



GPOT

GLOBAL POLITICAL TRENDS CENTER



CYPRUS: UNITY AND DIFFERENCE

***Rauf R Denktas
Michael Moran***

April 2009

CYPRUS: UNITY AND DIFFERENCE
Rauf R Denктаş & Michael Moran

Istanbul Kultur University Publications No: 96

ISBN: 978-975-6957-99-8

Prepared for Publication by: Esra Köse
Book Design : YA/BA Yayın Basım A.Ş.
Cover Design : İpek Topal
Prepared for print : YA/BA Yayın Basım A.Ş.
Printed by : Golden Medya Matbaacılık ve Tic. A.Ş.
100 Yıl Mah. MAS-SİT 1. Cad. No: 88 Bağcılar-İstanbul
Tel: (0212) 629 00 24 - 25 Faks: (0212) 629 20 13

Istanbul Kultur University
Ataköy Campus Bakırköy 34156 / İstanbul
Phone : +90 212 498 44 76
Fax : +90 212 498 44 05
www.gpotcenter.org

Copyright© 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced electronically or mechanically without the prior consent of the Global Political Trends Center.

The viewpoints in this book belong to the authors, and they may not necessarily concur partially or wholly with either GPoT's or IKU's viewpoints.

CYPRUS: UNITY AND DIFFERENCE

***With the rejection of the Annan Plan
can the two existing states in Cyprus
still sensibly seek to become one?***

A Discussion, in a series of Letters,

between

Rauf R Denktas

Formerly President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

and

Michael Moran

Sometime Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Sussex

Together with

Various Supporting Documents

Edited by Michael Moran

GPoT's Foreword

Global Political Trends Center (GPoT) is proud and privileged to bring this extraordinary book to the readers. As you will see in the editors' introduction, it was not intended as a book when this endeavor started earlier back in 2008. At its inception it was simply a spirited mail correspondence between the authors on the variety of issues related to the decades-long Cyprus problem.

Both authors got engaged in the exchange of questions and answers to share the views and ideas with each other and hardly had they imagined that one day the wider public would be able to draw upon this great source of knowledge. And indeed it would have stayed hidden had it not been Moran's effort to bring pieces of Denktaş's remarkable comprehension of the Cyprus issue to the form of an edited publication.

Although the authors' views rather critically differ from each other, their respectful treatment of the questions and honest and sincere approach to the answers, make this book a novelty among the numerous publications written worldwide on the Cyprus question.

It is perhaps, also for this reason that a meticulous account on the Cyprus problem is finely combined with an intellectually philosophical touch which can be clearly sensed from the following pages, accompanying vast technical knowledge about the Cyprus issue that has developed through years of valuable personal experience.

We believe that this study will provide some extra thoughts to the long-overdue settlement of the Cyprus problem. At the same time, we believe it will shed some light to the history of the conflict and for that matter contribute to a better understanding of the problem for those not so much interrelated with the historical facts that have brought the issue thus far.

Although this book is the first ever publication of GPoT, it does not necessarily correspond with the political views and the preferences of both the staff and the advisors of the Center. However, considering GPoT's

experience with the Cyprus problem both at institutional and individual level, publishing this exceptional book becomes even more crucial.

Besides the authors, many people have spent time and energy on getting this study ready for publication. Members of the GPoT team – Esra Köse, Ceren Ak and Can Yirik - has contributed to the realization of this project. But most of all Dr. Sylvia Tiryaki who inspired some of the debates you will read in the following pages was the motivating force behind this project. We owe a lot to the endless energy of Ayla Gürel.

We are also thankful to YABA associates for the design and formatting of the book. Last but not the least, we would like to express our gratitude to Mr. Fahamettin Akingüç, Honorary Chairman of the Board of Trustees; Dr. Bahar Akingüç Günver, Chairman of the Board of Trustees; Prof. Dr. Tamer Koçel, Former Rector of IKU; Rector Prof. Dr. Dursun Koçer; Vice Rector Prof. Dr. Çetin Bolcal and Vice Rector Prof. Dr. Bahri Öztürk not only for the publication of this book but also for the realization of the entire endeavor.

Mensur Akgün

Director
Global Political Trends Center (GPoT)

CONTENTS

GPoT's Foreword	p. vii
Editor's Preface	p. xi
Some abbreviations used in the texts	p. xv
Letters	p. 3
Appendices	
1. A letter to the Editor of the <i>London Review of Books</i> , dated 23 April 2008, from Michael Moran criticising an article by Perry Anderson.	p. 73
2. An article entitled 'How Mr Anderson Gets Cyprus Wrong' by Sylvia Tiryaki in the <i>Turkish Daily News</i> , 12 May 2008.	p. 79
3. An article entitled 'Cyprus and international security: a plea for a more realistic approach' by Michael Moran in <i>Cyprus Dialogue</i> , 14 December 2007.	p. 81
4. A 'Memorandum of Understanding between Cyprus and the UK', dated 5 June 2008.	p. 95
5. A transcript of Denktas being interviewed for Greek Cypriot television in November 2008 by journalist Costas Yennaris on the subject of the TRNC's alleged unilateral declaration of independence in 1983.	p. 99
6. An article entitled 'Zürich – from curse to blessing in disguise' by Makarios Droushiotis in the <i>Cyprus Mail</i> , 1 October 2008, and a letter to the editor in which Denktas takes the author up on certain points.	p. 107
7. 'How I see the Cyprus problem today' extracted from a briefing given to foreign journalists by Denktas on 18 October 2008.	p. 117
8. The last part of an address entitled 'Legal Aspects of the Cyprus Problem' given by Denktas to an audience of EU representatives, European Council officials, and others, in Strasbourg on 23 April, 2002.	p. 129

Editor's Preface

This series of letters came about as follows. Sometime late in April, 2008 I went to see President Denktaş at his office in Nicosia, partly as a courtesy visit and partly because I thought he would be interested to read two documents I brought with me. One was a long article on Cyprus by Perry Anderson, a well-known British leftist, now teaching at an American university. Anderson's piece had recently appeared in the *London Review of Books* to which journal he was a regular contributor. The other thing I gave Denktaş was a letter I had sent to the *LRB* pointing out, in effect, what a one-sided, slapdash assortment of misinformation Anderson had inflicted on the British reading public.

Before Denktaş had had a chance to look at these two items we began talking about the current state of play in the politics of the island. In rather different ways, we both questioned the widely held assumption – especially among the external players – that 'reunification' of the two Cypriot communities was self-evidently the goal to be sought. Discussions to this end were already being planned between the two new leaders of the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots, Demetris Christofias and Mehmet Ali Talat, supposedly unhampered and unsupervised by the three Cyprus guarantors or by the UN, the EU, or the Americans. This current agenda – with its slogan 'The Cyprus problem will be solved by the Cypriots' – struck both of us as decidedly utopian. Unfortunately we could talk for only half an hour or so on that occasion because the former President, no longer in power but politically as active as ever, had a fairly full morning ahead of him. He promised to read the items I had brought and to drop me a line about them when he could.

Anderson's article, 'Divisions of Cyprus', which was widely welcomed in the Greek part of the island, is too long to be included in this booklet (Anyone interested should still be able to find it on the *LRB* website). However, I think my comments on it provide a fair idea of the article's contents, and probable purpose. This letter of mine to the *LRB* is given here as Appendix 1.

On May 2 Denктаş wrote to me briefly as follows:

Dear Michael,

Your letter to the LRB is perfect and well-deserved. Sorry for this rather late reply. Naturally, you know that I personally believe that had Britain come up to her obligations as a guarantor she should not have recognized Makarios and his government as “the legitimate government of Cyprus” and should have vetoed “Cyprus” entry into the EU until Turkey became a full member. The safety of the British Bases was more important than doing her duty as a guarantor. The USA was under the influence of the Greek Lobby from the beginning and later her global interests in the area affected her decisions on Cyprus. But all this does not affect the relevance of your reply to the LRB.

Yours sincerely,

Rauf R. DENKTAŞ

My reply, on May 12, is given here as Letter 1 in the series that follows. In that reply, as in my other letters, I attempted to draw Denктаş out: to get him to tell me candidly what he now thinks about some of the more important issues relating to Cyprus. Readers will have to judge for themselves how well I succeeded in that attempt! Further letters followed all of which are included here. I am sure that this exchange of views – but more especially Denктаş’s contribution of course – will be of interest to anyone seriously concerned with Cyprus at the present time. When this correspondence started I thought I had a pretty good understanding of the Cyprus issue – after all, I had been seriously thinking about it for the best part of twenty years! But almost every time I received a letter from Denктаş I learned a little more.

It will be observed that while I am, at times, critical of Denктаş’s stated or apparent positions, and he of mine, we remained remarkably polite and intellectually considerate towards each other throughout our exchange of

views. Perhaps I may be permitted to suggest that this could serve as an example to others with strong opinions about these matters, on both sides of the island and elsewhere.

Eventually, with Denктаş's permission, I decided to prepare these letters for publication. I have added a few footnotes to the original texts, sometimes for reasons of greater clarity and sometimes simply for the benefit of the uninitiated. Eight Appendices are included. The first four of these are articles, etc., referred to in the Letters; the next three are recent public statements Denктаş has made that will help further to explain his views. Appendix 8, although part of an address to European officials, and others, given as long ago as 2002, was worth including, I thought, because it well expresses Denктаş's objections to the EU's intention to accept a wholly Greek-run 'Cyprus' as a member-state. It also shows Denктаş, speaking just from notes, in good rhetorical form.

Some points about typographical matters: in writing in English Denктаş naturally uses Turkish conventions, while I use British ones. So, for example, he invariably employs double inverted commas for quotations, etc., while I use single ones. He uses a lot more capital letters than I do and rarely employs italics, even for foreign words. For instance, he writes 'Enosis' while I write '*enosis*'. To emphasize he will sometimes underline a word or put it in bold or put a word or a whole line in capitals. Again, he often spells names in the Turkish way while I use anglicised spelling, so his rendering of the current Greek Cypriot leader's name is 'Hristofyas' (or sometimes 'Hristofias') while I call him 'Christofias'. I have left these typographical differences as they are. They should not cause any confusion. When a word or a phrase occurs inside square brackets in any of the texts collected here this is an interpolation of mine for the sake of clarity or information, e.g., '... [former Greek Prime Minister, Kostas] Simitis...'

I am greatly indebted to Ayla Gürel for getting this booklet into transmittable electronic form, and for her many useful suggestions, regarding content as well as style.

Since his official retirement in 2005, Denktaş's voice is little heard outside the Turkish-speaking world. It seemed to me that what really mattered was to get his perspective – a uniquely informed vision, whether one can agree with all of it or not – once more into the public domain in English so that it would be more widely available, not least to those actually working on the Cyprus issue today.

People tend to hate or to love Denktaş; dispassionate consideration of his views and actions (quite often, his *imagined* views and actions) is rare, particularly among Cypriots. Many elder statesmen everywhere suffer this kind of indignity, needless to say. Yet, when all the emotion settles, it cannot be denied that there is no Turkish Cypriot – and probably no one in Turkey – quite so well-informed or capable of being so articulate about all the manifold aspects of the Cyprus problem as he is.

He is no longer at the negotiating table. Nevertheless, the deeply-considered views of the former long-term leader of the Turkish Cypriots cannot sensibly be ignored, it seems to me, at what may soon become a decisive point in the history of Cyprus.

Michael Moran
Bellapais
November, 2008

Some abbreviations used in the texts

AKEL:	The Progressive Party of the Working People, main partner in the Republic of Cyprus coalition government
AKP:	The ruling Justice and Development Party in Turkey
AP:	Annan Plan
CTA:	Cyprus Turkish Airlines
CTP:	The Republican Turkish Party, main partner in the TRNC coalition government
ECHR:	European Court of Human Rights
GC/ TC:	Greek/Turkish Cypriot
<i>LRB:</i>	<i>London Review of Books</i>
<i>TDN:</i>	<i>Turkish Daily News</i>
UNSC/SC:	UN Security Council
UNSG/SG:	UN Secretary General

Just as the Greek Cypriot preoccupation was that Cyprus should be a Greek Cypriot state, with a protected Turkish Cypriot minority, the Turkish preoccupation was to defeat any such effort and to maintain the partnership concept, which in their opinion the Zürich Agreement created between the two communities. The conflict, therefore, was a conflict of principle and for that principle both sides were prepared to go on arguing and even, if need be, to fight, rather than to compromise.

Glaucos Clerides, *Cyprus: My Deposition* (Nicosia, 1990), vol. 3, p.105

LETTERS

BRIEF SUMMARIES OF THE LETTERS

LETTER 1

I suggest that the 1960 Accords were created largely by the Cyprus Guarantors for their own benefit; that at the moment there is no common basis for an agreed solution to emerge in Cyprus; that any successful agreement will have to be one supported by a number of external powers; and that the Turkish side needs to get its position more widely understood.

LETTER 2

Denktaş agrees with much of this and he fills in some important details about how the 1960 Accords were arrived at. He agrees that unless the Turkish side relinquishes its key demands for (a) political equality and (b) Turkey remaining a guarantor, there will be no basis for a ‘compromise’ with the GCs – who, as always, are seeking dominance on the island. He hints that the GCs would have eventually achieved that goal even if they had accepted the AP. We should seek a solution along the lines adopted in Czechoslovakia, i.e., recognition of a separate TC state.

LETTER 3

I make some points about the diminishing chances of Turkey’s EU membership because of Turkey’s stand on Cyprus. Should Turkey withdraw her EU application because of the EU’s sometimes rather thoughtless treatment of her? I enclose two articles for Denktaş to read (These are included here in Appendices 2 and 3).

LETTER 4

Denktaş explains more about Turkey, the EU, and the need to preserve the ‘state of affairs’ established by the 1960 Accords. The EU’s acceptance of ‘Cyprus’ as a member before Turkey became one constitutes, he maintains, a violation of the 1960 Accords, in particular of the Treaty of Guarantee. (For Denktaş’s more detailed objections to this EU decision, see especially Appendix 8.) The Turkish side’s acceptance of the AP was actually a mistake. For it merely served to enhance the ‘legitimacy’ of the GCs’ EU application. A two-state system in Cyprus is the real answer.

LETTER 5

Given the Greek side's overwhelming rejection of the AP, I agree that two recognised states in Cyprus seems the best – and probably the only sensible – option. But I feel I have to raise various difficulties about the TRNC becoming independent. On the other hand, I severely criticise the 'Memorandum of understanding between Cyprus and the UK' which appeared on 5 June 2008 (for this document see Appendix 4).

LETTER 6

Denktaş worries about the US's wish for a 'mild Islamic Turkey'. He replies to the difficulties I raised about independence for the TRNC and tries to clarify the concept of 'political equality' as applied to the two Cypriot communities. Again, he thinks this would be best achieved through there being two separate states. He believes the AP would never have worked because the GCs would have invoked EU norms and have eventually established their own hegemony throughout the island.

LETTER 7

I venture to disagree with him about this possibility of the GCs being able to subvert the AP, had both sides accepted it. I enclose a letter I wrote in 2003 to Denktaş's then Undersecretary explaining more fully my views about the AP, and why I thought the TCs should accept it. I boldly suggest that Denktaş's opposition to the AP may be due to his having a too 'nationalistic' view of politics.

LETTER 8

In a spirited reply, Denktaş freely admits that he is a Turkish nationalist (a follower of Atatürk) but denies, rather convincingly, that this nationalism has in any way blinded him to the realities in Cyprus. He defends Turkey's actions in the island. Recognition for the TRNC has not yet been seriously sought (even by Turkey). Now it should be. Once again he dismisses the AP. All past experience shows, he believes, that the GCs would never stick to such a joint compromise.

LETTER 9

I accept that Denktaş is not a ‘blind’ nationalist. But I still express doubts about the way his account of things makes Turkey seem entirely blameless in her dealings with Cyprus. I invoke certain UN resolutions that condemn Turkey’s division of the island in 1974. Just as the GCs (and Greece) violated the 1960 Accords in 1963-1974, didn’t Turkey, in turn, violate them from 1974 to the present? Moreover, I am still not absolutely convinced that, had they accepted it, the GCs would have been able to subvert the AP (though, of course, they may well have wanted to and have tried).

LETTER 10

Denktaş expresses grave doubts about the tactics now being employed by the GC leader, Christofias. The latter’s talk about ‘one people’ is a code implying GC dominance. Denktaş thinks the ‘Cyprus problem’ has never been properly diagnosed by the international community. This is why Turkey has not accepted some of the UN resolutions I quoted. There is no ‘occupation’ in Cyprus and no ‘acquisition of territory by force’. What there is is a ‘temporary police duty’ on Turkey’s part, under the 1960 Accords. This is necessary until the original ‘state of affairs’ those Accords established – including equality between the two communities – can be restored. Unfortunately the UNSC failed to do the homework needed to understand the true situation in Cyprus before passing its resolutions. And, as everybody now knows, the EU’s acceptance of a wholly Greek-run ‘Cyprus’ as a member state has further exacerbated the situation. The solution now has to be ‘two peoples and two states.’ Alas, the on-going talks between Christofias and Talat are not along these lines.

Letter 1

12th May 2008

Dear Mr President,

Many thanks for your kind comments about my letter to the *London Review of Books*. As far as I can tell they haven't printed my letter. Given that Perry Anderson is, for some strange reason, one of their regular writers I suppose they didn't want to offend him. Pity.

I perfectly understand your comments about Britain failing to do her duty as a Cyprus guarantor, and let me add that I haven't any desire to defend Britain's behaviour myself. But my impression about the 1960 Accords is that they were created largely by the guarantors at least as much for their own benefit as for the benefit of the Cypriots. The independence of Cyprus was a diplomatic fiction from the beginning. None of the guarantors intended to make a move – 'to take action'¹ – to defend that 'independence'. Any action they took would be to defend their own interests in the island. And this is exactly what happened. Greece wanted Cyprus to be Greek, preferably through effecting *enosis*; Turkey didn't want Cyprus to be Greek and, eventually, put a firm stop to the *enosis*-bid; Britain had had quite enough trouble in Cyprus already and, as you say, she just wanted to keep her bases safe and operational. All 3 guarantors were much more concerned about their own perceived interests than they were about those of the Cypriots. Reluctantly I have come to believe that this is how international politics generally works.

However, I would like to make two related observations in order to see what you think about them.

¹ This phrase comes from article IV of the Cyprus Treaty of Guarantee which says that 'In the event of a breach of the provisions of the present Treaty... each of the three guaranteeing Powers [viz. Britain, Greece, and Turkey] reserves the right to take action with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty.'

(1) For reasons I needn't spell out, I can see no basis for a compromise solution to emerge from the currently proposed discussions between the two Cypriot leaders. I am even rather alarmed that the UN, etc., are making optimistic noises about these proposed discussions (especially given that the Greek Cypriots not only rejected the AP but have refused to put forward any alternative, even when earnestly requested to do so by the UNSG!). It seems plain that the Greek side want to minimise the 'agreements' reached via the UN since 1977 and are hoping to get a 'solution' that will leave them largely in charge of Cyprus, something like things were before 1974 but with the Turks being permitted to have a small, ineffectual role in the government. It's a bit worrying that the international community is, so far, not telling the Greeks that they should perish any such thoughts.

(2) Since there are not just 2 parties in the Cyprus dispute but at least 5 (the Cypriots plus the guarantors – and in fact, of course, there are in effect more: the UN, the EU, the US...), any solution to the problem will have to be agreed to by outside powers. This was so in 1960 and there was nothing the Cypriots could do but to accept what the guarantors proposed. In a way this was just as well. Because the two Cypriot sides will never agree to a solution on their own. The next, largely externally-conceived, blueprint for a solution² came in 2004, the AP. This time the Greek side was able to resist its imposition, simply because they were an internationally recognised government of a sovereign state, a very different position from the time the 1960 Accords were imposed. Interestingly enough, this was the first time the international community itself had suffered from its own mistake, in 1964, of recognising all-Greek governments in Cyprus as legitimate! But has it drawn the right conclusions from this? Apparently not. For, even after their rejection of the AP, the EU accepted the Greek Cypriot state as an EU member, thus confirming the supposedly unproblematic validity of the Greek Cypriot government! (The few EU ambassadors in Cyprus I have since spoken to all admit privately that this acceptance was a mistake – but what a mistake! And what do they propose to do about it? Not much, it seems.)

² Leaving aside the 1992 'Set of Ideas', which never got to the stage of being voted on by the two Cypriot communities.

There can be no doubt that any third proposal about what should happen in Cyprus will also be largely scripted by the usual external powers. Although the Greek Cypriots have annoyed a lot of people by their last minute rejection of the AP, the fact that the UN is nevertheless positive about new negotiations (not necessarily geared to the AP, apparently) seems a bit ominous. Moreover, it's anybody's guess what state Turkey will be in in a year's time. Britain will doubtless continue to want her bases, given the various sorts of chaos in the Middle East. Greece might be happy enough with the lesser form of *enosis* she achieved with 'Cyprus's' EU membership. But can the Turkish Cypriots hope to get another deal anything like as good as the AP? (At our meeting we discussed some of the reasons why the alternative of getting independence for the TRNC would be difficult.)

Today it seems to me to be as important as it ever was for the Turkish Cypriot case – above all, the reasons why they cannot accept wholly or even predominantly Greek governments of the whole island – to be widely disseminated. For I suspect that what the Greek Cypriots will do from now onwards is to ingratiate themselves in every possible way with the international community, always being seen as good boys now that the 'misguidedly' hardline Papadopoulos has gone. So that by the time they chair the EU in 2012 they will have enough collective sympathy to get support for the idea of the Cypriot Turks as a 'protected' minority in a Greek island. I think every effort should be made to prevent the growth of this sympathy.

Yours, etc.,

MM

Letter 2

14 May 2008

Dear Michael,

Thanks for yours of 12th May.

I agree that “the 1960 accords were created largely by the guarantors at least as much for their own benefit as for the benefit of the Cypriots”. But we must remember that “the problem” they were challenged to solve had not been created by Cypriots for Cypriots, in other words, there was no Cypriot (Turkish and Greek) call for independence. The call was for Enosis by the Greek Cypriot side, fully supported by Greece. For Turkish Cypriots this was “changing colonial masters for the worse”; but for Turkey it was changing the Treaty of Lausanne, unilaterally, in favour of Greece.¹ Under that Treaty Cyprus had been ceded to Great Britain. Hence Turkey’s policy on Cyprus, until Greece took the matter to the UN General Assembly asking for Enosis “through the right of self-determination for the people of Cyprus”, was “Turkey has no Cyprus problem; the status quo must continue”. After 1954 the Turkish cry against the Greek claim for Enosis was “Cyprus is Turkish and shall remain Turkish; if Great Britain is to leave Cyprus she is duty bound to hand it over to its ex-owner Turkey”. Then, partition is on and Turkey grabs it because it will settle a dispute between two Nato countries while protecting the Greco-Turkish balance established at Lausanne! The Greek side rejects partition. By 1958, as the death-toll grows on the Turkish Cypriot side; Turkey’s determination to protect Turkish Cypriots at all costs leads to the 1959 Zurich and London Agreements, which again take care of the Greco-Turkish Balance by prohibiting both Enosis and Taksim while establishing a guaranteed

¹ After Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk, ‘the father of the Turks’) defeated the Greek army in Anatolia in 1922, the Treaty of Lausanne (24 July, 1923) enjoined, among other things, that Smyrna (İzmir) and eastern Thrace be recognized as part of Turkey. This led to over 1m Greeks leaving Turkey and about 350,000 Turks leaving Greece. Thus the modern Turkish Republic came into being.

partnership independence on the basis of political equality for both communities. The prohibition or the requirement that “Cyprus should not unite with any other state whatsoever”, unless both motherlands are also involved, was again taking care of the Greco-Turkish balance, which the Greek Cypriot side was determined to disregard and thus make it ineffective at the first opportunity, which they tried to do by applying for EU membership as “Cyprus”!

In short, the Cyprus problem was regarded as a problem between Enosis-seeking Greece and Turkey objecting to it on geo-political grounds, and the problem was settled, as you point out, “for the benefit of the guarantors” while giving the chance to Cypriots to rule themselves freely! The problem was not really settled because the Greek side did not abandon its original policy of Enosis. The 1960 independence remained a diplomatic fiction because Makarios and guarantor Greece looked upon it as a stepping-stone for Enosis. You may have read the confessions of a veteran Greek Cypriot who gave a full picture of how the Greek Army Officers in the Cyprus Army, trained young Cypriots for a fight against Turkish Cypriots while the Turkish contingent [present in Cyprus under the 1960 Treaty of Alliance] refused to give us any help, even after the attacks on us in December 1963! So, guarantor Greece was involved in destroying what she had guaranteed to uphold, while guarantor Britain watched her own interests.

Recognition of the Makarios administration as the legitimate government of Cyprus all through these years and refusal to veto the Greek Cypriot application for EU membership are good examples on this point; her refusal to help Turkey for a joint, token, bloodless intervention through the Bases underlines Britain’s concern not to confront the Greek Cypriot side for the sake of the Bases! So, Turkey was left alone in defending her interests (protection of the Greco-Turkish balance) while helping us to survive! Looking through the British and American archives underlines your belief that international politics generally work as they did in Cyprus.

As to your observations: unless the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey abandon the argument of political equality (co-founder partner) status for

the Turkish Cypriots, coupled with agreeing to forego the right of guarantees, I agree that there is no basis for a compromise solution to emerge from the current discussions. The optimistic noises by the UN and others are part and parcel of “how international politics generally work”. I lived through such “shows” dozens of times each time there was a resumption of the talks after some break-down. This show is meant to put pressure on the interlocutors to keep the optimistic atmosphere which they themselves created by agreeing to talk!

Your assessment that “the Greek side want to minimize the agreements reached via the UN since 1977, hoping to get a solution that will leave them largely in charge of Cyprus, something like things were before 1974 but with the Turks being permitted to have a small, ineffectual role in the government” is quite realistic. The international community is not only “not telling the Greeks that they should perish any such thoughts” but, on the contrary, Mr. Bryza of the USA has publicly called upon Turkey “to fulfil her obligations towards the EU (meaning recognition of the Greek Cypriot Administration as the legitimate government of Cyprus) and to amend its proposals so that the Greek Cypriots would be able to accept them”. And no doubt the whole exercise envisaged by “the international Community” (meaning US + British + the Russian-propelled Secretary-General’s Representative at the talks) is for amending the Annan Plan (without even mentioning its name) in such a way that Greek Cypriot objections will be removed!

Under these circumstances [your asking] can we expect anything better than the Annan Plan begs the question because, under EU norms, Cyprus would become Greek Cypriot no matter what rights were to be given to us on paper. The 1960 Agreements, with all the guarantees, was wrecked let us remember!

If we do not stick to our rights and status as one of the two peoples of Cyprus and defend our state while continuing to underline the importance of the Greco-Turkish balance for the permanence of any solution, I cannot visualize the end of the Cyprus problem. As you know, when Mr. Hoon, the British Minister, was confronted with the UN-held public poll results

Cyprus: Unity And Difference

that 65% of the Greek Cypriot youth and 45% of the Greek Cypriots in general did not want to live with Turkish Cypriots, his reaction was: “if this is true, then the answer should be confederation”. I believe the Czech-Slovak example is the way to a solution, and I agree entirely with your views expressed in the penultimate paragraph of your letter. What is needed is an extraordinary effort at PR-lobbying!

Yours, etc.,

RRD

Letter 3

18th May 2008

Dear Mr President,

Many thanks for your letter of 14th May and your illuminating points about what was at stake in 1958-9. Needless to say, while it is intellectually gratifying to learn that you largely agree with my apprehensions about the current round of negotiations on Cyprus, the situation is still quite worrying. I will mention only a couple of things.

You will know a lot better than I can what is liable to happen in Turkey if the present AKP government is removed.¹ But I imagine that, whoever takes over, there will be no question of their recognising the Greek Cypriot administration as the legal government of the whole of Cyprus. This will mean that the Turkish army will have to stay here. Consequently the chances of Turkey becoming an EU member state will further diminish. I say ‘further’ because, of course, there are other reasons why Turkey will have great difficulties in joining the EU. In fact, my impression is now that Turkey might in any case be better off outside the EU with perhaps a ‘special relationship’ rather like the one suggested by Germany. One of my reasons for this belief is the very foolish way the EU has behaved over

¹ At the time this letter was written the Turkish Constitutional Court was considering whether to ban from politics for 5 years the ruling AKP, which has Islamic roots, on the ground of its alleged anti-secular activities. From a Western point of view, this would have involved the extraordinary phenomenon of a democratically elected government being removed by the judiciary, something the EU found almost incomprehensible. In July 2008 the Constitutional Court, by a narrow margin, decided not to ban the AKP but cut the party’s treasury funding for that year, the Court’s president, Haşim Kılıç, calling this action a ‘serious warning’. Political instability is by no means at an end in Turkey. For one thing, conflict is still very visible between the elected authorities and what is not very helpfully called the ‘deep state’, against which the government is, in turn, attempting to take legal action. Presumably Denktaş is alluding to this continuing instability in Turkey when, in the first para. of Letter 6, he speaks of ‘a weak government always responsive to big power demands.’

Cyprus. The good thing about Turkey's attempt to meet the EU's requirements for membership is that at least some moves have been made to make Turkey a more democratic country.

What we both seem to be saying about the currently proposed new negotiations on Cyprus is that they have come into being because of a desire, on the part of the international community, to make concessions to the Greek side. Since, on the Turkish side, there can be no concessions as regards (a) political equality; (b) Turkey's guarantee; (c) bizonality, these further discussions seem to be a waste of time. And the UN, et al., should know this by now. So, it seems to me at any rate, that these new negotiations, about which everyone is so enthusiastic, are in reality a tiresome attempt to put pressure on the Turkish side. What Turkey needs to do – apart from reasserting her well-known reasons for not recognising the present Cyprus government – is to make it abundantly clear that, with this kind of behaviour on the part of the EU, she is very inclined to withdraw her membership application. I would imagine that a mere 'special relation' is all Turkey needs to get adequate economic benefits from the EU. But I'm no economic expert, of course. Such a threat (at any rate) of withdrawal might have interesting effects, not least in the US.

You say: 'The 1960 Agreements with all the guarantees were wrecked...'. What is true is that these Agreements were, in certain crucial respects, illegally ignored. But the Treaty of Establishment was maintained. Could Britain safely deny even today that any of the 1960 Accords are valid?

I am enclosing two articles.² The shorter one is from the *TDN* written by a friend of mine to whom I sent my letter about Anderson. She included a useful quote from my letter but also, unfortunately, referred to me as 'a living legend'! In a note to her I had to reprimand her for this, while praising her for her criticisms of Anderson. The other enclosure is an article of mine of which you have doubtless read an earlier version. No one would publish

² The two articles just mentioned can be found below as Appendices 2 and 3, respectively.

it in Turkey and I got it printed in *Cyprus Dialogue* only because one of the editors is a (British) friend of mine. In this article I was trying to generate a perspective on the Cyprus issue that might have a slight effect – positively, from the Turkish point of view – on foreign diplomats. As it turned out, no one has said anything to me, positively or negatively, about this article.

Hope these enclosures don't waste too much of your time!

Yours, etc.,

MM

Letter 4

3 June 2008

Dear Michael,

Sorry for this delay in reacting to yours of 18th May due to my three short visits to Istanbul.

What Turkey does with her EU venture I do not know, but bowing to the ever increasing demands and the way this is done is quite unacceptable. As to Cyprus! The EU's continuous assertion that Cyprus (meaning the 1960 Partnership Republic) is a member, is also unacceptable. As long as the 1960 Cyprus Agreements are valid, Cyprus pre-1963 or thereafter could not apply nor become a member of the EU unless Turkey was also a full member.¹ As you point out no one can argue, least of all Britain, that the

¹ Denktaş frequently refers to this point: that the Republic of Cyprus – if it was still what it was intended to be, a jointly-run Cyprus and not, as it is now in fact, a solely Greek state – cannot legitimately join an organisation of which Turkey is not a member. He seems to have two grounds for upholding this position. (i) Article 1 of the Treaty of Guarantee, para. 2, states, in part, that the newly-founded Republic 'undertakes not to participate, in whole or in part, in any political or economic union with any State whatsoever'. (ii) A fundamental feature of the 1960 Cyprus Accords was that they were designed to help maintain a broader balance of power in the region between the two traditional rivals, Greece and Turkey. Cyprus, a strategically important island close to Turkey's southern shores and in which Turkey has a number of legitimate interests, could not, if that 'balance' was to be maintained, become wholly Greek or a part of Greece. Cyprus's becoming, like Greece before her, part of the EU, while Turkey is left out, is from this point of view also held to be detrimental to the Greco-Turkish balance in the region. Needless to say both (i) and (ii) can be, and have been, argued about. For a useful summary of these arguments see, e.g., Clement Dodd, *The Cyprus Imbroglia* (Huntingdon, 1998), pp. 82f. There is, however, a third point that, quite understandably, never leaves Denktaş's mind. (iii) Not only did the EU admit Cyprus, despite (i) and (ii). They in fact admitted a Cyprus now entirely run by GCs. What is more, the EU did this immediately after the GCs had firmly rejected a solution to the Cyprus problem (the AP) that practically the whole international community, including the present Turkish government and the TCs themselves, had regarded as the best compromise that could be devised. As later letters clearly show, Denktaş himself never believed that the AP would have worked even if the GCs had agreed to it, and this is a point of contention throughout our correspondence. However, I think one can only sympathize with his justified consternation at the EU's behaviour over Cyprus, even if, like them, one were to put less weight on (i) and (ii) than he does. It should be noted that making 'Cyprus' an EU member before a political settlement on the island is only the latest of a number of serious blunders by the international community – none of which can inspire confidence in the Turkish side's assessment of Western intentions.

Agreements “wrecked or ignored” are no longer valid. What we have been trying to do, in the course of all the talks, is to preserve the “the state of affairs” established by these Treaties, namely the balance between the two sides in Cyprus and the Greco-Turkish balance under the guise of guarantees, which also covered the needs of Britain as far as her Bases were concerned.

So, Turkey and the TRNC, I agree, should rely on this defence of “incapacity of Cyprus to become a member” and thus refute the EU’s endeavour to keep Turkey responsible for settling the Cyprus problem “or else!”. Naturally, the fact that Turkey signed the Additional Protocol² and the TRNC feels “honoured” to deal with EU Representatives – despite the fact all these Representatives affirm that they do not recognize the TRNC – weakens our position. But the wrong done by the EU in accepting Cyprus – the “Greek Cypriot party” – as a member has to be corrected if “the realities” of Cyprus are to be reinstated and the myth on which everyone has been acting so far is left behind. Your suggestion that Turkey should threaten withdrawal may be one of the ways to open this gate!

Tiryaki’s article is superb and to the point. One would be entitled to object being called “another living legend” just because she has bestowed that same honour on Anderson also, otherwise why object and why reprimand her! Too much modesty is not good.

I read your article twice. Your view, as expressed in the first paragraph is becoming a reality with the repeated statements by Hristofyas and others about “no sacrifices” on their “red line”! As to your view that “the Cyprus problem is also essentially a security problem concerning the whole Eastern

² The ‘Additional Protocol’ was an addition to an agreement establishing a trading association between Turkey and all EU member states signed by Turkey on 29 July 2005. While signing this agreement, however, Turkey sought to exclude Cyprus from the list of member states on the grounds that ‘The Republic of Cyprus referred to in the Protocol is not the original partnership State established in 1960’. In response, on 21 September 2005, the EU regretted Turkey’s refusal to recognise the Republic of Cyprus and asserted that Turkey’s position on Cyprus ‘has no legal effect on Turkey’s obligations under the Protocol’.

Mediterranean region and beyond”, I have this to add. Weren’t the 1960 Agreements made specially because this need was realized by all concerned? Three Nato countries were made responsible for keeping Cyprus in the Western Alliance while giving the chance to the two Cypriot sides to enjoy “the independence” jointly. A unified Cyprus failed because guarantors (Greece and Great Britain) failed in foiling Makarios’s attempt to use the independence as a “spring-board for Enosis”. Today two states, guaranteed by three powers and collaborating on agreed matters, as the Czechs and Slovaks are doing, should suffice to satisfy the needs of the region from the Western point of view.

Your analysis of Cyprus and EU and the Turkish Cypriot attitude to Greek Cypriot legitimacy are quite realistic.

As to your statement that “had the AP been accepted by both sides, they would have entered the EU together, as the United Cyprus Republic, thus removing the chief Turkish objection to EU membership for the present Greek-run ‘Cyprus’”, this has to be challenged. As you rightly pointed out earlier, the reason for the Greek Cypriot application for EU membership was political, namely, to challenge the Treaty of Guarantee which provided that Cyprus could not unite (or enter such a union as the EU) unless Turkey was also a member. That is why “entry into the EU together with Greek Cypriots” had no attraction for those of us who regarded the protection of the Greco-Turkish balance as a fundamental duty for not allowing the Greek Cypriots to enhance their “legitimacy”. De Soto failed to appreciate this aspect of the problem for the Turkish side because the CTP [the currently ruling political party in the TRNC] jointly with Akel, were not concerned with such niceties!

On the question of “disparity of purpose” between “Greek Cypriot nationalism” and “what is really the determination of larger powers to incorporate Cyprus into the Western defence agenda”, all that you point out as disparity between full independence and what seems to curtail it, was worked out in order to facilitate the security needs of the Region. It was a

Cyprus: Unity And Difference

compromise between Enosis and reversion of Cyprus to Turkey, later amended as “double Enosis - Taksim”, and finally a guaranteed independence serving the interests of all concerned. Phoney independence? Maybe yes! But “full independence” would have meant Enosis and an unavoidable Greco-Turkish war!

I always say that the Greek Cypriots should enjoy their right as a majority and be allowed to rule themselves as long as they concede that the Turkish side has the same right over an agreed part of the territory.

Whatever steps are taken to maintain a balance, constitutionally and otherwise, between 80% and 20% will cause resentment in the 80%, as it did under the 1960 Agreements. That is why a final divorce and two-state settlement remains the best solution. But for this to happen it is necessary that the guarantors and the USA tell Greece and the Greek Cypriots that Turkish interest in Cyprus shall never be ignored and that Greek Cypriots have no legitimate claim over the whole island! (Perhaps I am dreaming.)

As to the rest of your article, what can I say except that Tiryaki was right in her description of you!

Yours, etc.,

RRD

Letter 5

9th June 2008

Dear Mr President,

Various points occurred to me while reading your letter of 3 June and, for your ease of reference if you want to take me up on any of them, I will number them:

(1) I think what you are saying about my article on ‘Cyprus and Security’ is that international (and especially regional) security – notably the ‘balance between Greece and Turkey’ – *was always* a central issue in the ‘Cyprus problem’, and that indeed it was this concern that gave the 1960 Accords their rather complex form. You are of course right. What I have been wondering about is, given the now very different international situation, what revised Accords would be appropriate or, more realistically, what new arrangements can we expect the big powers to try to impose.

(2) I was interested to see your ‘admission’ that the 80% will always resent the 20% having ‘political equality’ in any single-state Cyprus. This is true, especially given the traditional Greek Cypriot assumption that they are a rather superior people anyway! Needless to say, terms like ‘political equality’ and ‘bizonality’, still so readily used in talk about a solution, are open to a great deal of interpretation; and it seems very doubtful that, in any further negotiations, the Greek side will allow those words to mean what the Turkish side wants them to mean.

(3) On the face of it,¹ I think there is a lot to be said for your view that the best solution would be two separate states in Cyprus. But when one tries to envisage this in practice some fairly formidable problems seem to emerge. Here are just a few:

¹ I.e., given the GC’s remarkably firm rejection of the AP and consequent revelation that they are actually still seeking hegemony in Cyprus.

- a) Presumably the Turkish side would have to return some land to the Greek Cypriots (perhaps as much as envisaged in the AP) and pay compensation for some Greek properties. This would make the TRNC even smaller; and where would the money come from, even when this was offset by Greek compensation for Turkish property in the South?
- b) Given the large sums the TRNC receives from Turkey every year, could the TRNC ever manage to be financially self-sufficient? We have, I think, to remember in this connection that Turkish Cypriots haven't been particularly successful in their business dealings, consider, e.g., the mess CTA seems to be in, or look at the horrors perpetrated by some sections of the building industry – none of which has done the country's image abroad the slightest bit of good and is an embarrassment to us all. There is something seriously wrong with a government that allows this sort of thing to happen.
- c) Could the TRNC defend itself militarily?
- d) Do we have here enough suitably educated and articulate people effectively to fill all the diplomatic posts, here and abroad, that an independent state would need?
- e) Given the proximity to Turkey, the common language, religion and the various Turkish mainland interests (I mean business interests) already established here, together with Turkey's strategic interests in the island, the idea that the Turkish Cypriots could run their own country largely alone begins to look exceedingly unlikely. In fact, even if there was a federation with the Greek Cypriots, because of the things I've just mentioned Turkey would always play a very significant role in the North – something the Greek side wouldn't like, of course. But it seems to me to be inevitable. Of course, there was a time when Greece played a comparable role in the lives of the Greek Cypriots. But for reasons we needn't go into here (geography being a crucial one) this is now far less so.

Put very quickly and roughly, these are the kind of worries I have about the plausibility of our having a truly separate state here.

(4) I can touch once more on some of the things we have been discussing by giving you my initial reactions to the ‘Memorandum of understanding between Cyprus and the UK’ published on 5 June.² It is a very disappointing document. One sentence makes me wonder if my own government is living in the real world: ‘The two countries reiterate their commitment to their respective obligations under the Treaties signed in 1960’! As everybody knows – *everybody!* – these are the Treaties that the Greek Cypriots have openly, time and again, sought to abolish. And, as you have repeatedly said, Britain has done little to fulfil her obligations under the Treaty of Guarantee. And, of course, talking to a wholly Greek Cypriot government of Cyprus as if there is absolutely nothing wrong with it means that Britain can be of no real help in solving the Cyprus problem. The para. about ‘the need for Turkey to fulfil its outstanding obligations....’ is insensitive and may seem even rather belligerent since it pretends to be oblivious to the crucial, widely known, fact that Turkey cannot accept a Greek Cypriot administration as the Cyprus government. The para. about having a ‘constructive’ attitude ‘on all issues emanating from the Treaty of Establishment’ is rather pathetic and surely redundant if, indeed, the two countries are in any case so committed to the 1960 Treaties! The idea that only the Turkish community needs to be helped to ‘prepare ... for reunification’ is – no doubt unconsciously – another diplomatic insensitivity. In fact, this Memorandum might just as well have been written by Christofias and handed to Brown for his signature! All rather disappointing.

(5) Why are the British taking this sort of line? This is just speculation, but I am inclined to see what is happening now on the international stage as follows (you will be very familiar with this kind of thing).

² For this Memorandum see Appendix 4 below.

The Annan Plan failed because the Greeks rejected it in no uncertain terms. For them, it envisaged a form of ‘bizonality’ and ‘political equality’ which they can’t bear the thought of. It also didn’t really get rid of the Turkish army or effectively block Turkey’s strategic interest in the island. As you know, I believe myself the AP was the best compromise solution we have seen so far. It tried to take some real account of Turkish Cypriot and Turkey’s interests. But it wasn’t accepted. So the international community’s next move will be to try to take less account of Turkish interests and see if they can get an agreement on that. The Cyprus problem is actually insoluble, on my view, given the attitudes and requirements of the contestants. All the international community can do is to bring pressure to bear on one side and then, when that fails, to bring it to bear on the other side. It is now the Turkish side’s ‘turn’ to be pressurised, Turkey’s desire to join the EU being seen as a potential weak point.

Because of Britain’s unique role in the Cyprus issue – including her former colonial power (and guarantor) status, the existence of her bases on the island, her UNSC membership, EU membership, and ‘special relationship’ with the US – this recent document tells us (if we weren’t quite sure already) what an unsympathetic stance towards the Turkish side the West has decided to try on. All very unfortunate and a terrible waste of time!

Yours, etc.,

MM

Letter 6

16 June 2008

Dear Michael,

Para (1) is our mutual understanding. Is the present-day international situation really any different than in 1950-60-80's? Nato's interest was real during those years, as it is today. Nato did not want a rift between Turkey and Greece then and until now; Russia is waking up, China is picking up its "chains". Is Turkey of any less value now to the Western Alliance than she ever was? I don't really know! What I feel is that "the west" needs Turkey but not a strong Turkey, the Army still supporting Atatürk's reform, but a weakened Turkey on sectarian and religious grounds. Hence, the EU's admonition: "Atatürk's Principles are not compatible with EU norms" and the USA's wish for a "Mild Islamic Turkey"!¹ This means continuous internal strife for the country; a weak government always responsive to big power demands etc. So, we shall see, as you say, "what new arrangements can be expected the big powers to try and impose"! Britain's memorandum with Hristofyas, I feel, is a good indication. "Cypriots should settle their problem without interference from outside" is in fact a good way of ousting Turkey as a guarantor and getting rid of the guarantees. What Britain will do with her Bases, which are also guaranteed, is to be seen!

¹ There may be something in what Denktaş says here. But we have also to bear in mind that the Americans have consistently dismissed this theory about US aims in Turkey – a theory also held, incidentally, by certain factions in the Turkish military and by the Turkish Chief Prosecutor of the Court of Appeals in his recent case against the AKP. According to US diplomats, this is just another of the many 'conspiracy' theories with which, they say, Turkey is plagued. See, e.g., David Arnett's defence of America's position in a recent article, 'Problems of perception and vision: Turkey and the US' reprinted in the *TDN* on 6 October 2008. Arnett claims that America's attitude to Turkey is the very reverse of what Denktaş is inclined to believe. 'The US', writes Arnett, 'has absolutely no interest in lessening the secular nature of the [Turkish] state. Turkey would then become just one more problematic country that has been unable to integrate Islam into modern democratic life. Turkey is important to NATO precisely because it is a secular democracy that boasts a strong modern military force and can help the world avoid the threatened "conflict of civilisations."... There is no conceivable strategic scenario that could provide any benefit to the United States in a militarily or politically weakened Turkey.'

As to Para (2) – the Greek Cypriots want to eat their cake and to still have it. They feel unjustly treated under the 1960 Agreement because they look upon their numerical majority internally, forgetting that their “National Cause” was/is Enosis, which brings in Turkey and Greece in which case they are a minority. That is why Cyprus must have a special treatment in settling the Cyprus problem. 1960 did not work; so, this time, the Greek Cypriots must be allowed to have a free run of their state as Greek Cypriots in the South, and Turkish Cypriots enjoy their freedom free of any new threats from their neighbour in the North. Hence the necessity of maintaining a Greco-Turkish balance as in 1960. The Greek Cypriot claim that they own (or are entitled to own) the whole island is nonsense. Territorial adjustment is necessary and settling property questions globally with exchange, compensation and limited return as in the Set of Ideas,² should be the way to a settlement. It was Kyprianou’s statement that “no settlement until all refugees get their properties back” which prevented the settlement of this thorny subject.

“Political equality” was worked out in the 1960 arrangement and it did not work. The UN’s interpretation of “political equality” has allowed Greek Cypriots to get away with the title of “the legitimate government of Cyprus”. So, there is no need to devise artificial meanings to “political equality”. Two separate states will put an end to this argument.

“Bizonality” has been on the table since 1977 and no Greek Cypriot leader was ready to accept it as an agreed end. As stated by Clerides they [the Greek Cypriots] “attended the talks for tactical reasons”, to gain time and embody themselves more and more as “the government of Cyprus”, and to project Turkish Cypriot side as “the intransigent side”. Hristofyas is not doing anything different. The unanimous decisions of the [Greek Cypriot] National Council are as binding on him as they were on the

² The 1992 ‘Set of Ideas’ was the most elaborate precursor of the 2004 AP. Put together under the guidance of the then UNSG, Boutros Ghali, as ‘an appropriate basis for reaching an overall framework agreement’ in Cyprus, it was never enthusiastically received by either side; though Denktas *did* accept 91 out of the 100 paragraphs proposed.

previous leaders. Enosis, unitary state, no partnership, no guarantees, no soldiers, no settlers are part and parcel of “these unanimous decisions.” Look at what Hristofyas wants!

Para 3 (a) For making us say yes to the AP, we were promised help from an international fund to be contributed by friendly countries in addition to adjusting claims from one side to the other. We are entitled to the use of the same criteria as used in the Loizidou³ case for not being able to go back to our properties over so many years; compensation for loss of jobs by civil servants, by the families of missing persons, destroyed villages, stolen tractors, cattle, etc! Greek Cypriots should claim with us and with Turkey, “war compensation” from Greece. At least, having all these things in mind, it should be easy to settle this question also globally – if the Greek side was made to feel the need for a settlement by the Big Powers telling them that a two-state settlement is what is needed for permanence!

(b) As the TRNC is also a factor for the defence of Turkey in case of need, financial aid to the TRNC would be like British expenditure to the British Bases, which cannot also be self-sufficient (although the British Bases have no relevance to Turkish-TRNC relations under the 1960 Treaties, of course). A free TRNC with no embargoes would be able to look after itself eventually!

The building industry, I agree, has to pull up its socks and do better. I attended a black-tie gathering of these “ladies and gentlemen” some days ago and I was astounded to discover that 75% of the companies in building industry is composed of Brits. One consolation is that even in making an unsatisfactory image abroad we have not been able to surpass Greek Cypriot colleagues in the South. It is a shame how people are being swindled.

³ In 1998 a Greek Cypriot lady, Mrs Titina Loizidou, was awarded a large sum in damages by the European Court of Human Rights in a case she and the Greek Cypriot government had brought against Turkey for allegedly denying her access to some of her property in Northern Cyprus. Turkey paid this compensation in December, 2003.

(c) Militarily, the Turkish guarantee is essential. My agreement with [former Turkish President, Süleyman] Demirel that any attack on TRNC will be deemed to be an attack on Turkey should be developed into an internationally recognized agreement.

(d) Yes we have, most of them dispersed all over Europe, in Turkey and in Britain. Any shortages can be supplemented temporarily from the Turkish Foreign Ministry. What is important is to feel free and not to be treated as an unwanted interference by the Greek Cypriot side in a new artificial (and temporary) partnership arrangement, which Greek Cypriots do not want in any case.

(e) We see nothing wrong in joint endeavours with Turkey. Even Britain had to be with the USA on policies which most of the people did not like. The Greek Cypriot side is working hand in glove with Greece – see how Greece black-mailed the EU in making Greek Cypriots (Cyprus) a member,⁴ and the on-going high-level visits and counter visits. I believe that Enosis is still on their agenda although, they may both be satisfied with a second Greece (Cyprus) internationally working with mother Greece which will have her bases, etc., [in Cyprus], once all Turkish ties are cut off. Don't forget that, even with the 1960 Agreements still valid and the Turkish presence in the island, [former Greek Prime Minister, Kostas] Simitis described EU Membership of Cyprus as “Enosis achieved”. Without Turkey in the EU as a full member how can one say this is not so? And that is what they (Greece and the Greek Cypriots) are trying to achieve: a simulated, artificial bizonal, bicomunal federation without guarantees and no Turkish Cypriot state (no TRNC), no Turkish soldiers! Then a few terrorist activities here and there; economic difficulties, a feeling of being unsafe [on the part of the Turkish Cypriots] – emigration and a repeat performance of the Cretan Affair!

⁴ On this ‘blackmail’ see, e.g., Nathalie Tocci, *EU Accession Dynamic and Conflict Resolution* (Aldershot, UK, 2004), pp. 97-98.

The TRNC supported by Turkey under a new Agreement, and refusal by the TRNC to enter the EU unless/until Turkey becomes a full member, making the TRNC a free zone for the area: this should be our answer to the above scheme.

Para 4: I fully agree, but this was no accident. It is a final notice to us, not to insist on the TRNC or sovereignty. That Britain regards 1960 Agreements as valid only in so far as her interests are concerned has been true since 1964. But she feels open to attack through the British Bases and has to be on the Greek Cypriot side.

Para 5: I agree with you, minus your assessment of AP. It would never work. We would be in the same difficulty as in 1963-1974 once the Turkish Army was out. Subtly they [the Greek Cypriots] would have deprived us of many of our rights by resorting to the ECHR on the ground that such separate treatment of a minority is not compatible with EU laws of establishment, etc. The EU had refused to grant us derogations; secondly and more importantly, it was making us a party to the Greek Cypriot endeavour to nullify the Treaty of Guarantee which provided that Cyprus could not be a member of any organization (or join any other country in part in whole) unless Turkey was also a member. The Greek Cypriot application for EU membership was political – just in order to do away with this part of the guarantee system, which we had (and Turkey had) protested as illegal etc, and now, under the pretence of a settlement, we were joining the Greek Cypriots in legitimizing their defiance of the Treaty of Guarantee.

Yours, etc.,

RRD

Letter 7

26th June 2008

Dear Mr President,

Many thanks for your letter of the 16th which raises many interesting points, as usual. I can't do justice in this reply to all of them because on Friday, 27th, I am going to England for 2 or 3 months and I still have many preparations to deal with. I will just try to say something about why I think you are wrong in your interpretation of the AP and, more speculatively, I will go on to suggest an explanation for your negative attitude towards the AP (and, indeed, towards the EU). The explanation is, I shall boldly suggest, that you have embraced a certain kind of nationalism, an outlook which is in essence not all that different from that of your Greek Cypriot adversaries.

'Nationalism', as we know, is a word which has for many people nowadays strongly negative overtones. I am not using it in that way. There is nothing wrong, and everything right, about love of one's country, language, culture, traditions, etc. I remember when I was a boy in the 1940s how these feelings were strong in England, and although we doubtless went too far in believing, for example, that 'British is best!' (a label used on many products at the time, as you may remember), I have always regretted that since the 1960s these sentiments have diminished to the extent that, for many British people, national pride has given way to irresponsible cynicism and mindless consumerism. But nationalism can sometimes lead to certain kinds of blindness to important realities, and I want to suggest that you may be suffering from this. I say *may*. I cannot presume to know.

In fact in November 2003, when you were still in power, I wrote a letter to Ergün Olgun, your undersecretary at the time, in which I explained some of my apprehensions about the TC side's apparent intention to reject the

AP. Having read the letter, Ergün rang me and said ‘Shall I show it to Denktaş?’ I was hesitant because I knew these were difficult times for you and I didn’t want to add, however slightly, to your burden. But in the end I left it up to Ergün. So, for all I know, you may have read this letter already. Nevertheless, since I don’t think I can improve on it as a careful outline of my views, I hope you won’t mind my inflicting it upon you once again.

Last night I read once more through the relevant sections of the March 2004 version of the AP just to see if I could find anything I might have missed that would lend support to your apprehensions about how the Plan ‘would never work’ – because the Greeks would seek to undermine it. I can’t see how, once they had signed that agreement, they ever *could* undermine it. The Treaty of Guarantee is still there; no Cypriots would have armies or paramilitary groups, etc. Moreover, Basic Article 18 states that ‘Cyprus shall maintain special ties of friendship with Greece and Turkey respecting the balance established by the Treaty of Guarantee...’ etc.; and the political equality of the two constituent states is so firmly laid down throughout that long document that it is surely inconceivable that the Greeks could successfully appeal to any court to have the TCs reduced to a ‘minority’. Of course, as things turned out, they *didn’t* sign it. My belief is that they rejected the AP because they realised that, had they accepted it, that would have been the end of Hellenism in Cyprus (except, no doubt, as a harmless cultural phenomenon in their part of the island). Given this, what I’m hoping to do in this letter is to answer the question: ‘Why was Denktaş himself so disinclined to sign the AP? And why does he still dismiss it with such firmness?’

Here is what I wrote to Ergün nearly 5 years ago:¹

¹ This letter to Ergün Olgun needs to be read in the context of the time it was written. In November 2003 I was assuming, like almost everyone else, that the GCs intended to accept the AP. Once they so firmly rejected it (or anything like it) it became quite clear they were not really interested in a compromise solution and merely wished to continue reasserting their own hegemony throughout the island. After that final revelation, it became much more plausible for the TC side to seek independence. Indeed they hardly had another choice. So by 2008 I had become entirely sympathetic towards that latter solution, difficult though it will doubtless be to get the international community to appreciate its now luminously self-evident merits.

To Ergün Olgun from Michael Moran
Bellapais, 17th November 2003

Dear Ergün,

I recently read, with great interest, your paper delivered to the ‘Conference on the Annan Plan: Myths and Realities’ in Istanbul in July this year, and I was tempted to send you some detailed comments on it. As you probably know, I am myself in favour of the Annan Plan (AP), assuming that a few important changes can be negotiated; and of course I realise that President Denktaş has taken a firm stand against it, not I think primarily on matters of detail but in principle. And certainly it seems that the reservations about the AP you express in your paper are such that arguing about details might be pointless. What you (meaning the TRNC negotiators) seem to want is nothing less than a recognised independent Turkish state in Cyprus with its own sovereignty, a state which may perhaps enter into a confederal arrangement with the Greek Cypriots, but would not become part of the EU next year but only when Turkey does (and this could easily be 10 years from now, if at all). If I am right about this – particularly about how the AP is unacceptable to you in principle, for all your reassurances about wishing to reach an agreed settlement in the UN context – your stance worries me for a number of reasons. So instead of talking about the details of your paper, I would like to make a few general remarks. For brevity’s sake I shall be rather blunt, something a busy man might appreciate!

If I really thought the TRNC – with the blessing of the international community, by which I mean in particular the UNSC, including guarantor Britain, and superpower America, and the member states of the EU, including guarantor Greece – could become a recognised independent state, I would be all for it. Unfortunately nothing seems clearer to me than that none of the powers I’ve just mentioned will recognise the TRNC in its present form. Therefore it must be a mistake to aim, in effect, for its recognition. Shortly I will suggest why you are making this mistake.

The reasons for the universal reluctance to recognise the TRNC are known to everyone. Yet your paper suggests to me that you are inclined to forget them. The Turkish army was quite right (i.e., acting perfectly in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee) when it intervened in 1974, preventing *enosis*; but by subsequently dividing the island, turning 160,000 Greek Cypriots into refugees (their homes, possessions and lands being given to TCs), and later by condoning the establishment of the TRNC, Turkey acted in a way that was plainly incompatible with the Treaty – and indeed arguably with the spirit of the 1960 Accords as a whole; and, what is even worse, Turkey’s actions have been regarded ever since by the UNSC as incompatible with the UN Charter itself. Now you may well want to argue about this. You may, for example, refer to the 1975 Voluntary Exchange Agreement (for my criticisms of the Turkish interpretation of that Agreement see *Denktash at the UN*, p. 98²) in order to deny that the Greeks were in effect kicked out. But I believe you would lose those arguments. Given the circumstances of that time, one can sympathise with Turkey’s actions after the second Geneva Conference in 1974 (as indeed I have done in print); but, alas, I don’t see how one can defend those actions by appeals to ‘international treaties’. And, in any case, what I have just said summarizes the perceptions of the international community, and these are not at all likely to change. As you know of course, these are the main reasons why the TRNC will not be recognised. As one SG succinctly put it in 1993, ‘the status quo in Cyprus [he meant the division of the island and the setting up of the TRNC] was established through the use of force and is sustained by military strength. Such a status quo is not viable in the long term’ (S/26777, para. 101c).

Needless to say, it’s a very great pity the SG didn’t go on to acknowledge the other striking anomaly on the island: the continuing existence of an unconstitutional wholly Greek government in the South (which itself had been established by a combination of force and diplomatic cajolery), posing

² The book referred to is my edition of President Denktash’s addresses to the UNSC: *Rauf Denktash at the United Nations: Speeches on Cyprus* (The Eothen Press, Huntingdon, 1997).

since 1964 as the government of the whole Republic. But he didn't. Not out of any enmity towards the Turkish side, I believe, but because by then the Greek side had been so long and widely regarded as the *de jure* Cyprus government that this was not an issue the SG wanted to get into, at least not directly.

But doesn't the AP now promise to remove both of these anomalies? To any dispassionate observer this will be seen immediately. On the one hand, the Greeks will no longer be regarded as solely in charge of the Cyprus government; on the other hand, there will no longer be a *de facto* separate (and allegedly sovereign and independent) Turkish state on the island, a state actually protected by, and wholly dependent on, Turkey. In the New Cyprus sovereignty will be shared. This sharing of sovereignty has always been one of the central parameters of the UN negotiation process, as it was central to the 1960 Accords. I really don't see on what plausible grounds you could hope to change it, so as to get separate sovereignties. (This is not to say that I don't see why you *want* separate sovereignty. Essentially, I don't think you and Turkey are in a position, vis-à-vis the GCs and the international community, to have any chance of getting it.)

My main point here, however, is that while there can be no doubt that the Greeks in Cyprus did do terrible things (and the international community itself didn't behave very brilliantly in letting the Greeks get away with a lot of it), yet so did Turkey do terrible things. This will perhaps sound heretical to you, in your official capacity, but it is a point that needs to be made on this side of the island more often, I think. With your talk about the sufferings of 'the Turkish Cypriot people', you can easily give the impression that the Turkish side is completely innocent, and that not only have the TCs continued to suffer because of the wholly unjustified embargos, etc., but that they are the undeserving victims of profound international misunderstanding and abuse. Even, it is sometimes suggested, the Western Powers (the 'imperialists') as well as the UN itself are in league with the Greeks and plotting against the Turkish side! This is absolute nonsense, I need hardly tell you. In fact, the TCs themselves may be

relatively innocent but, in the eyes of the international community, Turkey is not so innocent. It seems to me to be important to recognise that there have been serious transgressions of international law on *both* sides. And it's important to recognise this in order to get a proper sense of political reality in negotiations for a solution. As regards the TCs themselves, let me just say this: a political side consisting of 20% of Cyprus's population, which has had, for almost 30 years, the military and economic power of Turkey behind it, enabling it to live exclusively in 36% of the island, cannot convincingly maintain the posture of being simply a victim.

One thing that seems to me to be getting in the way of 'a proper sense of political reality' – as I have presumptuously called it – on both sides, is *nationalism*. I will not try to define the word. But when I ask myself 'Why has President Denktaş done his level best – an impressive performance, incidentally, under the, for him, most trying circumstances – to rubbish the AP right from the beginning, a Plan that seems to me (and to almost all other Western commentators) to deserve the most serious consideration?', the best answer I can come up with is as follows.

The AP's merits may be considerable, but to a certain kind of Turkish nationalist any such Plan will be anathema. The real reason for its rejection is that not only does the AP undoubtedly abolish the TRNC, it also requires the current connexion between the TCs and Turkey to be very considerably attenuated. Nothing could be more alarming to the nationalist mind. Despite relentless local propaganda to the contrary, I don't see that these changes will lead to any physical dangers for the TCs. Unlike in the 1960s and 1970s there will be no Greek Cypriot army or paramilitary groups. The Treaty of Guarantee will remain in place, the Turkish army here will be reduced to, say, 6000. There will be an equal number of Greek mainland troops, both contingents reporting their movements, etc., to the UN. But what will not appeal to the generals, any more than it will appeal to those I am calling Turkish nationalists, is the fact that the role and purpose of the army under the AP would be quite different from what it is today. Today the Turkish army in the TRNC is not under the command of the TRNC elected

government. (Indeed, one may still reasonably doubt that the army is answerable even to *its own* government!) And most unfortunately, after all this time, the army is still in charge of the supposedly civil TRNC police. In other words, the army has a free hand here to do anything it likes. All this would change under the AP. Similarly the Turkish Embassy here would, under the AP, become just one important embassy among others. These aspects of the Plan may well be deeply disturbing to any Turkish Cypriot (or mainland general) who is persuaded that the TRNC is already a fully justified independent state (to a nationalist, the distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* states may well seem unimportant) and, at the same time, a part of the great Turkish nation. (Again, to a Turkish nationalist, this last fact would not seem to contradict ‘independence’. For what he is most concerned to be independent of is, of course, the Greeks!)

The proposed new situation could easily be interpreted as an actual ‘defeat’ by those susceptible to strong nationalistic emotion and convictions. After all, where is a nationalist without his state? Hence such cries as ‘They are trying to take away our state! We must do everything in our power to stop them!’ I realise these feelings are not insincere, even though they are to my mind deeply unfruitful. Listening to President Denktaş’s performances on television (my trusty translator at my side), I find it difficult to suppress the belief that some such articles of faith are guiding his political agenda, however much they may not be mentioned in discussions with Western diplomats (or be immediately visible in your own paper).

You will be delighted to know that I won’t try to discuss the merits and demerits of nationalism here (including its undoubted importance in matters of identity, etc., which are, of course, highly relevant). I offer these observations merely as part of the explanation – a rarely openly discussed part – of why the AP has been so firmly dismissed by the TC side from the outset. There is doubtless also another, more banal, reason for this negative attitude to the UN’s most thoughtful and carefully prepared Plan. (This is all quite apart from the particular criticisms of the Plan mentioned in your

paper, some of which, I assure you, I do take seriously and at their face value. But, in my view, these items – for instance, the political implications of the proposed permanent residency rules – should be dealt with by negotiation.)

I can best indicate this additional, more banal, reason by quoting Bertrand Russell: ‘In every organisation’, he writes, ‘there are two purposes: one, the ostensible purpose for which the organisation exists; the other, the increase in the power of the officials. This second purpose is very likely to make a stronger appeal to the officials concerned than the general public purpose they are expected to serve.’ When a proposal is made threatening those powers (and interests) with significant diminution, he might have added, it is not surprising the officials will do everything they can to oppose it. But this isn’t something unique to TRNC officials.

I am inclined to see, for example, Gen. Özkök’s otherwise incomprehensible remarks in the light of Russell’s observation. I am referring to the General’s repeated claim that the removal of the (present) Turkish army from Cyprus would constitute a strategic danger to Turkey! If the AP was accepted, Cyprus itself would become a very safe place. Does the General think the small Greek mainland contingent in Cyprus is going to confront the second most powerful army in NATO, situated only 40 odd miles away? And for what reason? The only power in the region which could, in theory, cause serious military trouble for Turkey is nuclear-armed Israel, a country which actually has a very positive military alliance with Turkey. The General talks about having a very long term vision. If we stare speculatively and long enough into the future we can, of course, imagine anything we like. But we have to keep our eyes on the current realities. So – leaving aside a crucial point that the General seems to be overlooking, namely, that any agreed solution to the Cyprus problem will surely require the removal of the Turkish army in its present form from the island – what can he be talking about?

The knock-down rejoinder that must be made to those who cry ‘We have our state in the North and we want to keep it!’ is that nobody else (outside

the Turkish-speaking world) believes you legitimately do have a state. Hence keeping it is not a possible option: not, that is, if the Cyprus problem is going to be solved and the TCs are going to get out of their isolation. Any solution envisaged by the international community will minimally require (a) a shared Cyprus government, and (b) the abolition of the TRNC in its present form (partly achieved by the return of some land to the Greeks). No doubt it will also include (c) bizonality (a concept that needs discussing); (d) the final rejection of the idea that the TCs are a political ‘minority’; and (e) the abolition of the present Cyprus Republic.

Instead of finding this new state of affairs unacceptable (indeed rather horrifying), why not focus your attention on the AP’s positive merits, some of the more obvious of which are: (1) international recognition for the TCs within the new framework; (2) all the advantages of being part of the EU (seeing this as a ‘threat’, ‘plot’, ‘trap’, etc., is just a hang-over from the old nationalist mentality. It is the same sort of hang-over that insists that the TCs can enter the EU only with Turkey. There is no good reason for this insistence that I can see. Moreover, if Cyprus is to be one state both sides have to go into the EU at the same time. No one will sympathise with your attempt to make the GCs wait for Turkey too); (3) having much less dependence on – and hence more freedom from – the Mother-Land (and being very much less of a financial and political burden to her); (4) gradually getting rid of the harmful psychological effects on many individuals that political isolation has inevitably produced since even 1963; (5) if some kind of workable reconciliation with the Greeks is possible – and it surely is, if you want it to be – it will occur under the AP.

With all these, and other, momentous advantages for the TCs in accepting the AP, doesn’t it strike you as very strange indeed that all we are hearing from the TC administration are very negative things about it, many of them obviously mischievous misinterpretations of the text, plainly designed to mislead the voting public? Are you quite sure it is the real interests of the long-suffering ‘Turkish Cypriot people’ that are uppermost in your minds?

We can be sure, incidentally, that the Greek Cypriot administration have some similar misgivings to yours about a Plan which would abolish their own government and their 'Republic of Cyprus'. As things stand at the moment, however, they have not needed to voice their own worries much. And it looks as if they will get into the EU with their own hegemonic aspirations and title intact. Letting them do this strikes me as a major blunder on the part of the Turkish side. One of many points in the Plan's favour is that, if you accepted it, some of the most nefarious original motives behind the Greek Cypriot unilateral application would be substantially frustrated. It wouldn't be the present 'Republic of Cyprus' with its wholly GC government that got in, from then onwards able to assert itself against you even more effectively; it would be the new United Cyprus Republic with its joint government. If they get in on their own with their spurious title, and the Turkish side is perceived to have rejected a pretty good deal from the UN (i.e., the AP), the TRNC can only become more isolated.

Surely the thing to try to do is to at least modify what I am suggesting is your far too doctrinaire nationalistic (and insufficiently pragmatic) posture, a posture that is unconsciously involving you in what could be a fatal blindness to the virtues of the UN's proposed solution. And please don't, like George Bush, accuse the UN itself of being of doubtful legitimacy when it doesn't agree with you! The UNSC is by no means an angelic body. But it is the only international peace tribunal we have. Bush is, needless to say, today's leading nationalist. And all nationalists have a natural suspicion of international or supranational organisations, as we know. Bush can afford to be rude to the UN and the EU (not that it does him any good outside the US). The Turkish Cypriots simply can't afford to. Nor can Turkey herself.

I must conclude these all-too-brief – and I hope not too blunt! – comments on a series of very complex issues. This letter has become longer than I intended.

I should perhaps just add this. Your own commitments, which you mention on p. 1, para. 6 of your paper, surely require you to acknowledge a little more than you habitually do that there have been wrongs on both sides. The TC people, it seems to me, have always been relatively innocent. The Greek Cypriots (that is to say a powerful few of them) originally caused most of the trouble in Cyprus, and they, being the much larger community, used their military muscle (strongly reinforced from Greece, of course) to press on with their own parochial nationalistic agenda. But eventually Turkey hit back devastatingly. And we have to bear in mind, I think, that the close presence of overwhelming Turkish military superiority has made the Greeks suffer since 1974 considerably. Apart from their material losses, it has exerted an enormous psychological pressure on them. So, for example, Makarios agreed to ‘bizonality’ only with great reluctance. (It’s an interesting point, not to be pursued here, that almost *all* basic ‘agreements’ in Cyprus have so far been reluctant, including the 1960 Accords themselves!)

Can we be sure that your present dismissal of the AP isn’t just another episode in the wasteful struggle between two superannuated nationalisms, neither of which seem able to understand the profound virtues of compromise and reconciliation? And what happens to the Turkish Cypriots and to Turkey if the Turkish side doesn’t accept (a negotiated version of) the AP? I am not expecting you to answer these questions!

Hope this wasn’t too tiresome.

Yours, etc.,

Michael Moran

I would like to end, Mr President, by saying a bit more about ‘nationalism’. Isaiah Berlin, one of the best British political thinkers in the 20th century and a much admired friend of mine, included an essay on this subject in a work of his called *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas* (London, 1979). He characterized the essential beliefs of those who embrace what I take to be something like the nationalism that exists on both sides in Cyprus (for all their differences) as follows (I give just a brief summary of the sort of thing he would say about the beliefs lying behind this phenomenon):

- (i) Men belong to particular groups defined in terms of their territory, history, customs, laws, memories, language, forms of artistic and religious expression, social institutions, etc., etc. In their particular combination, these are unique characteristics for a given nationality. Individuals in a given nation are shaped by all these things and hence differ from individuals of other nationalities;
- (ii) Nations are like organisms: the whole is in some senses conceived to be greater than its parts. Individuals have little purpose or meaning outside this whole. A truly ‘free Turk’, for example, on this view is a Turk living within the Turkish nation, not one living in an artificial (and inevitably unstable) ‘federation’ with Greeks;
- (iii) The only compelling reason for holding a particular belief, value, etc., is not, say, its supposed universal validity (whatever that could mean). Values are held because they are the values of my nation. And I can achieve personal fulfilment – true fulfilment, that is – only by adhering to those values at all costs;
- (iv) If the fulfilment (some nationalists might say ‘destiny’ or ‘vocation’) of my nation is incompatible with that of another nation, then so much the worse for them! Compromise, reconciliation are forms of debilitation, at least potentially a dangerous dilution of my nationality;

- (v) There are no universal, overreaching standards of value. Hence international organisations, like the UN and the EU, are suspect *a priori*. Kofi Annan, de Soto, Verheugen and their current counterparts are rootless cosmopolitans, drifting self-importantly in an illusory world of international humanitarianism – illusory because all genuine values are rooted in particular locations, specific social and cultural milieux. Supranational imperatives – the concept of universal human rights, for instance – are abstract, not concrete. It is impossible to apply them. They spring from a perverse misunderstanding of the nature of politics, the essential reality of which is the existence of competing nations. Consequently, although we nationalists may, for our own purposes, pay lip-service to these universalistic ideals (originating for the most part from the West), we cannot feel any real need to adhere to them. Indeed, if the truth were told, often we can hardly make sense of them. Frequently they just arouse our mistrust...

These, at any rate, are *some* of the sentiments held (not always consciously) by many nationalist thinkers both in the 19th century, when nationalist feelings became widespread, and today. I do not claim that you personally would subscribe to all of these positions. All I am saying is that it seems to me that both the Turkish and the Greek Cypriots are deeply affected by views of this sort. This is the only way I can explain the rejection of the AP.

My hypothesis also throws light on two other things. It explains why, so far, progress with the Cyprus problem, under the auspices of the UN, has been so very minimal. And it lends support to your view that what is needed is two separate states. The remaining problem, of course, is how to achieve that!

Yours, etc.,

MM

Letter 8

1 July 2008

Dear Michael,

Thanks for your response of 26th June.

About nationalism, I plead guilty. “Peace in the world and Peace at home” was one of Atatürk’s principles, “provided the independence and sovereignty of Turkey are not threatened”. To “Blindness to important realities because of nationalism” I plead not guilty. Your letter to Ergün! I don’t remember seeing it earlier.

I prefer to be judged not on blind nationalism, but on failure to appreciate the fact that “justice, fair-play, sanctity of international agreements, respect for democratic rights” meant nothing when big power politics were involved.

The Turkish Cypriot side was satisfied with the guaranteed 1960 Agreements, although I feared that Makarios would try to wriggle out of them eventually. If he resorted to force? I expected the guarantors to act. We had political and legal rights to defend as co-founders of the 1960 Republic. This was quite different from a nationalistic approach for dividing Cyprus or keeping it, as when the Greek Cypriot side actually divided it by leaving us stateless. My talks with Clerides on local autonomy (1968-1974); and attempts to settle all humanitarian problems (1974-75); my agreements with Makarios (1977) and Kyprianou (1979); my positive approach to the Set of Ideas [1992], countered by Greek Cypriot rejection, are all on record, and now “certified” by Rolandis in his several articles!¹

¹ Nicos Rolandis was Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister during Kyprianou’s Presidency. In 1983 he resigned because he saw that Kyprianou was not seriously seeking a bizonal federation in his negotiations with Denktas. During 2008 Rolandis’ numerous articles, published in the *Cyprus Mail* and elsewhere, demonstrated once more his rare capacity to see through his own side’s official propaganda.

We came to the 1983 declaration of Independence after seeing that there was no hope whatsoever of settling “the problem” while big powers and UNSG treated the Greek Cypriot side as representing Cyprus legitimately. A mere hint that the TRNC had a chance to be recognized by the USA and Britain would have driven the Greek Cypriot side (compare the effect of Kosova’s independence in 2008) to come to the negotiating table on a basis of equality. This opportunity was not grasped by the Big Powers who chose to continue treating the guilty party as the legitimate government of Cyprus. Your belief that Turkey also did horrible things, etc., cannot equalize the guilt of the two sides. One was in the course of a war [in 1974], while the other was in the course of a deliberate plan to get rid of the [1960] Agreements (and the Turks) and unite the island with Greece. To this day there is no talk about compensating Turkish Cypriots for crimes committed against them during 1963-1974 period; for 103 villages plundered etc! But Turkey is asked to pay compensation to the Greek Cypriot side.

Your finding that I was wrong in believing that the AP would never work is based on what is written on paper. The same “rights” existed in the 1960 Agreements and yet, in spite of three guarantors, the Republic was taken over by the Greek Cypriots on the plea that “Turkish Cypriots had rebelled and had withdrawn from the government”!

You forget that until we came to the AP, I had negotiated with Makarios and agreed on bi-communal, bizonal federation; from which Kyprianou tried to get away but I forced him to confirm it. Where is nationalistic blindness in that? We then had Vassiliou followed by Clerides rejecting the Set of Ideas. Then Clerides, again forced by me to meet, which takes us to the Glion meeting where Clerides declares that “they [the GCs] attend the talks for tactical reasons – to show that Turkish Cypriots are intransigent!” Keeping the title of the government of Cyprus is “the nearest thing to Enosis”. They will not compromise on that. My intransigence arose from the fact that I did not accept the Greek Cypriot administration as “the government of Cyprus” and I did not compromise on the status of my people and on the guarantees – and that was long before the TRNC was declared.

So, I had to deal with Greek Cypriot nationalism at its best/worst! What did I want? To keep and maintain the status of my people which would have no meaning without Turkey's effective guarantee. This the Greek Cypriot leadership would never accept. The rejection of the AP by the Greek Cypriot side was merely a repeat performance. As to my position: this time, the Greco-Turkish balance would also be destroyed or disregarded by "uniting Cyprus" and making it an EU member while Turkey was still out, contrary to the 1960 Agreements. The AP was asking me to undersign EU membership "of Cyprus" while Turkey was not yet a member and thus legitimize the Greek Cypriot application for membership as "the legitimate government of Cyprus" when we all knew that the purpose of this application was political, viz., to destroy the Greco-Turkish balance in favour of Greece and establish themselves as the government of Cyprus! This, I could not do, not for reasons of nationalism, but for fear of the future and the fact that without Turkey's equal rights over Cyprus, EU membership would not give us the security we needed. I am still of the same opinion!

As to unworkability, Hristofyas is of the opinion that the AP (like the 1960 constitution) is unworkable and therefore is seeking an agreement which will be workable. And, he clearly says that Turkish Cypriots should not have "**again**, rights to overshadow the rights of Greek Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins". "Again", indicates that our 1960 corporate rights as a co-founder partner continue to be regarded as making any agreement unworkable. "Equality under the laws" and "freedom of movement, settlement and land ownership as per EU laws" are the prime demands of Mr. Hristofyas, plus "no soldiers, no guarantee, all refugees back to their properties"! This reduces bizonality to a mere fiction.

"The universal reluctance to recognize the TRNC are known to everyone", you wrote in your letter of 17 Nov. 2003, and you mention that this is due "to [Turkey's] subsequently dividing the island, turning 160,000 Greek Cypriots into refugees and later by condoning the establishment of TRNC". This is forgetting that the island was divided into "Turkish

enclaves” and “the government area” as from December, 1963, when we had to move out of 103 villages and nearly half of our people became refugees until the arrival of Turkey in 1974! Greek Cypriots who chose to stay, stayed with us – nearly 30,000 until the agreement of Population Exchange in 1975; even then, some continue to be with us. Turkey did not push anyone out of the North. Varosha was evacuated “in fear of the Turk”, not because they were thrown out of it. Ecevit offered a free return which was embedded in the Security Council records, but no one was allowed by Kyprianou to return. Hence, we could not touch anything in Varosha with the result that almost everything became useless. Your complaint that we took over Greek Cypriot properties is a lob-sided view. We had to rehabilitate almost half of our population. Without title-deeds they would not feel “settled and at home”. They would do nothing to improve themselves and whatever was given them “on hold” they would never develop. Economy would stagnate. So, they lodged their title-deeds with our authorities for the purpose of exchange. Exchange and compensation were accepted as part of a global settlement in the [1992] Set of Ideas. What did “the Cyprus government” do? They compulsorily acquired some of our properties, after enacting a law which provided that compensation would be payable after the settlement of the Cyprus problem. We see from the Greek Cypriot press that Turkish property in the south is in a turmoil. Your view that “Turkey acted in a way not compatible with the Treaty” also needs some further comment.

Turkey offered multiple cantons at the First Geneva Conference which was rejected. Then came a bizonal federation agreement. In other words, Turkey did not impose anything outside the 1960 “State of Affairs” which provided for internal equality between the two Cypriot sides and externally the Greco-Turkish balance to be maintained. My 1968 proposals for local Autonomy, and later bizonal federation, and since 1983 confederal settlement – all aimed at keeping this balance as provided in the 1960 settlement! The key phrase being “the state of affairs” so created.

Talks were on-going between myself and Clerides who had replaced

Nicos Sampson, who had ejected Makarios out of the country. All that Turkey wanted was an agreed settlement compatible with the 1960 “State of Affairs”. The Greek Cypriot side did not want a return to the 1960 Agreements. We, the Turkish side, wanted to retain its structure and bring more security to the Turkish Cypriot side, so that the Greek Cypriots would not be able to repeat what they had done so far! For us “the permanence of any solution” was vital.

There was nothing, therefore, which could justify universal reluctance to recognize the TRNC, which was declared 20 years later, while in the meantime we and Turkey went through several talks and UN plans – the Greek Cypriots always refusing to let go of their title as the government of Cyprus! Had Britain and the USA not bestowed this title on the wrongdoer, the problem would have been settled long ago. Again, you forget the fact that Bangladesh had recognized the TRNC immediately, only to be threatened by the USA and forced to retract the recognition, thus preventing Pakistan and others from following suit! Furthermore, Turkey, because of her ties with the USA I guess, did not seek recognition for the TRNC and chose to follow the line of inter-communal talks, even after we declared the TRNC. So, this “non-recognition issue” has not been truly tested because we did not seek it, except using it as a balancing factor against “the (Greek) government of Cyprus”, and chose to proceed with the talks for reunification of Cyprus under a federal structure. For the international world the issue of recognition never arose. If it is to be raised (and I feel that it should be in order to maintain the balance between the parties as envisaged in the 1960 “State of Affairs”) talks should be suspended, because we all know that the Greek Cypriot side attends these talks for “tactical reasons”, as stated by Mr. Clerides. As long as they are treated as “the legitimate government of Cyprus (now a member of the EU)” they do not need anything else, as they believe time will solve their problem which is, for them, “invasion, the question of refugees, departure of settlers and the army and no guarantees”!

Your statement that “the UNSG has regarded Turkey’s actions as

incompatible with the UN Charter itself”: if so (I have seen nothing in the UNSG reports or resolutions to this effect) all rests on the wrong tackling of the problem as from 1964 by recognizing the guilty party as “the government of Cyprus”. Not bowing to such illegality/absurdity/injustice is, I believe, the right of all honourable people!

The idea that the TRNC was established through the use of force, should be balanced with the undeniable fact that the title of the government of Cyprus was “stolen” through acts of terrorism and with the clandestine infiltration of 20,000 Greek troops into the island – which was the beginning of the Cyprus problem. How can one blame the “remedy finders” without blaming the original guilty party? The idea that the “status quo” created by the Greek Cypriot side, as from 1963 December onwards, was quite viable, but the situation brought about by our success in escaping the tragedy in which we lived is not, continues to prevent the establishment of the necessary balance of equality needed for a just solution. How can we accept such lob-sided decisions? Your excuse for the Secretary-General for not pointing out the anomalous situation, etc., can be understood by many outsiders but certainly not by us, the victims of the situation for eleven years – and how can simply the lapse of time, make de jure what is in fact the result of a criminal action?

Your views on everything you wrote can be understood, one way or another, but your view that the Greek Cypriots, in a new, for them unwanted but imposed, partnership as in the AP, will pose no threat or danger for Turkish Cypriots is impossible to accept in the light of our past experiences and the present set up: with the same Church and schools and Greece in the EU while Turkey is out! And this has nothing to do with good or bad nationalism. This is the reality as far as we are concerned.

The division/separation of the partners took place in 1963. Had Turkey not arrived in 1974, Cyprus would have become a Greek island. Turkey’s presence gives both sides a chance to come to a realistic agreement, having regard to the existing realities which are two peoples and two states.

Accepting these as a basis on which the future can be built is realism and not nationalism. Rejection of this reality by the Greek Cypriot side is solid nationalism going back to the Megali Idea in the 1840s.² We say let us start from what we have on the ground and leave the door open for a fuller cooperation and unison as time goes by; but do not deny the security which the smaller partner needs in view of its past experiences.

Turkey would not have been in Cyprus had the Greek side not inflicted the injuries it did on the Turkish side and on the International Agreements. Kofi Annan, de Soto, Verheugen, Talat, Erdoğan have all confessed that they have been deceived by the Greek Cypriot leadership to believe that they would vote “yes” for the AP. And apparently your letter to Ergün was written by you under the same impression, that the Greek Cypriots would say “yes” and we would miss the boat with dire consequences. I knew that Papadopoulos would make them say “No”. In which case the international family of nations would have understood that a two-state solution was the only way out! Today Hristofyas’s “red line” consists of “no guarantees, no soldiers, all refugees back to their properties, EU norms (freedom of movement and settlement thus making bizonality nonsense). But, “for Cyprus, [he wants] derogations so that no one can come and settle from Turkey even when Turkey becomes an EU member”! And everyone talks of a window of opportunity!

Yours, etc.,

RRD

² The *megali idea* or ‘great idea’ was a central notion in Greek nationalism from 1844 when the phrase was coined, and the concept expounded before the Greek constituent assembly, by Ioannis Kolettis. Proponents of this doctrine believed that all Greeks, including those living outside Greece as it then was, should aspire to unite within the bounds of a single state, whose capital would be Constantinople. After the Turkish war of independence (1919-1922), and Atatürk’s creation of the modern Turkish Republic, any realistic hope the Greeks may have once had of actually implementing the *megali idea* vanished. However, the GC notion of *enosis*, which was derived from the Greater Greece ideology, cannot be said to be entirely dead. It seems that the existence since 2004 of two Greek states in the EU is almost as good, if not in some ways better, for the GCs than their original desire to become politically part of their ‘motherland’.

Letter 9

23rd July 2008
Lewes, UK

Dear Mr President,

Many thanks for your letter of 1st July. I received it only 3 days ago because it was sent to my PO Box in Kyrenia from where it was somewhat belatedly forwarded to me.

I must say, first of all, that you acquit yourself admirably of the ‘charge’ of ‘blind nationalism’. I think I have to take all, or very nearly all, of that back. Secondly, I cannot disagree with anything you say about the intentions and actions of the Greek side in Cyprus. There can be no doubt that they started all the trouble and that what Christofias is now seeking – and hoping to use his recently acquired additional weapon of EU membership to promote – is the fulfilment of the familiar Greek goal of making Cyprus Greek, as far as possible; something he could not have achieved (I still think) through the AP. Political equality between the two sides is something no Greek Cypriot leader will accept, it seems. Consequently, as I must have said in earlier letters, the current negotiations are surely just a waste of time. It’s remarkable that anyone who understands the Cyprus problem could imagine otherwise.

However, although – as was only to be expected – you do very well in rebutting my allegations about the role of nationalism on the Turkish side, there are still some lingering doubts in my mind about some of the things you say.

I suppose the main thing that strikes an outsider, like myself, is that your account makes the Turkish side seem *entirely* innocent: the TCs are simply the victims of (i) Greek nationalistic determination to make Cyprus Greek, and (ii) the egoism and indifference of the main Western players, but especially of Great Britain who as a guarantor power should at an early stage – in 1964 perhaps – have prevented Makarios’ wholly Greek administration becoming recognised as the legitimate government of

Cyprus. Moreover, in your view, Turkey was entirely justified in what she did because in 1974 she (a) intervened under the Treaty of Guarantee, as was her right (and indeed duty), and (b) divided the island because at the second Geneva conference she could not get an agreement with the GCs that would have assured the future security and political equality of the TCs. And, as you frequently and significantly put it, Turkey could not get an agreement that would have restored ‘the Greco-Turkish balance’ in Cyprus.

These positions are all, to say the very least, plausible. But is it likely that one party – in such a complex and longstanding struggle – will have quite such a monopoly of justice on its side? This is not impossible of course, but it would be unusual.

In no particular order, I will try to raise a few objections to this picture of comprehensive Turkish probity, and also to your entirely understandable belief, given your own central (and often heart-breaking) role in all these events, that big power politics (as you say on the first page of your letter) is wholly indifferent to the ‘sanctity of international agreements’, etc.

Needless to say, the fact that you were actually deeply and centrally involved in all the Cyprus negotiations, etc., naturally makes me feel – as someone who can only read about what happened and talk to a few other Cypriots who lived through this period (from, say, 1963) – that I have to tread very carefully when I want to disagree with you, whether about matters of fact or matters of international law! But here goes.

Britain’s failure effectively to confront Makarios is regrettable. Yet, up to a point – given the importance of the bases to NATO and Britain’s declining military capacity as her former empire fully unravelled in the 1960s – this failure can be understood as a perhaps inevitable result of Britain’s decline as a great power. I have discussed this point elsewhere,¹ as you may recall, and I won’t say more about it here. It is true, of course, that Britain’s inaction over Cyprus, whatever its compelling causes may be

¹ See my article ‘Britain and the 1960 Cyprus Accords: A Study in Pragmatism’, shortly to be published in booklet form by Istanbul Kültür University’s Global Political Trends Center (GPoT). The article should also be available on their web-site.

thought to be, was a tragedy for the TCs. That is something I have no wish to play down or overlook.

My impression that Turkey's division of the island was seen by the UNSG – or rather, as I actually said, the UNSC – as incompatible with the UN Charter is derived from the wording of a number of UN resolutions as well as from a few things individual UNSGs have said. I could be wrong about this of course. Alas, all my materials on Cyprus are in my house in Bellapais. Here, in my flat in England, I can consult only a copy of *Denktash at the UN* which includes just a few UN resolutions as Appendix 2. I will have to do my best to justify my impression by referring to some of those.

The celebrated resolution 186 (1964) refers to article 2, para. 4 of the Charter which forbids member states to use force 'against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State'. No doubt this was placed there by the GCs who feared that Turkey might intervene under the Treaty of Guarantee. This is, at any rate, the relevant part of the Charter.

SC resolution 353 (July, 1974) refers back to 186 and in its numbered paras. 3 and 4 appears to demand the Turkish army's withdrawal from Cyprus, whose 'sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity' Turkey is alleged to be violating. General Assembly resolution 3212 seems to be repeating this in its paras. 1 and 2; and this resolution is 'endorsed' by SC resolution 365. As I'm sure you know only too well, all this is continued in SC resolution 367 (1975) which, in operative para. 1, warns about 'any attempt at partition of the island' though, while regretting the establishment of the 'Federated Turkish State', the SC seems to accept that this establishment does not amount to partition. General Assembly resolution of 13th May 1983, however, reaffirms 'the principle of the inadmissibility of occupation and acquisition of territories by force', and makes all the familiar points about 'the withdrawal of all occupation forces' and the need 'for respect of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots..' And then, with the declaration of the TRNC, SC resolution 541 regarded this declaration as 'legally invalid' and 'incompatible with the 1960 Treaty concerning the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus and the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee'.

On the face of it, then, the SC regards both the continuing existence of the TRNC and the original division of the island by Turkey (though not Turkey's initial intervention) as incompatible with the 1960 Accords, and Turkey's continuing military presence as contravening the UN Charter. To come to these conclusions the SC needed to swallow a great deal of Greek propaganda about 'invasion and occupation', of course.

Have I misinterpreted these resolutions?

But let me turn to what you say in your letter in Turkey's defence. 'Turkey did not impose anything outside the 1960 "State of Affairs" which provided for internal equality between the two Cypriot sides and externally the Greco-Turkish balance to be maintained.' This statement makes sense only if one takes a very particular view about what the 1960 "State of Affairs" amounted to. This phrase, 'State of Affairs' cannot be synonymous with 'The 1960 Accords as a whole', which clearly prohibit partition and, in the words of the Treaty of Guarantee (from where you no doubt take the phrase), limit an intervening guarantor to 're-establishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty.' So, as far as I can tell, you see Turkey's actions in 1974 as directed, above all else, towards the restoration of the *external* 'balance of power' between Greece and Turkey, as regards their interests in Cyprus.

There can be no doubt that Turkey, having been very foolishly provoked, asserted her power (by preventing *enosis*, etc.). Indeed, given the way Greece collapsed, the junta quickly realising that when it came to military action they were no match for Turkey, it might be said that rather than re-establishing a *balance* of power, Turkey made it perfectly clear to the Greeks in Greece as well as to the GCs that Turkey was a power not to be meddled with. In my opinion what Turkey did in Cyprus in 1974 (excluding a few atrocities, which all armies seem to commit) was quite understandable. But, apart from the initial intervention, I cannot see it as compatible with the 1960 Accords. Your own way of seeking to avoid this conclusion is, I think, to say that a very important part of the reason for the establishment of the 1960 Accords was to maintain the Greco-Turkish balance of power in the region, and that what Turkey did 1974 resulted from her perception of the need to restore that balance. Yes, concern for

that balance was an important part of the motivation behind the 1960 Accords, and perhaps Turkey did simply ‘restore’ it in 1974. But the Accords were about a number of other things too, and Turkey ignored – or at any rate didn’t manage to deal all that well with – those. True, there is a clear sense in which the GCs divided the island (in late 1963) before Turkey did and this was contrary to the 1960 Accords. But this doesn’t alter the fact that the Turkish division in 1974 was also contrary to the Accords.

I have to say, by the way, that you are surely in danger of being seen as disingenuous when you write: ‘Turkey did not push anyone out of the North. Varosha was evacuated “in fear of the Turk”...’ There is only a subtle distinction between being pushed out and leaving because of a very understandable fear! Having largely failed to convict you of being ‘blinded by nationalism’, I shouldn’t really take the risk of now charging you with a tendency to think that Turkey can do no wrong – at least in its dealing with Cyprus! But it sometimes seems like that.

Sentences like the one I just quoted might be the result of your being a barrister. I once tried to say something about the sometimes unfortunate consequences of the Cyprus negotiations being conducted largely by barristers in *Denktash at the UN*, pp. 98f. I don’t know if there’s any truth in this suggestion.²

I still think it is obvious that you ‘took over Greek Cypriot properties’. But I didn’t mean to complain about it. I agree you had no choice to do other than what you did and I accept the reasons you give. All I meant to say is that the international community, as always affected by Greek propaganda, will find it harder to be sympathetic than I do. Hence, for this

² At the time I produced the book mentioned, the two Cypriot negotiators were Clerides and Denktas – both British-trained barristers. My point was that barristers are not so much concerned with establishing ‘the truth’ in a given case as with, e.g., preventing their client being convicted. They will therefore say anything at all plausible they feel may be conducive to that end. Arguing with President Denktas occasionally brings to my mind the story about a brilliant Irish barrister who was being questioned in court about his alleged adultery. His wife’s counsel interrogated him for some time but could get no admissions from him. At last the judge, now quite irritated by this virtuoso display of evasiveness, intervened. ‘Mr O’Brian’, he said, addressing the defendant, ‘Just, for once, answer this simple question: “Did you or did you not sleep with Miss X on the night of the 24th of June this year?”’ The barrister replied: ‘Not a wink, Your Honour!’ What I might call ‘the barrister’s defence technique’ is frequently resorted to on both sides of the island.

and other reasons, they will be reluctant to grant the TRNC recognition. I agree with you that recognition should be sought after; but unless some major international event makes recognition of the TRNC important for some of the big powers, gaining it will be very difficult. We should all try to think about this issue and come up with some useful ideas.

Back finally and very briefly to the AP. You say that my idea that the AP could have worked (if both sides had accepted it) 'is based on what is written on paper' (i.e., I am overlooking the realities of the GC capacity for ignoring agreements). Well, of course, all plans are initially presented to us on paper. But my impression was that the designers of the plan had taken Greek duplicity into account in drafting it. One reason why, under the AP, there couldn't be a repetition of what happened in 1963-4 is that the GCs would have no army and no paramilitary thugs. Still, you will say, they would find some other way! Well perhaps they would.

I shall be here until mid-September when I'll return to Bellapais. You may be too busy to reply to this letter now. In any case, when I get back I'll make an arrangement with your secretary to see you in the hope that we can continue these discussions, which I hope you find as interesting as I do.

Yours, etc.,

MM

Letter 10

10 October 2008

Dear Michael,

This is a delayed reaction to yours of 23rd July, mainly because you pointed out in your said letter that you would be with us in September and you gave a hint that an early reply was not expected. Now that you are in Bellapais, here is my reply to yours. Probably it is better that I shall be discussing your letter in the light of “the talks” which have begun between Talat and Hristofyas.

I will begin by saying that “nationalism proper” as expounded by Atatürk has not, and cannot be a cause for internal or international conflict. “Peace at home, peace in the world” is the bulwark of his policy, and he firmly stated that war is a crime unless a nation is threatened or actually attacked by others! In the case of Cyprus we have to begin, for convenience’s sake, from the 1960 Republic. Did we have basic rights as a co-founder in the sovereignty and independence of this Partnership Republic? The answer must inevitably be in the affirmative. Did Greek Cypriot leadership, from the outset, plan to destroy this Partnership State for achieving Enosis, the aim specifically outlawed by the 1960 Agreements? Again, the answer must be in the affirmative. The fact that Greek and Greek Cypriot nationalism meant aggression does not make our defence of our vested rights wrong because we defended ourselves as Turks of Cyprus; because the rights given to us were given because we were the Turks of Cyprus and not a minority in a Greek Cyprus. Had Makarios not resorted to force against us, and had he allowed the partnership envisaged by the constitution to proceed unhindered, would the bi-nationality of the island end in disaster?

In a conflict as in Cyprus where two partners/ethnic groups/nations, call it what you may, have fallen at each other’s throat, the attempt to settle the problem must begin with a fact finding mission and the party who had

started it all must be pin-pointed as the guilty party prior to dealing with the two sides on a basis of absolute equality. None of this was done in Cyprus. On the contrary the guilty party was exonerated and honoured as “the legitimate government of Cyprus” and whatever we did, or had to do, in order to prove the contrary and defend ourselves had been treated as a sign of proof of our intransigence. In other words, we are asked to conjoin those big powers who created a Greek Cypriot Republic under the old “Republic of Cyprus” title, in recognizing this Republic by joining this time minus the guarantees and other vested rights. Hence the “red line” of Mr. Hristofyas: No guarantees, no soldiers, yes to bi-zonality but subject to freedoms of settlement, ownership and movement; Turkish Cypriots should not expect, anew, such rights which will overshadow the rights of Greek Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins; equality under the law is a must because we are ONE PEOPLE, ONE STATE, ONE SOVEREIGNTY, and we shall have a united territory, united economy, united establishments/associations!

The Church leader [Archbishop] Hrisostomos, after a two hour meeting with Hristofyas declared publicly that “secret/private/undisclosed information given to him by the President has satisfied him and that he will give the President his full support as long as he keeps his word”. Only this is enough to ring the alarm bells in the Turkish front! It does not need much intelligence or imagination to diagnose how “The President of Cyprus”, an atheist, gladdened the holy heart of the Head of the Greek Orthodox Church, the Church, but for which the century-old Enosis policy would not have brought misery and strife to Cyprus. Here is my diagnosis of what was told to the Holy (!) man:

“Dear father! I have managed to get from Talat such principles that the dream of Makarios will be fulfilled in 5-10 years if we proceed our talks on these gains which are ONE PEOPLE (as we have always argued, Cypriots mean by majority us, the Hellenes of Cyprus, with a 20% Turkish Cypriot minority). ONE sovereignty means that there will no longer be a Turkish Cypriot state so we are getting rid of the TRNC and all that it stands

for. We are, by taking Turkish Cypriots back into the existing Republic of Cyprus, which Makarios had declared to be “the nearest thing to Enosis”, solidifying our EU membership, thus completely defying the main part of the Treaties of 1960 which provided that Cyprus cannot enter any such union unless Turkey is also a member! Indeed this was the main reason why we had applied for membership, and now the Turkish Cypriot minority will, by joining us, fully legitimize this membership. As Simitis has stated EU membership is Enosis! Our struggle aimed to get rid of the restrictions of the 1960 Agreements on us, and thus getting hold of Cyprus as Hellenes of Cyprus; the guarantees and the TRNC have delayed this so far. We shall soon be free to become truly the owners of Cyprus.”

Hence, the Holy priest’s approval of the process!

I am glad to see that you agree with me on the Greek Cypriot goal of making Cyprus Greek by using EU membership. For 45 years this is what we have been trying to avoid, by insisting on a new partnership settlement on the basis of equality, subject to the continuation of the guarantees. We are offered anything but guarantees under the flag of ONE people which means eventual Osmosis as Papadopoulos predicted. I do not, however, agree with you that the Annan Plan would have prevented the Greek Cypriot side from making Cyprus Greek. The 1960 Agreements with all the in-worked and outside guarantees had been destroyed inspite of the existence of the National Contingents.¹ What guarantee was there that a new agreement like the AP would not be subjected to repeated erosions by resorting to EHRC on the plea that what was given to us as rights was incompatible with EU’s foundation laws and principles? Papadopoulos rejected the plan because it would mean a few more years to come back to where they are now. Why waste time since they had deceived all concerned and had achieved EU membership? Now Hristofias is ready to play for time because Kosova’s recognition has agitated a lot of his people. A slight chance of

¹ Denктаş is referring to the two small contingents of Greek and Turkish mainland troops – 950 Greeks and 650 Turks – who were stationed in Cyprus in 1960 in accordance with the Additional Protocol attached to the Treaty of Alliance.

recognition of the TRNC has thus been done away with! The talks will go on and no one will stop to put a diagnosis on it.

I accept and underline your statement that “no Greek Cypriot leader will accept political equality and consequently current negotiations are just a waste of time” and that “it is remarkable that anyone who understands the Cyprus problem could imagine otherwise!” But have these realities not been apparent in all the negotiations? And yet each time the “Big Powers” and the UN secretariat have welcomed the start of the talks as a “window of opportunity”, etc. Rolandis is explicit in his articles in the Cyprus Mail to the effect that it is the Greek Cypriot leaders who rejected each and every plan: but I still preserve my “Mr. No” title with pride!

I continue to say that we are the victims of lack of a proper diagnosis on the so-called Cyprus problem. Having been attacked what happened thereafter is history. But for the Greek Cypriot partner to destroy a guaranteed partnership state and get away with it so happily is really hurtful! What is most hurtful is the fact that all those who are trying to be helpful in solving the problem are reluctant to diagnose the problem and have made a just solution impossible by treating the Greek Cypriot side as the legitimate government of Cyprus. By doing so they actually settled the problem for the guilty party and they fail to understand why we refuse to follow suit.

We are agreed that Britain’s inaction over Cyprus has been a tragedy for Turkish Cypriots, whatever the reasons may be!

My complaint is that all UNSC Resolutions are based on the wrong, initial Resolution 186 of 1964, which treated the Greek Cypriot side as the government of Cyprus in complete disregard of the events in the island. Therefore, whatever action we took in defending ourselves against the aggression of the so-called “government of Cyprus” has been treated by the UNSC (with the full support of Britain and USA) as unacceptable. Hence ours and Turkey’s refusal to accept most of those Resolutions. You

will recall that Lord Hannay has very recently reminded Mr. Hristofyas that most of these Resolutions are dead!

You talk of “Turkey’s division of the island”. No one realizes that the island was divided into about 30 zones, referred to as “Turkish Cypriot enclaves” until my agreement with Clerides in 1975 to unite these enclaves in the North by voluntary transfer of population; because we had agreed that the settlement would be bi-zonal in order to give better security to Turkish Cypriots and avoid internal strife as much as possible. It took Makarios another two years to agree to such a geographical basis for an agreement!

Turkey came in in order to prevent the occupation of the island by Greece, and pushed back the occupying forces to a line which could have become, more or less, the dividing line between the two sides pending a final settlement – had Clerides and Greece fulfilled the terms and conditions of the First Geneva Agreement. When we attended the Second Geneva Conference the FM of Turkey, the late Mr. Güneş, asked me to see Callaghan and Clerides with the message that the conditions agreed at the first Geneva meeting had not been fulfilled. The major condition for Turkey was that a neutral zone should be established between the Turkish line and Greek Cypriot side under the control of the UN because the Turkish Army was squeezed in a very narrow area; another part of the Agreement was that the restrictions around the Turkish enclaves should be lifted forthwith, and yet another that mine-laying around Kythrea should stop and further transport of troops from Greece should come to an end.

Callaghan pleaded ignorance of all these infringements, while Clerides denied any infringement of the First Geneva Talks. In the meantime Greek and Greek Cypriot propaganda was afoot for pulling Turkey out of Cyprus.

What was offered by us was bi-zonal federation. The ground for this was laid down with the 1975 Exchange of Population Agreement. There was no thought or policy of partition as is evident from the fact that even

when the TRNC was declared, we indicated that bi-zonal federation could still be discussed and that continues to be the case till today. Partition is, and has always meant to be, double Enosis, one part to Turkey and one part to Greece. It was the condition for Turkish acceptance of Enosis. Again the Greco-Turkish balance is activated. The UN Resolutions prohibiting partition do not prohibit agreed division of the island between the two sides. Hence, I venture to say that rejection by the Greek Cypriot side of “a viable, just and permanent” solution on the ground that [the existence of the] TRNC means partition is wrong. Continuation of the TRNC will not be in defiance of any Resolution passed so far! Provided of course “friendly” big powers at last see that any agreement on the basis of Hristofias’ terms will be the end of the Turkish Cypriots and will adversely affect the security of Turkey by violating the Lausanne Treaty! As to General Assembly Resolution of 13th May 1983, reaffirming the principle of the inadmissibility of occupation and acquisition of territories by force, one can only say that “there is no occupation but only temporary police duty under 1960 Agreements which will end when an agreed solution is found”, and certainly there is no territorial acquisition – only, “division between two old partners!”

“Withdrawal of all occupation forces” is a wrong call, because there is a legal positioning of troops pending a settlement. As to “the need for respect of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots”, I say that this call is surely to the Greek Cypriot side who, under the pretence of being the legitimate government, is pressing on with embargoes and isolation of the Turkish Cypriot side, while violating the most fundamental human right of not being ruled by people not freely chosen by the people!

Resolution No 541 regarded the TRNC’s declaration as legally invalid and incompatible with the 1960 Treaty concerning the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus and the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee: one would think that in coming to such a decision the Security Council members would have fully examined these Treaties and concluded that the Greek Cypriot Administration was quite compatible with these Treaties! Because they did

nothing of the sort, their finding is of no effect as long as the TRNC is able to stand on its feet with the support of guarantor Turkey, until a mutually acceptable solution is found. Your finding that to come to the conclusions they did the Secretary General needed to swallow a great deal of Greek propaganda about invasion and occupation is very much to the point. Unfortunately [the international community's] swallowing Greek propaganda has been at the root of all our troubles since 1963, thanks to big power politics.

“The State of Affairs” mentioned in the Treaties is the foundation of the 1960 Accords, namely, without agreeing to the Greco-Turkish balance to be established and respected fully there would be no 1960 Accord. Anything done by the Greek side to destroy this balance should immediately be countered by the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey in order to maintain it.

Examples: the 1963 onslaught and ejection of the Turkish Cypriot partner from all the organs of the partnership state was countered by establishing a Turkish Cypriot Administration under the Vice-President, and in the words of Mr. Clerides, “the Turkish Cypriot Administration in time had become a state but not recognized by any country, etc.” long before Turkey had landed in the island.

As to the duty of Turkey as an intervening government to “re-establish the State of Affairs created by the present Treaty”: as you see the duty is not to re-establish the constitutional order. This would be absurd, since no one wanted this. What was to be re-established was “the State of Affairs”, namely, internally the balance between the two sides had to be maintained as equal co-founders, one having no right to overpower or rule the other; the other [thing to be established] was to maintain the external balance [between Greece and Turkey]! We offered bi-zonal federation which was accepted by Clerides when we agreed on exchange of population. Since then talks have gone on, on the basis of bi-zonal federation; then came the Annan Plan still trying to protect “the State of Affairs” but falling lamentably short of it by ignoring the Greco-Turkish balance and making

Cyprus a member of the EU prior to Turkey's membership. Other shortcomings need not be listed here!

So, there is nothing wrong in Turkey's stand; the only short-coming is that Turkey is not stating her "red-line" clearly and effectively. The recent statement by the President of the Grand Assembly, Mr. Toptan, to the effect that the problem has to be settled on the reality of TWO PEOPLES, TWO Democracies, TWO STATES and the guarantees should be an eye-opener for all concerned. As you know, this was Turkey's red-line until the Annan Plan dropped in from Washington and London and it does partially take account of the State of Affairs but not conclusively. For us, if the Greek Cypriots claim to be a separate state, the balance is maintained by the TRNC.

If we take your argument that "Greek side divided the island in 1963 before Turkey did and this was contrary to the 1960 Accords, but this does not alter the fact that the Turkish division, in 1974, was also contrary to the Accords" as correct what is the position except the glaring fact that a partnership has split into two and the ex-partners are unable to agree on a new Partnership. Is that the end of the world? But for the intervention of the EU, time could have brought home some sensible solution. The EU, by accepting Greek Cypriot partner as Cyprus, has complicated the matter even further because that membership was sought by Greek Cypriots just for destroying the external balance in favour of Greece. Some EU members now say they know they have done wrong but have no chance of correcting it. Well, this is their problem. But unfortunately they are trying to put the blame on Turkey for solving their own self-created problem and this also boosts up the morale of the Greek Cypriot side in refusing any sensible compromise.

Finally, your view that "under the Annan Plan there couldn't be a repetition of what happened in 1963-4" because "Greek Cypriots would have no army and no paramilitary thugs" is, excuse the expression, too naïve! In 1963 there was no army to speak of; Makarios had authorized party leaders to organize their own militia under the leadership of the

Minister of Interior. Even today already two “illegal” militant organizations are at work harassing Turkish Cypriots who visit the South. We were “done in” in spite of the guarantees. We cannot submit to something without stronger and better guarantees than the 1960 ones.² That is why the solution has to be on the basis of TWO PEOPLES and TWO States, but the ongoing talks, as you know, are not on these lines. Even then the two old comrades are 180 degrees apart even on “agreed terms.”

Sorry this took much longer than I expected.

Yours, etc.,

RRD

² Today the more perceptive among Greek Cypriot commentators fully understand Denktas’s profound scepticism about the Greek Cypriot administration’s intentions. Compare the following remarkably frank remarks by Loucas Charalambous:

‘Much as we do not like it, the argument of the Turkish Cypriot side is pretty compelling. In 1960 we signed an agreement for the setting up of a partnership state. Just three years later we destroyed this state through our criminal stupidity. And the Turkish Cypriots are now asking: ‘Who will guarantee that you will not do the same this time?’ Under certain conditions, we could reply: ‘No we will not do this again. We have become more sensible and mature... After all, we are no longer ruled by Archbishop Makarios, the “invisible leader” of the Akritas organisation...’ Have we succeeded [in establishing those conditions]? How could we have succeeded when to this day, Makarios’ plot to have the constitution changed – which is corroborated by a plethora of evidence and personal testimonies – is still referred to by official mythology as the ‘Turkish revolt’? As we have failed so lamentably to persuade the Turkish Cypriots that we have changed, we will once again have to accept the guarantees, at least until we could prove in practice what Christofias has been maintaining – that we need no guarantees.’

Loucas G. Charalambous, ‘Turkish Cypriots have little reason to trust our word’, *Cyprus Sunday Mail*, 2 November 2008, p. 19.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

To: The Editor, *London Review of Books*

23 April 2008

Dear Sir,

Perry Anderson's piece on 'The Divisions of Cyprus' engagingly combines a superficial display of knowledge about the history of modern Cyprus with his familiar concern about political oppression, wherever it may be seen, or imagined, to occur. But as regards Cyprus his distortion of the facts shouldn't be allowed to stand without at least a few obvious criticisms.

First of all, readers of his long article should note his unhelpful (and largely unjustifiable) abusive comments about many of the non-Cypriot players in the seemingly endless Cyprus dispute. The highly emotive tone of these comments alone betrays something of the deep-seated naivety underlying his posture as an expert in international politics. Here are a few examples.

According to Anderson, in her role as the colonial power in Cyprus, Britain behaved – as he would doubtless be inclined to see the behaviour of all colonial powers – pretty vilely, both throughout the EOKA period and, indeed for the most part, up to the present. He writes of 'the peculiar *malignity* of the British record in Cyprus' (my italics), surely quite the wrong word for any sensible observer to use in this connection.

Makarios, by contrast, he sees as especially heroic in his (admittedly impressive) attempt to make Cyprus Greek. Understandably Anderson has mixed feelings about Grivas. But Grivas (and less directly Makarios) is seen as a freedom-fighter rather than a perpetrator of terrorism. Field Marshal Sir John Harding, on the other hand, appointed by the British government

as governor of Cyprus and as a suitable person to deal with the ghastly chaos EOKA had fomented throughout the island by 1955, is inevitably scripted as a brutal hard man bent on indiscriminate repression. In fact, the first thing Harding did on arriving in Cyprus was to try to negotiate with Makarios about the possibility and timing of ‘self determination’ for Cyprus, something HMG was not opposed to in principle. These discussions went on, with no real progress, from October 1955 until February 1956, a major point of contention being the Archbishop’s insistence that responsibility for internal security be transferred to him. Given Makarios’ well-known aim of effecting *enosis* with Greece (which would have had dire consequences for the Turkish Cypriots and might well have led to a war between Greece and Turkey), together with the proven irresponsibility of EOKA – which was murdering not only British servicemen (and occasionally the latter’s wives, while out shopping) but also targeting Greek Cypriots who didn’t support the ‘national’ cause – it was out of the question for the governor to make such a concession. So the horror continued, with Harding naturally doing whatever he could to limit it.

Of course Anderson chooses to ignore this, as well as the various *positive* benefits many Cypriots derived from the British colonial period (no doubt an almost unthinkable possibility in his mind); benefits such as fluency in the English language, the acquisition of various technical and administrative skills, and, for a significant few, legal training in the UK. The virtues, for the Western Alliance as a whole, of Britain retaining her bases in Cyprus from 1960 – originally to help keep the Soviets out of the Eastern Mediterranean – is again something Anderson is ideologically blind to (at one point he even compares the British bases to Guantánamo!). He *does* remind us, however, about the fact that a few really lucky Cypriots, including the present Greek Cypriot president, experienced the advantage of being educated not in England but in the Soviet Union.

Much could also be said about his totally unreasonable polemic directed at Lord Hannay – obviously a terribly provocative establishment figure, given Anderson’s political sensibilities.

But there is much more. The Americans, the UN, and the EU officials, all of whom have worked hard to get a good, lasting compromise solution in Cyprus – culminating, after over 40 years of work, in what came to be known as ‘The Annan Plan’ – are systematically and often very crudely derided, as indeed is the AP itself.

De Soto, for some time the UN special representative in Cyprus, is described as ‘a dim Peruvian functionary’. No one who has actually met de Soto could possibly entertain such a view of him. This is just silly abuse. Pfirter, another UN figure who worked on the AP, is characterized as ‘an obscure scrivener from the crannies of Swiss diplomacy’. Verheugen, once the EU’s commissioner for enlargement, is said – as if this was a relevant point – to have been photographed ‘cavorting in the nude with his secretary’! Even the then UN secretary-general himself, Kofi Annan, is seen as decidedly scrubby. Anderson describes Annan, in his dealings with the Cyprus problem, as merely playing ‘his normal role as a dummy for Anglo-American ventriloquists’.

Given these preliminary elucidations about the flawed personalities and very limited mental capacities of the international diplomats most involved in drafting the AP, it is hardly a shock to find the AP itself comprehensively dismissed after a brief summary. It is said to amount, after all, to ‘a ratification of ethnic cleansing’; to involve a ruse for absolving Turkey from what the Greek Cypriots call her ‘invasion and occupation’ (and worse); to be contrary to international law; and not least ‘contemptuous of the principles of any existent democracy’. All this is being said, we have to remind ourselves, about a very carefully considered Plan that had, of course, been accepted as a fair and workable compromise by practically the whole international community, with the sole exception of the Greek Cypriots.

We need hardly absorb much more of this tasteless tomfoolery to become faintly suspicious about what Anderson is up to. Could it possibly be that he has established quite cordial relations with AKEL, the Greek

Cypriots' anachronistic communist party, and perhaps even with its leader, Christofias, the recently-elected Greek Cypriot president? If so, an even more disturbing thought occurs to one. Does the current Greek Cypriot administration actually share many of Anderson's views and their quite dramatic implications? Not thinking it wise to express these things directly themselves – they are already in enough trouble with the international community as it is, because of their rejection of the AP – did the Greek Cypriots encourage someone they took to be a distinguished Western scholar to do it for them? This is sheer speculation, of course. But one cannot easily forget what Christofias's distinguished predecessor, Papadopoulos, said in a speech broadcast on Greek Cypriot TV just before his community was due to vote in the referendum on the AP.

On 7 April 2004 Papadopoulos tearfully pleaded with his electorate to vote against the Plan: 'Taking up my duties [as president of Cyprus]', he said, 'I was given an internationally recognized state. I am not going to give back "a community" without a say internationally and in search of a guardian... I urge you to defend the Republic of Cyprus, saying NO to its abolition.' This was a most revealing statement. For surely *any agreed* Cyprus settlement whatsoever would involve the abolition of the present Republic which is, in reality, a wholly Greek state. If Christofias retains similar views, and if he agrees more or less with the perspective produced by Anderson, all the recent optimism about the new Cyprus negotiations planned to begin in earnest this June would evaporate. For look what Anderson is affirming, if not always directly at least by implication:

- (1) There is nothing wrong with the present all-Greek government of Cyprus;
- (2) In 1974 Turkey, for no good reason, invaded and occupied over a third of a tiny, sovereign and inoffensive Greek island. It should withdraw its troops at once and compensate for all its depredations in full;

- (3) Cyprus's so-called 'guarantors', and especially Turkey and Britain, should cease to meddle in Cyprus's affairs so that the island can, at long last, enjoy unfettered independence;
- (4) The British bases on Cyprus, used after all for NATO's nefarious purposes, should be dismantled and the 99 square miles they occupy should become part of the Republic;
- (5) The Turkish Cypriots should be seen for what they really are: not only a *numerical* minority but also a *political* minority, and hence they should be given a correspondingly small share of political power (even smaller than that they received under the 1960 Accords – never mind the outrageous further inflation of their significance proposed in the AP!);
- (6) Since the present division of the island is illegal and flagrantly unjust and, given the small role that would be allotted to the Turkish Cypriots in any proper solution to the Cyprus problem, 'bizonality' – a highly mischievous concept invented and forced upon the Greek Cypriots by external powers – should obviously be disregarded.

One can only hope that, in fact, Anderson thought up all this one-sided and utterly unrealistic nonsense entirely on his own.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Moran
Bellapais, Cyprus.

Appendix 2

How Mr Anderson gets Cyprus wrong*

By Sylvia Tiryaki

Undisputedly, Perry Anderson is one of the living legends of political science. In Turkey's intellectual circles he would be perhaps best remembered with his book titled "Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism," published in 1974. Even though it can be argued that he is well known mainly for his endorsement of Marxism and inputs to leftist political theory, his reputation in fact goes far beyond that. Therefore, if an intellectual historian of Anderson's format writes a political-historical article on such a serious issue as the Cyprus problem, one would expect him to be above certain solidarity or admiration and to give a more objective account of history. However, that doesn't seem to be the case with his article "The Divisions of Cyprus," published recently in the London Review of Books (LRB). In my view, this time Anderson wasted the space given to him by the LRB. The piece raises question marks not only because of a highly selective approach to the facts and tastelessly detailed personal attacks on diplomats involved with the latest peace plan (Annan Plan), but also because of its timing.

Omitting a reality:

While Greek and Turkish Cypriots have just started talking again about the settlement of the conflict, Anderson published his piece, in the entirety of which he barely mentions the Turkish Cypriots. When describing the important modern historical events in Cyprus, he repeatedly omits to mention the political existence and sometimes even the physical presence of the Turkish Cypriots, and finally in the last sentence he calls Cyprus a Greek island. A sort of passing reference is given to the creation of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus – that had been established as a partnership state of the

* First published in the *Turkish Daily News*, 12 May 2008

Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots – as though it was something largely unimportant. The article’s overall attitude continues in line with the type of Greek Cypriot terminology hoped by many to be the music of the past. To reach a just settlement for Turkish Cypriots, he recommends “[constitutional] guarantee of welfare of the minority [rather] than provocative over representation in elected bodies.” This raises eyebrows substantially high. There simply seems to be no logical explanation for an eminent scholar to write this kind of piece and to get it published now. Unless, as has been suggested by a real Cyprus expert, Michael Moran, the almost propagandistic description of the Cyprus problem and the great achievements of the Progressive Party of The Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) might be based largely on a certain solidarity. Moran, though coming from a different part of the spectrum, is yet another living legend. Having spent many years in Cyprus, he has been publishing extensively not only in the field of modern intellectual history but also of the Cyprus problem.

Dubious and disturbing:

In his insightful response to the Anderson’s article – sent to the LBR but as yet not published – Moran is asking: “Could it possibly be that he [Anderson] has established quite cordial relations with AKEL, the Greek Cypriots’ anachronistic communist party, and perhaps even with its leader, [Demetris] Christofias, the recently-elected Greek Cypriot president? If so, an even more disturbing thought occurs to one. Does the current Greek Cypriot administration actually share many of Anderson’s views and their quite dramatic implications? Not thinking it wise to express these things directly themselves – they are already in enough trouble with the international community as it is because of their rejection the Annan Plan – did the Greek Cypriots encourage someone they took to be a distinguished Western scholar to do it for them?” The tone of Anderson’s article is questionable. Its aim is dubious and the timing unnecessarily disturbing. And as Moran puts it in his reflection: “One can only hope that, in fact, Anderson thought up all this one-sided and utterly unrealistic nonsense entirely on his own.” Indeed, one can only hope that the current Greek Cypriot administration doesn’t share Anderson’s view. Otherwise, the whole new rapprochement would once more be in vain.

Appendix 3

Cyprus and International Security: a plea for a more realistic perspective*

By Michael Moran

Those concerned about the achievement of a political settlement in Cyprus in the very near future have a natural tendency to focus on two things: first, on the hope that EU membership for the whole of Cyprus could still facilitate rapprochement between the two Cypriot communities; and, secondly, that serious negotiations between the two Cypriot leaders will soon get underway, using the now proverbial ‘good offices’ of the UNSG. I want to suggest that this conventional focus of attention is less fruitful than we might think, and that we should turn at least some of our attention elsewhere.

Needless to say, the Cyprus problem is not just a problem about how safely to resolve the long-standing ‘ethnic’ conflict between the Cypriots themselves; it is also essentially a security problem concerning the whole Eastern Mediterranean region and beyond. I shall argue that any settlement in Cyprus will inevitably be linked to prevailing Western security needs, and that it is still an open question whether these needs demand a unified Cyprus. First a few words about Cyprus and the EU.

The original EU application, made of course by the Greek Cypriots alone in 1990, was never likely to lead to an agreed unification of the island. It was, after all, at that time a Greek and not a Turkish idea. Moreover, the main reason for this interest by the Greek side in joining the EU was not because of any broad cultural desire to become more European. Nor was their motivation primarily economic. It was, first and foremost, that they hoped to use their EU membership as a trump card in their ongoing

* First published in *Cyprus Dialogue*, 14 December 2007

diplomatic battle with the Turks. If the present Greek-run Republic of Cyprus could get into the EU then there would exist the striking anomaly of an EU member state over a third of which was militarily ‘occupied’ by a foreign, non-EU power. This, the Greek side has always hoped, would eventually lead to the dismantling of the TRNC and the ejection of the Turkish army from Cyprus. Whatever the rights or wrongs of this hoped-for scenario on the part of the Greeks, it should have always been plain that the Turkish Cypriots would never participate in a scheme expressly designed to reduce them to a minority in a Greek state. More generally for the Turkish side, we need to bear in mind, any proposed joint venture that involves regarding the present government of Cyprus as quite unproblematically legitimate is bound to be a non-starter. For the Turks, recognition of purely Greek governments in Cyprus is precisely what the Cyprus problem is all about. So the Greek Cypriot EU application, in its original form and on its own, never had much chance of leading to reconciliation between the two Cypriot sides. Far from it.

But then, in November 2002, the UNSG presented both sides with what came to be called the ‘Annan Plan’ (AP). Within the framework of a *compromise*, the AP showed admirable sensitivity towards the two sides’ very different fundamental positions. And one of its greatest virtues was that, had the AP been accepted by both sides, they would have entered the EU *together*, as the United Cyprus Republic, thus removing the chief Turkish objection to EU membership for the present Greek-run ‘Cyprus’. Moreover, by its wide endorsement of the AP, the international community seemed, for the first time, to display an adequate understanding of the Turkish side’s perception of the Cyprus issue and had ceased to be largely spell-bound by Greek propaganda.¹

Yet, as we know, in two referenda in 2004 the Turkish Cypriots overwhelmingly accepted the Plan and the Greek Cypriots overwhelmingly

¹ See my ‘Why the Turkish side should welcome the UN’s proposals’ in *Cyprus Today*, November 23-29, 2002. And in further defence of the AP against one of its most articulate detractors, ‘Professor Dodd’s delusions’ in the *Turkish Daily News*, 9 December 2002.

rejected it. What is more, the EU made any further negotiations much more difficult by allowing the Greek Cypriots into the EU on the basis of their original unilateral application! This was a spectacular piece of European mismanagement.²

Now, to come to the second conventional hope about a settlement in Cyprus, I think it is rather unlikely that negotiations between Papadopoulos and Talat alone will provide an agreed solution on the island. This is because, after all these years, the positions of even these relatively new Cypriot leaders show every sign of being irreconcilable. If we had space to examine the most recent pronouncements by both sides outlining what each would regard as a ‘just and fair’ settlement, this irreconcilability would become obvious enough.

If I am right about this – if neither the current ‘Cyprus’ EU membership nor the negotiations between the two Cypriot leaders alone, or some happy cross-fertilisation of these two things, are likely to lead to a solution – where else can we look for one? My suggestion is that we have to look outside Cyprus. In the first instance, we need to turn to the three Cyprus ‘guarantors’.

We shouldn’t forget that the guarantors were not only signatories to the 1960 Cyprus Accords: they themselves virtually created them; the Cypriots, for the most part, doing simply what they were told to do in 1959-1960. Yet, interestingly enough, today none of the parties to the Cyprus dispute seem to want openly to deny the validity of the Accords. The 1992 UN ‘Set of Ideas’ included the provision that the “Treaties of Guarantee and of Alliance continue in force”. (The key word here is ‘continue’.) This is in effect repeated, with some modifications, in the provisions of the AP. In reality, of course, the Greek Cypriots themselves have strong reservations

² For a penetrating account of how, more generally, the EU – despite its good intentions – has mishandled its potential to act as a ‘catalyst’ in the creation of a united Cyprus, see Nathalie Tocci, *EU Accession Dynamics and Conflict Resolution* (Aldershot, UK, 2004), *passim*.

about the original, let alone the continuing, validity of the Treaties. The latest comprehensive Greek Cypriot proposals, those of 1989, predictably took a much more cautious line, a line that Papadopoulos himself would certainly have to follow if the UNSG could manage to extract from him an explicit statement about his proposed changes to the AP. “The Federal Republic of Cyprus”, the 1989 document said, “as a Sovereign Independent State... can only have guarantees which will be in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”; and “No guarantor should have unilateral rights of intervention” (Greek Cypriot 1989 Proposals, sect. IV, para. 1).

The Greek Cypriot conviction that they already have a perfectly viable and independent state, whatever others may think, came through clearly in Papadopoulos’s speech broadcast on Greek Cypriot TV on 7th April 2004. There he tearfully pleaded with his electorate to vote against the AP. “Taking up my duties [as president of Cyprus]”, he said, “I was given an internationally recognized state. I am not going to give back ‘a community’ without a say internationally and in search of a guardian. ... I urge you to defend the Republic of Cyprus, saying NO to its abolition.” This is a revealing statement. For surely any Cyprus settlement whatsoever would entail the abolition of the present Republic of Cyprus which is, in reality, a wholly Greek State.

Now I want to underline a certain disparity here, one that is not always mentioned. This is a disparity of purpose between what we can safely call Greek Cypriot ‘nationalism’, on the one hand, and what is really the determination of much larger powers to incorporate Cyprus into the Western defence agenda, on the other. Much of the confusion about Cyprus results from a reluctance to deal directly with this issue. The reluctance is understandable because it involves recognition of the declining factual importance – even the very meaningfulness – of ‘sovereignty’, especially for small states, in an increasingly ‘globalised’, *interdependent* world.³

³ Adam Watson, *The Limits of Independence: Relations between States in the Modern World* (London and N.Y., 1997), has much of interest to say on this topic.

In a clear sense, of course, the Greek Cypriots were always right about the phoney independence the guarantors had bestowed upon Cyprus. In the 1960s the guarantors' guarantees seemed blandly oblivious to the then current imperatives about 'self-determination'. For instance, according to the Treaty of Guarantee – said to be an agreement between Cyprus, on the one part, and the three guarantors, on the other – the guarantors “recognise and guarantee the independence” of the Republic of Cyprus. Yet a further stipulation says that the guarantors will be permitted, under certain circumstances, militarily to intervene in that supposedly independent state. Again, the Treaty of Alliance – between Cyprus and Greece and Turkey – designed, in its own words, “to uphold peace and to preserve the security of each of them” – prescribes that a “Tripartite Headquarters” be set up in the new sovereign republic, a headquarters which would inevitably be controlled by the two ‘mother countries’ who would be permitted to keep their own military contingents in Cyprus, perhaps indefinitely. And according to the Treaty of Establishment, not only would Britain retain 99 square miles of Cypriot territory for its two sovereign bases, but the new republic was deemed to have agreed to “co-operate fully” with the UK “to ensure the security and effective operation” of the bases. When, in addition to these Draconian requirements, one recalls certain things about the Cyprus constitution, notably that parts of it, the so-called ‘basic articles’, were held to be ‘unamendable’ (see Annex III of the constitution) by any democratically elected Cypriot parliament, it seems clear that what the guarantors were really doing was not so much to guarantee Cyprus’s independence, as to preserve and perpetuate their own – far from harmonious – interests in the island.

It was this uneasy – and in retrospect rather too facile – international pact, primarily between external powers, that created an environment where ethnic conflict could flourish. Although all the international players were NATO members, two of these (Greece and Turkey) were primarily preoccupied with their own historic antagonisms. Britain was of course essentially concerned about the retention and proper operation of her bases. But a most important point about Britain’s role in Cyprus was that she, in

close collaboration with the United States, saw herself as serving the wider interests of the Western Alliance by keeping a military contingent on the island and gathering intelligence electronically, thus helping to keep the Soviets out of the Eastern Mediterranean. The positive virtues of this British role are something the Greek Cypriots especially have always chosen to ignore.

This brings me to a claim that may at first seem unwelcome to many Cypriots. Yet the more I think about what is at stake in Cyprus, the truer the following claim seems to be: giving Cyprus wholly and exclusively to the Cypriots, Turkish as well as Greek, is a wonderful idea, but it will never be realised while the island retains its strategic significance for much larger powers.

To become clear about the nature of the Cyprus problem we have to disabuse ourselves, I think, of the notion that Cyprus has ever been an independent state run entirely by its own citizens. It never has been and, for the foreseeable future, never will be. When a Turkish army first invaded Cyprus in 1571 it took the island not from the Greek Cypriots but from Venice. When Britain finally annexed Cyprus in 1914, Cyprus was part of the Ottoman Empire. As we have seen, the 1960 Accords were certainly not designed to put Cypriots fully in charge of their own destiny. And what about today? Today is different, some will still try to maintain.

“But isn’t Cyprus universally recognised as a perfectly proper democratic and sovereign state?” they will ask. “Isn’t this so much so that Cyprus is now a fully-fledged EU member? Of course, there is still a bit of unfinished business to conclude with an intransigent minority of Turks on the island. But that shouldn’t take long. Given their difficult financial circumstances alone, the Turkish Cypriots will soon find the promised economic benefits of full EU membership irresistible. They will realise that they don’t need ‘bizonality’ and all the inevitable frictions that go with it. They will be quite happy just becoming part of the existing Cyprus Republic, a country inevitably and rightly ruled by its massive Greek-

speaking majority. And won't Turkey have eventually to make major concessions concerning Cyprus if she herself is ever going to get into the EU? And once the Turkish army is forced to withdraw, all will be well!"

So those who talk only to Greek Cypriot officials may be led to believe. If only it were that simple. Anyone who wants to argue that the present 'Republic of Cyprus' is already a sovereign democratic state, free from foreign tutelage, and perfectly poised to enjoy its new EU membership, should conduct the following simple thought-experiment.

Imagine a contemporary map of Cyprus with the Green Line marked in. Consider, first of all, the extraordinary military situation, even leaving aside all Cypriot forces. Surely it is something unique in Europe:

- * In the north we see 35,000 Turkish soldiers who have been firmly bedded in to their defensive positions for 33 years. Turkey has the second most powerful army in NATO. No one, least of all the EU, is going to move it from Cyprus until the Turkish Cypriots get something very close to the deal they believe they deserve. There is also in the north an airfield for Turkish troop-carriers and warplanes. (In any case, Turkish jets can reach Nicosia in 5 or 6 minutes from the mainland).
- * In the south, under the so-called 'defence dogma' with Greece, there is a military airfield near Paphos for the use of the Greek airforce and a Greek naval base on the south coast, halfway between Limassol and Larnaka. I have myself no way of knowing the number of mainland Greek military personnel at present stationed in the south, but I would be surprised if that number isn't much greater than the 950 officers and men permitted by the Treaty of Alliance.
- * Along the Green Line we have another foreign force of course, today around 800 UN soldiers.

- * And then, most importantly, there are the two British bases. These are really NATO bases which doubtless will be used by the United States as it continues relentlessly to pursue both real and imaginary terrorists in the Middle East and keeps a watchful eye on ‘rogue states’ in the region who might start to manufacture nuclear and other WMDs. You may object to the inclusion of the bases since they are outside the Cyprus Republic. All right. But don’t forget that under the Treaty of Establishment the Cyprus government is not only required to ‘cooperate fully’ with the UK, as we noted earlier. The Cyprus government is also enjoined to let the British keep and operate certain facilities actually *inside* the Republic, notably the electronic listening installations in the Troodos mountains (and perhaps we shouldn’t forget in this context the American ‘monitoring station’ now operating from a building in the centre of Greek Nicosia; though this wasn’t of course an item considered in the Treaty of Establishment).

Now, leaving aside the considerable Cypriot forces on both sides – including reservists and potential paramilitary formations – and ignoring the alarming fact that the Greek Cypriots alone have been spending, on average, 200 million Cyprus pounds each year since 1980 on military equipment,⁴ ignoring all this, here we have the military situation on the island today: all three guarantors are at least as firmly installed there as they ever have been. Is this heavy concentration of foreign forces, all belonging to incomparably larger powers, compatible with Cypriot sovereignty? You think it is? Then, glancing at the imagined map once more, consider the island’s division.

What is known as the Republic of Cyprus hasn’t had access to 37 per cent of its territory (and this figure includes the buffer zone) since 1974. An independent state was declared in the north in 1983. Among many other things, this means that, given the long passage of time, the ‘Cyprus

⁴ See L. G. Charalambous, ‘What a scandalous waste’ in the *Cyprus Sunday Mail*, 2 April 2006.

government' can hardly claim to have detailed statistics about, for instance, the economy in the north. Despite some recent improvements (largely due to dubious house building), that economy is still in a poor and somewhat unstable condition. Isn't it rather astonishing that the EU regarded this supposedly sovereign entity called 'Cyprus' as an economically viable candidate for membership solely on the basis of the economy in the south?

Let us note another curiosity about the 'divided island', if only in passing. Both existing Cypriot states are really *de facto* ones, if we regard the 1960 Accords as still valid. And by the same token both of them are illegal. Yes, I know, the administration in the Greek state is recognised by the international community as the Cyprus government. I will touch on the main reason for this in a moment. But I would ask any international lawyers who might read this article to tell me whether the fact of international recognition can in itself bestow *de jure* status on a government whose own constitution requires it to be formed and run very differently indeed from the way it has been since 1964.

In questioning the *de jure* status of the present Cyprus government my purpose is not to score points against the Greek Cypriots. I am merely trying here, as earlier, to give credence to my thesis that the existence of a sovereign independent Republic of Cyprus has always been, still is, and in all probability will continue to be, a diplomatic fiction. And that it is a fiction at the heart of the Cyprus problem, serving to obscure some crucial political realities: not least realities concerning international security. Treating Cyprus as a *bona fide* independent state, given its recent history, makes any sustainable solution to the terrible mess on the island virtually impossible. Hence the reason for my scepticism about the value of Cyprus's new EU membership: that membership could simply serve to perpetuate the illusion of Cypriot sovereignty (What is worse, of purely *Greek* Cypriot sovereignty.)

Perhaps the main point I have been trying to get over throughout this paper can be put like this: there is a certain conflict in Cyprus that is causing

much of the trouble. It is the battle between what is really an anachronistic form of narrow, inward-looking – and especially Greek – nationalism, on the one hand, and, on the other, the need for Cyprus to take its proper place as a key site not only for Western defence, but where a much more benign multinationalism and multiculturalism could thrive. Situated at the very south eastern edge of Europe, with its own unique historical experience of multiculturalism – not all of it conflictual – Cyprus is a perfect place for international understanding to be cultivated. A deep-rooted antipathy to ‘interference in Cyprus’s internal affairs’ needs to be replaced by a better appreciation of the unavoidable interconnectedness of the contemporary world. Parochialism has had its day.

Certainly the sorry state of affairs we see on the island now could not have occurred without powerful extraneous influences. Yet it is a mistake to see these external actors as if they are malevolent intruders, usurpers of that most desirable thing, true Cypriot self-determination; antigens, as it were, from whose unwelcome contamination the island needs to be cleansed. We can admit that British colonialism had its darker side, and that, at various times, both Greece and Turkey did some deeply regrettable things in Cyprus. But we now live in different times, within a network, as I keep emphasizing, of greatly increasing interdependences. With Greece already in the EU and Turkey (as we hope) on its way there, we may reasonably expect their antagonisms to diminish and eventually disappear. In a world where economic competition is set to rise sharply, with countries like China and India flooding Western markets with good but inexpensive products of all kinds; where communications are almost instantaneous; where nuclear and other WMDs are, alas, almost bound to get into irresponsible hands; where even the US can be reached by terrorist groups whose bases are thousands of miles away; where such things as immigration and fuel supplies are serious problems for Western countries; and where everyone has reason to be worried about the degradation of the natural environment – in these changed circumstances, Cyprus needs to cease being a ‘problem’ within the western security agenda and become what it easily could be: an important asset. For this to happen, any

narcissistic preoccupation with local nationalisms – and especially, I have to say, with the more vociferous Greek Cypriot kind – will have to be replaced by much wider perceptions.

More than anything else, the Cyprus problem as it emerged in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, was the result of various attempts to reconcile the interests of Britain, Greece, and Turkey, all NATO members, and to prevent the Island of Aphrodite becoming a Mediterranean Cuba. Of course, Makarios took advantage of the tense international situation to further his own sub-plot of Hellenic ‘redemption’. But he was allowed to indulge in this *divertissement* only to the extent that it didn’t seriously conflict with the overriding libretto of Western interests. At that time, incidentally, purely Turkish interests were not seen by Britain and America to be of paramount importance. This was the main reason why the Greek Cypriots were able to appropriate for themselves the title of ‘the government of Cyprus’. Provided NATO’s concerns weren’t jeopardised, the big powers didn’t mind all that much who ostensibly ran Cyprus. A crucial difference between then and today is that now not Russia but something rather elusively called ‘terrorism’ is perceived as the major threat to the West. And there are other threats too. The need to deal with all of these can only serve to enhance Turkey’s importance in Western eyes.

An able Turkish commentator recently spoke of what he called America’s “grand new design”, a new map of Western concerns in the Middle East and beyond, allegedly drawn up by “the Pentagon cartographers”, as he put it. “This map encompasses the sources of... oil and natural gas” in the whole vast region of the Middle-East and beyond to the borders of China, and “certainly includes”, he noted, “the strategic... island of Cyprus.”⁵ We might add that it will also be found to include, as an indispensable ally, a rapidly modernizing Turkey.

⁵ Yüksel Söylemez, ‘End game in Cyprus’, *Turkish Daily News*, 23 February 2004.

Since 1974, and indeed 1963, the international scene has changed dramatically. The stances of the two Cypriot communities have also changed, but incomparably less. Those Cypriot postures might be said to have remained, in some essential respects, almost in a time-warp: in a self-absorbed state of trauma, nurtured by local nationalistic sentiments, to some degree dangerously insulated from what is happening on the world-stage.

The reason for the current flurry of diplomatic activity in, and around, Cyprus is that a point has now been reached in the wider drama when a readjustment in the status quo on the island is required in order to bring the situation there more conveniently into line with the changing Western agenda. It is this ‘grand new design’ we have to keep our eyes on. As in the past, this is what will be decisive for Cyprus.

Before ending, I would like to make one final point.

Although at least one part of Cyprus is now (presumably irreversibly) part of the EU, there is another current development that could influence the island’s future in a quite different direction. If the American neoconservatives stay in power, the West could itself divide. As Pierre Schori, Sweden’s ambassador to the UN, said in 2002: “The list of issues that divide the EU and the US is getting longer – the Kyoto Protocol, steel tariffs, farm subsidies, the death penalty, the ABM Treaty, and the International Criminal Court. If nothing is done, this divide could become permanent.”⁶ We must now add to this growing list of contentious issues Iraq, Guantánamo, European fears about America perhaps using the ‘military option’ in dealing with Iran, and, not least, President Bush’s plan to erect a ‘security shield’ which would include military installations in European countries bordering with Russia – a prospect which many Europeans, and especially President Putin, naturally find deeply alarming.

⁶ *International Herald Tribune*, 6 August 2002.

Now, any major rift between Europe and the US in matters of ‘defence’, which sometimes seems likely, could have a decisive effect on the future of Cyprus. This is because, given such an eventuality, the Cypriot Greeks (following Greece) would surely side with Europe; while the Cypriot Turks (along with Turkey and Britain) would probably, despite some misgivings, join the Americans. In other words, any bifurcation in matters of Western defence strategy could result in a reinforcement of the island’s present division. The Cypriot microcosm would for once reflect the Western macrocosm. The fault line running through Nicosia would be part of a fault line running through the West as a whole.

I agree this is, at the moment, a purely speculative possibility. Yet it may serve to suggest another conceivable ‘solution’ in Cyprus outside the orbit of our conventional wisdom.

Postscript added in November 2008: Yes, that was a ‘purely speculative’ possibility which we may now happily dismiss. Fortunately, for the whole world, the US neo-conservatives lost the presidential election. It remains to be seen whether President Barack Obama, confronted by so many desperately serious problems, will find time in 2009 to do some new thinking about Cyprus.

Appendix 4

Memorandum of understanding between the Republic of Cyprus and the United Kingdom

5 June 2008

The President of the Republic of Cyprus and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom hereby establish a framework for developing a stronger relationship between the UK and the Republic of Cyprus.

A reunited Cyprus will bring an end to conflict in the island and lead to greater prosperity for the people of Cyprus. A united Cyprus will be able to contribute further to the stability of the region and strengthen the EU's ability to respond to global challenges.

Therefore the UK commends the leaders of the two communities on the process agreed on 21st March and 23rd May.

The Republic of Cyprus and the United Kingdom will cooperate in the following areas:

- Both countries commit themselves to working together to reunify the island. The aim is a comprehensive and durable settlement based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation and political equality, as defined by the relevant UN resolutions and the principles upon which the EU is founded. This settlement must be based on a single sovereignty, international personality and a single citizenship.
- Both countries support the on-going process under the Good Offices of the Secretary-General, including the move to full negotiations on a date agreed by the two leaders.
- The UK and the Republic of Cyprus will work with the UN, with relevant support from the EU, to ensure a successful conclusion to the on-going process and the achievement of an agreed, negotiated solution, between the two communities, as soon as possible.

- The two countries reiterate their commitment to their respective obligations under the Treaties signed in 1960.
- The UK reiterates its commitment to its obligations as a Guarantor Power. The UK will continue fully to respect existing UN resolutions on Cyprus, including UNSCRs 541 and 550. Therefore the UK will not support any moves towards the partition of the island or the recognition or up-grading of any separate political entity on the island.
- In addition, the two countries will continue to work together in a constructive manner on all issues emanating from the Treaty of Establishment.
- The UK and the Republic of Cyprus reaffirm their support for measures aimed at the economic integration of the island in accordance with the 26 of April 2004 EU Council Conclusions and helping to prepare the Turkish Cypriot community for reunification and the full application of the *acquis communautaire* on the basis of Protocol 10 of the Treaty of Accession.
- The UK commends the measures taken and proposed by the Republic of Cyprus for the benefit of the Turkish Cypriot community. The UK will work with the Republic of Cyprus to help promote further contact between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in order to support the reunification of the island.
- The UK recognises the positive proposal made by the Republic of Cyprus towards the establishment of an accreditation process for enabling the Turkish Cypriot higher education institutions to participate in international co-operation programmes.
- The UK undertakes to continue to inform its citizens on the legal situation prevailing in Cyprus regarding the properties issue and relevant ECHR judgments.

- The Republic of Cyprus and the UK will establish a programme of bilateral co-operation on a range of priority issues. It will identify common interests between the two countries, based on the common legal framework, administrative structures, economic complementarity, people-to-people ties and shared strategic interests.
- This co-operation will be developed through exchange of best practice and direct co-operation in specific areas. The sectors to be covered will be identified, developed and adjusted by the diplomatic representatives in London and Nicosia. Initial priorities include:
 - Education and Health: schools, higher education, technical, vocational education and training;
 - Police and security issues: organised crime, counter-terrorism, illegal immigration, road safety and football hooliganism;
 - Economic and commercial issues: competitiveness, research and development, financial services, energy and environment.
- The Millennium Development Goals: The Republic of Cyprus has today joined the Call to Action. The UK and the Republic of Cyprus strongly support the need for an EU action plan to be agreed at the June Council;
- The Olympics: we will work together to identify areas for co-operation as the UK prepares for the 2012 London Olympics.
- The Republic of Cyprus and the UK will establish closer dialogue in Brussels, London and Nicosia on EU issues where they have shared interests (e.g. to promote a more effective social dimension and co-operation on issues such as Justice and Home Affairs (JHA), taxation, budget reform, climate change).
- As the Republic of Cyprus prepares for its EU Presidency in 2012, the UK will offer to share its experience, including through inward secondments.

Cyprus: Unity And Difference

- The two countries will also hold a regular dialogue on EU/Turkey, where they share the objective of full membership once full conditions have been met. Both countries agree on the need for Turkey to fulfil its outstanding obligations towards all member states in accordance with the Negotiating Framework and the 21st September 2005 EU Declaration. The two countries will pursue dialogue by discussing issues relating to the negotiations at an early stage to clarify and resolve outstanding difficulties.
- This programme of action will be delivered through six-monthly reviews at Ministerial level in Nicosia or London and regular discussions between High Commissions and Governments in capitals. It will also be delivered through contact between Representations in Brussels and New York. The UK and Cyprus will also aim to hold an annual Cyprus/UK Forum to address specific issues of mutual interest.

Gordon Brown
Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

Demetris Christofias
President of the Republic of Cyprus

Appendix 5

A transcript of Rauf Denktaş being interviewed for Greek Cypriot television in November 2008 by journalist Costas Yennaris on the subject of the TRNC's alleged unilateral declaration of independence in 1983

Question 1: *Could you please give us a short narration describing the moves taken and the preparations carried out from the moment the decision to go ahead with your unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) was taken until the declaration of the TRNC as a separate state was made?*

Denktaş: First of all ours was not a UDI; it was the decision of the Turkish partner, forcefully ejected from the partnership and left stranded in enclaves for eleven years; who had tried to save the 1960 partnership by calling for a return to normality while setting up its own Transitional Administration while Makarios was declaring the Constitution dead and buried.

If UDI is to be referred to at all, it should be used to describe the break-away of the Greek Cypriot partner from the Partnership State established by virtue of international Agreements. The fact that they managed to use the title of the State they had destroyed – thanks to big power politics – does not change this reality.

The decision to establish a proper state was by the Turkish Cypriots who, having been ejected from the partnership state, had been ruling themselves for twenty years, from 1963 onwards, and saw no hope of a settlement as long as the Greek Cypriot partner was treated as the legitimate Government of Cyprus. Unless the equilibrium or balances of the 1960 Agreement were protected and maintained there was no hope that the Greek Cypriot leadership would agree to a new partnership. We were saved by the Turkish Peace Operation at the eleventh hour. A Population Exchange Agreement had been implemented in preparation for a bi-zonal, bi-communal federal agreement; talks had continued on this issue only for Mr Kyprianou to

declare that he never believed in a federal settlement and that he was proud he honoured the will and testament of Makarios, namely using the stolen title of “the Government of Cyprus” for proceeding to Enosis. We saw that the exercise for setting up a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation (for which we had strived since 1977) was not the aim of the Greek Cypriot leadership, and yet we continued talking until 1983. Finally, we saw that the Greek Cypriot side had no intention whatsoever to settle the problem by re-establishing a new partnership subject to better guarantees so that what happened would not happen again. That is how a partner people, denied its rights for twenty years and left stateless, had to cover itself by declaring its independence. We did not break-away from a unitary state; we, as co-founder partners, were thrown out of the partnership and kept out for twenty years. What could we do except declare our independence and thus re-establish the balance between the two sides?

UDI is breaking away from a unitary state by force or otherwise. We did not break away from any lawful state. We were thrown out of a Partnership State in which we had guaranteed rights as equal co-founder partner and we were asked to submit to minority rights. It is after attempting for twenty years to settle the problem, and a further six years trying to re-establish a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation, that we decided to declare full independence in order to keep and maintain the balances established by the 1960 Agreements. These were the internal balances between the two co-founder parties and external balances between Turkey and Greece. It is forgotten that the Greek attempt to unite Cyprus with Greece was a direct affront to the Greco-Turkish balance established at Lausanne where both Turkey and Greece had left Cyprus to the British as part of this balance. The attempt to unite the island with Greece was therefore a matter for Turkey also which had the double duty of additionally saving us from annihilation.

Don't forget that we had declared a Federated State back in 1975 and had called upon the Greek Cypriot side to do the same and thus discuss powers and functions of the central government, boundaries, settling the property questions etc. We were taken to the Security Council to be

reprimanded and the so-called Cyprus Government rolled on with Vassiliou succeeding Kyprianou and then he was succeeded by Clerides. Time wasted? Yes: with Makarios from 1963 to 1974, with Kyprianou from 1977 to 1983, another five years with Vassiliou, and ten more years with Clerides. In the meantime the Turkish Cypriots had to live, survive and develop. What we offered for settlement in 1975-76 onwards naturally no longer holds. And what are the two leaders talking about now? Bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. Why insist that it will not be between already existing states and waste more time?

Furthermore Mr. Hristofias is playing exactly the same game played by Mr. Kyprianou back in 1986, when [UNSG] Mr. Cuellar invited us to N.Y. to sign the Agreement on which we had worked for months, Mr. Cuellar and everyone else thought that an accord now existed. But all of a sudden Mr. Kyprianou sent a letter demanding things which were not items we had been bargaining about. The latter were the Guarantees and stationing of national contingents and restrictions on freedoms of settlement, ownership, etc., “having regard to Turkish Cypriot difficulties”... All this is in the UNSG’s Report to the Security Council

To-day Mr. Hristofias is exactly on the same line stating that no guarantees are needed and that the freedoms mentioned above cannot and should not be restricted. So bi-zonality becomes a joke while Turkish Cypriots are asked to forego the Guarantees which saved them from annihilation.

This long introduction was necessary in order to let you know that in any new settlement “the state of affairs” established by the 1960 Agreements, namely the internal and external balances I have outlined above, are of paramount importance together with the Guarantees. While I was at great pains trying to accommodate Greek Cypriot demands during the talks, while taking care of these balances, Mr. Kyprianou, each year in September, used to go to the Non-Aligned Conference, obtain a resolution contradicting everything which was on the table, then proceed to the UN

General Assembly addressing the Assembly in similar vein, and coming back and wasting time with me by pretending to negotiate.

In 1982 I warned him not to do this and to concentrate on the talks. In the meantime I explained to the Turkish Government that unless we acquired a status of equality, instead of allowing the Greek Cypriot side to circulate as the legitimate Government of the whole island, there was no hope of a fair and balanced settlement; and that we had to declare our independence and then sit at the table. By the time Kyprianou flew to the Non-Aligned Conference Turkey was also convinced that there was no other way of motivating the Greek side to sit and talk sense than to declare our own independence. I had warned Kypriaou publicly that if he came back again with a Non-Aligned resolution contradicting what we were talking at the table he would find us in a new status. So, when Kyprianou flew to the Non-aligned Conference and got his resolution we began our efforts here for gaining support for independence. This involved talking to friends in the opposition parties also while our people went around the villages telling the people that Kyprianou was closing all doors for a fair settlement. Finally I had to prepare Dr. Küçük whose immediate question was “Is Turkey with us?”. Yes, this time Turkey had no alternative because it was clear that the Greek Cypriot side would not be motivated otherwise. All that Turkey wanted from us was that we should make it clear that we were ready to continue the talks for a federal settlement. This we accepted.

Kyprianou came back with a Churchillian victory sign, asking us to sit and talk under the resolution he had got from the Non-aligned. I sent directives to our people in London, N.Y. and Washington to await news from us before they opened sealed envelopes which contained announcements of a declaration of independence.

On 14th November I gave a dinner to the leaders of all parties together with their associates. About midnight when dinner was over I told them that we would be declaring our independence next day and I explained the reasons. If we wanted a balanced settlement we should establish the balance by this

declaration: so that the Greek Cypriot leaders understood that our Turkish Cypriot status was to continue to be that of an equal co-founder of any new partnership, and that there was no chance we would accept them as the government of Cyprus. Those in the opposition opposed the idea and asked me whether Turkey had consented. I told them the decision was ours and that we had sufficient support for passing a resolution the next day. If they opposed the declaration then they should consider their position in the parliament. Next day they all voted in favour of the declaration. Thousands of people had gathered around the Parliament. The decision was taken very enthusiastically by the people who later voted for the Constitution with a magnificent margin.

Greek Cypriots complained and I was at the Security Council within the week telling “the fives” that they should use this declaration of ours for motivating the Greek Cypriots to come to the negotiating table on terms of equality. They did the contrary, saying that they recognized only one government in Cyprus, etc. Result? More lost years and increased difficulty in the way of settling the problem.

Question 2: *What was Turkey’s role in the decision, given that you are on record saying that Turkey did not support the idea?*

Denktaş: Turkey wanted nothing but a settlement and gave all her support to the negotiations. I always pointed out that the Greek Cypriots had achieved what they had set out to achieve, namely to be regarded as “the government of Cyprus, the people of Cyprus”. The term “Cypriot” meant for them “the Hellenes of Cyprus” – a way of deceiving the world that there was a Nation of Cypriots. They would not readily give this up, and re-establish a guaranteed partnership, unless they saw the danger of permanent separation. Security Council resolutions gave them all they needed. We had to establish our equality. It took time for Turkey to come to this point. Mr. Kyprianou’s intransigence helped.

Question 3: *You talked of declaring a separate state from 1974 onwards. Why was the decision taken at that particular moment?*

Denktas: I believe this question has already been answered. I will explain again. The 1960 Agreements were made for outlawing Enosis and its counter-reply, double Enosis or Taksim. When the Partnership was destroyed [by the Greek bid] for Enosis, the Turkish side should have raised Taksim immediately in order to keep and maintain a better balance for negotiations; in other words we aimed at a better guaranteed compromise. But that did not happen with the result that Clerides was able to say publicly: “the world is recognizing us as the Government of Cyprus in spite of the fact that we have no Turkish Cypriot vice-president, no Turkish Cypriot ministers or parliamentarians, so why should we make compromises? They will either accept what we offer or will have to leave”.

In 1975, when Makarios was to be sent back to Cyprus as “the President of Cyprus”, I again sought to have the north declare independence. Turkey did not agree. That is why we declared [merely] a “Federated State”. I invited the Greek side to do the same and let us talk boundaries, central government powers etc. The Security Council again encouraged the Greek Cypriots to continue as the Government of Cyprus. Had they had any sense and had supported me, the problem would have been settled back in 1975 or 1976.

Question 4: *In 1983 other Turkish Cypriot leaders alleged that you had practically blackmailed them into supporting your decision. Why would they have alleged something like this unless it was true?*

Denktas: Had this been true, one has to ask, how did they bow to blackmail? What happened was that by the morning of the 15th they saw the full and enthusiastic support of the people and voted for the declaration unanimously. But they had ties with Akel, as you know, so they had to find excuses to save their faces vis-à-vis the old comrades.

Question 5: *Reports in the TC press since suggested that the Turkish Cypriots did not show much enthusiasm or trust in TRNC. Why was that?*

Denktaş: As an experienced journalist you must also know that this is not true. Nearly 70 per cent of the people voted for the TRNC. And during the Referendum for the Annan Plan the people were told by Mr. Talat himself that voting for the plan would bring recognition for the TRNC and would enhance it, in addition to other promises by the British, the EU and UN diplomats. And to-day our national polls indicate that 60 per cent of people, if not more, would rather retain the TRNC than vote in favour of another Annan-like plan.

Question 6: *You said at the time that UDI would have helped efforts to find a permanent solution. However, 20 years later there is no recognition and no solution. If anything things have become more complicated. Do you still believe establishing the TRNC was a wise move, especially as this move was condemned by the rest of the world at the UN?*

Denktaş: A declaration of independence, after the failure of talks coupled with the clear intention of the Greek Cypriot leaders to press for the utter Hellenization of Cyprus, left us with no other option. If the Greek Cypriot partner by itself claimed to be “the State of Cyprus” we, as the ex-Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner, had to achieve a similar status taking care of our share in the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus in which, under the 1960 Agreements, we had an equal share. This we did and it is because of the existence of the TRNC, now 25 years old enjoying all the faculties of a democratic state, that the Greek Cypriot side has not been able to complete its illegal course towards complete Hellenization of the island. Recognition is not essential for the existence of a state; non-recognition of it is injustice to the people who were left with no alternative but to declare their independence. In the case of the TRNC, one of the main reasons for non-recognition lies in the fact that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership gave undue importance to the continuation of the inter-communal talks, even after the declaration of independence. It is a sad story that even after the Referenda of 2004, when the Greek Cypriot side came out with a resounding NO, we did not say “from now on we shall talk with the other side on conditions of two states” and, instead, gave much and

undue importance to the removal of the embargoes. As to the [current] resumption of the talks on the 1977-79 basis, all I can say is that the two sides are really joking with each other. While the Greek Cypriot leader is playing for time, the Turkish Cypriot side is still trying to prove its sincere adherence to a peaceful settlement, pointing out that Greek Cypriot side is not! This will take Cyprus nowhere. The Turkish side cannot accept the conditions so bluntly put forward by Mr. Hristofias. A fair, just and permanent settlement needs acceptance of realities and not reliance on a false title (“Govt. of Cyprus” – the Republic still exists in theory) but on facts, namely, that the partners have fallen apart and two establishments have come about which cannot be wiped off the map of Cyprus.

In a conflict like the one we have in Cyprus, the key to a solution lies in treating the parties to the conflict on absolutely equal terms. It is here that everything went wrong from the beginning, when the guilty party was treated as “the legitimate Government of Cyprus” in complete disregard of the events on the ground and in utter defiance of the Rule of Law. Big Power interests so ordained things that they all thought the Turkish Cypriots would not be able to survive under the conditions prevailing during the 1963-74 period; no one (including the Greek Junta) believed that Turkey would or could one day militarily intervene in Cyprus.

In 1977, when I asked Makarios whether he admitted any mistake he had made in the past, his immediate reply, in the presence of [UNSG] Waldheim, was: “Yes, I always knew that the Colonels in Greece were fools, but I never thought that they would be mad enough to stage a military coup in the island, not knowing that this was a clear invitation to Turkey to intervene”.

I had expected him to say something to the effect that he had hurried in amending the constitution and that Akritas Plan was wrong, something like that. No, he had only one mistake: his overestimation of the intelligence of the Greek Junta.

Appendix 6

(1) Zürich – from curse to blessing in disguise*

By Makarios Droushiotis

Today, October 1st, like every year, is a holiday. Most of us have the day off to celebrate our country's independence. Yet few of us recall that, according to the constitution, the Republic of Cyprus is a bicomunal state with a Greek President and a Turkish Vice-President (the Constitution makes no mention of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, only of Greeks and Turks), a Council of Ministers consisting of 7 Greeks and 3 Turks, and a mixed House of Representatives, with seats divided between the two communities in the same proportion.

Often, those who oppose a federal solution to the Cyprus issue suggest a return to the unitary state of the Zürich agreements with a President, a Vice-President and a mixed House of Representatives. If there were a choice between the Zürich agreements and a federation, the majority would undoubtedly choose a return to Zürich. The Zürich agreements have also been lauded by ex-President Tassos Papadopoulos as a “blessing” for Cyprus, which had not been properly valued at the time. In a public speech he gave on January 13, 2005, he said that the Constitution of 1960 “was not, on one hand, Union with Greece, but on the other, it was something better: it was independence for the people as a whole.”

How satisfactory the Constitution of 1960 was, under the circumstances, can be seen today in the efforts of President Christofias to enhance the bizonality of the Republic of Cyprus and to introduce the presidential system into the proposed solution, offering rotation of the presidency in exchange.

¹ First published in the *Cyprus Mail*, 1 October 2008.

Why the Zürich agreements collapsed in 1963 is a separate issue. What will be examined here is the fate of the mixed legislative and executive instruments of the Republic of Cyprus, that is, the House of Representatives and the government. All the information used here is drawn from reports by the then United Nations Secretary-General U Thant, which are the most objective of all available information sources. Note that none of these sources are cited in any of the history textbooks used in our schools. In any case, the history taught in our schools is flawless and does not require any revision.

After the collapse

Immediately after the collapse of the Zürich agreements in December 1963, the Turkish government under Prime Minister İnönü urged the Turkish Cypriots to return to the Republic of Cyprus. In a letter to Vice-President Fazıl Küçük dated March 9, 1964, İsmet İnönü called upon him to seek an understanding with President Makarios and return to the government, with the Vice-President and Ministers leading, and the Ministers, the Representatives and later, the civil servants, following.

Küçük replied the next day, saying that this was impossible, citing a crisis of confidence and fear, and claiming that if he insisted, the Turkish Cypriot officials would resign their posts.

The Turkish government of the day was in conflict with the Turkish Army and desired the implementation of the Zürich agreements. That is why they forced Rauf Denktaş to remain exiled in Turkey from 1964 until 1968. The Turkish Cypriot leadership and the paramilitary organisation TMT were under the influence of the army, which desired the division of Cyprus.

The Turkish Cypriots were unwilling to return to the Republic of Cyprus, but the Greek Cypriots were also unwilling to accept them. As early as March 1964, the Greek Cypriot leadership had renounced independence, and set its sights on immediate union with Greece. Until this was achieved,

the Greek Cypriots treated the Republic of Cyprus as a purely Greek state, unilaterally abolishing those provisions of the Constitution which secured the bicommunality of the state. The Turkish Cypriot response to this was to demand immediate implementation of the Constitution, which forbade union with any other country and secured the rights and privileges the Turkish Cypriots had achieved in 1960.

Minority

On August 15, 1965, the five-year term of the first President, Vice-President and House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus came to an end. On July 20 (a date which achieved a different significance later), the Council of Ministers approved draft legislation extending the term of the President and House of Representatives for a year. It also approved a revision of the electoral law, abolishing the Turkish Cypriots' right separately to elect the Vice-President and the members of the House of Representatives from their community.

The draft legislation violated several fundamental (and, according to the Constitution, therefore immutable) articles of the Constitution.

Revision of the electoral law also required, according to the Constitution, separate majority votes from representatives of both Communities in the House. The draft legislation was referred to the House for enactment into law, and the Turkish Cypriot representatives requested protective escort from the United Nations Forces in Cyprus to attend the session of the House. UNFICYP relayed the request to the then Speaker of the House, Glafcos Clerides, who imposed such conditions on its acceptance as would be tantamount to an acceptance of minority status by the Turkish Cypriots. He stated that "it must be understood that the paragraph of Article 78 which refers to separate majorities has been abolished, and each Member will only have one vote on all decisions". Article 78 had been abolished unilaterally, without due procedure and, of course, without any negotiation with the Turkish Cypriots.

On July 22, 1965, three Turkish Cypriot members of the House met Clerides in his office to discuss their intention to return to the House and take part in the discussion and vote on the electoral law. Clerides repeated his response as he had given it to UNFICYP: the Greek Cypriot community did not recognise the relevant provisions of the Constitution.

The next day, *Phileleftheros* newspaper published the news under the headline, “Turkish Cypriot ‘Members of Parliament’ have no right to return to the House of Representatives”. The Representatives elected according to the provisions of the Constitution of 1960 were now pseudo-parliamentarians, and the denomination of their office entered quotation marks. The rest of the press treated the issue similarly.

The House passed the law, without Turkish Cypriot participation, on July 23, 1965.

The United Kingdom and Turkey, as guarantor powers, made representations to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus about the revision of the electoral law which violated the Constitution. The government responded that it “could not, under any circumstances, contribute in any way to the restoration of circumstances as they prevailed before December 1963”.

On October 11, 1965, the government of the Republic of Cyprus submitted to United Nations Secretary-General U Thant a “Declaration of intentions on the Constitutional Rights of Turkish Cypriots”. The document made clear the Greek Cypriot policy of unilateral abolition of the bicomunal nature of the state, and made a commitment to respect of the minority rights of the Turkish Cypriots.

The 1968 Elections

President Makarios’ term kept being extended similarly until 1968, when it was decided to hold presidential elections. Insisting on the Constitution remaining in force, the Turkish Cypriots unilaterally declared elections for

a Vice-President on the same date. Fazıl Küçük was the only candidate, and was declared elected unopposed. Makarios won the election with an unprecedented, and since unmatched, 95.45 per cent of the vote, against 3.71 per cent gained by his only opponent Takis Evdokas.

Two days before the elections, Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives Orhan Müderrisoğlu wrote to Speaker of the House Glafcos Clerides, asking him to convene the House in a session in which the Turkish Cypriot members would also take part, so that they could take the oath of office together as provided for in the Constitution.

Küçük also wrote to Makarios and asked him to implement Article 46(3) of the Constitution, and appoint three Turkish Cypriot Ministers. Küçük made public his regret that Makarios did not respond to his request that they take the oath of office together, which would have been “a gesture of good will and genuine commitment by the Greek Cypriot leadership to respect the rights of the Turkish Cypriot community”.

The Greek Cypriots did not respond to the request, because they had unilaterally abolished the provisions of the Constitution which referred to the bizonal [bicomunal?] character of the State. Government Spokesman M. Christodoulou stated that elections were not declared by communities or groups of citizens, but by the State, and were held through the mechanisms of the State, and therefore the election of Küçük to the Vice-Presidency was neither legal nor binding. The Turkish Cypriot response was that, since the Greek Cypriots were acting unilaterally and in violation of Article 39(1) of the Constitution, the elections for the Vice-Presidency were as valid as those for the Presidency.

Hindsight

From 1964 to 1974, Makarios did not recognise the bizonality [bicommmunality?] of the Constitution and considered the articles which concerned the participation of the Turkish Cypriot community in the structure of the State to be not implementable.

On July 23, 1974, three days after the Turkish Army had landed in Cyprus, Makarios sent from New York, where he was in exile, via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece, a message to Speaker of the House and Acting President of the Republic Glafcos Clerides. Makarios instructed Clerides to request, via the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in Cyprus, a meeting with Rauf Denktaş, who had in the meantime replaced Fazıl Küçük as leader of the Turkish Cypriots. Clerides was to suggest to Denktaş the immediate implementation of the Zürich agreements, and the return to their posts of all Turkish Cypriot officials, including the Vice-President, Ministers, Members of the House of Representatives, members of the Police Force and civil servants.

Clerides requested the meeting as instructed, and his request was accepted the same day. He met Rauf Denktaş in the official residence of the Vice-President of the Republic in the Turkish quarter of Nicosia. Clerides was accompanied by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in Cyprus Mr. Weckman-Muñoz, and Commanding Officer of UNFICYP General Prem Chand.

Denktaş, on hearing Clerides' request, responded that that was a matter that required consultation with the Turkish government. He told Clerides that he would travel to Ankara by helicopter, and would respond within four days. Denktaş eventually responded via the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, stating that "the Turkish government could not examine an issue of a return to the London-Zürich agreements", which "the Greek Cypriots refused to implement for ten years [...] claiming that they were not implementable".

(2) How the Zürich agreements unravelled*

By Rauf R. Denктаş

Makarios Droushiotis' article "Zürich – from curse to blessing in disguise" ... gets full marks on impartiality and adherence to facts. Yet a few points need clarification:

a) Under the sub-title "After The Collapse" Droushiotis writes:

"Immediately after the collapse of the Zürich agreements in December 1963, the Turkish government under Prime Minister İnönü urged the Turkish Cypriots to return to the Republic of Cyprus. In a letter to Vice-President Fazıl Küçük dated March 9, 1964, İsmet İnönü called upon him to seek an understanding with President Makarios and return to the government, with the Vice-President and Ministers leading, and the Ministers, the Representatives and later the civil servants, following.

Küçük replied the next day, saying that this was impossible, citing a crisis of confidence and fear, and claiming that if he insisted, the Turkish Cypriot officials would resign their posts."

Dr. Küçük's reaction to İnönü's suggestion is understandable. İnönü, rightly and wisely, wanted to prevent the collapse of the 1960 set-up (a guaranteed partnership, a functional federation, and not a unitary state as alleged), believing that it could be saved, whereas Dr Küçük was not even able to go to his office which was now on the Greek side and had already been taken over by the gunmen of the organisation as per the Akritas Plan.

Makarios had already declared the constitution to be "dead and buried" and Turkish inhabitants of 103 villages had already become refugees in

* Denктаş's reply to Droushiotis published in the *Cyprus Mail* on 10 October 2008.

what became known as Turkish enclaves. Schoolchildren were unable to go to their villages and Makarios, who had declared that he recognised no Vice-President, had cut off even telephone contacts with Dr Küçük. Omorfita had been taken over by Sampson and his gunmen, while Turkish Cypriots moving from one place to another were being “arrested” never to be seen again. İnönü’s request therefore was out of line with the realities in the island.

A few Turkish Cypriots who had taken the risk and attended their jobs were not seen again until recently, when their bones were recovered in different places. Murder was afoot for any Turk who dared to enter the areas patrolled by the Enosis patriots.

b) Another aspect of Mr Droushiotis’ piece, which needs correction is the paragraph which reads:

“The Turkish government of the day was in conflict with the Turkish Army and desired the implementation of the Zürich agreements. That is why they forced Rauf Denктаş to remain exiled in Turkey from 1964 until 1968. The Turkish Cypriot leadership and the paramilitary organisation TMT were under the influence of the army, which desired the division of Cyprus.”

It was not the Turkish government which prevented me from coming to Cyprus; it was the “order of the day” issued by Makarios and his Minister of Interior, the commander of “the organisation” Yiorkadjis, who declared me, unconstitutionally, to be “persona non grata to be arrested for starting the Turkish uprising etc.” Being “arrested” in those days meant disappearing.

İnönü believed that the arrival of UNFICYP would help in my safely entering the country. This also did not work. In the end I had to try and enter the island once through Erenköy (Kokkina) and a second time through Larnaca when we were caught in November 1967 and sent back without

any charge of “responsibility for the so-called non-existent uprising or any other crime”.

The aftermath of my arrest and return to Turkey was the attack on Kofinou (Geçitkale) and Boğaziçi which resulted in a near military intervention by Turkey, which was prevented by Cyrus Vance’s efforts in sending Grivas and some of the Greek Army personnel back to Greece, Makarios promising to compensate the villagers for deaths and damage (which he never did) and agreement to start unofficial talks between me and Mr Clerides, which began in Beirut soon afterwards.

The result was a very close agreement on local autonomy, which Makarios rejected because I had not accepted minority status for my people and he had not managed to get rid of the Treaty of Guarantee. Today Mr Christofias is still trying to achieve these ends through smooth talking.

As to the finding of Mr Droushiotis that Makarios instructed Clerides to offer me a return to the 1960 set-up, this is also true but it was obvious that this was a tactical move by Makarios in order to put a swift end to Turkish intervention. Clerides came to me with this offer and I did tell him that, though I saw no merit in it, I would discuss it with the Turkish government.

In order to do so, I had to be satisfied that Clerides was really in charge of the situation. He was not. He had taken over the Sampson government and EOKA B with some or all of the Junta officers still active all over the country.

The return of Turkish refugees to their destroyed homes in 103 villages in safety could not be assured. Those who had staged the coup could not be arrested and tried. It was quite obvious that Makarios was up to his tricks again and the offer of going back to a situation which had given us no protection for eleven years could not be treated as a serious offer.

Cyprus: Unity And Difference

By the time I replied, the three guarantors were already discussing the situation and at the first Geneva Talks they had agreed that two separate administrations existed in the island.

The rebirth of the destroyed Partnership Republic and the treatment of its destroyers as the government of Cyprus has prolonged the settlement of the problem so far.

Appendix 7

How I see the Cyprus Problem Today*

By Rauf R Denktaş

So far, during these last 45 years neither the Security Council nor any of the Fives in it have considered it necessary to diagnose the problem for which they have been prescribing remedies which have been consistently rejected by “the Government of Cyprus” because acceptance would mean sharing power, once again, with the Turkish Cypriot side whose need for the continuation of the Guarantees, they knew, would increase and not diminish. IT IS BECAUSE THE TURKISH SIDE STUCK TO THESE TWO PRINCIPLES (STATUS AS AN EQUAL AND GUARANTEES THAT GREEK CYPRIOT SIDE PREFERRED TO CONTINUE WITH THE BLOODY STATUS QUO THEY CREATED FOR THE SAKE OF ENOSIS RATHER THAN AGREE TO THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW, THIS TIME PERMANENT PARTNERSHIP. No matter what the pundits say, the process which has just started between Talat and Hristofias is bound to crash, somewhere in the future, on these same “rocks” unless, due to international pressure, Talat submits to Greek Cypriot rule in spite of his people’s objection. This will not only be his end as a political figure; it will also be the end of the Turkish Cypriot people in the island. THE CRETAN MODEL WILL BE SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED.

Looking back

Mr. Clerides is on record saying: “why should we make any concessions to the Turkish side since the world continues to recognize us as the Government of Cyprus, although we no longer have a Turkish Cypriot Vice-President, nor any Turkish Minister in the cabinet and no Turkish Cypriots in Parliament? They will either have to accept what we offer or leave

* This is the larger part of a briefing Denktaş gave to foreign journalists on 18 October, 2008.

Cyprus”. That was pre-1974. Later he was frank enough to state that there was no need to make concession to the Turkish side. “Don’t you know that we attend these talks for tactical reasons in order to project the Turkish side as intransigent? This has been a very successful tactic so far. So why should we make any concessions now?”

One of the parties in an ethnic conflict is put into this superior position vis-à-vis the other by the big powers for their own interests; and the same powers criticize the party who refuse to bow to this injustice and in spite of repeated proof that it is this imbalance, this utter injustice which prevent a fair and permanent settlement, “the talks must go on” policy continue to rule the day.

The incorporation of “Cyprus” into the EU in complete disregard of the facts on the ground (a divided island seeking a settlement under the auspices of the UNSC in which the Rule of Law, human rights, democracy, partnership, etc., need a new and agreed adjustment) naturally hindered even further any chance of a settlement because the Greek Cypriot party, whose national aim is to continue as “the Government of Cyprus” until Turkish Cypriots surrender and Turkey pulls out of Cyprus, feel that it has secured a stronger and better bastion for continuing its onslaught against the Turkish Cypriot partner and Guarantor Turkey.

MY CONSIDERED VIEW IS THAT AS LONG AS THIS IMBALANCE EXISTS AND THE GREEK CYPRIOT SIDE STANDS TO LOSE NOTHING WHILE WAITING FOR THE COLLAPSE OF THE TURKISH FRONT, THERE IS NO CHANCE OF A JUST AND PERMANENT SETTLEMENT BASED ON THE GUARANTEED EQUALITY OF BOTH SIDES, an agreement which will lock the door for Enosis and for Greek Cypriot dominance, which to us is the same thing.

The atmosphere of high expectations purposely engineered on the Talat-Hristofias Talks can give one result under the pressures of all those who have treated Greek Cypriot side as “the Government of Cyprus” and have

made Cyprus a member of the EU in complete violation of the Rule of Law and Justice, and that is subordination of the Turkish Cypriot side to Greek Cypriot rule, which in itself will result in the evacuation of the island by the Turkish Cypriots or a final round of Greco-Turkish conflict over Cyprus – because the Turkish nation will not accept such humiliation and injustice.

Talks on the USA line

The Talat-Hrisofias talks have begun on “the USA line” which is damning to the Turkish side. I will explain. It was the US authorities who convinced Prime Minister Erdoğan that the Annan Plan was the best finale for all concerned, and in turn the Turkish Government put all its effort into convincing the Turkish Cypriots to say YES to this plan, everybody believing that the Greek Cypriots would also say yes eventually. Paradise was promised to us if we voted yes and the USA spent 30 million dollars to achieve this “wonderful end”. The result was a resounding NO by the Greek Cypriot side and YES by the Turkish Cypriot side. BUT not only all promises to us were forgotten but the Americans immediately interpreted our YES vote to mean that “The Turkish Cypriot side will no longer claim recognition for the TRNC OR SOVEREIGNTY”. Another blow to our attempt to keep and maintain the balance envisaged in the 1960 set-up: the State of affairs. The TRNC was established in order to keep and maintain that balance. If the Greek Cypriots had become, in defiance of the 1960 set-up, “the Government of Cyprus” then the ex-partner who had been deprived of state protection and all its rights in the partnership State had the right to establish its own State in the North. So that any future negotiation for a new partnership should start between two equals and not between “the Government” and its “rebellious minority who leaves and helps the occupier”.

The Talat-Hristofias Talks have started from this very AMERICAN line by going back to my 1977 Agreement with Makarios seeking bi-zonal, bi-communal federation with the difference that what has happened since then and why are ignored, while Hristofias talks as the owner of Cyprus, now a member of the EU, and tells us that we should not expect any

derogations from the EU nor the same rights we had under the 1960 Agreements “which overshadowed Greek Cypriot, Armenian, Maronite and Latin’s rights”.

The uninitiated may say “what is wrong in that?”, to which the answer is the following:

a) I talked bi-zonal, bi-communal federation with Kyprianou for eleven years without coming to any agreement because, as later stated by Kyprianou himself, he never believed in a federal settlement. “I HONOURED THE WILL AND TESTAMENT OF OUR GREAT LEADER MAKARIOS”, he said, “by making no concessions on the title of the Government of Cyprus”. As you will remember, this was “the nearest thing to Enosis” according to Makarios.

b) What Kyprianou really wanted – but knowing that those things were not subject of our talks, he had not raised them at the talks – he demanded in a letter to the UN Secretary-General. This was when we were called upon to sign what everyone had assumed was THE Agreed text between us. An extract from the then SG’s Report to the SC in June, 1986 makes this clear. Here, in part, is what Mr Perez de Cuellar said at that time:

7. In my covering letter to the two leaders ... I stressed that acceptance of the draft framework agreement would allow, for the very first time, all the outstanding issues to be tackled in earnest as an integrated whole, and I assured the parties that I would spare no effort to maintain the momentum towards a just and lasting solution of the Cyprus problem and that the procedures contained in the text were designed towards that end. I concluded by expressing the hope that both sides would seize this opportunity to break through to a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem.

8. Because of the significance of the stage we had reached, I gave a copy of the draft framework agreement together with the substance of my covering letter to the President of the Security Council and I requested him to give a copy to the members of the Council. I also gave copies to the Permanent Representatives of Greece and Turkey. In addition, at the invitation of the President of the Council, I briefed its members at an informal meeting on 24 April on the status of my latest effort.

9. On 20 April 1986 I received a letter from President Kyprianou ... He stated that before the Greek Cypriot side could express its views on the draft framework agreement 'it was necessary that there be agreement on the basic issues of the Cyprus problem as a matter of priority', namely on 'withdrawal of the Turkish Forces of occupation and settlers, effective international guarantees, and the application of the three freedoms, that is freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and the right to property'. Towards that end he requested that I convene an international conference to deal with the first two issues or, if this proved impossible, that I convene a high-level meeting to deal with all three issues.

10. On 21 April 1986 I received a letter from His Excellency Mr. Denktash ... in which he set out views and considerations in the light of which he informed me of the Turkish Cypriot acceptance of the draft framework agreement. In a further letter dated 27 April ... His Excellency Mr. Denktash stated that he was prepared to sign the draft framework agreement as it was when the blank dates had been filled in. He further stated that he had examined President Kyprianou's letter of 20 April as published in the press and informed me that the Turkish Cypriot side could not accept any procedure other than that contained in the draft framework agreement.

What Kyprianou was asking for, at that late hour, were matters which had nothing to do with our negotiations and on which he knew we would never compromise. To-day Hristofias is asking exactly those very things which were not subject of discussion under the agreed "bi-zonal, bi-communal federation" formula of 1977-79 which he pretends is the basis of his talks with Mr. Talat.

- c) I lost another five years talking bi-zonal, bi-communal federation with Mr. Vasiliou who bolted again when we were invited to N.Y. to sign the agreement because it was GC election time and his opponent Mr. Clerides was challenging him not to sign such a "sell-out to the Turks". Clerides won the elections and another ten years were lost in the same manner, Clerides attending all our talks "for tactical reasons", as he was to confess. Finally the Annan Plan was rejected by them. WHY? Because they do not need a settlement as long as they are treated as THE GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS, now further empowered as a member of the EU, and while they are able to project the Cyprus problem as a problem of occupation which arose in 1974.

For Greek Cypriot leaders talking about the 1963-74 years is a clear show of intransigence because “we must look to the future”. But for them the 1974 intervention by Turkey, our salvation, continues to be THE MATTER UNDER DISCUSSION, the real issue to be settled.

It is on this lie that the Greek Cypriot side is intent to settle the problem, and it is because of this lie that 65% of Greek Cypriots do not want to live together with Turkish Cypriots. That is why it is very important that the truth about 1963-1974 be publicly admitted by the Greek Cypriot leadership, offering compensation to all those who lost their homes or loved ones during those years. Mr. Hoon, a British Minister, when confronted with the public poll results as stated above said that if this was true then a federal solution was out of question: confederation is the answer he said. In fact for any settlement to be fair and permanent we need something better than the 1960 Guarantees, and that is a partnership between the two existing STATES.

During my talks with the above-stated leaders the Guarantees were untouchable; they were not subject of the talks; it was granted that they would continue. Furthermore the reference to bi-communality was not a disputed term in the sense that the reference to “two politically equal communities” carried with it the right of the two communities to separate self-determination, if ever this need arose. That is why we had agreed with Mr. Vassiliou during our talks that any agreement by us would be put to separate referenda of our people, as in fact it was done for the Annan Plan. Otherwise the Turkish side always challenged the use by the Greek Cypriot side of the expression “People of Cyprus composed of two communities, Turkish Cypriots being denominated as the minority within the people of Cyprus”. For them as Mr. Papadakis, an expert on education, says “Cypriots mean Greek Cypriot people” and the term does not include Turkish Cypriots. Thus the world is made to believe that there is ONE people, ONE nation of Cypriots and that the Turkish Cypriots are a minority within that nation of Hellenes.

THIS HAS BEEN A CONTINUOUS AND CONSTANT TUG OF WAR BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES SINCE 1954 WHEN GREECE TOOK THE CYPRUS PROBLEM TO THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ASKING FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR “THE PEOPLE OF CYPRUS”. Immediately TWO peoples became the main issue and the term “communities” was never used by the Turkish Cypriot side to mean anything less than Turkish people – a political equal of the Greek Cypriot people with the right of self determination as confirmed by the British Government and Parliament back in 1956. But for the Greek Cypriot leadership, for the Church and schools, Turkish Cypriots were Islamicized Greeks and the term “Cypriot” covered “the Hellenes of Cyprus” in which Turkish Cypriots were a minority. In the words of Mr. Papadopoulos OSMOSIS would solve the problem in time. This is an extract from the 2008 report of Mr. Yiannis Papadakis, to the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, under the title *History Education in Divided Cyprus*:

“Cyprus is and has been Greek and nothing but Greek” is the message conveyed by the cover of the major Greek Cypriot primary-level schoolbook on the history of Cyprus, which shows a row of ancient columns...; as for its people: “Cypriots were and are Christian Orthodox.” This book covers the Roman period to the present, thus presenting the most complete narrative of the whole of the history of Cyprus in primary school. From the start it subsumes the history of Cyprus within the history of Greece with the two first sections entitled “The Conquest of Greece by the Romans” followed by “The Conquest of Cyprus by the Romans.” This and the other Greek Cypriot schoolbooks to be discussed follow the periodisation of history, a precedent established for recounting the history of Greece, by presenting history “from above”, as a succession of empires/rulers with the adjective *kratia* (domination) signifying oppression, used for everyone but (ancient) Greeks or Byzantines, as in *Frangokratia*, *Enetokratia*, *Tourkokratia*, *Agglokratia* (Frankish, Venetian, Turkish, and English Domination). In all the books, “Cypriot Hellenism” is the central actor of history from beginning to end.

All the books employ the term Cypriots ‘*Kyprioi*’ as equivalent to Greeks ‘*Ellines*’, often within the same sentence or paragraph. As Koullapis rightly argued, “this practice inculcates in the historical consciousness of Greek Cypriots the belief that from the period of the Mycenaeans to the present there have never been any other indigenous population groups except the Greeks or, at the very least, that the presence of any Others was and is parasitic.” As a secondary-level schoolbook states in the foreword:

“Many peoples passed over Cyprus or conquered her... But its inhabitants safeguarded its Hellenic character created since the Mycenaean settlers in Cyprus...” This “Hellenisation thesis”, reproduced in all relevant schoolbooks, has attracted considerable academic critique, although mainly from outside Cyprus. According to the logic of this model, others (Turkish Cypriots, for example) have (historically speaking) no rightful place in Cyprus; hence the category “Cypriots” is constantly used in a manner that excludes them. As the previous quote indicated, the arrival of the Mycenaean is considered the most important historical event that has sealed the Hellenic character of Cyprus. [Op. cit. pp 6-8]¹

As seen above, all through my talks with the Greek Cypriot leaders what I tried to protect – and what each of them tried to do away with – were THE EQUAL STATUS OF THE TURKISH CYPRIOT SIDE AS A CO-FOUNDER PARTNER IN A NEW PARTNERSHIP and THE CONTINUATION OF THE GUARANTEES. I believe Mr. Talat, together with Turkey, is also eager to protect these factors. The bi-zonality to which Greek Cypriot side had seemingly agreed was also protected from Greek Cypriot influx because it was agreed that the number of Greek Cypriots to settle or buy property in the Turkish Cypriot zone would be subject to restrictions under the laws of the North – whereas now Mr. Hristofias wants to water-down bi-zonality under the pretence of appealing to human rights and EU norms so that bi-zonality becomes a joke. He intends to effect this by claiming a full right of return/restitution of property in complete disregard of what the GCs had done to Turkish properties in the South. The 1975 Exchange of Population Agreement, followed by the bi-zonal federation agreement, was based on the security need of the Turkish Cypriot side. All these agreements are not heeded by Mr. Hristofias, who seems to

¹ Following a Council of Europe recommendation about the teaching of history signed by the Cyprus Republic in 2001, on 1 September, 2008 the GC education minister Andreas Demetriou suggested, in a widely distributed circular, certain changes to the school curriculum. These included a revision of school history books. If implemented, these revisions would go a long way to counteracting the biases in GC history teaching lamented by Dr Papadakis. The minister’s circular was welcomed by many academics and other liberal-minded people in the South, but not of course by the nationalists. Archbishop Chrysostomos warned the government that the Church would ‘act vigorously’ against any such changes. ‘We were pupils once and we were also taught history’, he pointed out. ‘Does this mean that the history we were taught was false?’, he asked incredulously.

suffer from utter forgetfulness of the 1963-74 years and of the Akritas Plan on the basis of which everything the Greek Cypriot side did to us was planned and executed.

To-day Mr. Hristofias insists that:

- a) There is one people called Cypriots composed largely of two communities and that the rights to be given to the Turkish Cypriot community ANEW shall not be such as to overshadow the rights of Greek Cypriots, Maronites, Armenians and Latins. This means that the reason for attacking us back in 1963 (namely the belief that the rights given to Turkish Cypriots did injustice to the “people of Cyprus”) still stands.
- b) Indeed, he made it absolutely clear that he is really not in love with a federal solution “but needs it in order to get rid of the Turkish soldiers”.
- c) His further demand, supported by Greece, is that Cyprus as an EU member needs no Guarantees and no Guarantors.
- d) The problem should be settled within the EU norms and laws and UN Resolutions, meaning that the bi-nationality of the State, its partnership character and the need of the Turkish Cypriot partner to substantial derogations from the EU, should not be granted; that the 1960 State was a unitary state and that all that is needed is that the Constitution of 1960 (which Makarios had declared to be dead and buried and has not been implemented since 1963) shall be amended in order to make Cyprus a bi-zonal state as Hristofias envisions.
- e) The constituent states [as conceived by Hristofias] are merely provinces in a Greek Cypriot-dominated island and can have no other

meaning. SINGLE STATE-SINGLE SOVEREIGNTY is the answer.

- f) Cyprus should be demilitarized and all Turkish settlers should go back to Anatolia; although he seems open to discuss how many of them can stay. He forgets, however, that according to their own Minister of the Interior the Greek Cypriots themselves have given citizenship to one hundred thousand people not counting those from Greece and the Pontus Greeks, which means they themselves have almost two hundred thousand “settlers”. This, of course, is no problem for “Cyprus”. But the Turkish ones – who came to work here in the North thirty years ago, and finally acquired citizenship, having children born here, some of them now in their twenties or more – are to be dispatched to Turkey!

- g) Hristofias had a long meeting with Archbishop Hrisostomos who publicly declared his absolute satisfaction about private/secret information given to him by Hristofias, promising to back up Hristofias as long as he keeps on this national line. Knowing the century-old policy of this militant Church this is confirmation of our fears that Hristofias has no objective other than getting rid of the Guarantees and the Turkish soldiers and then, dealing with us as his subjects in a unitary state.

WHAT IS FORGOTTEN BY ALL CONCERNED is that the problem in Cyprus arose from the overt acts of the Greek side in order to unite the island with Greece; that this movement was in breach of the Treaty of Lausanne whereby a Greco-Turkish balance was struck and Cyprus, a Turkish land until this Treaty, was ceded to Great Britain. 60 km from her shores, Turkey could not be indifferent to the Greek attempt to take over Cyprus from Britain on the ground that the majority was Greek Orthodox. In the context of Enosis, and the Turkish side’s right to object to it, majority should be counted between Greece and Turkey taking into account the geopolitical interests of the parties also. It is because of these realities that Enosis and its counter-reply, double Enosis (taksim), were abandoned for

the sake of peace and for the good of NATO, and a Guaranteed Partnership State was set up in which Turkish Cypriots would not be dominated by Greek Cypriots and Enosis would be forgotten. THE EVENTS WHICH BEGAN IN 1963 AND CONTINUE TO THIS DAY PROVE THAT THE TURKISH CYPRIOT SIDE NEED MORE THAN THE GUARANTEES OF 1960, AND THAT IS A STATE OF AFFAIRS WHICH WILL GIVE NO CHANCE TO THE GREEK SIDE TO INDULGE IN A REPEAT PERFORMANCE; and, moreover, that further and better guarantee lies in A CONFEDERAL SOLUTION. Something like the Czech-Slovak formula is the answer. The TRNC should be made a member of the EU simultaneously with Turkey in compliance with the 1960 Agreements.

As stated above, the 1960 Agreements which gave birth to the partnership Republic of Cyprus were based on THE STATE OF AFFAIRS established by these Agreements. These were INTERNALLY absolute political equality of the two Cypriot sides, internally supported by two separate democracies and autonomous communal governments plus protection of equality through veto rights and a special voting process in certain important matters. AND EXTERNALLY: the Greco-Turkish balance, in other words, the extension of the Lausanne balance over Cyprus.

THESE RESTRICTED THE INDEPENDENCE OF CYPRUS in so far as to prevent it from committing suicide at the Enosis altar. That this was needed very badly has been proven by the events as from December 1963 to this day. Makarios deceived the non-aligned world that “the independence of the PEOPLE of Cyprus was restricted by the Imperialist powers and that his struggle was for FULL INDEPENDENCE – getting rid of the restrictions on Cypriot independence”. That this was merely a ploy for opening the way to Enosis, and therefore colonizing Cyprus once again, has always been ignored by all concerned.

In Conclusion

The distrust between the two sides continues to be as wide as it ever was while talks for a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation continued on and off from 1977 to this day. The vision of the two sides on a federal solution are also wide apart, the Greek side seeing it as an exercise for amending the existing constitution and inviting the Turkish minority to join the “legitimate” Government with certain powers, the Turkish zone being nothing but part of a united Cyprus where all Cypriots will be free to move, settle and own property and certainly with no need for guarantees; while the Turkish side talks about founder states of equal structure and equal power-sharing coupled with the continuation of effective guarantees, which takes care of the “state of affairs” as created by the 1960 Agreements, subject to agreed internal changes.

These official approaches of the parties should also be considered in the light of popular feelings of the two sides: 65% of Greek Cypriots not wanting to live together with Turkish Cypriots and 80% of the latter now wanting confederation (a partnership of two states) to be united as such under the EU roof when Turkey becomes a full member, as per the 1960 Agreements.

Shortly the balance of equality has to be established between the two sides prior to a settlement if it is to be a just and permanent settlement. An acknowledgement of truth by the Greek Cypriot side to the effect that the trouble all started in 1963, with an offer of compensation, will pave the way for building confidence between the two sides. Otherwise the ongoing effort will lead nowhere, unless the Turkish side surrenders – which is very unlikely.

Appendix 8

Part of a speech entitled ‘Legal Aspects of the Cyprus Problem’ delivered by Denktaş before representatives and officials of the Council of Europe, EU and others, in Strasbourg on the 23rd of April 2002

Until 1994 I kept on inviting Mr Clerides to come and talk to me on the Set of Ideas. His answer was that there was no common ground to talk about, “the set of ideas are out of the question”, he said. We lost another three years.

In 1997, finally, the UN Secretary-General brought us together to talk face to face at Troutbeck in New York and in Glion, Switzerland. Just at that time, while the talks were on, the EU produced its “Agenda 2000” assuring Greek Cypriots that Cyprus was a good candidate with excellent prospects of becoming a member. The whole atmosphere changed when I was obliged to challenge Mr Clerides that the way he was presenting his case was as if he was our legitimate government. He said, in the presence of Mr Cordovez, the UN Secretary-General's representative, “I know I am not your government, I know I do not represent Turkish Cypriots, but everyone treats me as the Government of Cyprus. Do you expect me to tell the world that I am not?”.

I said to him, “No, I don't expect you to tell the World that you are not, because you destroyed the partnership State in order to be this and it was our defence and resistance which prevented you from taking over the whole Island, but I expect Mr Cordovez to report to the Secretary-General what he has just heard and I hope the Secretary-General will report to the Security Council that this treatment of the Greek Cypriot wing of a destroyed partnership State as its legitimate government, is the obstacle which prevents the solution of the problem.”

A few days ago, as you know, Mr. Solana made a statement, underlining not only a legal position and the status of the two parties, not only a 39 year

fact of life, but also a reality. He said, “Greek Cypriots do not represent the Turkish Cypriots. Therefore if Cyprus is to enter the EU, it is only the Greek Cypriot side which must enter.” In other words he meant “Turkish Cypriots cannot be forced or dragged in to the EU”. There was a very big outcry from the Greek Cypriot side that this was wrong, that they had been promised membership as the best candidate etc.; and we have statements repeated practically every day by the EU bureaucrats that Cyprus will be accepted as a member in its present position even if there is no settlement of the Cyprus problem.

So I go back to 1960 and point out how two equal parties had established a partnership state and how this was destroyed in 1963 in the name of Enosis, how we were kicked out of all the organs of the State and its budget; how we were treated as rebels because we did not submit to the unconstitutional demand of Makarios that he was our government; how we refused to become a minority.

We are at the 39th year of this ongoing struggle. I am sure there are honest, upright diplomats and statesmen who would be ready to underline the fact that Greek Cypriots cannot represent Turkish Cypriots, and therefore this application to the EU “by Cyprus” is not an application by Cyprus, that it is an application by Greek Cypriots, if only they cared to look at the facts.

Mr. Clerides is on record saying why they applied for EU membership: “Once we enter the EU the guarantee system of 1960” – which saved us, the Turkish Cypriots, from utter destruction – “will be of no effect and whatever has been promised to Turkish Cypriots as bi-zonality, restriction of the three freedoms, political equality will all be contrary to the laws of Europe. Thus Greek Cypriot refugees will be able to go back to their properties”, knowing that no Turkish Cypriot refugee will again disperse amongst Greek Cypriots because of what they suffered for 11 years! Yes, knowing that no Turkish Cypriot will choose to go back to the south, the Greek Cypriot leadership is determined to send all Greek Cypriots back to

their properties, and once that happens “Hellenism in Cyprus will be victorious” says Mr. Clerides.

When the application for the EU membership was made we objected orally and in writing. Turkey did the same. We were not listened to. The excuse for this disregard of law and of fact is very thin. Only recently, I was talking to a representative of the EU. He said: “Mr Denktaş, the Cyprus government is recognized by all, we are dealing with that government, why are you complaining, why are you saying that we are doing wrong to you?” My answer is this: “The Security Council did not recognize China for 30 years and then they had to change that decision. The Security Council has treated the Greek Cypriot wing of a partnership state as the legitimate government of Cyprus. I cannot change that and you tell me that you cannot change it either unless I agree with the Greek Cypriot side to change it. But I ask you this: Is the recognition of any state by the Security Council the only reason why you make them candidates for membership? Haven't you got your own format, your own conditions for membership? Obviously you have, because you are asking Turkey to correct its internal affairs, human rights etc. So you are interested whether a state is up to your format. Why are you not looking at Cyprus in order to find out whether from a human rights point of view, from a constitutional point of view, from a legal point of view, it is a proper candidate for entry? Have you got any candidate or a member which has thrown out one quarter of its population from the books of the government, from its budget, from the organs of the State just because that one quarter has said: “You have no right to change the constitution of the land, you are not my government. We had established a partnership, which you have destroyed by force of arms. I want my partnership status. I am not going to be your minority. We have committed no other sin except this.”

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have been punished for it for 39 years. So I ask the EU representatives, “Have you got any other country which is continuing with economic, social, political, sporting embargoes on one quarter of its people and yet claiming to be a proper government up to the

standards of Europe? Have you got anyone? You keep on appointing rapporteurs to come to Cyprus at the request of Greek Cypriots to look what is happening to a Greek Cypriot in the North. We welcome them. But we have been complaining for 39 years about the denial of the human rights, the isolation, and the abrogation of the constitutional rights of 200,000 Turkish Cypriots. Please have a look at it". No-one is interested. Why? There is no answer.

We are told that the Security Council has recognized the Greek Cypriot side as the government of Cyprus, that it is the best candidate politically and economically and therefore it will enter the EU whether we like it or not. We have, we are told, no right to veto it, no right to oppose it. We are told that Cyprus shall not be at the mercy of Turkish Cypriots, or of Turkey, in her application for entry into the EU.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Is this the Europe which we were taught and believed from our school days onwards to be the source of democracy, of justice, of fairness, champion of human rights?

We are indeed disappointed. We are afraid to be dragged into Europe prior to confirming our status in Cyprus as a co-founder partner, in a new Cyprus as political equals and this time, certainly, in a settlement based on bi-zonality and certainly not as shareholders, as we were under the 1960 Agreements but as owners of our sovereign share, agreeing to come together at the top as a joint government so that the EU and the international world will have one effective voice from Cyprus, so that the Greek Cypriots will not be able to use the excuse they have been using from 1963 to 1974: "What is happening in Cyprus is an internal matter, no one should interfere". We want to take that excuse, that weapon away from them because we want permanent peace and we can have permanent peace if we are treated as equals, so that the Greek Cypriots begin to understand that what they hijacked is not wholly theirs.

As you know, because of the statement of Mr. Clerides that he knew he was not our government, he knew he did not represent us but the world recognizes him as such, we had stopped talking to him after our 1997 Glion meeting and we said “We can only talk if you can concede this publicly, if you concede that we are as sovereign as you are, and that the exercise is how to unite these equal sovereign entities.”

Naturally he could not, because his aim and priority is EU membership. That is why arming under defence arrangements with Greece is gaining momentum.¹ So, there were no talks for about a year. But the interest in resuming the talks did not cease and finally Mr de Soto succeeded in starting the proximity talks (as they were called). These talks lasted for almost a year with no result because the Greek Cypriot priority was still membership of the EU. They rejected the UN Secretary-General's diagnosis of 12 September 2000 for establishing a new partnership with two partners of equal status, one not having the right to speak for the other.

Finally I said: “Look, proximity talks are not good enough, I want to speak face to face with Mr. Clerides, I leave aside all my principles to the effect that I will not talk to a person who projects himself as my president, also, who calls my community a minority. I leave all that aside, I want to talk to him face to face because I see the trend of events going in the wrong direction, going in a dangerous way. Why? Because Cyprus is not united, Cyprus has been under the tutelage of the Security Council for 39 years, but it is treated as a normal country and we are looked upon as intransigent and stupid people who do not know the good or the goodies that exist in EU membership and we are told all roads are open to Greek Cypriots to enter the EU as representatives of the whole Cyprus.”

¹ During the 1980s and 1990s the Greek Cypriots spent large sums of money on armaments. In 1993 they signed a ‘Common Defence Doctrine’ with Greece which involved the integration of Greek armed forces throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. This included the establishment of Greek air and naval bases in Cyprus. In 1996 Greek Cyprus spent \$600m on the purchase of the Russian S-300 missiles, with a range of 600km. Due to a Turkish threat to take them out, these missiles were eventually installed in Crete rather than in Cyprus.

Certain bureaucrats were making statements that the Turkish Cypriots have no right to stop this trend that they should jump on “the Cyprus train” and that “Turkey is bluffing. Don't believe that Turkey will sacrifice her desire for entry into Europe for the sake of Cyprus, Turkey is bluffing”. And I saw the Greek Cypriots proceeding in this direction on “the rails” leading this so-called “Cyprus train” to Brussels.

I know Turkey, I know the Turkish government, I know the Turkish parliament, I know Turkish people, and I know what they feel about Cyprus. I know that Turkey has made every effort in helping us to settle the Cyprus problem, but I also know that in spite of her application for EU membership, Turkey will not withdraw from “the rails” when it comes to the final point, that it cannot nationally afford to withdraw. Also I know that its Parliament, its people will not digest it, will not accept it, I know this. And I know my people: as a fully fledged equal partner they will never accept to enter the EU as a minority of the Greek Cypriots. They want their status.

How do I know it? A serious public poll gave a clear picture on this issue: 90% of my people (and I am included it) want to enter the EU. This is reported to the EU by its representatives in Cyprus who disregard the second line at the poll which says “90% yes to EU but after a settlement”. That part is not reported to the EU and I see in the EU reports this false presentation: “90% of Turkish Cypriots want to enter the EU; what Denktas says is therefore not relevant, he has lost control of his people.”

These are deliberately reported to the EU, to people who invite me “to jump on the Cyprus train”. I say, “Look this is not the Cyprus train for heaven's sake, this is a Greek Cypriot train. I am trying through the talks, to make it a Cyprus train. Help me, help me by naming this train as a Greek Cypriot train. And help me by asking the Greek Cypriots to take us on as their equals. Otherwise this invitation ‘to jump on the Cyprus train’ is a blank invitation. Are you asking us to jump onto it as a worker in the cabins, as a third class passenger, as what? I want and I have the right to claim to

be in that train as one of its owners. Otherwise it is not Cyprus' train, otherwise we are not going to be on it and the EU which wants Cyprus in order to bring peace, solidarity into the area, will have on its hands a very big problem. Do you want this?"

Today I saw a journalist, probably in order to provoke me, he kept on saying when I tried to point out the dangers of this trend, "It does not matter, the EU has decided and it shall be Mr. Denktas, what shall you do?" I said: "No one can drag us by force of arms into the EU. We are not going to enter without our status and a divided Cyprus will enter with all its problems. Greek Cypriots will start immediately saying that Turkey is now in occupation of an EU territory, therefore help me, as the government of Cyprus which you have recognized for so long to eject Turkey from Cyprus, to send back my refugees to their own properties, therefore to uproot Turkish Cypriots for the fourth time in 40 years. This will be a continuous problem for the EU."

The journalist said: "It does not matter. The EU will face it." Well, then I have nothing more to say. If the EU will face it, we will face the EU's injustice and we shall continue to ask, "Why this indifference to the rights, human rights, political rights, constitutional rights of a people who have stood up against aggression, who have stood up against the Milosevic of Cyprus? (That is how I describe Makarios and what he did to us for 11 years). Why this indifference, this enmity against us?"

I am sure history will also ask this question. When I asked people who come to see me, diplomats and others, "How is it that Milosevic is in court for doing things to his people which Makarios did to us for eleven years, and Makarios and his associates in crime have been made the government of all? And now these people are proceeding to become a member of EU without paying for, without answering the charges about common graves in my land, village after village destroyed, 16 days old babies, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 year old children and their young mothers, 80, 90 year old people were not spared; they did not die in a war, they were lined up and shot! These

are all proved in Greek and Greek Cypriot documentation. No one is interested, we have no status before the Human Rights Court. We can only appear as witnesses if the Court will allow us. We cannot bring charges against Greek Cypriots as an ex-co-founder partner. Only recently, for recent events, have we been able – thank God again to the Human Rights Court – have individuals been able to bring charges against the Greek Cypriot side. So my question is this: What is the Cyprus problem which you are all trying to solve? Greek Cypriots say: “It is a problem which has started in 1974, it is a question arising from occupation and a matter of human rights of our refugees.” We say: It is the destruction of an internationally established partnership State contrary to all its provisions. It is what has been done to us: refugees, common graves, killings, abductions, missing persons, everything. Until 1974. Who has done it? Greek Cypriots have done it. But while applying for membership of the EU, no one tells them: “First settle the problem that you have created, then come here”.

However, Turkey, which came 11 years later, under international agreements, and stopped the worst genocide in the middle of the Mediterranean, is asked as an additional criterion to settle the Cyprus problem or else. This is what makes us sorry, worried and insecure in the World of the 21st century.

Thank you.

