and they are now on display in the Byzantine Museum in Nicosia.

According to the Republic of Cyprus, it is estimated that more than 60.000 ancient artefacts have been illegally transferred to other countries. Sadly, most of these artefacts have yet to be recovered.

Cyprus has some of the finest collections of Byzantine art in the world, offering scholars and others the priceless study on the development of Byzantine wall-painting from the 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century until the 18<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The United States has recognized Cyprus' endangered cultural heritage, and in 1999 and 2003 the U.S. Treasury Department issued emergency import restrictions on Byzantine Ecclesiastical and Ritual Ethnological Materials from Cyprus.

In 2002, the United States and the Republic of Cyprus signed a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the import restrictions on pre-classical and classical archaeological objects from Cyprus. The Memorandum was amended and renewed in 2006 and 2007 to include additional artefacts.

“The Cyprus issue has been ignored for decades by the United States [...] Although there are issues that appear to be more important than the Cyprus issue, because we don't have that immediacy of seeing deaths or events on a daily basis in Cyprus and thankfully, that does not make the continuing occupation by Turkey of the northern part of Cyprus any more acceptable». <sup>168</sup>

---

168. Andreas Kakouris, Cyprus Ambassador to the United States, to CHRISTIAN POST.

## Epilogue

On 20 July 1974, about 40.000 Turkish soldiers, backed by the Turkish air force and the Turkish navy, raided and illegally invaded the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, in violation of the Charter of the Security Council of the United Nations.

The Turkish invasion was performed in two stages and the raid was concluded by mid August, with the capture of the 37% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus. This resulted in the uprooting of more than 200.000 people from their homes and properties, the killing of more than 4.000 troops and civilians and resulting in 1.619 missing persons.

The occupied territory covered 65% of agricultural land, 70% of mineral resources, 70% of industrial activity and 80% of the tourist installations of the Island.

“[...] Her Majesty’s Government cannot accept that the Turkish armed forces were acting otherwise, than as agents of the Government of Turkey. Nor can HMG accept that the government of Turkey (who have themselves claimed that the intervention of Turkish forces was justified on the basis of rights of Turkey under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee) were acting as agents of the Turkish Cypriot community. The Turkish Cypriot community had no standing, under either Cypriot or International Law, to authorise such action [...]”.<sup>169</sup>

Since then (35 years), the British continue to support Turkey in their false international propaganda:

---

169. Foreign & Commonwealth Office Document FCO 9/2162, August 1975.

- I. That “it was not a raid and illegal invasion, but a peaceful intervention, aiming to restore constitutional order and the status quo that existed prior to the coup of 15 July 1974”!
- II. That “the right of intervention is provided by the Treaty of Guarantee of the Republic of Cyprus, which was drafted with the aim to safeguard the independence, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus”!
- III. That “the Greek-Cypriots are to blame for the developments from 1955 to 1974, because they had enforced a policy of genocide against the Turkish-Cypriots”!

**Lie I** is refuted by what is documented in Chapter D.

**Lie II** is refuted by the Treaty of Guarantee itself, which:

“Does NOT give to the Guarantor Powers the right of military intervention, except and only if 1<sup>st</sup> the guaranteeing country needs to defend itself in the case of invasion by a third country, 2<sup>nd</sup> the United Nations ask one of the guarantor powers for such a military intervention and 3<sup>rd</sup> the Republic of Cyprus asks for a military intervention and the United Nations Security Council agrees to that demand.”

The Republic of Cyprus had never asked Turkey to intervene militarily and the United Nations Security Council never agreed to such a demand.

**Lie III** is refuted by all the documented contents of this book.

---

«Θα επαναλάβω εκείνο που είπα στο παρελθόν. Η τουρκική κοινότητα είναι θύμα προδοσίας που διέπραξε η τουρκική κυβέρνηση. Οι Τουρκοκύπριοι δεν είναι θύματα της κυπριακής κυβερνήσεως ή των Ελληνοκυπρίων. Όλος ο κόσμος πρέπει να γνωρίζει ότι η διαίρεση υπήρξε επιθυμία και εισηγήση των αποικιοκρατών...»

*Ιχσάν Αλή, Ραδιοφωνικό Ίδρυμα Κύπρου,  
28 Σεπτεμβρίου 1965*

«I will repeat what I said in the past. The Turkish community is a victim of treason by the Turkish government. The Turkish-Cypriots are not victims of the Cypriot government or of the Greek-Cypriots. Everybody should know that partition has been the desire and proposal of the colonialists...»

*Ihsan Ali, Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation,  
28 September 1965*

ISBN 9789963962204



9 789963 962204