



# AKEL *bulletin*

EDITED BY THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BUREAU

No. 26 P.O. Box 21827 tel. +357 22761121 e-mail: [InterBureau@akel.org.cy](mailto:InterBureau@akel.org.cy)  
OCT 2007 CY-1513 NICOSIA fax. +357 22761574 <http://www.akel.org.cy>

## DEMETRIS CHRISTOFIAS

### Candidate for the next Presidential Elections

The General Secretary of the C.C. of AKEL Demetris Christofias will be candidate for the next Presidential elections in Cyprus, on February 2007. This decision was taken on the 8th of July, by the Extraordinary Pancyprrian Conference of AKEL, after an internal-party discussion and voting by the Local Party Organizations. It is the first time during the 47 years since the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus that our Party proposes to the Cyprus people the candidacy of its General Secretary.

Our decision was based both on the Cyprus problem as well as on the social-economic issues. Regarding the efforts to solve the **Cyprus problem**, we believe that better conditions can be created. A flexible policy should be followed which, whilst it would not negotiate the principles of solution of the Cyprus problem and the rights of cypriots, will at the same time convey the messages of political will for the solution of the problem. A flexible active policy will enable either the overcoming of the current stalemates depending of course on whether Turkey will change its position; or it will expose the responsibilities of the Turkish side regarding the intransigent policy it is following.

Concerning the **social-economic issues**, there were some important disagreements with the policies of the government during the last 1 ½ years. First of all, concerning the timetable for accession to the **Euro zone**, AKEL strongly requested to postpone the accession for one year, so that the negative consequences for the people would be restrained. At the same time we expressed our discontent about the limited **social benefits** during this last period. We came to strong disagreement with the other parties of the government and with their ministers about these issues.

Beyond all these, for us there is a more general issue, the need for **renewal and modernisation**.

Demetris Christofias is a very popular politician, highly accepted and appreciated by the people. He operated successfully as Presidency of the House of Representatives, promoting mutual respect and consensus among all the political parties. He has proved that he defends with consistency and determination the principles for the solution of the Cyprus problem, but at the same time he is distinguished by flexibility and political will. He enjoys the respect and trust of the broader strata of the Turkish Cypriots, an essential element for rapprochement and cooperation of the two communities.

➤ **Speech of the G.S of AKEL for the cadres of the EDON**

Youth Organisation

*p. 2*

➤ **Cyprus Independence Day** - Speech

of the G.C. of the C.C. of AKEL.

*p. 9*

**Speech of the General Secretary of the C.C. of AKEL at the Pancyprian Seminar for the cadres of the EDON Youth Organisation,  
15th of September 2007 Larnaca**

Comrades and friends,

I'm very happy to be here once again with you, the members and cadres of EDON, amongst the vanguard youth of Cyprus; to be together with the young people who constantly through time, with consistency and dedication, are in the front line of the struggle for a just solution and a just society.

Knowledge has always been a firm foundation upon which the struggle and action to achieve great goals and the prevalence of noble ideas can be based on. **EDON has always paid, and continues to pay, particular attention to the ideological education of its cadres so that the essence of its struggles is substantiated, with a fixed agenda and consistent.**

I congratulate EDON for continuing and upgrading its ideological work, but also for its broader activity in the political, cultural and social field, which always serves the well-intentioned interests of the young generation and country. This is so because EDON, at the side of AKEL and the rest of people's movement, has made and continues to make a great contribution so that our country and people can advance forward to progress and prosperity.

In our discussion today allow me to begin and dedicate most of my speech to **the Cyprus problem.**

The traitorous coup d'état on the 15th of July 1974 gave the excuse for the barbarous Turkish invasion to take place on the 20th of July. The enormity of the catastrophe that Cyprus suffered in the summer of 1974, the occupation of nearly 40% of the territory of the island, the forcible displacement of populations and the fact that roughly 200,000 people became refugees in their own homeland created a totally horrendous situation which made an examination about the ways to reunify our homeland and people imperative.

In the face of the new harsh reality reflections concerning federation began immediately after the Turkish invasion. As the then Foreign Minister Ioannis Christofidis had disclosed in an interview, the relative reflections in question had already begun shortly after the invasion with respective consultations being conducted between the governments of Cyprus and Greece.

No one is suggesting that federation is the ideal system for Cyprus, which is a very small country to have a problem of decentralisation and administration of vast areas. Nor is Cyprus such a rich state that will not be affected by this costly state structure of multiple legislative, executive and judiciary institutions. However, federation is the only feasible way to reunify our country and people. In the face of the nightmarish situation that the junta of Greece and the forces that carried out the coup d'etat had inherited us, a return to a

***Today an open or disguised questioning of bi-zonal bi-communal federation is being observed which without any hint of exaggeration threatens to take the political life of our country thirty years back in time.***

unitary state was feasible only in an academic sense. Federation in the final analysis represents the necessary intersection between centripetal and centrifugal forces. On the one hand it safeguards a single state, with a single sovereignty, a single international personality and citizenship and on the other hand it grants wide-ranging territorial and institutional autonomy to the two communities.

It was precisely these reflections that led Makarios to sign the High-Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979 with Denktash which signified the official acceptance of bi-communal federation with two regions consequently becoming official policy and adopted by all the international bodies, but also by the two communities as bi-zonal bi-communal federation. The second Kyprianou-Denktash High-Level Agreement followed after two years, which reaffirmed the above-mentioned commitment.

**Today an open or disguised questioning of bi-zonal bi-communal federation is being observed which without any hint of exaggeration threatens to take the political life of our country thirty years back in time.** Back then, with the signing of the Makarios-Denktash High-Level Agreement, a fierce discussion prevailed regarding bi-zonality and its content.

Others reject federation altogether, whilst others reject bi-zonality arguing that it is an inappropriate term in constitutional law and is not included in the Makarios-Denktash agreement. Others argue that today, now that we have become a member of the European Union, the conditions have changed in our favour and that the High-Level Agreements are outdated and have been overtaken by events.

What therefore is the content of bi-zonal bi-communal federation? Let us look at the three "labels" or terms one by one, which of course are not empty shells. We shall indeed limit ourselves to their minimal commonly accepted content without making any kind of far-reaching conclusions which could lead to different interpretations.

Concerning **federation** it has recently been stated that there are around fifty states with this concrete state structure and that there all different from each other. Consequently, according to this argument, the term itself does not mean that much and each and everyone can give a different content to this term.

The truth is that today there are around 20 federal states (which however encompass nearly half of the size of the planet and around 40% of the earth's population) and you cannot find two of them which are completely similar between them. Each federation has its own peculiarities. Some were established through the union of separate states (classical federal systems of the 19th century - USA, Germany, Switzerland), others were founded through the decentralisation of the unitary state (nearly all the contemporary federal states with the latest example being Belgium), others were founded in order to decentralise vast states, others due to historical reasons and others in order to tackle problems between different nationalities. All of these examples explain why there are differences between one federation to another. However, this is only partly true. The rest

of the truth is that common characteristics can also be found between all federal systems without exception which indeed are those that define the content of the term.

Therefore, each federation is composed of at least two regions, each one of which has its own Legislative, Executive and Judiciary institutions and this is the essential difference from the unitary states, whose districts do not have their own Legislative, Executive and Judiciary institutions but are subordinate to the central government. Since there are central and regional institutions the allocation of competences is imperative between them. The basic competences, which safeguard the unity of the state, belong to the central government, whilst the regions of the federal states have identical competences. **It goes without saying that all federations are characterised by a single sovereignty, a single international personality and citizenship and safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms, elements which separate federation from confederation and that is why we are justifiably demanding that they should be accepted by the Turkish Cypriot side.**

As far as **bi-zonality** is concerned the view is supported that it is not included in the 1977 High -Level Agreement. It is true that the concrete term is not included in the Agreement. However, given that we state that we are concerned about is the content and not the label, let us examine the relevant content of the agreement in question:

"(1)We are seeking an independent, non-aligned bi-communal Federal Republic.

(2) The territory under the administration of each community should be discussed in the light of economic viability, or productivity and land ownership.

(3) Questions of principle like freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and the right to property and other specific matters are open for discussion taking into consideration the fundamental basis of a bi-communal federal system and certain practical difficulties, which may arise for the Turkish Cypriot community".

Of course, the safeguarding of the unity of the country is also mentioned in the agreement; a term which is addressed to the Turkish Cypriot side. The question, as far as our own side is concerned, is whether we accept paragraphs 2 and 3. If that is the case, then this means that we accept the content of bi-zonality which is none other than the existence of two zones (or states as they are called in the USA or Landers as they are called in Germany or cantons as they are called in Switzerland or districts as they are called in Canada, this is not of crucial importance), each one of which will be administered by the respective community, without of course this leading to nationally homogeneous populations. In the unanimous Greek Cypriot proposals of 1989 it is provided that *"each community will administer a region which will have equality of the two constituent states"*. By the way, it is wrong to make a comparison with the zones in Germany after the Second World War because those zones had no relation whatsoever with the state structure of the country and consequently different situations are being compared.

As far as the "label" is concerned this was also subsequently accepted, given that all the plans of the United Nations which were submitted after the High Level Agreements explicitly provide for a bi-zonal federation regarding the territorial aspect, that is to say they adopt the term and lend it the content which we have referred to above. The same also goes for a whole number of Security Council resolutions. None of the above mentioned

plans were rejected because they referred to bi-zonality. We don't have to look elsewhere, the 8th of July Agreement itself, under the heading "*Set of Principles*" provides for:

"1. Commitment to the unification of Cyprus based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation and political equality, as set out in the relevant Security Council Resolutions".

We note that the Turkish Cypriot side was rejecting the above mentioned principle but in the end, on the insistence of the Greek Cypriot side, was forced to accept it. As the President of the Republic had characteristically stated in his recent interview transmitted by all television channels, he dedicated half of the duration of the meeting in order to convince Talat to accept bi-zonal bi-communal federation.

Finally, the term "**bi-communal**", as it is defined by the UN itself, means that both communities will participate effectively in the institutions and decisions of the central government. This is not something new. It is also included in the 1960 Constitution.

In conclusion, if we are sincere that we are interested in the content and not on the form or term, then we cannot choose only those basic elements of federation which separate it from confederation (a single sovereignty, international personality and citizenship, respect of fundamental freedoms and other) but pretend not to be aware of the basic elements which differentiate it from the unitary state. We should reply without any hesitation: **Do we accept that the solution of the Cyprus problem will provide for two zones or whatever they will be called, each one of which will be administered by the respective community and will have their own Legislative, Executive and Judiciary institutions and competences, identical with those of the other region? Do we accept that we accept that both communities will have an effective participation in the institutions and decisions of the central government? If that is the case, then we accept the High-Level Agreements. If not, then it is the High-Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979 themselves that we reject and all that is being debated surrounding the label and content are merely evading the issue.**

Is our disengagement today from the High-Level Agreements and the goal of achieving in essence a unitary state feasible after our accession to the European Union? If this is the conclusion that we have drawn after three years of being a member of the EU and at the same time when we are struggling determinedly and by every means to thwart the upgrading of the pseudo-state, then we are worried that we harbour great illusions. If nothing else, let us bear in mind what kind of messages we are conveying currently at the same time when the Chancellor of Germany, Mrs. Rotte until recently a friend of Cyprus and so many others are suggesting that it was a mistake to accept Cyprus' accession to the EU because allegedly we are now not interested anymore in a solution. The recent unacceptable resolution of the German Parliament, which amongst other things demanded the acceptance not only of direct trade but also of the institutions of the pseudo-state, should cause us to reflect on things.

Even the most progressive forces of the Turkish Cypriot community will not be able to comprehend us if we deviate from the path and fight for a unitary state solution. We will therefore lose our credibility among those forces within the Turkish Cypriot community, but also with those forces in Turkey itself who want to see a compromise settlement.

We declare once again for the umpteenth time: The dilemma which the coup d'etat, the invasion and the many years of occupation has put before us is between federation and partition. The return to the period of questioning and challenging the compromise of federation, however well-intentioned it may be, leads at the end of the day to the official formalisation of partition. Even worse, in the new conditions created by the accession of the whole of Cyprus to the European Union, the suspension of the implementation of the European *acquis communautaire* in the occupied areas and with the Turkish Cypriots considered as European citizens, there is no such thing as "pure" partition. If we were to follow this policy we will sooner or later with mathematical precision end up with a bi-communal state in the free areas and with a Turkish homogeneous state in the occupied areas. That is to say, we will be writing off a large part of our country without even having the "homogeneous" Greek Cypriot state that, perhaps, some are dreaming about. Of course such a distorted and crooked settlement with no control over the occupied areas and with the continuous influx of settlers from Turkey could potentially lead for all we know to new adventures and "lost homelands" in the long term.

**That is why we are very concerned about the growth of anti-federation trends.** That is why we resolutely and persistently continue to fight for a peacefully agreed solution on the basis of the resolutions of the United Nations, the principles of International Law and the European Union and the High-Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979 which provide for a bi-zonal bi-communal federation. These, amongst other things, mean that the solution must restore the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus; safeguard a single sovereignty, international personality and citizenship, the withdrawal of the settlers, fundamental freedoms and human rights, including the right of the refugees to return to their homes and properties. The abolition of any right of unilateral military intervention and the withdrawal of the Turkish occupational troops go without saying, whilst the demilitarisation of Cyprus remains the ultimate goal. With regard to the latter, we consider the reactions of the Turkish side to the position taken by the President against the occupational troops in his recent televised interview as totally unacceptable. It is not this principled position of our own side which exhibits a refusal for the solution of the Cyprus problem but rather the insistence of the Turkish side not to implement the resolutions of the UN which call for demilitarisation and not comprehending that the presence of the Turkish Army is illegal and that it constitutes a source of immense insecurity for the Greek Cypriots and as such it is not possible to achieve an agreed solution without the withdrawal of the occupational troops.

***In the current conditions the only feasible way to move forward is the immediate implementation of the 8th of July agreement. Towards this end we must work so that the ground can be prepared in order to arrive as soon as possible at meaningful comprehensive talks between the leaders of the two communities aiming at an overall settlement.***

**In the current conditions the only feasible way to move forward is the immediate implementation of the 8th of July agreement. Towards this end we must work so that the ground can be prepared in order to arrive as soon as possible at meaningful comprehensive talks between the leaders of the two communities aiming at an overall settlement.**

Comrades,

The solution of the Cyprus problem is a precondition of crucial importance in order to safeguard the future of our country. Without a solution to the Cyprus problem, based on the content we have outlined, the future of our country and people remains questionable and doubtful.

That is to say that our very life, our own future in this country remains questionable because you the young generation represent the future and the perspective. Our own generation, who tomorrow will hand over the baton to you, has a duty to safeguard all those conditions and preconditions so that you will be able to live in a united and free land, in security and peace.

**We are struggling to hand over a homeland without occupational troops where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots - and especially the young generation - will live together, will be learning and studying together, will enjoy their lives together and share the benefits of progress and prosperity; in a country that will have the young people and people in general at the centre of its attention.**

***We are struggling to hand over a homeland without occupational troops where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots - and especially the young generation - will live together, will be learning and studying together, will enjoy their lives together and share the benefits of progress and prosperity; in a country that will have the young people and people in general at the centre of its attention.***

It is you, the young generation, whose dreams and aspirations are being trampled on by the fierce and merciless competition which is dominant in all sectors of society; a competition that is pushing many young people to marginalisation, that is looking down at them and that is driving them away from social reality.

We have a vision of a just society for young people. We want a young generation with an enhanced social and political role. **We are convinced that the time has come for the renewal of the political life of our country.** We pledge that if the Cypriot people show their trust in us we will not remain in the Presidency for more than one term, because the younger generations must continuously renew a political reality that is currently at a stalemate and has given all that it could have.

We lay emphasis on the tackling of social problems which young people face today. We lay emphasis on the promotion of concrete policies and actions that will open up new horizons for the young generation.

**Our own vision is that of a just society for our young people that will safeguard the right to education, work, create and for young people to become useful citizens for our country and society.**

Our philosophy is the elaboration of a comprehensive policy which will be characterised by social sensitivity and centred on the needs and concerns of people and which will support our youth at all stages and levels of their development; a

policy for children and the younger generations; school students, students and soldiers; young workers and young family couples.

We have elaborated comprehensive proposals for the decisive tackling of the curse of drugs and juvenile delinquency; to combat unemployment among young people; to put an end to the attempts underway to raise the retirement age in public education, in the broader public and private sector; for young couples to obtain a house, a commodity that has been reduced to an unachievable dream; for the resolute promotion of meritocracy; for the creative utilisation of free time with the promotion of culture and sports; for free high quality education with a human-centred content that will correspond to the demands and challenges of our times; for the decisive implementation of the reform of the educational system and for a creative and dignified military service in the National Guard.

Comrades,

We don't just remember youth and students today. We have unbreakable bonds with the young generation which have been solidified through common struggles, visions and goals for many decades. We have always consistently supported the demands and struggles of the youth movement. The evident imprint of our struggles and demands can be found in the great and small gains of the young generation, in all the gains of the young generation! Our own imprint is very prominent in most of what has been achieved for the young people in the last five years, but also more broadly for the people and the working people in the socio-economic field.

**We come from the youth movement and that is why we can understand your problems. We can feel your pulse and concerns. The relationship we have developed over the years constitutes the guarantee that our policy regarding young people will be implemented.**

We are convinced that you, the cadres and members of EDON, will as always be in the front line of the struggle in the forthcoming Presidential elections for the great election victory that will bring to Cyprus a just solution and a just society.

Together we shall continue on the same path even if it is full of obstacles.

Together we shall continue our common struggles for the young generation.

Together for our Cyprus!

Together for a just solution and a just society!



## Cyprus Independence Day

### ***Speech of the General Secretary of the C.C. of AKEL and President of the House of Representatives Demetris Christofias at the AKEL meeting to commemorate Cyprus Independence Day, Limassol 2nd October 2007***

We commemorate, as every year, Cyprus Independence Day with our thoughts turned to our occupied lands. Our own independence took a long time coming. Many years of sacrifices through the struggles of our people were needed. When independence did come we were not able to enjoy its benefits. The celebrations were replaced very quickly by new problems and new painful adventures.

In honouring Cyprus Independence Day we have a sacred duty to pay the necessary homage to all those who fought, and indeed many of them sacrificed their own lives, so that our country could liberate itself from colonial subjugation. We also honour all those who later on fought, and many of them gave their lives, in order to defend our independence, defend democracy in this land and the dignity of our people.

We also do not forget all those, the hundreds of thousands of people who worked hard on the front of peaceful labour and construction so that our country could free itself from the misery that colonialism had inherited to us, so that we could again reconstruct this land after the catastrophe of 1974 and to take the road of progress, development and prosperity.

Compatriots,

The Zurich-London Agreements were the founding agreement from which the Republic of Cyprus was born. Independent Cyprus was established unfortunately with the worst omens. As it is well known AKEL had disagreed with the Zurich Agreement. It ascertained that it granted a shackled independence with many dependencies on third countries. It centred its disagreement on the perpetuation of the British presence on the island through the so-called "sovereign" military bases; on the imposition of a system of guarantees of Britain, Turkey and Greece with rights even of intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cyprus; on the stationing of Turkish and Greek military detachments on the territory of Cyprus and on the imposition of a given constitution whose provisions would potentially bring into conflict once again the two communities.

Bearing the reality of these negative elements of the Zurich Agreement in mind, AKEL advised Makarios not to accept it. However, as always, AKEL did not just take a negative position. It also proceeded to submit a concrete proposal regarding what needed to be done because we recognised that a simple "No" to the Zurich Agreement would not have constituted a responsible stand given the reality of an explosive situation which prevailed in Cyprus and the real danger of partition the island faced. We therefore proposed to Makarios that he reject the Zurich Agreement and at the same time clearly state that the armed struggle should come to an end, that the struggle of the Cypriot people should continue with political means and the utilisation of the international factor and that this struggle should be waged with the unity of all the forces of our people in a united anti-colonial front.

Unfortunately the proposals of AKEL were not accepted. Perhaps one of the main reasons why they were not accepted was the fear that AKEL's position would be vindicated, which since 1955 had been warning about the deadlocks the armed struggle would lead to. In April 1957 Grivas (note: the extreme right wing anti-communist nationalist leader of the military struggle) in a letter addressed to Makarios and referring to the pressures he was under to end the armed struggle wrote the following: "If our struggle were to cease, then they (note: meaning AKEL) would appear on the scene and declare that their tactics were correct". This particular passage speaks for itself. How many times has this country paid the price and will perhaps continue to suffer because issues of crucial national importance are handled in such a way as to serve internal consumption and petty party expediencies?

In London Makarios under unbearable pressure, that was exerted on him not only from abroad but also from circles in Greece and domestically, accepted the Zurich Agreements which then became known as the Zurich-London Agreements.

***AKEL declared that independence, even shackled and limited, represented a great historical gain for the Cypriot people which should be utilised for the people's progress and welfare.***

The conclusion of the Zurich-London Agreements created a totally new environment. AKEL took a constructive position regarding this new reality. It still maintained its disagreement with the content of the Agreements. However, once again it did not just take a negative position. AKEL declared that independence, even shackled and limited, represented a great historical gain for the Cypriot people which should be utilised for the people's progress and welfare. We were under no illusions about the difficulties ahead. However, we could have exploited the positive elements of the independence, to heal the wounds, to build a new life and in time to work for the completion of our independence and the liberation from the negative aspects of the Agreements.

Independence was accompanied by a feeling of optimism and with many expectations, which unfortunately were not met. What was to blame? The question which we have put and the answers we are looking for are not an academic exercise. It should not only concern historians. It should concern us all because it is necessary to learn lessons from our history, to draw conclusions which we can use in our struggle today against occupation and division.

It seems that, according to certain forces from abroad and bearing in mind the realities of the cold war period, the dependence and obligations which were forced on us at Zurich were not enough. The possibility of freeing ourselves from this dependence filled them with fear. Some forces, in order to serve their egoistical geo-political interests, were planning to put Cyprus completely under their own control. Towards this end the aggressive designs of Turkey against Cyprus coincided with the aspirations of NATO to transform our island into an aggressive launching pad in the wider region. The refusal of Makarios to consent to these plans and the resistance of our people, headed by the pioneering force of the Left, provoked the rage of those who were trying to regain the lost ground and to decide the fate of the people. Thus began the subversion of the Republic of Cyprus.

Some support the view that if we had gone along with NATO we would not have gone through all the suffering that we did. This is the same philosophy that we can observe and

hear today when some forces and people accept blindly and uncritically whatever is proposed by foreign powers based on the logic that we are just a numerically small and weak people. Thus, these forces put the blame on Makarios and AKEL. Do they really believe that the NATO alliance would have respected the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and the dignity of our people? We shouldn't mislead people by trying to justify unrealistic positions. If we had gone along with the NATO plans we would ourselves by our own doing have transformed our country into a puppet subservient state for foreign powers that would not have taken long to also satisfy the desires of Ankara.

As a result, we were quite correct in our position and we resisted then during the 1960's and 1970's the subversive plans of foreign powers and forces. We are also quite right in resisting every attempt to undermine the Republic of Cyprus and every effort to impose a solution which does not correspond to the interests and aspirations of the Cypriot people as a whole. **We always were, and always will be, in the first line of resistance. Consequently the consciousness of every democratic citizen is justifiably enraged when we who have such a history of resistance and struggle against various foreign conspiracies see some forces today insisting on presenting us as people allegedly of depleted resistance serving foreign powers that are aiming to implement their anti-Cypriot plans. This is shameful.** The trend to monopolise patriotism constituted from the very beginning one of the most horrible demons that afflicted Cyprus. Let us never forget this.

The second reason why events did not go as we had wished for after independence has to do with the activity of internal forces in Cyprus, those nationalistic and chauvinistic forces in both communities who never accepted independence. They have never accepted the fact that the Republic of Cyprus since its very foundation was a bi-communal state; a state that was not an extension of Anatolia but also neither a second 'pure' Greek state in the Mediterranean. These forces never embraced with love the Republic of Cyprus as the common homeland of Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins either due to a narrow-minded outlook of reality and a blind fanaticism or because they served foreign interests: the former dedicated to the slogan of Enosis (note: union with Greece) and the latter dedicated to the policy of partition. The coup de etat of the army colonels in Greece strengthened these forces among the Greek Cypriot community, whilst Turkey provided continuous support and backing to Denktash (note: the reactionary, extreme nationalist and anti-communist leader of the Turkish Cypriot community) and his followers.

***The trend to monopolise patriotism constituted from the very beginning one of the most horrible demons that afflicted Cyprus. Let us never forget this.***

In the end nationalism and chauvinism and the extreme right-wing became the vehicle for the implementation of the plans of the foreign powers against our homeland. The tragedy came to a climax in the summer of 1974. Those who were presenting themselves as the 'true patriots' caused the greatest ever catastrophe that occurred in this country.

We have constantly combated nationalism and the extreme right-wing. We have fought nationalism and chauvinism. We have made sacrifices in this struggle and we have lamented the loss of so many dear comrades, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots.

**The relationship of AKEL with the Turkish Cypriot community goes back a long time. It has been formed and tested in the common class and social struggles. We fought on the same side both in the years of colonialist rule as well as in the years after the foundation of the Republic, despite the bi-communal conflicts and against the divisions and bigotry. We were the political and social force which never looked down on and disregarded our Turkish Cypriot compatriots. On the contrary, we always addressed the Turkish Cypriots with respect. AKEL and the broader People's Movement is also their own creation and gain. In confronting the slogans of bigotry we projected the slogan of common struggle for the salvation of our common homeland. In the years following 1974 we founded the policy of rapprochement as a component part of the anti-occupation struggle. We led the struggle so that rapprochement could become a conscious among the people and be adopted as the official policy of the state.**

**It is not by chance that even today despite so many hardships the Left and its leadership maintains channels of communication with patriotic and progressive Turkish Cypriots; that it has the trust and respect of a large section of the Turkish Cypriot community and has an open dialogue with it. No one doubts the special relationship which exists between the Turkish Cypriots and AKEL. This precious chapter of friendship, trust and mutual understanding is daily being put at the service of the struggle for the reunification of our homeland. We are ready to utilise it even more if our people, as we hope and believe, elects us to the Presidency of the Republic. Without the cooperation of our Turkish Cypriot compatriots the Cyprus problem cannot be solved. We have all the background and credentials to succeed in achieving this cooperation.**

***No one doubts the special relationship which exists between the Turkish Cypriots and AKEL. This precious chapter of friendship, trust and mutual understanding is daily being put at the service of the struggle for the reunification of our homeland. We are ready to utilise it even more if our people, as we hope and believe, elects us to the Presidency of the Republic.***

Dear friends,

47 years after independence, 44 years after the bi-communal clashes and 33 years after the traitorous coup de etat and the Turkish invasion, we are continuing the struggle to liberate ourselves from the occupation, for the reunification of our island and for the refugees to return. The duty of defending the entity of the Republic of Cyprus always remains a primary goal because the entity of the Cypriot state is continuously being undermined by Turkey and those foreign powers that are aligned to it. The very essence of the Cyprus problem is being distorted. The invasion, colonisation, national cleansing and the destruction of our cultural heritage and the usurpation of Greek Cypriot properties is being minimised and ignored. An attempt is being made to transform the Cyprus problem into a problem solely concerning the lifting of the so-called isolation of the Turkish Cypriots. We cannot and should never allow this distortion to be imposed. We must make every effort so that the substance of the Cyprus problem as a problem of invasion, occupation and violation of the human rights of our people is a position that will be maintained until its solution.

The Turkish leadership pressingly reiterates that it desires and is working for a solution of the Cyprus problem. At the same time however it is campaigning around the world aiming at the international acceptance and recognition of the pseudo-state. There is an obvious contradiction here. You cannot on the one hand state that you are in favour of a solution and on the other hand through your actions you are promoting the division of the island. Unless the solution that Turkey has in mind is a two state solution.

The unacceptable statements made by the Foreign Minister of Turkey Mr. Gul during his illegal visit to the occupied areas that two separate republics, two different states, two different languages and religions exist in Cyprus and that the solution cannot but take into account the so-called 'realities' gives us the right to believe that Ankara is continuing to work for a two state solution. Mr. Gul by taking these positions aligned himself with the military. He reconfirmed what we had already noted, that is to say that a compromise and a "give and take" between the political leadership of Turkey and the armed forces took place, with the political leadership adopting the intransigent positions of the military on the Cyprus problem.

**The Turkish Cypriot leadership is also declaring that it is in favour of a solution. Indeed it contends that the proposals it submitted had as their goal to bring the solution nearer. However, at the same time it is also campaigning around the world issuing passports and granting citizenships of the pseudo-state and promoting various actions that are aiming at the recognition of the occupational formation.** Here also we can observe the same blatant contradiction; a contradiction which enables us to question the stand and sincerity of the Turkish Cypriot leadership.

We condemned and denounced the statements made by Gul. We believe that the Government should have made very strong representations to the United Nations, the European Union and in every possible direction. The fact that there wasn't the appropriate reaction by the international and European factor to these statements also saddens us and raises questions in our minds. Their stand should have been different. They should have pointed out to Turkey that the two states policy is rejected by the international community because it violates international law and the framework for the solution of the Cyprus problem as defined by the United Nations and that if Ankara continues to follow the same policy it will have to pay the cost, particularly with regard to its effort to join the EU.

**The policies of Ankara concerning the essence of the Cyprus problem, but also its public relations gimmicks, unfortunately find a response internationally.** Of course the fact that powerful allies of Turkey always want to satisfy its demands should not elude us. This however should not be an excuse we can invoke and lead us into adopting a passive stand and inactivity. On the contrary it underlines the **importance for us to implement a robust dynamic policy.** A solid foundation upon which such a policy can and should be based on is the correct perception of the essence of the Cyprus problem, the proper prioritisation of our goals and tactics and above all else consistency and dedication to the principles governing the solution of the Cyprus problem. Based on these foundations we can take initiatives that will bring results. We can promote continuous action with clearly defined goals on different levels and in various directions. We are committed to following such a pro-active policy that will combine the assertion of rights with determination, consistency on principles and flexibility after our election to the Presidency of the Republic. The people understand that we will carry out our commitment because they recognise our consistency and credibility in deeds not in words.

In honouring the Day of Cyprus Independence we reaffirm our dedication to a peaceful solution which will be based on the UN resolutions, international and European law, as well as on the conventions regarding human rights; for a solution that will provide for the withdrawal of the Turkish occupational troops, settlers and the demilitarisation of the Republic of Cyprus; for a solution that will restore the respect to the independence, unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus without giving the right of unilateral intervention to any foreign country.

We are aiming at a federal solution that will reunify our homeland, as provided by the High-Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979; at a federal Cyprus that will have a single sovereignty, a single international personality and a single citizenship. We accept the political equality of the two communities within the framework of a federal solution as defined by the resolutions of the United Nations. Cyprus since 1960 was a bi-communal state even if its state structure was not federal. Thus the bi-communal character is not something new which is being introduced. **If some forces are dreaming of going back to the situation that existed even before the Zurich Agreement in the name of allegedly "pure" solutions what they are doing in fact is to propose a road that leads to the final catastrophe. The Cypriot people through the experiences it has gained over these decades will not allow anyone to play games once again with its fate.**

In brief, we are aiming at a solution that will render a free, independent, sovereign state; a common happy country for all of its children of our small but beautiful homeland.

Compatriots,

Forty seven years afterwards, our desire and vision is still the completion of independence. It continues to be the primary aim of a struggle that has been going on for decades. We will not allow time, hardships and difficulties to dismay us and cease our struggle. We will not allow them to divert us away from our path and achieving our goal. For us, partition is not a choice. It is a curse. A solemn obstinacy is glowing in our hearts. We shall continue the struggle so that our desire and vision will become a reality. We shall continue with determination because great goals are gained through the fire in hearts, but also through the sense of wisdom and prudence.

The Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins can and must liberate our country from the foreign presence and dependence and build a free and prosperous Cyprus, a common homeland for all of us. We pledge that we will give our all to the realisation of this great and noble goal.