

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS
AND THE CYPRUS QUESTION
1878-2005

A Master's Thesis

by
CELAL ŞAR

Department of
International Relations
Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2005

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS
AND THE CYPRUS QUESTION
1878-2005

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

CELAL ŞAR

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2005

I certify that I have read this thesis and I have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst.Prof. Hasan Ünal

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and I have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst.Prof. Bestami Bilgiç

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and I have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst.Prof. Hasan Ali Karasar

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Erdal Erel

Director

ABSTRACT

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS AND THE CYPRUS QUESTION 1878-2005

Şar, Celal

M.A., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal

September 2005

This master's thesis aims to analyze British policy towards Cyprus and the Cyprus question in the period of 1878 to 2005. British policy towards Cyprus is mainly for military aspects. Cyprus has an importance for Britain, as it has SBAs in the island especially for intelligence, communication. British policy is directed more towards the external circumstances than the internal affairs in Cyprus, such as considering Soviet threat. Britain also considers its role in the UN and EU.

The most important international organizations such as EU and UN continue to be involved with the Cyprus Question. Britain, as a former colonial power in Cyprus continues its policy towards Cyprus in the UN and US with the aim of not losing its military sovereignty over any solution appropriate for the other states.

Keywords: Britain, Cyprus, RoC , SBAs, UNFCYP, UN, EU

ÖZET

İNGİLTERE’NİN KIBRIS POLİTİKASI VE KIBRIS SORUNU 1878-2005

Şar, Celal

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dç.Dr. Hasan Ünal

Eylül 2005

Bu tezin amacı, İngiltere’nin Kıbrıs politikası ve Kıbrıs sorununu 1878-2005 dönemi kapsamında incelemektir. İngilterenin politikasında Kıbrısın önemi askeri yönde olmuştur. İngiltere’nin Kıbrıs’ta istihbarat ve iletişim amacı taşıyan kendi egemenliğinde bulunan Askeri Üsleri bulunmaktadır. İngiltere’nin politikası, Kıbrısın iç politikasından daha çok, Sovyet tehdidi gibi bölgesel ağırlıklı olmaktadır. Ayrıca, İngiltere’nin BM ve AB içindeki rolleri, İngiltere’yi etkilemiştir.

BM ve AB Kıbrıs sorununu ele almaya devam etmektedir. Bu bağlamda, İngiltere’nin Kıbrıs politikası ağırlıklı olarak Kıbrıs’taki askeri varlığını, taraflar için uygun olacak herhangi bir çözümde devam ettirebilmek yönündedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngiltere, Kıbrıs, Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti, İngiliz Üsleri, BM Barışı
Koruma Gücü, BM, AB

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: BRITISH CONTROL ON CYPRUS: 1878 TO 1950.....	5
2.1. British Rule on Cyprus.....	5
2.2. The Early Call for Enosis.....	7
2.3. Lausanne Treaty.....	8
2.4. The 1931 Greek–Cypriot Revolt and the 1930-1950 Period.....	9
CHAPTER III: BRITISH POLICY FROM 1950 TO 1960.....	11
3.1. EOKA and Enosis.....	11
3.2. The Macmillan Plan.....	16
3.2.1. <i>The Root of the Macmillan Plan</i>	16
3.2.2. <i>The Original Provisions of the Macmillan Plan</i>	17
3.2.3. <i>The Alterations of the Macmillan Plan</i>	18
3.2.4. <i>Implications of the Macmillan Plan</i>	19
3.3. The Zurich–London Treaty: The Three Agreements.....	21
3.4. The Treaty of Establishment.....	22
3.4.1. <i>Why Britain gave upon Cyprus</i>	23
3.4.2. <i>Keeping SBAs in 1960s</i>	23
3.4.3. <i>Implications of the Treaty of Establishment</i>	24
3.5. The Treaty of Guarantee.....	26
3.6. Treaty of Alliance.....	28
3.7. The Republic of Cyprus.....	29
3.8. Membership in the UN.....	31

CHAPTER IV: BRITISH POLICY FROM 1961 TO 1970.....	33
4.1.The Thirteen Points of Makarios.....	35
4.2.Collapse of the Republic.....	37
4.3.The Acheson Plan and the British Policy	40
CHAPTER V: BRITISH POLICY FROM 1971 TO 1980.....	43
5.1.Cyprus During Cold War.....	43
5.2.Significance of Cyprus	44
5.3.Political Transformation and the British Policy	45
5.4.Peace Operation.....	48
5.5.Political Divide:	51
CHAPTER VI: BRITISH POLICY FROM 1981 TO PRESENT.....	55
6.1.British Policy.....	55
6.2.Negotiations under UN Auspices.....	56
6.2.1. <i>The Initiative</i>	57
6.2.2. <i>Proximity Talks</i>	58
6.2.3. <i>The Draft Framework Agreement</i>	59
6.3.USA–Britain Agreement.....	60
6.3.1. <i>The Root of the USA–Britain Agreement</i>	60
6.3.2. <i>The Provisions of the USA–Britain Agreement</i>	61
6.3.3. <i>Implications of the USA–Britain Agreement</i>	62
6.4.September 11 Terrorism	63
6.5.Cyprus and the EU.....	65
6.6.Cyprus, UN and the Annan Plan.....	72
6.7.Societies in Cyprus and British Policy.....	73
CHAPTER VII CONCLUSION.....	78
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKEL	The Progressive Party of the Working People (Anorthotikon Komma Ergazomenou Laou)
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
EOKA	National Organization of Cypriot Fighters
EU	European Union
MA	Main Article
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PASOK	Panhellenic Socialist Movement
PEON	Pancyprian Greek Youth Organization
RoC	Republic of Cyprus
SBA	Sovereign Base Area
TMT	Turkish Resistance Organization
TRNC	Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
UN	United Nations
UNFCYP	United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus
USA	United States of America

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Ottoman Empire had sovereignty over Cyprus during the years 1571-1878. When the Ottoman Empire was in World War I (1914-1918), Britain annexed Cyprus. But although the Ottoman Empire demanded the return of Cyprus after Russia evacuated Ottoman territories, Britain rejected it.¹

After several years, Greek-Cypriots began requesting for *enosis* which meant annexation with Greece. Though the request claim was denied, the attempt to further its cause did not cease. Due to British authority over the land, Cypriots had to follow several rules and provisions of the British government such as the Lausanne Treaty. This brought more riots and uprisings from Greek-Cypriots but only to end up with a more repressive regime.

During the 1950s, the Cypriots' call for independence increased. *Enosis* developed and EOKA, an underground organization that attacked the British administration, emerged. Even Turkish-Cypriots started advocating for *taksim* or partition of the island for their own security.

Due to such strong, even forceful, petitions for two differing interests, Britain resorted to taking its hands off Cyprus. However, two areas remained under their sovereignty to serve their interests in the Mediterranean. The London-Zurich Agreement brought Cyprus its independence- but neither *enosis* nor *taksim*-, and

¹ The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm

gave Britain the area of Akrotiri and Dhekelia. British army had two tasks in Cyprus; in the SBAs and in the UNFICYP.

The RoC, along with its Constitution, was established but Britain ensured that it still has control over the island. A few months after Cyprus' independence, it became a member of the UN.

Though the establishment of the Cyprus Republic was primarily grounded on the goal of achieving a bi-communal relation between the two distinct ethnic communities, governing the island in a federal set-up turned out to be complicated for the two Cypriot communities. Various proposals existed to revise the Constitution including the Thirteen Points of Makarios and the Akritas Plan. Due to some assaults on the British people in Cyprus, Britain, with the help of the USA, passed several plans to Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots but to no avail. In August 1975, an agreement between the representatives of the two Cypriot communities was reached for the regrouping of the Cyprus population with the Turkish zone in the north as TRNC and the Greek zone in the south. The situation worsened after Greek-Cypriots made an illegitimate unilateral application for membership of the European Union (EU) in 1990. In 2002, the Annan Plan was the latest proposal for a solution to this Cyprus problem. It has a power-sharing mechanism similar to that of the 1960s arrangement but only with a bi-communal set-up.

After the Cold War, the significance of Cyprus as Britain's strategic military base was lessened. However, it was heightened again when the Western war against terrorism was aroused. This time USA emerged more in the picture when the USA-Britain Agreement was signed, along with other participating countries. Military facilities and intelligence units were installed in certain strategic areas in Cyprus to

be able to monitor military developments and activities in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East.

In May 1, 2004, Cyprus entered the European Union as a divided island.² In fact, this was formal accession of Southern Cyprus but the name used was the RoC.

Initially, the Greek–Cypriot government claimed recognition as the lawful RoC and has been treated in this way since 1964 leaving Turkish–Cypriots excluded from all diplomatic relations.

The international environment ignored to recognize the equal status of Turkish–Cypriots as co-founders of the Cyprus Republic but Cyprus is the common home of Turkish–Cypriots and of Greek–Cypriots. Accession of the TRNC was almost not being considered.

But if the TRNC’s claim and right for recognition of the state quality of the applicant republic is upheld and accepted, in that case an agreement must cover either the formation of a state of “Cyprus” composed of both communities which are TRNC and Southern Cyprus. As a result, an isolated accession of the Southern Cyprus to EU was considered.³

As a solution method for the Cyprus Question, it can be said as a beginning that both parties should loosen up their inflexible and decisive stance in which they are illegal according to a jointly accepted system of law; if they want to secure a peaceful, agreeable and equal resolution of the crisis. For a solution, a jointly accepted system of law is crucial.

² Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey’s Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.72-75

³ The Annan Plan: A Model of Governance in Multiethnic Society (September 11, 2004), Fifth Pan-European International Relations Conference, <http://www.sgir.org/conference2004/papers/Sozen%20-%20The%20Annan%20plan.pdf>

In the solutions of the Cyprus Question, all Greek–Cypriot and Turkish–Cypriot forces would be dissolved as a way of demilitarizing Cyprus but not including Britain’s full sovereign bases.

Cyprus is Britain’s base for its power in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East with its SBAs. For instance, Britain moved to Cyprus after the loss of their military bases in Suez to Egypt and stored nuclear bombs on Cyprus.

Finally, absolute peace in all aspects in Cyprus seems to be faraway or nonexistent to happen in short-term, but Cyprus’ importance for Britain continues with little changes. Main themes of British policy on Cyprus have not changed radically. But it sometimes showed little differences. It is not expected to change radically in the near future.

CHAPTER II

BRITISH CONTROL ON CYPRUS: 1878 TO 1950

2.1. British Rule on Cyprus

The Ottoman Empire annexed Cyprus in August 7th, 1571 and had sovereignty over the island until 1878. After the 1877-1878 Ottoman–Russian War, British policy towards Ottoman government changed and supported the break-up of the Ottoman Empire. Invading Cyprus would be a step towards this aim.⁴

The Ottomans being forced to sign a devastating peace treaty in 1878 known as the San Stephano under Russian dictation, the British came up with a suggestion of controlling Cyprus for a period of ninety nine years in return for the British protection of the Ottoman Empire against further Russian encroachment. The Ottomans had no alternative than to accept the British offer.⁵ On June 4, 1878 the Ottoman Empire and Britain signed an agreement, and Ottoman Empire consented to assign Cyprus to be controlled and administrated by Britain.⁶ Britain would support the Ottoman Empire against the Russian aggression until the provinces of Kars, Ardahan and other territories occupied by Russia during the war would be surrendered.⁷

⁴ Ertekün, N.Münir, *The Cyprus Dispute and The Birth of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*, University Press, Oxford, 1984, p.1

⁵ Ünal, Hasan, *The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest Developments*, Stradigma, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis, http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

⁶ Ertekün, N.Münir, *The Cyprus Dispute and The Birth of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*, University Press, Oxford, 1984, p.1

⁷ Erim, Prof. Dr. Nihat, *Devletlerarası Hukuku ve Siyasi Tarih Metinleri (Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Antlaşmaları)*, Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Publication, Ankara, 1953, V.I.

The British presence in Cyprus though was only provisional as stipulated in the Convention of Defensive Alliance signed in 1878. According to it, if Russia restored to the Ottoman Empire the provinces of Kars, Ardahan and other territories in Eastern Anatolia during the war, Britain would have evacuated Cyprus and the Convention of Defensive Alliance would be terminated.⁸

When the Ottoman Empire joined Germany and the Austro–Hungarian Empire in World War I (1914-1918), Britain unilaterally annexed Cyprus. When war was declared between the Ottoman Empire and Britain, it formally annexed Cyprus on November 5th, 1914.⁹ Moreover, when the Ottoman Empire demanded the return of Cyprus after Russia evacuated Ottoman territories, Britain rejected it.¹⁰

In 1915 Britain offered the island to Greece to induce it to enter the war on its side, but Greece declined.¹¹ In addition, through a Royal Decree signed on November 27, 1917, Britain also requested the islanders to opt for British citizenship. Turkish–Cypriots who preferred to save their Ottoman citizenship were treated as enemy aliens. The onslaught of the Turkish community by Greek–Cypriots thus intensified and the situation resulted in the emigration of Turkish–Cypriots to Anatolia as they were suffering economic and administrative discrimination.¹²

⁸ The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy, <http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

⁹ Oberling, Pierre, *The Road to Bellapais*, The Turkish Cypriot Exodus to Northern Cyprus, Columbia University Press, New York, 1982, p.29

¹⁰ The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm

¹¹ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus, British Annexation, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_british_annexation.html

¹² The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm.

2.2. The Early Call for Enosis

Greek–Cypriots waged an early uprising for *enosis*¹³ after British took over in 1879.¹⁴ The petition though was sympathetically received, and denied. However, attempts to further the cause did not cease.

Greek–Cypriots' demand to unite with their so-called motherland Greece was ignited by the Greek rebellion against the Ottoman government in 1821, as a result of which an independent Greek Kingdom was established. The idea of *enosis* at first was confined within a small-educated segment of the society.¹⁵ As trade prospered, Cyprus economy grew and more Greek–Cypriots were able to study in Athens. As time went by, the wish to unite Cyprus with Greece spread through Greek–Cypriots and it gained more supporters.

Greek–Cypriots were not contented with the British rule and they preferred to be united with Greece. However, the presence of Turkish–Cypriots on the island posed a major obstacle for them to assert *enosis*. The Turkish–Cypriot community was naturally against the idea of becoming a minority under Greek rule. Fearing colonization by Greece, Turkish–Cypriots cooperated with the British administration on the island. Except for a few, the British used Turkish–Cypriots in the administration of the island as a counterweight in the institutions against Greek–Cypriots who were demanding *enosis*.¹⁶ However, as the activities for *enosis* strengthened, some resorted to violence to advance their objective and the Turkish–Cypriot community was consequently subjected to an onslaught by Greek–Cypriots. As Turkish–Cypriots were lesser in number and were widely dispersed across the island; it was easier for Greek–Cypriots to intimidate them. They were driven out of

¹³ Greek word for 'union' or 'the political union of Cyprus with Greece'

¹⁴ First Years (1878 - 1879) of the English Administration,
http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/beginproblem/beginproblem_sover_rent01.html

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

mixed villages and were deprived of land and homes. The attacks resulted in the general impoverishment of the Turkish–Cypriot community.

2.3. Lausanne Treaty

Under the terms of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne-Article 23-, both Turkey and Greece recognized that Cyprus was under British sovereignty. Nonetheless, the Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus continued to strengthen its activities for *enosis*. To appease them, Britain kept a presence of Greek–Cypriots in the government when Cyprus was declared as a British colony in 1925.

Cyprus became a British naval base. In 1878, Prime Minister of Britain at that time intended to take the island as a base to support the Ottoman Empire against Russian attacks. In November 5, 1915, Britain announced the annexation of Cyprus. Although the Ottoman Empire did not assert to this illegal action by Britain, the Ankara government, which was the new Turkish regime, accepted it in July 1923 in Lausanne.

This was one of their actions to be able to strengthen its rule in Cyprus. According to Article 21 of the Lausanne Treaty, Turkish–Cypriots were given two years to choose between British or Turkish citizenship. If an individual Turkish–Cypriot chose to be a Turkish citizen; he or she had to leave Cyprus within a year of the choosing.

Some Turkish–Cypriots chose to be Turkish citizens and some chose to remain on the island. Because of this, the number of Turkish–Cypriots in Cyprus declined. This had changed the lives of Turkish–Cypriots who remained on the island. After a number of Turkish–Cypriots left the island, their population decreased

as time went by, and Greek–Cypriots increased at the same time. Due to this, Greek–Cypriots had an easy time terrorizing the Turkish population in Cyprus.¹⁷

2.4. The 1931 Greek–Cypriot Revolt and the 1930-1950 Period

Despite British efforts to prevent uprising, Greek–Cypriots launched riots and revolted against the British government in 1931. The government however was able to suppress the rebellion. It banned all political parties and abolished the legislative council. The constitution was withdrawn and a repressive regime took over and remained in force until the early 1940s. The emergency measures implemented after the Greek revolt included prohibitions on the importation of books from Turkey and Greece, on the flying of both Turkish and Greek flags.¹⁸ These are of the British attempt to limit and reduce the influence of Turkey and Greece on the Turkish–Cypriot and Greek–Cypriot communities. Britain realized that the more connected the communities to their respective motherlands were, the stronger their inclination to identify with them and the greater the tendency for the communities to resist foreign rule which was British rule would be.

On the other hand, Greek–Cypriots demands for *enosis* were strengthening. Cypriot communists founded AKEL as the successor to an earlier communist party that had been established in the 1920s and proscribed during the 1930s.¹⁹

Greek–Cypriot activities for *enosis* intensified again shortly after World War II ended in 1945, and tension began to rise in Cyprus once more. On February 28, 1947, the Greek parliament unanimously passed a resolution approving *enosis*. The resolution was as follows: “The time has come for the settlement of the sacred national claim of the union of Cyprus to Greece. The Greek National Assembly

¹⁷ The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus, World War II and Postwar Nationalism, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

appeals to the noble and gallant people of Britain, expressing the conviction that this claim will be fully satisfied.”²⁰

In 1946 Britain proposed constitutional changes leading to self-government on Cyprus. The appointed Governor of Cyprus, Winster, gathered a Consultative Assembly of leading Cypriot representatives to carry out a new constitution based on self-rule. Turkish–Cypriots and left wing Greek–Cypriot representatives agreed to participate in the Consultative Assembly. However, the Assembly was indefinitely adjourned and later on dissolved after the Greek–Cypriot representatives renewed their objections and withdrew from the Assembly on May 20, 1948. The chance to develop the initial stages for independence was thus missed.²¹

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm

CHAPTER III

BRITISH POLICY FROM 1950 TO 1960

3.1. EOKA and Enosis

The so-called Greek “great idea” (*megale idea*) aiming at recreating the Byzantine Empire is connected with the Cyprus problem. After the annihilation of the Turkish–Cypriot community, annexation of the island to Greece was planned.²² Under British colonial rule (1878–1959), Greek–Cypriots began agitation for *enosis* a demand that alienated their Turkish–Cypriot neighbors.²³ According to Turkish–Cypriots’ claim, control of Cyprus should simply revert to Turkey in the event of British withdrawal, unless Turkey signed the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne but only in favor of Britain.²⁴

After plebiscite results held on 25 March 1921 in Cyprus and a petition for *enosis*, the plea for *enosis* was put into as a national policy of Greece. Greek politics had a radicalization and it can be seen from the statements of former Greek Defense and Foreign Minister Evangelos Averoff who said concerning Cyprus: ‘We are going to continue to back *enosis* wherever Greeks exist. The Greeks in Istanbul are very important for us. The Greeks have their wealth in the churches and other

²² The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy,
<http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

²³ Bryant, Rebecca, Justice or respect? A comparative perspective on politics in Cyprus, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 24, Number 6 (November 1, 2001), p.893

²⁴ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism,
http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

organizations there. For this reason we have to back *enosis*'.²⁵ Greek violence increased against the British and Turkish–Cypriots in the early 1950s.

The plebiscite results were also presented to the UN with a self-determination request for only Greek–Cypriots. Makarios, who became later the first president of the RoC, tried to denounce British policy before the UN in February 1951; but Britain held that Cyprus question was an internal affair and was not subject to UN consideration.²⁶ As a result, Greek–Cypriots decided to resort to violence to achieve *enosis*. Greek–Cypriots began forming secret subversive organizations.

In the 1950s, the *enosis* activities grew and accelerated under the control and provocation of Makarios. He took an oath that he would achieve *enosis* before his death. The pressure of Greek–Cypriots on the British government to permit *enosis* increased even more. Makarios led the political and military efforts to achieve *enosis* through providing the British for repression. Also, Greece made several attempts to utilize the UN as a means of self-determination and *enosis*.²⁷ Britain decided after the increased Greek-violence that the UN should take the matter in its hands. To the disappointment of the Greeks, the UN rejected the union of Cyprus with Greece.

A second anti-British organization, EOKA (Ethniki Organosis Kypriou Aghoniston), National Organization of Cypriot Fighters, was a group using guerrilla-techniques that desired political union, or *enosis*, with Greece.

It had effects on the island's gaining independence from Britain.²⁸ Makarios had invited Cypriot-born retired Greek army Colonel Georgios Grivas to form the

²⁵ Sabahattin Ismail, *Kıbrıs'ta Yunan Sorunu (1821–2000) (The Greek Question in Cyprus 1821–2000)*, Istanbul: Akdeniz Publications, 2000, p. 72.

²⁶ Solsten, Eric, *Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism*, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

²⁷ Ertekün, N.Münir, *The Cyprus Dispute and The Birth of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*, University Press, Oxford, 1984, p.3

²⁸ Background Note: Cyprus, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, December 2004, p.127, http://www.er.cna.it/biblioteca/files/200505140135212005051401357337Paesi_Lettera_C_pdf7351.pdf

Greek Cypriot youth organization PEON,²⁹ later the EOKA as the military arm of *enosis* in 1951.³⁰ EOKA's communist commander, George Grivas who learned the techniques of guerrilla war,³¹ aimed terrorist attacks mostly at the British army. With this aim, proving his attention being *enosis*,³² five years of terrorist activities were executed beginning from 1954 and 1955. On April 1, 1955, EOKA opened a campaign of violence against British rule in a well-coordinated series of attacks on police, military, and other government installations in Nicosia, Famagusta, Larnaca, and Limassol. Grivas circulated his first proclamation as leader of EOKA, and the four-year terrorist struggle was launched.³³

In 1955, EOKA started island-wide acts of violence and sabotage against British rule.³⁴ The demand of *enosis* eventually resulted in an armed rebellion (1955–1959) led by EOKA. This exclusively Greek–Cypriot guerilla organization was opposed not only by the British government but also by Turkish–Cypriots, many of whom supported the British forces or otherwise had to provide their security themselves against EOKA.³⁵

According to Turkish–Cypriots, *enosis* was 'a change of Colonial Masters for the worse' or simply meant 'slavery'. Greece's acquisition of the Dodecanese Islands in 1947 was a threat for Turkish–Cypriots. Turkish–Cypriots had two alternatives: (1) 'slavery' or (2) 'struggle and never consent *enosis*', which was a sufficient reason

²⁹ *Pancypria Elliniki Organosis Neoleas (Pancyprian Greek Youth Organization)*

³⁰ Sonyel, Salah R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications, p. 6-7

³¹ Solsten, Eric, *Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism*
http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Solsten, Eric, *Cyprus The Emergency*,
http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_emergency.html

³⁴ Sonyel, Salah R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications, p.8

³⁵ Bryant, Rebecca, Justice or respect? A comparative perspective on politics in Cyprus, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 24, Number 6 (November 1, 2001), p.893

for being killed by the ‘New Colonial Masters’.³⁶ But EOKA first had to erode the British government.

Turkey encouraged Turkish–Cypriots to opt for Turkish nationality. Cyprus was strategically vital for Turkey and when the danger of uniting Cyprus with Greece had reached to an alarming level, Turkey raised its voice to protect the Turkish–Cypriot community and its vital national interests.³⁷

On the island a political organization, which also knew guerrilla techniques, called Volkan, was formed to defend Turkish–Cypriots’ rights and interests after its former organization which was Turkish Resistance Organization-*Türk Mukavemet Teşkilâtı*(TMT)- was established in 1957.³⁸

During the terror of Greek–Cypriot’s cause for *enosis*, Britain wanted to keep their hold of Cyprus as base to protect the Suez Canal.³⁹ Several conferences and meetings among Turks, Greeks and British contingencies were held to be able to pacify the riots and uprisings of the terrorist actions of EOKA. In 1955, Britain attempted to focus on the dispute between the two communities and invited Turkey and Greece to discuss the future of Cyprus but the dispute continued. In this way, while the riots would not cease, British military forces increased rapidly in Cyprus to be able to control the activities applying terrorism. Makarios refused the British plan for gradual independence on February 02, 1956 and was exiled to Seychelles after a month due to his complicity with EOKA. When Makarios was exiled on the ground of *enosis* provocations, the reaction in Cyprus was so aggressive that a state of emergency was declared which caused EOKA propose a truce conditional on the

³⁶ Ertekün, N.Münir, *The Cyprus Dispute and The Birth of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*, University Press, Oxford, 1984, p.3-4

³⁷ Turkish Cypriot’s Efforts to Get Organized, Turkish Northern Republic of Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_9.htm

³⁸ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

³⁹ O’Carolan, Tom (2004), Cyprus: A Recent History, Three Monkeys Online, http://www.threemonkeysonline.com/threemon_printable.php?id=33

release of Makarios. At the same year, Turkey also rejected the British plan for *enosis*.

Due to this persistent insistence, the negotiations were then transferred to the UN in 1957. The Assembly resulted in the formulation of Resolution 1013 which announced the principle of an independent Cyprus state⁴⁰ but the resolution was far from what Greek–Cypriots were hopeful of. In June 1958, Britain proposed a seven-year partnership scheme of separate communal legislative bodies and separate municipalities to maintain international status quo and to establish a representative self-government.⁴¹ Turkish and Greek governments and Makarios once again rejected the plan. In October, Britain modified the 1958 plan but still to no avail.

In 1958, communal tension was increasing in Cyprus due to *enosis* aimed activities. During the first 10 days of April of the same year, more than 50 bombs have already been reported. The governor sent a message to Grivas to stop the bombing and to meet him in person unarmed and alone. Grivas refused the invitation to meet up personally with the governor but he ceased the sabotage temporarily.

British administration feared its political condition with the intensity of EOKA's aggressive activities and the resistance of the Turkish–Cypriot to *enosis* activities. Britain had to leave sovereignty over Cyprus to some extent.⁴² Cyprus gained its independence from Britain and established a constitutional republic in 1960. In March 1961, Cyprus was admitted as member of the Commonwealth because Britain was eager to retain some influence on the strategically important island,⁴³ and Britain retained sovereignty over its two military bases in the island.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Cooper, Tom, Cyprus, 1955-1973, Europe & Cold War Database, Oct 26, 2003, http://www.acig.org/artman/publish/article_454.shtml

⁴² Quoted from, Macmillan, Harold, Riding the Storm, 1956-1959, p.660, in, Cyprus History, British Take Over, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/h7.html>

⁴³ Makarios III, <http://www.greece.org/cyprus/MakariosIII.htm>

3.2. The Macmillan Plan

Turkish civilians and their farms and houses were targeted. In order to halt the violence, the British introduced the Macmillan Plan.

In fact the agreements consisted of international accords between Britain, Greece and Turkey designed to serve the interests of the three partners. Although the Greek side signed the agreements, it sought to sabotage them. They wanted to deprive the Turkish partners of any rights and thus it was Greek–Cypriots who caused most of the trouble in Cyprus.⁴⁵

3.2.1. The Root of the Macmillan Plan

The British government felt that the Cyprus problem would only be solved through negotiations and not with military activities over *enosis* aimed activities. At the time when Makarios was released and Britain was ready to cease its sovereignty on Cyprus, a new civil governor was appointed to form a new atmosphere towards the end of the British rule over Cyprus. After the autumn of 1957, Britain’s political image was seen to be impartiality and liberality, except for its interest on the military bases.⁴⁶

During the governorship of Hugh Foot in Cyprus after 1957, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan revealed his belief that partition of the island of Cyprus would be the only way out of the problem. A Macmillan plan was prepared to “provide for the delineation of British military forces, where full British sovereignty would remain, while the rest of the island would be ruled by a ‘sovereignty’ of

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Moran, Michael, ‘Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism’, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* (Ankara), Vol. VI, No. 2, 2001, p. 1

⁴⁶ Quoted from, Macmillan, Harold, *Riding the Storm, 1956-1959*, p.660, in, *Cyprus History*, British Take Over, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/h7.html>

Turkey, Greece and Britain in partnership.”⁴⁷ He also declared the main purpose of the Macmillan plan, which was to achieve a *status quo* between the two communities in Cyprus, the Turkish and the Greek governments with the British bases and other installations for Britain’s military power seeming as the safeguarding for the problems in Cyprus.

Thus, with this in mind, the Macmillan Plan was communicated to Ankara and Athens on June 10 of 1958.

3.2.2. The Original Provisions of the Macmillan Plan

The plan declares the participation and cooperation of both Turkey and Greece in an effort to achieve peace, prosperity and progress in Cyprus.

Cyprus would also possess a system of representative government from the Turkish and the Greek communities which will provide each of them autonomy in its own communal affairs through its own House of Representatives.⁴⁸ The governance of the land of Cyprus will be centered on a Council composed of a governor from Britain, representatives of the Turkish and Greek governments, six Cypriot ministers, two Turkish representatives who will also be elected to power, four representatives of the Greek representative in the House who will be elected to power.⁴⁹ The governor representing Cyprus will also have the power to ensure the protection of the interests of both Turkish and Greek communities.⁵⁰ This governor will also have the power to intervene with Cyprus in its external affairs, defense and internal security. The Turkish and Greek representatives will, in turn, can require any legislation

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p.67

⁴⁹ The MacMillan Plan, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/macmillan_plan.htm

⁵⁰ Quoted from, Macmillan, Harold, Riding the Storm, 1956-1959, p.67, in, Cyprus History, British Take Over, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/h7.html>

considered discriminatory to be passed to an impartial tribunal.⁵¹ The British government received all arrangements about Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots and so they could keep their own nationality in the land except for the continuing administrative and security problems.⁵²

The plan also indicates that the international status, the British sovereignty most importantly, will not change for five to seven years.⁵³

3.2.3. The Alterations of the Macmillan Plan

A number of Turkish and Greek oppositions to the plan lead to its revisions and alterations. Macmillan had to pattern the plan to be able to consent them.

First opposition from Greek–Cypriots was due to the idea of having Turkish and Greek representatives in the Governor’s Council. Greek–Cypriots were not pleased of having a Turkish representative with them in the Council since as they believe, having a Turkish representative in the Council will admit Turkish presence on the island.⁵⁴ The Greeks had considered Turkish–Cypriots as a minority in Cyprus. With this opposition, the plan was modified and released on August 15.⁵⁵

The plan was viewed by the Labor opposition in Britain as more likely to divide Cyprus, rather than to place the two communities in union with each other.⁵⁶ The result of the Macmillan Plan in Cyprus was an increase in violence. Twelve days before the plan was announced, fire sabotage started in Nicosia and the two-month Turkish–Greek fight began wherein 56 Greeks and 53 Turks died. With this, more

⁵¹ The MacMillan Plan, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/macmillan_plan.htm

⁵² Quoted from, Macmillan, Harold, *Riding the Storm, 1956-1959*, p.67, in, *Cyprus History, British Take Over*, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/h7.html>

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p.685

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ The MacMillan Plan, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/macmillan_plan.htm

British soldiers were sent to Cyprus to control the quarrel, increasing their number to 20,000.⁵⁷

The Greek government, upon modification of the plan, rejected it once again. With this, the Macmillan plan was revised. He asserted that the representatives of Turkey and Greece will not be any longer members of the Governor's Council but will have direct access to the governor. Together with this, Macmillan visited Ankara, Cyprus and Athens to announce the revisions of the plan.⁵⁸

Still, the revised plan was unacceptable to Southern Cyprus and to Greece. A few weeks later, the Turkish government accepted the plan and announced their cooperation with the British government in its implementation. On October 1, 1958 Turkey appointed a representative in Cyprus. Even with the declination of the Greek government, the plan was implemented due to the British belief that if they do not implement the plan, Turks would turn away from the British side.⁵⁹

Greece objected on Turkey acting in the controversy of any argument of its opponent. Also, Greece indicated that through the Lausanne Treaty, it has withdrawn its right on Cyprus. Ironically, *enosis* conflicts with the fact that Greece had already accepted British occupation under the same treaty.

3.2.4. Implications of the Macmillan Plan

The Macmillan Plan attracted Turkish-Cypriots because it returned them power and right over the island of Cyprus and also on its governance. It also gave them the influence in international relations and negotiations on Cyprus. For Turkish-Cypriots, not only did the plan postpone a decision for self-determination only for Greek-Cypriots - but also ensured Turkey a veto on *enosis*, which caused

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

aggressive activities against Turkish–Cypriots. No central government was made; therefore no Greek governance would be present in the island.⁶⁰

In Greek–Cypriot side respect, there would be no legislature that would be controlled by them since they overpopulate Cyprus compared to the Turkish–Cypriot community.⁶¹

The most important feature of the plan is that it formed separate communal assemblies between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots that the Turkish Cypriots view as a stepping-stone for *taksim* or partition for the security of themselves and a blockage towards *enosis*.⁶²

The Greeks considered the Macmillan plan as the worst policy of Britain ever presented. Because of the implementation of the plan without considering the rejection of Greece, Greeks' suspicions increased that the Turkish and the British governments were working against them. With this suspicion, EOKA-violence increased on August 21, 1958. EOKA members called for a boycott of the British government and of their goods, as a symbol of rejecting to so-called Turkish–British collusion. Months of violence that caused a threat for civil war between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots, followed as well as the increasing resentment between Greek–Cypriots and the British. The violence did not only remain between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots but Greek–Cypriots also started attacking British soldiers. 2000 Cypriots were under detention and many more were forbidden to leave their houses during daytime or nighttime.⁶³

With Greek suspicion that the Macmillan Plan may lead the way to the partitioning of the island, Makarios told the Greek government that he was ready to

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

accept the independence of Cyprus under the UN auspices after a period of self-determination for Greek–Cypriots.⁶⁴

3.3. The Zurich–London Treaty: The Three Agreements

In February 11th, 1959, Zurich Agreements and in February 19th, 1959, London Agreements were signed between Turkey, Greece and Britain and were about the founding principles of the new republic in Cyprus.

Talks among the major parties had begun in late 1958. The negotiations led to the Zurich and London Agreements that featured the creation of an independent Cypriot state. Under these agreements, Turkey and Greece decided that neither unilateral nor double *enosis* would be acceptable. It was also agreed that there would be bi-national independence, grounded on political equality and administrative partnership of the two Cypriot communities and that both would have full autonomy in their communal affairs. The Zurich and London Agreements were aimed at implementing a federal system in the Cyprus Republic that would eliminate discrimination and prevent inter-communal friction.⁶⁵

Along with the compromised settlement reached through the Zurich and London Agreements are three treaties designed to meet the desires and needs of Turkey, Greece and Britain. The Treaty of Guarantee affirms that Turkey, Greece and Britain guaranteed the transfer of sovereignty of the RoC to the two Cypriot communities. This treaty bans political or economic union of the republic with any foreign state and bans activities that would lead to such unions. The treaty's signatories were pledged to uphold the "state of affairs" established by the

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy,
<http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

constitution.⁶⁶ The Treaty of Guarantee also secures the territorial integrity and the constitutional order of the Cyprus Republic. According to the treaty, any violation of the territorial integrity and of the constitutional order would warrant the Guarantor powers of Turkey, Greece and Britain to intervene either together or, if not possible, unilaterally in order to maintain the territorial integrity and the constitutional order of the republic.⁶⁷

In accordance with the Zurich and London Agreements; Turkey, the RoC, and Greece entered a Treaty of Alliance that provided for the establishment of a Tripartite Headquarters and permitted the stationing of Turkish and Greek military contingents in the island.⁶⁸ This treaty allowed Turkey and Greece to deploy 650 and 950 military officers respectively.⁶⁹

Lastly, with the Treaty of Establishment, Britain controlled sovereignty over a territory on the island's southern coast for two military bases.⁷⁰

3.4. The Treaty of Establishment

According to the Treaty of Establishment, Britain retained sovereignty over about 256 square kilometers of territory, which consisted the Akrotiri and Dhekelia SBAs. Britain also retained certain access and communications routes.⁷¹

After the evacuation of forces from the Suez Canal zone, the headquarters of the British Middle East Land and Air Forces had also moved to Cyprus.⁷²

⁶⁶ Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus History, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks07.html>

⁶⁷ Historical Background of Cyprus, Touring Cyprus, <http://www.touringcyprus.com/historical.html>

⁶⁸ Treaty of Alliance, Cyprus History, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks07.html>

⁶⁹ Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus The Republic of Cyprus http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_republic_of_cyprus.html

⁷² Solsten, Eric, Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_postwar_nationalism.html

3.4.1. Why Britain gave upon Cyprus

British policy required that putting the whole Cyprus under their control would give them more disadvantages than benefits. British government foresaw problems in maintaining full control of the island because of financial difficulties and their declining economy, and the Greek–Cypriots asking for their self-determination and freedom against the British control through both peaceful-seeming and also forceful means. But, British officials tried to take every opportunity in preserving influence in Cyprus to protect their interests in the region. The two SBAs , which had been planned by Britain to preserve their influence, were Akrotiri and Dhekelia. These two areas remain under British legal authority, in accordance to the Treaty of Establishment as well.⁷³

3.4.2. Keeping SBAs in 1960s

Britain intended to keep these two bases under their control for mainly military but also some humanitarian reasons. Akrotiri and Dhekelia, which cover 98 square miles that is an area a quarter the size of Hong Kong, “enable Britain to maintain a permanent military presence at a strategic point in the Eastern Mediterranean”.⁷⁴ They are both strategic staging posts for British military aircrafts and communication facilities, which aid in Britain’s worldwide links.⁷⁵

As Britain resorted to releasing Cyprus and maintaining control on two areas in Cyprus, Treaty of Establishment was signed in Nicosia on August 16, 1960 by Turkey represented by Vecdi Türel, by the RoC represented by Fazıl Küçük, by Britain represented by Hugh Foot and by Greece represented by G. Christopoulos.

⁷³ Cyprus, United Kingdom Army, <http://www.army.mod.uk/aroundtheworld/cyp/>

⁷⁴ Quoted from, British Bases in Cyprus vital Military staging point, AFP Report, December 27, 2001, in, Srebrenica: Appendix 6, Chapter 5, Section 3, http://213.222.3.5/srebrenica/toc/p6_c05_s003_b01.html

⁷⁵ Cyprus, United Kingdom Army, <http://www.army.mod.uk/aroundtheworld/cyp/>

This was signed with the desire to give effect to the declaration made by the United Kingdom on February 17th, 1960 and in accordance to the Treaty of Alliance made by the Foreign Ministers of Turkey and Greece, by the Representative of the Turkish–Cypriot community and the Greek–Cypriot community.⁷⁶

The three treaties, the Treaty of Guarantee, the Treaty of Alliance, and the Treaty of Establishment, went into effect on the same day, in August 16th, 1960.

3.4.3. Implications of the Treaty of Establishment

The first article of the Treaty reiterated once again the SBAs, which remain under the British legal authority. The RoC covers the main island of Cyprus, along with the surrounding islands lying off its coast, but with the exception of the two areas that are the Akrotiri SBA and the Dhekelia SBA. The boundaries of the two SBAs⁷⁷ that were marked by Britain is not anymore included as part of Cyprus’ territorial land. The waters surrounding the SBAs, as has been marked and agreed upon is also under the legal authority of Britain and not anymore included as part of Cyprus’ territorial sea.

Because of the existence of SBAs under the British legal authority, the British army was sent to Cyprus to work to a tri-service headquarters and was fully tasked to protect the SBAs and other controlled sites in all costs. The army consists of “two resident infantry Battalions, the Joint Service Signals Unit at Ayios Nikolaos, 62 Cyprus Support Squadron Royal Engineers and 16 Flight Army Air Corps (equipped with Gazelle helicopters) at Dhekelia. There are also a variety of supporting arms

⁷⁶ Documents Relating to The Founding Of Cyprus, Including the Treaty Of Guarantee, 1959, from, Documents on International Affairs 1959 edited by Gillian King Oxford University Press, London, 1963, http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/treaty.html#D

⁷⁷ The only case that Britain has insisted on retaining base areas under its own fully-sovereignty was this one that was declared unilaterally. (Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm)

such as the Royal Logistics Corps, Royal Army Medical Corps, Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Royal Military Police and others located in both SBAs.”⁷⁸

One analysis of the Treaty of Establishment means that the British government will keep important rights outside the areas under its legal authority in the RoC. The British government had rights such as unrestricted usage of additional small sites outside the areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia upon necessity, free use of roads, ports and other facilities for transportation between the two SBAs, continued usage of port facilities in Famagusta, use of public utilities, use of specified territories for troop training purposes; etc.⁷⁹ This situation implies that even after Britain relinquishes sovereignty over the rest of Cyprus, Britain still maintained rights in the RoC, has territory which it retains under its full sovereignty substantial for its advantages in the Mediterranean areas.⁸⁰

This maintenance of British sovereignty over the two communities in Cyprus is also named as rather unusual arrangement. Foreign base rights in other countries can only be for a certain timeframe. Britain has maintained bases in several countries after ceasing control over them, but this is the only case where Britain has insisted on controlling base areas under its own legal authority.⁸¹ On the other hand, Henry Hopkinson, minister of state for the colonies infamous statement in July 1954 was that Cyprus as other certain territories in the Commonwealth, which, owing to their peculiar circumstances, “can never expect to be fully independent.”⁸²

It can be said that having British bases in Cyprus provides few advantages for both parties but also, consequences in the future. One advantage is as the settlement

⁷⁸ Cyprus, United Kingdom Army, <http://www.army.mod.uk/aroundtheworld/cyp/>

⁷⁹ Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Greek–Cypriots attack British military base (5 July 2001), Dawn Group of Newspapers: The Internet Edition, March 2, 2005, <http://www.dawn.com/2001/07/05/int4.htm>

⁸² Costas M. Constantinou & Oliver P. Richmond, The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and Britain Bases in Cyprus, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 65–84, March 2005, p. 68

of these bases remained; “greater safeguard against the unilateral abolition of base rights by an unfriendly local government” has been constituted. However, the bad side of it is that it may also cause points of friction between the British and Cyprus governments in the future, particularly over such matters as access, maintenance of additional sites, customs problems and similar questions.⁸³

One example of friction is the aggressive attacks from Greek–Cypriots against the British soldiers residing in Akrotiri and Dhekelia, which did not end when Britain gave Cyprus its freedom. On July 4, 2001, Greek–Cypriots forced the groups of the British police in their military compound in Cyprus demanding for the release of a local member of the parliament who was arrested for trying to break into the British bases.⁸⁴

On September 29, 2002, thousands of Greek–Cypriots attacked the British RAF communications base in Akrotiri in protest of their presence in the island and of the prospect of British installations being used against Iraq. This base in Akrotiri is one of the most valuable listening posts that give vital assistance to the USA-led intelligence in Iraq and Iran.⁸⁵

The relationship of Turkey, Greece, Britain and the two countries was unstable due to their desires and sometimes aggression against each other, which is named as the origin of the Cyprus problem.

3.5. The Treaty of Guarantee

First and foremost, the treaty, in its first article, indicates that the RoC would ensure the maintenance of its independence, territorial integrity and security. The

⁸³ Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm

⁸⁴ Greek–Cypriots attack British military base (5 July 2001), Dawn Group of Newspapers: The Internet Edition, March 2, 2005, <http://www.dawn.com/2001/07/05/int4.htm>

⁸⁵ Smith, Helena (30 September 2002), Greek–Cypriots turned against British bases, Guardian Unlimited, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/military/story/0,11816,801544,00.html>

respect that should be given to its Constitution should also be guaranteed. The ensuring of the independence, most importantly, implies that “It undertakes not to participate, in whole or in part, in any political or economic union with any State whatsoever”.⁸⁶

With this, Turkey, Cyprus, Britain and Greece signed the Treaty of Guarantee on August 16, 1960 in Nicosia. Signatories for Turkey was V. Türel, for the RoC were Fazıl Küçük and O. Kyprou Makarios; for Greece C. Christopoulos; for Britain Hugh Foot.⁸⁷ But, Greek–Cypriots were the ones using force of arms, destroying the Treaty and thus, trying to violate Turkish–Cypriots’ rights.⁸⁸

According to the second article, the three countries are given the responsibility to prohibit any activities, which aims to promote the union of Cyprus to any State or to the partition of the island.⁸⁹

The third article reiterates the rights of Britain that has been mentioned in the Treaty of Establishment. Here, Britain enforces Greece, the RoC and Turkey and to give respect to the integrity of the areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia as Britain properties at the time of the establishment of the RoC. With the signing of this treaty, the three countries guarantee, once again, the use and control by Britain of rights in Cyprus.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus History, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks07.html>

⁸⁷ Cyprus Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus History, <http://www.cypnet.co.uk/ncyprus/history/republic/try-guarantee.html>

⁸⁸ Olgun, Ergun, Confederation, the Last Chance for Establishing Peace, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001, p. 7.

⁸⁹ Treaty Concerning The Establishment of The Republic of Cyprus, Council of Europe, http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Legal_co-operation/Foreigners_and_citizens/Nationality/Documents/National_legislation/CyprusTreatyConcerningEstablishmentofRepublicofCyprus.asp#P126_745

⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Ibid.

The fourth article establishes the responsibility of Greece, Turkey and Britain and if joint action among the three signatories is impossible, “the Treaty permits unilateral action to safeguard its provisions.”⁹¹

One of the most important implications of the signing of the Treaty of Guarantee is Britain’s prohibition of both *enosis* and partition of Cyprus direct or indirect integration with Greece, integration with the European Union or with Turkey.⁹²

3.6. Treaty of Alliance

The second article reiterates that Turkey, Greece and Britain were required to undertake resistance against any attack or aggression against the independence and territorial integrity of the island.⁹³

The third article establishes a Tripartite Headquarters in the territory of the RoC in order to achieve the objectives of the first and second articles of this treaty.⁹⁴

The fourth article mentions that Turkey and Greece will join this Tripartite Headquarters with the military contingents, which will provide for the training of the army of the RoC.⁹⁵

The first additional protocol provides the Tripartite Headquarters with 650 Turkish officers, non-commissioned officers and men, and 950 Greek officers, non-commissioned officers and men.⁹⁶

⁹¹ Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Treaty Concerning The Establishment of The Republic of Cyprus, Council of Europe, http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Legal_co-operation/Foreigners_and_citizens/Nationality/Documents/National_legislation/CyprusTreatyConcerningEstablishmentofRepublicofCyprus.asp#P126_745

⁹⁴

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

3.7. The RoC

In August 16th, 1960 was the proclamation of the independence of the new republic in Cyprus. The solution that was found in 1960 was not the preferred option of either the two communities, which were security, *taksim* or separation for Turkish–Cypriots; and self determination only for one side that was a code for *enosis* or union of the whole island with Greece for Greek–Cypriots.⁹⁷

The RoC was established after independence was proclaimed on August 16, 1960. On the same year, Cyprus was admitted to the UN⁹⁸ and to the Commonwealth of Nations.⁹⁹ Independence was stipulated in a number of international treaties by the effects of Britain and no single power could have exclusive sovereignty of the island as a whole. A series of treaties among Turkey, Greece and Britain made the establishment of an independent Cyprus state possible. But in fact, this new state was not a fully independent one since other states than Cyprus, the guarantor powers, limited its independence to a certain extent.¹⁰⁰

According to the Zurich and London Agreement in 1959, the structure was described as a functional federation and not a unitary state, and the mechanism was reflected on all three branches of the republic: legislative, executive and judiciary.¹⁰¹

The Zurich and London Agreements dictated the Basic Structure (BS) of the Republic. In terms of executive power, the republic is a presidential system with a

⁹⁷ Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003, p.337

⁹⁸ Resolution 155: Admission of new Members to the UN: Cyprus (23 Aug), Security Council Resolutions – 1960, <http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1974/scres74.htm>

⁹⁹ History, Independence from, Britain, http://www.countriesquest.com/middle_east/cyprus/history/independence_from_britain.htm

¹⁰⁰ Ünal, Hasan, The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest Developments, *Stradigma*, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis, http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

¹⁰¹ Denктаş, Rauf, The Crux of The Cyprus Problem, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/denktash%20-%201999%20art.htm>

Greek–Cypriot as President and a Turkish–Cypriot for the Vice-President¹⁰². Both have powers to veto decisions of Council Members concerning defense, security and foreign affairs “except the participation of the RoC in international organisations and pacts of alliance in which Greece and Turkey both participate”.¹⁰³ The government of the RoC included a Council of Ministers, “composed of seven Greek Ministers and three Turkish Ministers”.¹⁰⁴ One of the three ministries among the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defense or the Ministry of Finance would be entrusted to a Turkish–Cypriot¹⁰⁵.

The House of Representatives exercised the legislative power of the government and was in the proportion of 70 per cent for the Greek–Cypriots and 30 per cent for the Turkish–Cypriots.¹⁰⁶ The Constitutional Law except for its basic articles requires a separate two-thirds majorities to be modified.¹⁰⁷

The Supreme Constitutional Court¹⁰⁸ and the High Court of Justice¹⁰⁹ made up the judiciary branch of the Republic. Each community had its own courts responsible for cases of purely communal matters.

The ratio of 30 percent Turkish–Cypriots to 70 percent Greek–Cypriots was applied in Civil Service, the Security Forces, the Council of Ministers, the House of Representatives.¹¹⁰

¹⁰² Documents Relating to The Founding Of Cyprus, Including the Treaty Of Guarantee, 1959, from, Documents on International Affairs 1959 edited by Gillian King Oxford University Press, London, 1963, http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/treaty.html#D, Basic Structure, Article 1

¹⁰³ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 8

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 5

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 25

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 6

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 7

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 6

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 16

¹¹⁰ Ibid, Basic Structure, Article 11

3.8. Membership in the UN

In March 4th, 1964, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 186, in order to maintain peace and putting an end to violence in Cyprus and stationed a force—the UNFICYP.¹¹¹ The 1,000-strong UNFICYP, consisting also British soldiers, served in Cyprus since 1964 and maintained the buffer zone between North and South.¹¹² British soldiers in the island serve in two places: one is the SBAs existing in Cyprus and the other is the territory the UN Forces existed where a regiments worth of British soldiers had been. British army has two tasks in Cyprus

These soldiers servicing with UNFICYP is on an unaccompanied six-month tour of duty as soldiers of the UN and are tasked to accomplish their responsibility on maintaining the integrity of the Buffer Zone which runs between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots. These UNFICYP soldiers also take command in Nicosia, the capital city of the RoC, which is the busiest area to patrol due to its common usage as a location for demonstrations and celebrations.¹¹³

Bases and safe havens operate by maintaining an easily protected, territorial zone and the owner’s socio-political practice and experience can be replicated and propagated into neighboring instability zones from these places.¹¹⁴

The SBAs provided the human and logistical backbone of the UNFICYP whenever the Cyprus government invited. As a guarantor power under the treaties, which established the RoC, one would have expected the bases to play a key role between Greeks and Turks in 1964, 1967, and in 1974.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey’s Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003) p.72

¹¹² Cyprus, The World Fact Book, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cy.html>

¹¹³ Cyprus, United Kingdom Army, <http://www.army.mod.uk/aroundtheworld/cyp/>

¹¹⁴ Costas M. Constantinou & Oliver P. Richmond, The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and Britain Bases in Cyprus, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 65–84, March 2005, p.73

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.66

They did to a degree in 1964 with the Joint Truce Force, “set up with British troops formed as a precursor either to NATO or UN involvement”. In 1974, except for dealing with the internally displaced persons who had fled to the SBAs for safety- especially thousands of Turkish Cypriots from the Limassol and Paphos regions and larger number of Greek Cypriots from the Famagusta region-, nothing was done to intervene militarily.¹¹⁶

After 1974 the Cypriot area, except for the British site, which retained its rights and made a profit by renting its installations to UNFICYP, became a buffer zone under UN jurisdiction.¹¹⁷

The bases represented the power and reach of Britain, on local and regional display, and this persisted in the first Gulf War, the invasion of Iraq, and indirectly in UNFICYP but the bases increasingly became of less importance to Britain strategically.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p.74

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p.71

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p.72, Also Britain provided 742 of 2000 soldiers in UNFICYP.

CHAPTER IV

BRITISH POLICY FROM 1961 TO 1970

The deep-rooted suspicions in the island against the West existed and were strongly reconfirmed by political events during the 1960s and 1970s. The Jupiter missile crisis in 1962 and the Cyprus crises of 1964 and 1974 are just some cases, which caused suspicions and insecurity with its conspiracy theories that lost confidence in the West for the Turkish population. Especially the letter of President Johnson to İsmet İnönü, written in 1964, reconfirmed Turkish suspicions by “cautioning İnönü that if Turkish action on the island would invite a Soviet attack, then NATO was not obliged to defend Turkey.”¹¹⁹ Another proof of the insincerity of the West was the arms embargo the American government put on Turkey after the 1974-peace operation in Cyprus.¹²⁰

Because Greek–Cypriots resented the 30 percent of the administration being in Turkish–Cypriot hands, Greek–Cypriots established their own plan which was Akritas Plan to force Turkish–Cypriots into submission to facilitate *enosis*.¹²¹ The Akritas Plan was ready for implementation in 1960 and was heading for capturing the whole island by force of arms and to expel all Turkish–Cypriots from the island.¹²² Although the international agreements preserved the rights of both

¹¹⁹ Criss, Nur Bilge (1997), Strategic Nuclear Missiles in Turkey: The Jupiter Affair, 1959-1963, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 20/3, p.119

¹²⁰ Jung, Dietrich, The Sèvres Syndrome: Turkish Foreign Policy and its Historical Legacies, American Diplomacy Volume VIII, Number 2, 2003, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/ad/ad_v8_2/jud01.html

¹²¹ Dodd, Clement, *Storm Clouds Over Cyprus*, a Briefing, Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 2001, p, 13

¹²² Olgun, Ergun, Cyprus: A New and Realistic Approach, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1999, p. 112.

communities in the island, 5000 Greeks began their radical activities in 1960-1963 against Turkish-Cypriots because of their refusal of accepting any changes in the Constitution that preserved their rights to some extent.¹²³ The killing of Turkish-Cypriots increased when arms, troops and tanks came into Cyprus from Greece and when Greek warplanes bombed areas that Turkish-Cypriots had lived.¹²⁴

The systematic genocide having the main aim of *enosis* against Turkish-Cypriots, which was implemented as planned, made Turkish-Cypriots as victims after Cyprus gained its independence from Britain although a constitutional republic was established in 1960.¹²⁵ EOKA terror organization massacred so many Turks during 1963-1974 and acted openly for *enosis*.¹²⁶ A massacre had taken place when heavily armed Greek-Cypriots surrounded Turkish-Cypriots in their villages in Limassol and began to kill and expel them.¹²⁷ For their life, Turkish-Cypriots were driven out of their homes, businesses and farms.¹²⁸ On 26 December 1963, Turkish-Cypriots' bodies in Ayios Vassilios were exhumed from a mass grave after being massacred.¹²⁹

“It is nonsense to claim, as the Greek-Cypriots do, that all casualties were caused by fighting between armed men of both sides. On Christmas Eve many Turkish-Cypriot people were brutally attacked and murdered in their suburban homes, including the wife and children of the

¹²³ Sabahattin Ismail, *Kıbrıs'ta Yunan Sorunu (1821-2000) (The Greek Question in Cyprus 1821-2000)*, Istanbul: Akdeniz Publications, 2000, p.90-91

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Background Note: Cyprus, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, December 2004, p.127, <http://www.er.cna.it/biblioteca/files/200505140135212005051401357337Paesi Lettera C pdf7351.pdf>

¹²⁶ Ünal, Hasan, The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest Developments, Stradigma, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis, http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

¹²⁷ Quoted from, Observer, February 10, 1964, in, Bamanie, Nuray, Cyprus' Forgotten Turks, *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2002, p. 446

¹²⁸ Stephen, Michael, How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001, pp. 4-5.

¹²⁹ Quoted from, Daily Telegraph, January 14, 1964 in, in, Stephen, Michael, How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001, p.1

Turkish–Cypriot head of army medical services allegedly by a group of forty men, many in army boots and great coats.”¹³⁰

In 1967-1968, a Turkish–Cypriot provisional administration had to be formed following another occurrence of inter-communal violence.

4.1. The Thirteen Points of Makarios

In November 30th, 1963, Makarios proposed to his vice president, Fazıl Küçük, 13 amendments that would facilitate, according to the aspect of Greek–Cypriots, the functioning of the state system and the Constitution.¹³¹

The implementation and interpretation of the constitution caused serious differences between the two communities. Greek–Cypriots argued that there were obstacles to efficient government because of the complex mechanisms introduced to protect Turkish–Cypriot interests.¹³²

Considering the desire of Greeks for *enosis*, Greek–Cypriots wanted to end the separate Turkish–Cypriot municipal councils established during the British government in 1958. With Greek–Cypriots’ feeling of disturbance, Greek–Cypriots led by Makarios developed a thirteen-point amendment to the present Constitution. This thirteen-point proposal was designed, in Makarios’s view, to eliminate impediments to the functioning of the government.¹³³ Makarios believed that the Constitution of the RoC, written by Greece and Turkey, impeded the development of the country and produced difficulties in its smooth functioning. Greek–Cypriots argued that there were obstacles to efficient government which were the complex

¹³⁰ Quoted from, the Guardian, 31 December 1963, in, Stephen, Michael , How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001, p. 1

¹³¹ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey’s Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.72

¹³² Background Note: Cyprus, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs December 2004,p.127, http://www.er.cna.it/biblioteca/files/200505140135212005051401357337Paesi_Lettera_C_pdf7351.pdf

¹³³ Solsten, Eric, Cyprus, The Republic of Cyprus http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_republic_of_cyprus.html

mechanisms protecting Turkish–Cypriots’ interests but not the true interests of the Public Service. The Thirteen Points of Makarios were sent to the Prime Ministers of Turkey, Greece and Britain on November 29, 1963.¹³⁴

The Thirteen Points of Makarios demands the abolishment of the right of veto of the President and the Vice-President of Cyprus.¹³⁵

The Vice-President of the Republic also will be given the authority to replace the President in his temporary absence or incapacity to perform his duties well. The case with the Vice-President and President of the House of Representatives is the same.¹³⁶

The elections are also to be modified. Instead of having Greek Members of the House to vote only for the Greek President of the House of Representatives and the Turkish Members of the House to vote only for the Turkish Vice-President, they will be voted as a whole.¹³⁷

Military arrangements are also to be modified. It was demanded that the division of the Security Forces into the Police and Gendarmerie should be abolished. The number of Security Forces and the Army must be determined by the law and not by arrangements made between the President and Vice-President of the Republic. The number of Turkish–Cypriot and Greek–Cypriot participants in the Public Service and Forces of the Republic must be proportionate with the ratio of the population of each community.¹³⁸

Within the Public Service Commission, the agreed number of ten members must be reduced to five or seven. All the decisions in the Commission will be based

¹³⁴ The Thirteen Points: ovember 1963, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ The Thirteen Points: November 1963, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm

on majority vote. If there would be allegations of discrimination on unanimous request, the matter would be forwarded to the Supreme Constitutional Court.¹³⁹

The Greek Constitutional Chamber would also be abolished, according to the Thirteen Points.¹⁴⁰

A reason why Makarios acted without doubt was because Sir Arthur Clark, British High Commissioner in Cyprus, supported Makarios's Thirteen Points. Makarios was lead to believing that Britain will continue its amendment based on his demands but Makarios thought wrong.¹⁴¹

4.2. Collapse of the Republic

In December 21st, 1963, two Turkish-Cypriots were murdered by Greek-Cypriot policemen in order to force Turkish-Cypriots to accept the 13 constitutional amendments. Following these events, Turkish-Cypriots abandoned their places in the parliament and the administration.

Still after Cyprus had gained its independence from Britain, Makarios and Greek-Cypriots supposed Hellenism to exist especially in the international relations and desired to establish union between Greece and Cyprus.¹⁴² By launching terror against Turkish-Cypriots they believed they would present a *fait accompli*¹⁴³ to the UN.

After the independent rule for Cyprus beginning in 1960, EOKA, as EOKA-B, was this time directly aimed against the president of the RoC, Makarios for *enosis*.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ The Thirteen Points: November 1963, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm

¹⁴² Moran, Michael, 'Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism', *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* (Ankara), Vol. VI, No. 2, 2001, p. 2

¹⁴³ An accomplished and presumably irreversible fact

¹⁴⁴ The Cyprus Conflict, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/narrative%20-%20part%204.htm>

On 1 March 1964, Makarios sent a top-secret letter to the Greek Prime Minister, George Papandreou, for the abolition of the Zurich and London Agreements and to get rid of the international agreements knowing that the unilateral abrogation of the agreements might possibly have serious repercussions.¹⁴⁵ UN sent in a peacekeeping force to prevent a recurrence of fighting, to contribute to the return to normal condition from violent confrontations.¹⁴⁶ It is still in Cyprus.

The establishment of the Cyprus Republic was primarily grounded on the goal of achieving a bi-communal relation between the two communities, but federal set-up turned out to be complicated. Greek–Cypriots’ refusal to abandon their objective for *enosis* became a major factor that prevented the Cypriots to arrive at a peaceful settlement. Makarios, the elected Greek–Cypriot president, did not recognize the constitutional agreement as an ultimate aim. Instead, he treated it as an initial move to achieve the union with Greece. As a matter of fact, the Republic was established, Makarios declared: “Independence was not the aim and purpose of the EOKA struggle... Foreign factors have prevented the achievement of the national goal, but this should not be a cause for sorrow...”¹⁴⁷ He expressed the same attitude when he made a statement to the press: “Union of Cyprus with Greece is an aspiration always cherished within the hearts of all Greek–Cypriots. It is impossible to put an end to this inspiration by establishing a Republic.”¹⁴⁸ Clearly, to Makarios and to the rest of Greek–Cypriots, *enosis*, which turned out to have aggressive activities against Turkish–Cypriots, was far from over.

¹⁴⁵ The U.N. and Cyprus - 1964, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm

¹⁴⁶ Resolution 186 (1964), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1102th meeting, on 4 March 1964, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr186.htm>

¹⁴⁷ The Republic’s Disintegration, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_11.htm

¹⁴⁸ Quoted from, London Times on April 9, 1963, in, The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy, <http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

Unfriendliness and acrimony between the two communities also barred initiatives for cooperation. Greek–Cypriots continued to regard the Turkish community as if they were minorities. Antipathy and resentment rose among them when the constitution presented Turkish–Cypriots some larger government posts than the size provided by their population. The Greek–Cypriot community asserted that a disproportionate number of ministers and legislators were provided to Turkish–Cypriots and they were distressed as Turkish representatives were allowed to veto budgets or legislation and prevent essential government operations from being carried out.¹⁴⁹ Despite the fact that Turkish–Cypriots were given equal status as co-founders of the Cyprus Republic, Makarios declares that the duty of the EOKA would not cease unless Turkish–Cypriots would have to abandon from Cyprus which shows that equal and mutual rights were refused. The political coalition between the two communities broke down three years after the Cyprus Republic was established and a series of constitutional changes was Greek–Cypriots’ aim. Constitutional amendments, which were strongly opposed by Turkish–Cypriots, would reduce the political rights and powers of the Turkish Cypriot community.¹⁵⁰

Turkish–Cypriots asserted that the objective of the amendments to reduce their status from co-founder to minority is clear and indicative of the move to alter the bi-communal structure of the Republic to a unitary state where Greek–Cypriot authority and powers would be dominant. On the other hand, Greek–Cypriots argued that the 1960 Constitution and the international treaties were imposed by external powers and that these were signed under the unwanted effects of the guarantor

¹⁴⁹ Historical Background of Cyprus, Touring Cyprus. <http://www.touringcyprus.com/historical.htm>

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

powers. Greek–Cypriots therefore insisted on modifying the constitution, which would be for only their advantage.¹⁵¹

The issue on constitutional amendments continuously increased the tension between the two communities and an inter-communal violence began in December 1963. Turkish–Cypriots demanded partition for security while Greek–Cypriots wanted a unitary state governed mainly by them for *enosis*. It was in March 1964 that members of the UNFICYP were sent to the island but hostilities were not disarmed and ceased until August 1964 when both sides accepted a UN resolution¹⁵² calling for a cease-fire. The UNFICYP kept peace between the two communities but the subsequent UN efforts to restore settlement failed. The government established in 1960 no longer functioned as Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots established their respective administrative systems.¹⁵³

4.3. The Acheson Plan and British Policy

There were two main Acheson Plans. According to the first one, Greece would make certain concessions to Turkey in return for the union of Cyprus with Greece.¹⁵⁴ During the 1963 assaults in Cyprus, Britain, with the support of the USA submitted a joint proposal on January 31, 1964. According to the proposal, a NATO unit of 10 thousand troops, wherein 1,200 American troops were included, will come to Cyprus, lead by a British commander and a mediator would be assigned by NATO. Makarios rejected this. In July 15 of the same year, the USA, supported by Britain, gave another proposal to Cyprus indicating that the Karpaz Peninsula, which makes up 5 percent of the total land area of Cyprus, would be handed over to Turkey

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Resolution 193 (1964), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1143th meeting, on 9 August 1964, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr193.htm>

¹⁵³ Historical Background of Cyprus, Touring Cyprus. <http://www.touringcyprus.com/historical.htm>

¹⁵⁴ The Acheson Plan, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/acheson_plan.htm

and in return, Turkey would accept *enosis*. With this, Cyprus would be then divided into 6 local administrations, wherein Turkish–Cypriots would handle 2 administrations. Turkish Cypriots would have minority rights. Greece, led by Makarios, again, did not accept the plan because it did not include *enosis* exclusively. In return, they came up with a plan of their own which they proposed to the concerned sides. According to the plan, Turkey would be given 32 square kilometers area in Cape El Greco for 25 to 30 years and offered them minority rights.¹⁵⁵

The Greek government did not accept the first Acheson Plan, and so a second one was submitted.¹⁵⁶ Acheson forwarded another plan during August of the same year and indicated that the whole island of Cyprus would be given to Greece except for that a territory of 200 square miles in the eastern section of the Northern-Southern line 2 miles west of Komikebir, which would be rented to Turkey for 50 years. The rest of the island would be given to Greece. Turkish–Cypriots would be given minority rights and the officials would deal with Turkish affairs in Nicosia. Greece again rejected this plan because of the absence of *enosis* unconditionally. Turkish rights would be guaranteed by USA and the Turkish government would accept the Acheson Plan.¹⁵⁷

After British rule had ended in Cyprus, its policy came to a time of revision in 1965s. Its SBAs were needed to reach Middle East, Persian Gulf and to support CENTO. Britain was also forestalling war between Turkey and Greece. Otherwise, Soviet threat might reach the island. Enosis was accepted for its interests but Cyprus seemed to have guaranteed its independence by the UN. Britain did not expect an increasing problem against itself as UNFICYP might avoid the fighting in the island.

¹⁵⁵ The Acheson Plan, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks06.html>

¹⁵⁶ The Acheson Plan, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/acheson_plan.htm

¹⁵⁷ The Acheson Plan, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks06.html>

Consequently, SBAs would be free for other tasks. UN auspices could arrange for talks between the two sides in Cyprus. Anglo-American initiative designed to bring about a UNFICYP mandate against the danger of a Turko-Greek war.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸ Sonyel, Salahi R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications, p.179-182

CHAPTER V

BRITISH POLICY FROM 1971 TO 1980

5.1. Cyprus During Cold War

The NATO alliance in the Eastern Mediterranean for both Turkey and Greece had strengthened the two countries' military capabilities and consequently allowed them focus on regional rivalries rather than the primary Soviet threat.¹⁵⁹

The Cyprus Question has pitted two NATO allies, Turkey and Greece, against each other for years because of the peace operation on July 20th, 1974 responding to a brief Greek–Cypriot coup on July 15th, 1974, engineered by the military then ruling Greece.¹⁶⁰

The extension of the Karpaz peninsula, being perceived as a dagger aiming at the stomach of Turkey,¹⁶¹ threatens Turkey's naval maneuverability by offering Cyprus the possibility of blocking the exit from İskenderun gulf being only 40 nautical miles¹⁶² away from Anatolian coasts.¹⁶³ On the other hand, Cyprus has been in more security since 1974, controlling more than one-third of the Mediterranean

¹⁵⁹ Krebs, Ronald, Perverse Institutionalism: NATO and the Greco-Turkish Conflict, *International Organization*, 53 (Spring 1999), p.343

¹⁶⁰ *New York Times*, November 9, 2002, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from,

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=234705801&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

¹⁶¹ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey's Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.56

¹⁶² Cyprus lies 40 miles from, the coast of Turkey, 250 miles from the nearest Greek island (Rhodes), and 460 miles away Athens. (Cyprus-Historical Overview in

http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MainIssues/Cyprus/Cyprus_HistoricalOverview.htm)

¹⁶³ Quoted from, Marie-Pierre Richarte, "La question chypriote dans la politique étrangère de la Turquie," *Trimestre du monde*, Vol.4, No.36 (Oct.–Dec. 1996), p.105, in Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey's Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.56

island in response to the ‘Athens *junta*-engineered coup against Archbishop Makarios’¹⁶⁴ led by Greek–Cypriots seeking *enosis*.¹⁶⁵

Turkey had participated in the 1960 international agreements. Turkey went along with them. Turkish action was legal according to the point of view of Standing Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. It had confirmed Turkish legal action by its statement in 21 March 1979:

“The Turkish military intervention in Cyprus, which was carried out in accordance with the Zurich and London Agreements, was legal. Turkey, as one of the Guarantor powers, had the right to fulfill its obligations. The real culprits...are the Greek officers who engineered and staged the coup and prepared the conditions for this intervention.”¹⁶⁶

TRNC was established in 1983, for national interests, security and human rights of the Turkish-Cypriots.

5.2. Significance of Cyprus

Britain initially had refused to withdraw its control over Cyprus to keep it as a base in guarding the Suez Canal. Moreover, during the transfer of sovereignty to the Cypriot communities, Britain had secured its hold of two bases on the island. The British claim of Cyprus therefore was mainly for military security. Western Europe would no longer be threatened as before by a split of the NATO’s southeastern flank if in case a Turkish–Greek war over Cyprus starts. Cyprus’ reduced geographical and political significance to Britain and to the rest of the international community was felt with the reluctance of the UN to keep its forces on the island.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003, p. 337

¹⁶⁵ *New York Times*, Mar 11, 2003, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=304104231&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

¹⁶⁶ Olgun, Ergun, Cyprus: A New and Realistic Approach, Perceptions: *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1999, p. 93

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

Among the major sides in Cyprus, Turkey was likely to benefit most from the situation if *enosis* was considered not to have occurred. Turkey's location and size made its cooperation and support crucial to Western powers. There were outside pressures to resolve the Cyprus Question in a way contrary to Turkish rights and interests, but strategic importance of Turkey would probably endure. Greece controlled its most important capability against Turkey – its ability to block Turkey's membership in the European Union if the Cyprus problem were not settled in a way it found satisfactory.¹⁶⁸ But Turkey did not veto Greece's turn back to military flank of NATO in October 20th, 1980. Turkey is Greece's rival in Europe¹⁶⁹ and since the island's independence from Britain in 1960; TRNC paid attention towards policies of Southern Cyprus.¹⁷⁰

5.3. Political Transformation and British Policy

The solution found in 1960 was in fact, not the preferred option of either Turkish–Cypriots overwhelmingly in favor of separation or *taksim* for their security, or Greek–Cypriots overwhelmingly in favor of *enosis*, union with Greece.¹⁷¹

In 1960s, Cyprus became affected with Greece's internal problems. The local politics in Cyprus became a three-way affair- (1) irredentism and the *megale idea*, (2) anti-royalism and (3) military intervention-, in which George Papandreou and his Center Union party balanced between the left-wing's pro-Communist United Democratic and the right-wing's National Radical Union. When the *enosis* became an important issue, together with the time when Papandreou failed to pursue *enosis*,

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ *New York Times*, May 1, 1998, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=29113893&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., Jul 15, 1997

¹⁷¹ Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003, p.339

they resorted to coup in April of 1967 with a group of middle-level army officers known as The Colonels. When the king pursued a counter-coup, he was put into exile.¹⁷² This military regime headed by Colonel Georgios Papadopoulos claimed to be anti-communism but three other Greek politics were clearly visible. One of which was irredentism and the *megale idea*, which is aimed at Cyprus; anti-royalist; and military intervention in civilian politics, which was evident since the 1909 coup.¹⁷³

During these complexities in the island British plan was based on the decision that if Turkey invaded Cyprus, SBAs were not expected to be involved in Turkish operations. Also it was believed that a possible operation in Cyprus was in fact against Greece as 12,000 Greek forces were in Cyprus illegally. On the other hand, sides were in NATO. A break-up of the NATO alliance brings the possible reaction of the Soviet Union. British policy was more related to the external circumstances when internal problems of Cyprus were considered.¹⁷⁴ British interests in Cyprus were to prevent the instability of the southeastern flank of NATO, to keep Cyprus linked to the west, to continue to use the SBAs in Cyprus, and to preserve Turkish overflying facilities granted to Britain. Partition of the island could risk the British retention of the SBAs. So, an independent republic should be preserved.¹⁷⁵

If the internal circumstances of Cyprus are focused, it can be seen that problems were increasing. Upon the economic crisis due mainly to the OPEC oil embargo, the Colonel dictatorship finally ended in 1973. Colonel Papadopoulos, a former chief of the EOKA terror organization, tried to unrest among Cypriot students and in the navy by proclaiming a republic but was soon displaced by the other

¹⁷² Sowards, Steven (14 April 2004), *Balkan Politics in the Cold War Years*, Michigan State University Library, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁷³ Greece, Lecture 22: *Balkan politics in the Cold War years*, *Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History*, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁷⁴ Sonyel, Salahi R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications, p. 234

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p.248

officers.¹⁷⁶ The EOKA terror organization, as well as the official police under full control of the Greeks in 1960s, confined Turkish–Cypriots from more than thirty per cent to three per cent of the Island. This ethnic cleansing continued for about eleven years until 1974.¹⁷⁷

In July of 1974, a group of Cypriot military men comprising of officers from Greece, EOKA and the Greeks established a coup against the government of Makarios, who was then president of the RoC. However, instead of gaining the objected *enosis*, the coup went wrong, backfired and brought about a crisis, which led to Turkish–Cypriots have power over the island. This time, Turkish–Cypriots were able to foresee the weakness of the Greeks after a legal peace operation.¹⁷⁸

Accordingly, after the military coup that destroyed the RoC regime in 1974, Turkey had to send in 30,000 troops to protect Turkish–Cypriots and maintain security for them.¹⁷⁹ But this caused some negative results for Turkey.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁶ Greece, Lecture 22: Balkan politics in the Cold War years, Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁷⁷ Ünal, Hasan, The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest Developments, Stradigma, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis, http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

¹⁷⁸ Greece, Lecture 22: Balkan politics in the Cold War years, Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁷⁹ Brief Overview of the Cyprus Problem, http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/overview.html

¹⁸⁰ Turkey has been purchasing its defense weapons from the United States during the Cold War to be able to maintain a large standing army. However, due to Turkey's peace operation in Cyprus, the United States imposed an arms embargo on Turkey between the years 1974 to 1978. This was one of the actions caused by the United States to be able to calm the bi-communal conflict in Cyprus between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots. This embargo action caused a Turkish determination to form their local defense industry. Since the late 1980s, Turkey has been producing weapon systems including surface-to-air missiles, submarines and ships, tracked armored vehicles, and transport planes. The most prestigious product of the Turkish defense industry is the F-16 fighter plane, in which 199 units have been built, 46 of which were exported to Egypt. (Kirisci, Kemal (July 1997). Post Cold-War Turkish Security and the Middle East, *Middle East Review of Internal Affairs*, <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1997/issue2/jv1n2a6.html>

5.4. Peace Operation

Public opinion in Turkey “agitated by stories and pictures in the press...strongly supported the idea of military intervention to protect the Turks on the island.”¹⁸¹

Ongoing conflict in 1974 divided the island into two *de facto* autonomous entities, TRNC in the North, and Southern Cyprus in the South, but on the contrary, Cypriot Government in the south was recognized internationally for the whole island.¹⁸²

EOKA-B had carried out the coup in 1974 with the encouragement of the Greek colonels, and it was still continuing to operate underground and with guerilla techniques as if their territory had been legally invaded. Hence, all these illegal attitudes and circumstances had brought about the Turkish peace operation, citing the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee to protect Turkish–Cypriots. These events laid blame on EOKA’s wrong method for reaching *enosis* by making union of Cyprus with Greece even more difficult than before.¹⁸³

After the Greek coup in Cyprus, the Soviet Union gave the Turkish government, which was one of the least militaristic one at the time, clear signs that they would not impede if Turkey chose the guarantee duty.¹⁸⁴ Britain did not fulfill its responsibilities obliged by the Treaty of Guarantee, and therefore Turkey, as a Guarantor Power by the 1960 agreements, alone made the peace operation in 1974.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸¹ Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. II, Reform, Revolution and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 430

¹⁸² Cyprus, The World Fact Book, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cy.html>

¹⁸³ Greece, Lecture 22: Balkan politics in the Cold War years, Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁸⁴ Birand, Mehmet Ali *30 Hot Days*, 1985, p.23.

¹⁸⁵ Quoted from, Demetriou, M. (2002) ‘Politicizing the Diaspora: Contested Identities among the Greek Cypriot Community in Britain’. Canterbury: University of Kent, unpublished doctoral thesis, in, Eva Østergaard-Nielsen, The democratic deficit of diaspora politics: Turkish–Cypriots in Britain

Before action, Turkey had approached Britain with an offer of military operation together but Britain avoided doing it. So, Turkey ordered an amphibious landing, which succeeded in putting an end to the violence against Turkish–Cypriots.¹⁸⁶

Greek-inspired coup against President Makarios caused to fighting in 1974. At first intra-communally occurring violence among Greek–Cypriots, then had involved Turkish–Cypriots and consequently a ‘peace operation (Turkish–Cypriot term)’ or ‘an invasion (Greek–Cypriot term)’ occurred.¹⁸⁷

In a two-stage offensive operation including different periods of fighting over two months, Turkish troops took control of 38 percent of the island and a ceasefire line began existing. Between 40,000 and 50,000 Turkish–Cypriots living in the south were sent towards north¹⁸⁸ and Greek–Cypriots went south which implied and meant the need and necessity of living in different areas. The systematic genocide against the Turkish community had continued up to Greek *junta* regime in 1974.

After the second peace operation, some had remembered an activity of criticizing the ‘wrong’; for example criticized Turkish–Cypriots’ and Turkey’s operation for peace in Cyprus in the time when some doubtful short-term calming down occurred, but ignored and forgot to criticize violation of Turkish–Cypriot’s human rights occurred in the short and long term. There are different perceptions in these events. Another one is:

“The second ‘operation’ carried the ‘operation’...beyond the area of...Turkish settlement; and it came after any acute danger to the ‘Turkish–Cypriots’ had passed and democracy in Greece had been restored. Hence, it was this second ‘operation’ far more than the first that, immediately and

and the Cyprus issue, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Volume 29, Number 4 (July 2003), p.694

¹⁸⁶ Ünal, Hasan, The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest Developments, Stradigma, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis, http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

¹⁸⁷ Diamond, Louise, Training in Conflict-Habituated Systems: Lessons from Cyprus, *International Negotiation*, 1997, Vol. 2 Issue 3, p.355

¹⁸⁸ Dodd, Clement, *Storm Clouds Over Cyprus*, a Briefing, Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 2001, p, 18

over the years, subjected Ankara to...criticism in Greece and among its friends in Europe, America and the world.”¹⁸⁹

Ironically, Makarios declared at the UN on 19 July 1974 that two Greek invasions of Cyprus had occurred before. In addition, the decision of Athens Court of Appeals dated March 21st, 1979 was that Turkish intervention was legal.¹⁹⁰

Since the events of 1974, UN peacekeeping forces maintained a buffer zone between the two sides after the partition in 1974 which was in response to a coup led by extremist Greek–Cypriots against the government of President Makarios, ‘citing his alleged pro-communist leanings and his perceived abandonment of *enosis*’.¹⁹¹

“...there can be no doubt that the responsibility for this barbaric putsch rests with the squalid military dictatorship in Greece...It is almost beyond belief that the Greek officers would attempt to install as President of Cyprus one Nikos Sampson, confessed murderer, professional bully boy and fanatical supporter of *enosis*...”¹⁹²

After the peace operation, the Greek government was blamed by even much of its own population for actions that appeared to isolate Greece from every country in the world.¹⁹³

After 1974, Greek voters refused to return to the traditional politics of the 1940s and a plebiscite also refused the restoration of the monarchy. Voters, instead, focused on the rise of power of the PASOK led by Andreas Papandreu. PASOK was a combination of socialist style speaking, populist economic and anti-Turkish nationalist advocacies, which were based on elements that had rejected the *junta*.

¹⁸⁹ Rustow, Dankwart, *Turkey: America's Forgotten Ally* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1987), p.96

¹⁹⁰ Oberling, Pierre, *The Cyprus Tragedy*, Published by K.Rustem&Brother, 1989, p.20

¹⁹¹ *New York Times*, March 11, 2003, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=304104231&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

¹⁹² Quoted from, GreekGift to Cyprus, *New York Times*, 16 July 1974 in, Adamson, Fiona B., *Democratization and the Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Turkey in the 1974 Cyprus Crisis*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 2 (July 01, 2001), p. 288

¹⁹³ Quoted from, Greeks Upset by Rumors of Changes in Leadership, *New York Times*, 23 July 1974, in, Adamson, Fiona B., *Democratization and the Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Turkey in the 1974 Cyprus Crisis*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 2 (July 01, 2001) p.288

PASOK was also anti-American because the USA did not support Greece in its pursuance of *enosis*.¹⁹⁴

In February 13th, 1975, the establishment of the Turkish–Cypriot Federal State¹⁹⁵ was proclaimed and nearly nine years later in November 15th, 1983, the independence of the TRNC was proclaimed.¹⁹⁶

5.5. Political Divide

The strategic significance of Cyprus lies in the fact that its existence represents a ‘stationary aircraft carrier’. So, in case of the annexation of Cyprus and Greece, a line of Greek islands would encircle Turkey’s coasts. Consequently, the change of balance of forces between Greece and Turkey, which signifies a threat against either side’s vital interests, had more an importance than humanistic reasons of the protection of Turkish–Cypriots and had more a danger and importance than the occurring violation of Turkish–Cypriots’ rights.¹⁹⁷

The Security Council called upon Turkey, Greece and Britain to enter into negotiations to re-establish a constitutional government in Cyprus. This resolution was conducted upon the intervention and peace operation of Turkey in Cyprus.¹⁹⁸ The Geneva declaration of July 30, 1974 was made in accordance with this resolution. With this declaration, Ministers of the three guaranteeing powers explicitly and unequivocally recognized the existence of the autonomous administrations of Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots in the island.¹⁹⁹ However, the two

¹⁹⁴ Greece, Lecture 22: Balkan politics in the Cold War years, Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>

¹⁹⁵ *Kıbrıs Türk Federe Devleti*

¹⁹⁶ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey’s Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.73

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 57

¹⁹⁸ Resolution 353 (1974), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1771st meeting, on 20 July 1974, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr353.htm>

¹⁹⁹ Geneva Declaration of July 1974 On Cyprus, <http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/ENGLISH/DOCUMENTS/5a.htm>

administrations could not work together any longer and in August 1975, the Voluntary Exchange of Populations Agreement was reached between representatives of the two Cypriot populations for the voluntary regrouping of the Cyprus communities with the Turkish zone in the north and the Greek zone in the South.²⁰⁰ It was a remarkable fact that one day before the UN Resolution 353 of 20 July 1974, the then Greek Cypriot leader Makarios had confirmed that it was indeed Greece that had invaded the island in 1974. This was declared in his address to the Security Council.²⁰¹

The two communities have been living separately within their own geographical territories. Greek–Cypriot administration, only itself, attempted to represent the RoC ignoring the existence of Turkish–Cypriot administration which occupied one third of the island. It is recognized internationally and is part of the UN General Assembly as a sovereign state.²⁰²

Meanwhile, Turkish–Cypriots declared TRNC. TRNC was proclaimed on November 15, 1983 by the unanimous vote of the legislative body of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus. The founding of this independent Turkish Republic is an expression and materialization of Turkish–Cypriots' claim of their right of self-determination as what Greek–Cypriots claimed.²⁰³ Both states in Cyprus maintained most of the European institutional practices that Britain had effects before, during its

²⁰⁰ Annex to the letter dated 22 November 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, UN General Assembly Security Council, Fifty-fifth session, Fifty-fifth year, Agenda item 64, Question of Cyprus, p.3, <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a55646.pdf>

²⁰¹ Ibid., p.2

²⁰² Resolution 155: Admission of new Members to the UN: Cyprus (23 Aug), Security Council Resolutions – 1960, <http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1974/scres74.htm>

²⁰³ Proclamation of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (15 November 1983), <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/republicofnorthern/theproclamation.html>

rule on Cyprus. They both have formed separate political systems and exercised free elections.²⁰⁴

The TRNC is highly committed to the UN Charter that promotes democracy, respect for human rights and rule of law. It presents a foreign policy whose principle of “Peace at Home, Peace in the world”, aims to build a world of peace, law and order. Despite being denied with international recognition and representation, TRNC continues to play its part in establishing and maintaining strong friendly relations with neighboring countries, and in upholding the pillars of mutual respect and non-interference with other’s affairs.

The Republic’s founding aim is to find a fair and peaceful solution to the Cyprus Question which Turkish–Cypriots believe would form a corner stone of a world in peace. Its foreign policy is constantly directed towards achieving a settlement in Cyprus. Conversely, there has not been a considerable progress in the negotiating process between the TRNC and the Greek side in 1970s.²⁰⁵

UN Security Council rejected the TRNC declaration stating that it ‘deplores the Declaration of the Turkish–Cypriot authorities of the purported secession of the part of the RoC; that it ‘considers the Declaration referred to above as legally invalid and calls for its withdrawal’; and also ‘calls upon all states not to recognize any Cypriot state other than the RoC’²⁰⁶ in Resolution 541. The Security Council again asked the Secretary-General to pursue his mission of good offices ‘in order to

²⁰⁴ Cyprus, U.S. Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18360.htm>

²⁰⁵ Foreign Policy, Defense and Representation Abroad, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/g006.html>

²⁰⁶ Resolution 541: Cyprus (18 Nov), Security Council Resolutions – 1983, <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1983/scres83.htm>

achieve the earliest possible progress towards a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus'.²⁰⁷

Not one Turkish–Cypriot has been compensated for loss of lives or property, but on the other hand, the international community pressured the victims to accept a federal system instead of liberty.²⁰⁸ In reality, facing the silence of the international system, Turkey had come to the conclusion that operation to protect the security of Turkish–Cypriots was a real duty.

Britain had military forces in the SBAs, which could be used in opposition to the Athens *junta*-engineered coup against Makarios although Britain had signed the Treaty of Guarantee that obliged the responsibility to maintain the independence of the RoC, territorial integrity, and security. In 1974, the Turkish–Cypriots called upon Britain as a Guarantor power under Article 4 of the 1960 Cyprus Treaty, but Britain did not fulfill its responsibility.

Turkish–Cypriots were equal co-founders of the RoC as Greek–Cypriots were, but Greek–Cypriots' continued to operate separately in all international relations. Britain ignored this though it signed the Treaty of Establishment.

In Geneva declaration of 1974, Britain recognized the existence of two autonomous administrations²⁰⁹ but did nothing in the UN against Resolution 541.²¹⁰

²⁰⁷ International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986, The Cyprus Conflict, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>

²⁰⁸ Stephen, Michael , How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001, p. 3

²⁰⁹ Geneva Declaration of July 1974 On Cyprus, <http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/ENGLISH/DOCUMENTS/5a.htm>

²¹⁰ Resolution 541: Cyprus (18 Nov), Security Council Resolutions – 1983, <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1983/scres83.htm>

CHAPTER VI

BRITISH POLICY FROM 1981 TO PRESENT

6.1. British Policy

British Policy towards Cyprus can be analyzed in six main points:

Britain is against complex institutional arrangements in Cyprus. Turkey, Greece, Britain had accepted 1960 Constitution and Britain had wanted to get rid of the problems in Cyprus.²¹¹

Britain is not so much concerned about the percentage of territory that is to be given from one side to the other in Cyprus. But if the weight of the political pressure from the Greek refugees reduces, there will be comprise over the initial powers of the central government in Cyprus.²¹²

Britain has two SBAs but also has other retained sites in other parts of the island. These are strengthening Britain's hand in its international relations and they have intelligence purposes.²¹³

The political importance of Britain in the EU increases by its SBAs and retained sites in Cyprus, especially when Turkish application to join the EU is considered.²¹⁴

Having military presence in Cyprus provides Britain to perform its policies towards Cyprus, Turkey and Greece more effective. There is no necessity to

²¹¹ Kyle, Keith, *British Policy towards Cyprus*, The Cyprus Conflict and the Role of the United Nations, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 1988, p.65

²¹² Ibid., p.66

²¹³ Ibid., p.66

²¹⁴ Ibid., p.67

recognize TRNC since its military presence in Cyprus has legality according to the Treaty of Establishment in 1960.²¹⁵

The conservation of the British Bases and revision of the failed 1960 Cyprus Treaties are the main hidden objectives of the whole Annan Plan negotiations and exercises. But in short-term, Britain and USA wish to gain UN sanction for the 1960 treaties because they are not compatible with the present EU law.²¹⁶

6.2. Negotiations under UN Auspices

Negotiations to achieve new agreements for settlement and to find a comprehensive solution to the Cyprus Question were continued under the UN auspices despite Greek–Cypriots’ decision to operate separately since 1963. They were held between Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots. These negotiations about the Cyprus question were held between 1968-1974, 1975-1979, 1980-1983, 1988-1992 and 1999-2004.²¹⁷

Through the efforts of UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, the UN from 1980 to 1986 launched a number of initiatives for peaceful settlements. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar was fully aware of the complexities and difficulties of the extended dispute and was eager to find a satisfactory solution. No independent initiative by any other organization or country occurred in this period, but deliberations took place over various UN initiatives concerning Cyprus between the two Cypriot communities and their main-countries.²¹⁸

According to Perez de Cuellar, it was useful to have frequent top-level meetings with the leaders of the two Cypriot communities. He considered that inter-

²¹⁵ Ibid., p.68

²¹⁶ Mallinson, William, *Cyprus, A Modern History*, I.B.Tauris Publication, 2005, p.168-170

²¹⁷ Cyprus, Historical Overview,

http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MainIssues/Cyprus/Cyprus_HistoricalOverview.htm

²¹⁸ International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986,

<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip.%20%2780-86.htm>

communal talks between representative Cypriots were the best available method of continuing the negotiating process. He also maintained direct contact with the foreign ministers of Turkey and Greece, meeting in New York between June and October 1982.²¹⁹

6.2.1. The Initiative

A proposal referred to as ‘the Initiative’ was sent to the sides in August 1983. This proposal was supposed to have been drafted by the Secretary General himself. The Initiative laid down basic proposals. First it suggested the idea of rotating the presidency to allow Turkish–Cypriots to vie for the post and head the reunified Cypriot State. Second, it proposed to have the legislative as bicameral instead of unilateral. The upper chamber was to have an equal number of representatives from each community, while the lower chamber would host representatives of the two communities in proportion to their population. Each community would vote for its own members in the parliament. It also suggested a ratio of 40 percent Turkish–Cypriots to 60 percent Greek–Cypriots for the executive branch replacing the then 30-70 distribution indicated in the 1960 Constitution. Moreover, the amount of territory to be given back by Turkish–Cypriots would be 8-13 percent. This would reduce the existing 37 percent to either 29 or 24 percent. Generally, the Initiative implied that Turkish–Cypriots would hand back some territory under their control while Greek–Cypriots side would return governmental powers to Turkish–Cypriots.²²⁰

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Ibid.

6.2.2. Proximity Talks

The Proximity Talks began in New York on September 10, 1984. They were conducted in three rounds and were held under the auspices of the UN with the Secretary-General acting as the go-between. The Secretary General met the two delegations separately throughout.²²¹

The first round of the Proximity Talks began on September 10, 1984 and lasted till September 20. Confidence-building measures, the structure of the federal government, and territorial adjustments were the three headings of discussions. The Secretary General proposed these headings. Also a re-commitment of the two sides to the High-Level Agreements of 1977 and 1979 and the points agreed during inter-communal talks was proposed. He recommended the negotiations to be kept confidential. Other topics discussed were the substance of the Cyprus Question and the structure of the proposed federal government. Every aspect of the problem was considered, but some topics received more the attention of the two parties such as the three freedoms of movement, settlement and ownership.²²²

The second round of Proximity Talks, beginning on October 15th, 1985, lasted for 12 days. Although the agenda, set by the Secretary-General, was meant to remain confidential, it was one way or another gone and leaked to the press. According to the leak to the press, the agenda included two levels: the points already agreed and the points to be agreed by the parties.²²³

The points already agreed were:

- “- Acceptance of the 1977 and 1979 High-Level Agreements,
- And the establishment at the earliest date of the federal republic of Cyprus, to be bi-communal in its constitution and ‘multi-regional’ in its territory.
- It also included acceptance of those constitutional points already agreed in the ‘1981-1983’ inter-communal meetings:
 - International representation of the Republic to be the function of the federal government,

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Ibid.

Sovereignty to be exercised by the federal government on behalf both federated states and their respective territories,
And the agreement on single citizenship afforded by the federal government.”²²⁴

Points to be agreed were powers and functions of the central government:

- “- Federal finance,
- Foreign affairs,
- International transport,
- Post and communications,
- Defense and security,
- Federal health paper.”²²⁵

Greek–Cypriot side refused to sign it as expected and the summit ended in failure.²²⁶

6.2.3. The Draft Framework Agreement

The Secretary-General had meetings with both Cypriot parties in London and Geneva towards the end of 1985 to discuss and agree the points of convergence and deal with the points of divergence between the two conflicting sides in Cyprus. He presented a new Draft Framework Agreement.²²⁷ This agreement was similar in many ways to the failed January 1985 summit proposals. It only differed in style on the formula equating Turkish–Cypriots’ concession over the amount of territory they would part with Greek–Cypriots’ concession over the powers of the central government with. The legislature would remain as what was stipulated in January 1985, except for important matters, which would require separate majorities for each community represented in the parliament. A working group was to be to deal with and deal with the three freedoms, the freedom of movement, settlement and ownership. The withdrawal of foreign troops would also be discussed. The Draft of Agreement, however, was rejected by the Greek–Cypriot administration.²²⁸

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ The Draft Framework Agreement, International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip.%20%2780-86.htm>

²²⁸ Ibid.

The proposals for a comprehensive solution foresaw a bi-communal federation between the Turkish and Greek communities, requiring some degree of cooperation, power sharing and integration. But the Turkish Cypriots wanted a confederation, or at least a state that has territory as one of the two federated states and wanted sovereignty on many things within its territory.²²⁹

In 1991 the UN passed a resolution that required and urged the establishment of a federal Cyprus state which would consist of two politically equal communities. The following year, in 1992, negotiations to resolve the island's *de facto* partition were initiated. The flow of negotiations during the first half of 1992 appeared optimistic towards reaching a settlement acceptable to both Cypriot communities. UN Secretary General Boutros Ghali was positive that an agreement was within reach. However, meetings between the Cypriot leaders, Denktaş and Vassiliou ended without success. The failure of the negotiations was due mainly on the irreconcilable and conflicting claim of power and sovereignty of the two communities. The reasons are: (1) the degree of sovereignty each component part of the new federal state would possess was not agreed, (2) the amount of territory Turkish–Cypriots would hand over was not agreed, (3) the conditions the Greek–Cypriot refugees from areas remaining under Turkish–Cypriot administration would return was not agreed.²³⁰

6.3. USA–Britain Agreement²³¹

6.3.1 .The Root of the USA–Britain Agreement

The initial idea of the agreement was to partition the globe into spheres of cryptological influence.²³² Ever since the beginning of the Cold War, the USA and

²²⁹ The Greek-Cypriot attitude to the Interim Agreement proposal, International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip.%20%2780-86.htm>

²³⁰ Historical Background of Cyprus, Touring Cyprus, <http://www.touringcyprus.com/historical.htm>

²³¹ This was a secret 1947 “UK-USA Agreement”

Britain have looked forward to placing their intelligence units and equipment in Cyprus, which they estimated and considered being the most strategic location for this interest. The SBAs in Cyprus, which were set up in the 1960s increased their activity and importance till present time. The equipments set in these sovereign bases catch and intercept military and diplomatic signals around the Middle East in assisting and aiding the USA and British intelligence.²³³

According to the analysis of the Treaty of Establishment of the RoC, particularly the setting up of the two sovereign bases in Cyprus in Akrotiri and Dhekelia, the freedom of Britain to build their facilities and units for their own interests has affected Cyprus until today.²³⁴

The USA's freedom to use Cyprus as its intelligence area began upon the signing of the USA–Britain Agreement but also included other countries like Australia, Canada and New Zealand as second parties due to any continuing war with Japan. Later on, Turkey, Germany, Norway and Denmark joined as third parties. In fact, this agreement had been functioning during the Second World War and outlined an international agreement between the USA and Britain.²³⁵

6.3.2. The Provisions of the USA–Britain Agreement

According to the USA–Britain Agreement, the five main English–speaking countries must take responsibility on checking the activities of the intelligence facilities' surveillance in the different parts of the world.²³⁶ The zones which were assigned to Britain included Africa and Europe in the eastern part of the Ural

²³² Bryce, Susan, *Silent Partners: The UKUSA Agreement*,

http://www.mindcontrolforums.com/pro-freedom.co.uk/silent_partners.html

²³³ Katsinaris, Stephen, *Cyprus: Washington seeks new military base*, Red Globe News, (07 June 2004), <http://www.redglobe.de/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2226>

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Campbell, Duncan (15 July, 2000), *Inside Echelon*, http://eridu.net/_echn.html

Mountains of the Soviet Union. Canada was assigned to the northern latitudes and Polar Regions. Australia, on the other hand, covered Oceania. Before obtaining knowledge on the arrangements of the members of the USA–Britain Agreement and before how the facilities would be handled, there were certain international rules and regulations that must be followed by the participants which are, mainly, secrecy, signal intelligence, indoctrination and information limiting in indoctrination. (1) Lifelong commitment to the secrecy, required by military and political attempts. (2) The participating country must be indoctrinated. (3) This indoctrination limits the information to only the things they need to know.²³⁷

6.3.3. Implications of the USA–Britain Agreement

During the 1950s, after the signing of the agreement, Cyprus became a major USA launching pad in their intervention into the Arab countries. It has been incorporated to the USA worldwide inspection and surveillance networks to forewarn them of military activities in the region. USA's military involvement in countries such as Lebanon and Jordan has been aided by USA facilities in the British bases in Cyprus.²³⁸

During the Cold War, Cyprus became a key part in the NATO security mechanism against the Soviet Union. During this time, the USA also secured rights from Britain to launch U-2 spy planes to monitor Soviet Union's military activities and developments.²³⁹

Facilities such as automated spy post were installed in TRNC by the United States National Security Agency, which were restarted after the Turkish peace

²³⁷ London faces lockdown to thwart third terror strike, Intelligence, http://www.ladlass.com/intel/archives/cat_echelon.html

²³⁸ Athanasiadis, Iason, US Seeks Major Military Base on United Cyprus, Asia Times Online, (10 April 2004), http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/FD10Ak04.html

²³⁹ Ibid.

operation in 1974. For a long time, it was not known to have restarted but the Cypriot government did not argue against it anymore.²⁴⁰

6.4. September 11 Terrorism

Not including rare demonstrations or occasional events between soldiers in the buffer zone, Cyprus was free of aggressive conflicts from 1974 till 1996, when two demonstrators died following illegal activities and tension escalated. It can be accepted as quiet since 1996.²⁴¹

After the Cold War, the intelligence units in Cyprus receded and came out of the international scene. However, after the September 11 terrorist attacks in Washington and New York, USA's war on terrorism was declared and began to operate. The USA worked closely with Cyprus in the war on terrorism. With this, Cyprus' role as the intelligence area of the USA and Britain in the Mediterranean reappeared. With the USA troops gathering around Iraq, Bahrain, Central Asia and Djibouti, the value of Cyprus in the military activities of the USA increased dramatically. Cyprus became a key base in such activities as the USA occupation in Iraq, the conflict in Palestine, increasing USA pressure in Syria, USA's concerns on their oil supply, other USA's economic interests, and NATO's expansion in the East and terrorist attacks in Turkey.²⁴²

Some USA facilities were set up in Nicosia, which are used for tactical intelligence, monitoring Arab radio broadcasts, which will then be transcribed and translated for the use of the USA. They also maintained sophisticated and high technology equipment on the top of Mountain Troodos, which is the highest point in

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ The Demonstrations of 11 August 1996, United Nations Report, <http://www.hri.org/MFA/foreign/cyprus/UN2.htm>

²⁴² Katsinaris, Stephen, Cyprus: Washington seeks new military base, Red Globe News, (07 June 2004), <http://www.redglobe.de/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2226>

Cyprus, to be able to survey the airwaves across Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia. This USA–British equipment scans radio waves, electronic waves, intercepting military, diplomatic and commercial signals through their huge dishes and antennas. In consequence, Cyprus was one of the important electronic ears for the whole of the Mediterranean.²⁴³

The USA was planning to send in a military force to Cyprus as a peacekeeping force. This had already been proposed to Turkish–Cypriots pointing out the importance of the island in USA’s geopolitical interests. Cyprus would then become an international mandate country serving the USA and Britain mainly facilitating their interventions in the Middle East and controlling their oil sources.²⁴⁴

The USA expects the reunification of Cyprus to gain opportunities to expand and install permanent military presence in Cyprus in addition to their well-established intelligence facilities, and so, the facilities would be upgraded into a full-fledged army base.²⁴⁵ The biggest intelligence presence on the island is of the USA.²⁴⁶

The Cypriots suspected that the aim of the USA was in fact, to provide the reunification of Cyprus by some activities such as political and financial help for the solution. Consequently both sides insisted on their people and urged them even to reject the reunification plan of the UN.²⁴⁷

On the other hand, as a result of the actions made by the USA government of redeploying its military troops from Germany to its bases in the Mediterranean; the

²⁴³ Athanasiadis, Iason, US Seeks Major Military Base on United Cyprus, Asia Times Online, (10 April 2004), http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/FD10Ak04.html

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

states in the region became fearful of the fact that Cyprus might become a USA-Britain protectorate.²⁴⁸

The USA uses an intelligence-sharing agreement with Britain and a listening post in the TRNC in the war against terrorism.²⁴⁹ A listening post in TRNC and an intelligence-sharing agreement with Britain and the Turkish-occupied north of the island are being used by the USA in the war against terrorism. Also NATO tries for access to the Geçitkale airport in the TRNC.²⁵⁰

The intelligence-sharing agreement of the UK-USA, the listening post in the Turkish-occupied north of the island, the island's role as the intelligence area of the UK-USA are the facts being used by the UK-USA in the war against terrorism.

6.5. Cyprus and the European Union

In September 12th, 1963, Association Agreement was signed between Turkey and the EU in Ankara and it came into force in December 1, 1964.

Association Agreement between the Greek Cypriots and the EC was signed in December 19, 1972 and came into force in June 1, 1973. In May 1, 2004, Cyprus entered the European Union as a divided island.²⁵¹

Only Britain and Greece were not only recently became concerned with the Cyprus Question; most other EU members were newly concerned through the EU enlargement.²⁵²

Ankara has stated repeatedly that it neither wants the EU to have an active role in the negotiations for settlement or become involved in the Cyprus question.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey's Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.72-75

²⁵² Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003, p.346

Greece was a member of the EU, thus Turkey was sure that the Union would not be impartial.²⁵³ On the other hand Britain, the former colonial power, and the USA concurred with Annan's plan and a sudden accession of Cyprus to the European Union.²⁵⁴ But, Greek Cypriots has, from time to time, threatened to veto Turkey's candidacy.²⁵⁵

Initially, the Greek-Cypriot government claimed recognition as the lawful RoC and has been treated in this way since 1964 leaving Turkish-Cypriots excluded from all diplomatic relations.²⁵⁶ Greek-Cypriots claim that Turkish-Cypriots deliberately abstain from their duties in the government since 1963 and all UN states, excluding Turkey, accept Greek government as the government of both sides in Cyprus. But in contrast, Greek government refused Turkish-Cypriots' request to return to the House of Representatives in 1965. In addition Greek-Cypriots wanted serious limitations of their power to be represented in the government.²⁵⁷ Such discriminatory treatment against Turkish-Cypriots and not recognizing TRNC was of the Commonwealth among the international institutions. It has every time excluded Turkish-Cypriots from contact with its Secretary-General, and from all its meetings, but Greek-Cypriots were the ones to rule and govern its measures and proceedings on Cyprus.²⁵⁸ With this system, the crisis of confidence continued to affect and disturb the two Cypriot communities and diplomatic initiatives were less expected to success. The situation got worse after Greek-Cypriots made an illegitimate unilateral

²⁵³ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey's Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p.58

²⁵⁴ *New York Times*, March 11, 2003, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=304104231&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=POD>

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, November 13, 2004

²⁵⁶ The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy, <http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

²⁵⁷ Dodd, Clement H., *The Cyprus Issue, A Current Perspective*, Eothen Press, 1995, p.5

²⁵⁸ The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy, <http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>

application for membership of the European Union (EU) in 1990, 9 years after Greece joined the EU.²⁵⁹

While Greek–Cypriots were applying for membership of the EU, the UN Security Council had adopted Resolution 649 in March 12, 1990. The resolution called upon Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots to reach an acceptable solution in the form of a bi-communal, bi-zonal²⁶⁰ federation.²⁶¹ According to the UN Secretary General:

Cyprus is the common home of the Turkish–Cypriots and of the Greek–Cypriots. Their relationship is not one of majority and minority but one of two communities in the State of Cyprus. The mandate given to me by the Security Council makes it clear that my mission of good offices is with these two communities. My mandate is also explicit that the participation of the two communities in this process is on an equal footing. The solution that is being sought is thus one that must be decided upon by, and, must be acceptable to both communities. It must also respect the cultural, religious, social and linguistic identity of each community.²⁶²

The Greek–Cypriot’s application for membership to the EU has (1) constitutional illegitimacy and (2) international illegitimacy because the Greek Cypriots were definitely committed to not participating in any total or partial political or economic union with any State according to the Treaty of Guarantee.²⁶³ By trying to push through its application for membership on July 4, 1990- even though the pending Security Council resolution- the Greek–Cypriot administration clearly and obviously disregarded and marred prospects to advance negotiated settlements. Moreover, its application was made on behalf of RoC as whole of the island, excluding Turkish–Cypriots from government since 1963. Turkish–Cypriots,

²⁵⁹ Tsakaloyannis, Panos, The European Community and the Greek-Turkish Dispute, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.19, No.1 (1980), p.52.

²⁶⁰ According to Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş, Rauf, the meaning of 'bizonal' is that “I am a state that has territory as one of the two federated states. I am sovereign on many things within this territory.” He asserts that sovereignty of TRNC is absolute and that no one can take it away, Quoted from, *International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986, The Cyprus Conflict*, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip.%20%2780-86.htm>

²⁶¹ Tsakaloyannis, Panos, The European Community and the Greek-Turkish Dispute, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.19, No.1 (1980), p.52.

²⁶² Quoted from, UN Secretary General reporting to the Security Council, (S/21183), in, Introduction, *Cyprus History*, <http://www.cypnet.co.uk/ncyprus/history/cyproblem/ertekun/intro.html>.

²⁶³ Documents Relating to The Founding Of Cyprus, Including the Treaty Of Guarantee, 1959, from, *Documents on International Affairs 1959* edited by Gillian King Oxford University Press, London, 1963, http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/treaty.html#B

being even not consulted for the access to the EU, were confronted with an illegitimate action as if they had no legal right to claim sovereignty in Cyprus. But on the other hand, under the 1960 International Agreements, sovereignty was vested in Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots jointly. So, such a basic step as application to the EU could not be taken without the authority of the elected leaders of both TRNC in the North, and Southern Cyprus in the South whose population were equal co-founders of the RoC. The same thing was stipulated in the Geneva declaration of 1974: Turkey, Greece and Britain recognized the existence of two autonomous administrations. Greek–Cypriots were therefore aware of the unconstitutionality of their illegitimate action but in spite of this, deliberately did they decide to close their eyes to that fact.²⁶⁴

Apart from the constitutional illegitimacy, international illegitimacy was another defect of the Greek–Cypriot’s unilateral application for membership to the EU because it was a direct violation of the international treaties negotiated by and agreed upon by Turkey, Greece and Britain and by both Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots.²⁶⁵

Britain and Greece are expressly violating the Treaty of Guarantee obligation responding them by promoting directly the union of the Greek–Cypriot administration with the EU. Consequently, they are also partitioning the island, because Turkish–Cypriots were ignored since they were not in the context of the unilateral application of the Greek–Cypriot community nor the treatment of this application by the instances of the EU. Moreover, because Turkey is not a member of the EU, a right of final veto for Turkish–Cypriots arises in the context of the unilateral Greek–Cypriot application for membership in the EU and the Turkish–

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

Cypriot opposition to this application is of a basic fact.²⁶⁶ Hence, there was an application but its authority had an internationally unlawful character, because in fact, it didn't have the legal capacity to apply. Consequently the application by this method made itself null and void. On the other hand, from a point of view of international law; the acceptance of this unilateral application by the EU, and the EU decision taken in Luxembourg to start negotiating with Greek-Cypriots, and therefore the negotiations taking place forward were, similarly, null and void as well.²⁶⁷

During the proceedings, the international environment ignored to recognize the equal status of Turkish-Cypriots as co-founders of the RoC. This is parallel to and thus helps the Greek-Cypriot intention to achieve monopoly of political power and reduce Turkish-Cypriots to minority status.²⁶⁸ But the Report of the Secretary General to the Security Council, S/24472 dated 21st August 1992²⁶⁹ clearly declared the fact that there was no longer a single RoC but bi-zonal, bi-communal circumstances.²⁷⁰ Also, in 1997, Turkey threatened to attack Cyprus over its decision to purchase S-300 Russian air defense missiles and implied that it might annex northern Cyprus if the Greek-Cypriot government joined the EU ignoring the co-founder Turkish-Cypriots.²⁷¹ On the other hand, on 20 July 1997, Turkey and TRNC agreed on a partial integration of the TRNC into Turkey with the fact that Turkey was to take over the responsibility for the foreign and defence policy of the TRNC. Consequently, Turkish-Cypriots passed two for the TRNC to coordinate its defense

²⁶⁶ Cyprus Prologue, (Sunday, 08 May 2005), p.6,

http://www.atcanews.org/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=68

²⁶⁷ Ibid., p.5-6

²⁶⁸ Ibid., p.3

²⁶⁹ Set of Ideas on an Overall Framework Agreement on Cyprus (1992),

<http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/photos/documents/agreement07.html>

²⁷⁰ Resolution 789 (1992), Adopted by the Security Council on 25 November 1992, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr789.htm>

²⁷¹ This decision is reinforced by the Turkish military Forces defense concept that focuses primarily on internal threats.

and foreign policy with that of Turkey and to have additional autonomy and political equality as Greek–Cypriots had²⁷². Britain, as a guarantor power in Cyprus, ignored equal status of Turkish–Cypriots as co-founders of the RoC.

European Council in Luxembourg officially invited Cyprus to join in December 1997 and Turkish-Cypriots were invited to participate in the Cypriot delegation in the spring of 1998. Greek–Cypriots' access to EU, despite its obvious illegitimacy, limited and declined further efforts to reach at an equally adequate and mutually acceptable solution for the Cyprus Question.²⁷³ Hence, UN efforts aimed at reunifying Cyprus continued with little progress.

The Greek Cypriots were faster towards the entrance of the European Union than even the European countries, and were preparing to become, additionally, a full member of the organization. Negotiations for accession began on March 30, 1998.²⁷⁴

In December 1999, Helsinki European Council meeting, it was stated that, the Cyprus Question being not yet solved, would not block Cyprus' accession to the EU.²⁷⁵

The European Union, then, remained definite and decisive of achieving a united Cyprus. Accession of the TRNC was almost not being considered. But if the TRNC's claim and right for recognition of the state quality of the applicant republic is upheld and accepted, in that case an agreement must cover either the formation of

²⁷² Brey, Hansjörg, Cyprus as an issue of Turkish domestic policy, Turkey and the Cyprus Question, *The International Spectator* Volume XXXIV No. 1 (January-March 1999), http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/iai/iai_99brh01.html

²⁷³ Yiangou, George S., The Accession of Cyprus to the EU: Challenges and Opportunities for the New European Regional Order, University of Cambridge, UK, Issue 2/2002, p.3, http://www.ecmi.de/jemie/download/Focus2-2002_Yiangou.pdf

²⁷⁴ Accession Negotiations for the First Six Applicants, European Union and Enlargement, Australian National University, 8 December 2000, p. 9, <http://www.anu.edu.au/NEC/A%20conference%20on%20European%20Union%20enlargement.pdf>

²⁷⁵ Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003, p.337

a state of “Cyprus” composed of both communities which are TRNC And Southern Cyprus. As a result, an isolated accession of the Southern Cyprus was considered.²⁷⁶

Formal accession of Southern Cyprus as the RoC was in May 2004. When Cyprus entered the EU in May 1, 2004, the TRNC was excluded. But international recognition may now stand as Azerbaijan has done.²⁷⁷

In April 2005, new efforts for the reunification of Cyprus moved closer to reality in twin referendums as Turkish–Cypriots’ votes approved it, but the Greek counterparts rejected it.²⁷⁸

Preliminary talks had begun at the UN aimed at refreshing a plan to reunite Cyprus that was not accepted in 2004 when Greek–Cypriots rejected it and then joined the EU as the whole island.²⁷⁹ The new talks were expected to be based on 2004’s UN plan, which required a loosely federated state with Turks and Greeks that maintained autonomous powers over domestic affairs.²⁸⁰ But before these, the European Union had formally wanted Turkey to recognize Cyprus.²⁸¹

²⁷⁶ The Annan Plan: A Model of Governance in Multiethnic Society (September 11, 2004), Fifth Pan-European International Relations Conference, <http://www.sgir.org/conference2004/papers/Sozen%20-%20The%20Annan%20plan.pdf>

²⁷⁷ Azerbaijan Hints at Recognition of Northern Cyprus, Financial Mirror, http://www.financialmirror.com/more_news.php?id=1833

²⁷⁸ *New York Times*, March 29, 2005, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=813675901&sid=5&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, May 17, 2005

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁸¹ *New York Times*, Dec 18, 2004, from, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=768062421&sid=5&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

6.6. Cyprus, UN and the Annan Plan

In 2002, the communities were presented with an agreement known as the Annan Plan. It is actually a mixture of confederation and federation.²⁸² Main aspects of the long and not accepted Annan plan proposed different solution methods for the Cyprus Question save conflicting interests of all sides. Some parts are mentioned:

The Treaty of Guarantee and the Treaty of Alliance would remain in force with necessary revisions.²⁸³ The new state would be the United Cyprus Republic modeled on the status of Switzerland.²⁸⁴ Cyprus is a member of the UN and has a single international legal personality and sovereignty.²⁸⁵ The executive power of the United Republic would be vested to the Presidential Council composed of at least one third coming from a constituent state. Foreign Affairs and European Union Affairs would not come from the same constituent state.²⁸⁶ The two chambers that comprise the federal Parliament would exercise the legislative power²⁸⁷ as a bi-cameral Parliament whose decisions require the approval of both Chambers by simple majority.²⁸⁸ Both sides would have their own courts but the Supreme Court would be the judiciary power of the federal state.²⁸⁹ Under the updated Treaty of Alliance, Turkish and Greek contingents would station in the Turkish and Greek states respectively.²⁹⁰ A Monitoring Committee chaired by the UN would be composed of representatives of the guarantor powers, and Cyprus would be nearly demilitarized. Both constituent states would have a fixed territory with clearly

²⁸² The Annan Plan: A Model of Governance in Multiethnic Society (September 11, 2004), Fifth Pan-European International Relations Conference,

<http://www.sgir.org/conference2004/papers/Sozen%20-%20The%20Annan%20plan.pdf> , p.3

²⁸³ Ibid.,p.12

²⁸⁴ Ibid.,p.13

²⁸⁵ Ibid.,p.13-14

²⁸⁶ Ibid.,p.14

²⁸⁷ Ibid.,p.14-15

²⁸⁸ Ibid.,p.14-15

²⁸⁹ Ibid.,p.15

²⁹⁰ Ibid.,p.16

defined boundaries.²⁹¹ Power sharing approach of the Annan plan would be based on the representation and the protection of rights of the sides. Integrative power aspect would be based on interethnic cooperation and coalitions in multi-ethnic state.²⁹² Cyprus would be referred to as the United Cyprus Republic.²⁹³

It is remarkable that only the Greek–Cypriot Government holds the island’s UN seat, but in fact, the federal government in Cyprus does not have superiority over the constituent states.²⁹⁴

A confederation of two largely independent states was the objective of Turkish–Cypriots but a two-zone federation linked by a central government was more beneficial for Greek–Cypriots interests as ruling more in Cyprus.²⁹⁵ The new UN plan for reuniting Cyprus in 2002 was a federal system with a weak central government.²⁹⁶ As Greek Cypriots have always wanted, the draft constitution in the Plan put the Greek Cypriots in charge and equal partnership common state is disregarded. Central federal institutions have not much importance since important legislation would anyway lie with the European Union. But, federal institutions include control of external relations, such as with the EU, and immigration, etc. which are important for all the citizens of Cyprus.²⁹⁷

6.7. Societies in Cyprus and British Policy

According to a point of view, ‘nation state’ strongly suggests the idea that a nation has a right to possess its own state. It was from this concept that the principle

²⁹¹ Ibid.,p.16

²⁹² Ibid.,20

²⁹³ Ibid.,23

²⁹⁴ *New York Times*, Jul 15, 1997, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=12990613&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

²⁹⁵ Ibid., Nov 9, 2002,

²⁹⁶ Dodd, Clement, UN Cyprus Plan: Solution or Delusion?, Assembly of Turkish American Associations, http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/cyprus_plan.html

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

of self-determination, the right of a group of people to determine its own form of government and decide on the legal and political status of the territory it occupies appeared. The international community decided to approach the dilemma by redefining self-determination as the right of people to participate in the democratic governance of the state in which it exists such as the Turkish–Cypriots’ circumstances.²⁹⁸

For a solution, a jointly accepted system of law is crucial. So, as a solution method for the Cyprus Question, it can be said as a beginning that both parties should loosen up their inflexible and decisive stance in which they are illegal according to a jointly accepted system of law; if they want to secure a peaceful, agreeable and equal resolution of the crisis.

Cyprus’ strategic location is important, as it is beneficial to the major nations’ competitive and defensive advantage. But in international relations, subjects of the system cannot ignore its environment if it exists. The existence of the living subjects- such as TRNC- cannot be ignored forever. Only approaches may differ for some interests.

The more Turkish–Cypriots and Greek–Cypriots continue to adhere to their respective “motherlands”, the longer the separatist ideology and bi-communal, bi-zonal approach will prevail between them. But the more one side’s motherland is concerned with the Cyprus Question, balance of power in the region affects other parts and larger unions of the international system as EU and UN are involved in the island. Minority differentiations in a small territory or state of affairs may sometimes play an important role in the major acts. The most important international organizations such as EU and UN continue to be involved with the Cyprus Question.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

Britain, as a former colonial power in Cyprus continues its policy towards Cyprus in the UN and US with the aim of not losing its military sovereignty over the Island in any solution appropriate for the other states related to the question.

Bilateral agreement in Cyprus may be possible but as long as the sides put their own interests over the benefit of the island and the region a whole, mutual respect for equal sovereignty will be difficult to achieve. Consequently, both parties will find ways to secure better benefits than the other.

According to Mr. Denктаş:

“I see Palestine, I see Kosovo and I say, ‘Not again.’ You can’t create one nation out of two. You can allow them to begin living together by treating them as equals, allowing trust to grow between them and allowing them to create an atmosphere where they won’t forget, but they won’t emphasize, that they are two peoples on the same land.”²⁹⁹

If we concentrate on the current situation, we can see some 35,000 troops from Turkey are stationed in TRNC, but under the UN plan, the number would have gradually dropped to 600, which was the size of the time 1960, the independence from Britain.³⁰⁰ Also Bakü-Ceyhan pipeline increases the strategic importance of Cyprus and the security of the region and people.³⁰¹ Controlling Cyprus has the strategic option of blocking access to Turkish ports; hence Turkey will insist on keeping troops on the island as well as the security of Turkish–Cypriots’ security.³⁰² On the other hand, Turkey agreed to recognize the RoC as an EU member but did not extend full diplomatic recognition to the RoC and declared that full recognition can come only when the island is reunified under a mutually acceptable agreement.³⁰³

²⁹⁹ *New York Times*, Apr 25, 2004, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=623406681&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=41533&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

³⁰¹ Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey’s Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003), p. 67

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Turkish Press Review, Office of the Prime Minister, Directorate General of Press and Information, <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2004/12/04x12x20.HTM>

Not only Turkey pays attention to the island's position. For instance the British moved to Cyprus after the loss of their military bases in Suez to Egypt and stored nuclear bombs on Cyprus.³⁰⁴ British policy towards Cyprus seems that the island will have an importance as a stepping stone for its policy towards the region.

Different solution methods may continue to be focused on, but some points of view should not be forgotten for a compatible resolution. The facts that Turkish–Cypriots:

- ‘Never rebelled against the Cypriot State’,
- ‘were perfectly satisfied with the Constitution of 1960’,³⁰⁵
- were co-founders of the RoC,
- did not have their own so-called Turkish-*enosis* to join their own motherland,
- did not have a motherland being a member of an international union as EU, though having the neighbor's not being a member of,
- did not have their own so-called political and military efforts to achieve Turkish-*enosis*,
- did not have aggressive and violent group of people as the military arm of the so-called Turkish “great idea” (*megale idea*) aiming at recreating an Empire.
- did not have a so-called Turkish-EOKA subversive organization,
- did not have their own so-called underground Turkish-*enosis* which attacked the administration, which conducted terrorist attacks against the administration and eventually sowed terror all over the island against their neighbors proclaiming that their sole ultimate objective was to invade the island of Cyprus to their motherland,

³⁰⁴ Athanasiadis, Iason, US Seeks Major Military Base on United Cyprus, Asia Times Online, (10 April 2004), http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/FD10Ak04.html

³⁰⁵ Oberling, Pierre, *The Cyprus Tragedy*, Published by K.Rustem&Brother, 1989, p.44

should not be ignored when Cyprus Question is considered.

Finally, absolute peace in all aspects in Cyprus seems to be faraway or nonexistent to happen in short-term, but Cyprus' importance for Britain continues with little changes. Main themes of British policy on Cyprus have not changed radically. But it sometimes showed little differences. It is not expected to change radically in the near future.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

British policy towards Cyprus is mainly for military aspects. Cyprus has an importance for Britain, as it is the only case where Britain had base areas under its own legal authority after its decolonization process.³⁰⁶ The bases represented the power and reach of Britain, on local and regional affairs, and this persisted in the first Gulf War, the invasion of Iraq, and indirectly in UNFICYP.³⁰⁷

British policy towards Cyprus in 1965s was revised. Its SBAs were needed to reach Middle East, Persian Gulf and to support CENTO. Britain was also forestalling war between Turkey and Greece. Otherwise, Soviet threat might reach the island. Enosis was accepted for its interests but its activity was the ignorance of the internal problems of Cyprus. British policy expected that UNFICYP would avoid the fighting in the island. Consequently, SBAs would be free for other tasks.³⁰⁸

British Policy towards Cyprus after 1980 to present can be analyzed as:

Britain is against complex institutional arrangements in Cyprus and had wanted to get rid of some unnecessary responsibilities by the 1960 treaties.³⁰⁹

Britain is less concerned about the exchange of territory in Cyprus but has its attention in providing additional rights from the central government in Cyprus.³¹⁰

³⁰⁶ Greek–Cypriots attack British military base (5 July 2001), Dawn Group of Newspapers: The Internet Edition, March 2, 2005, <http://www.dawn.com/2001/07/05/int4.htm>

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p.72, Also Britain provided 742 of 2000 soldiers in UNFICYP.

³⁰⁸ Sonyel, Salahi R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications, p.179-182

³⁰⁹ Kyle, Keith, *British Policy towards Cyprus*, The Cyprus Conflict and the Role of the United Nations, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 1988, p.65

³¹⁰ Ibid., p.66

Britain has two SBAs but also has other retained sites in other parts of the island. These are strengthening Britain's hand in its international relations also by their intelligence purposes.³¹¹

The political importance of Britain in the EU increases by its SBAs and retained sites in Cyprus, especially when Turkish application to join the EU is considered.³¹²

Having military presence in Cyprus provides Britain to perform its policies towards Cyprus, Turkey and Greece more effective. There is no necessity to recognize TRNC since its military presence in Cyprus has legality according to the Treaty of Establishment in 1960.³¹³

To conserve the British Bases and to revise the failed 1960 Cyprus Treaties are the main hidden objectives of the existence of the Annan Plan. But in short-term, Britain and USA wish to gain UN sanction for the 1960 treaties because they are not compatible with the present EU law.³¹⁴

Britain uses an intelligence-sharing agreement with the USA in the war against terrorism.³¹⁵

The most important international organizations such as EU and UN continue to be involved with the Cyprus Question. Britain, as a former colonial power in Cyprus continues its policy towards Cyprus in the UN and EU with the aim of not losing its military sovereignty over any solution appropriate for the other states.

³¹¹ Ibid., p.67

³¹² Ibid., p.67

³¹³ Ibid., p.68

³¹⁴ Mallinson, William, *Cyprus, A Modern History*, I.B.Tauris Publication, 2005, p.168-170

³¹⁵ Ibid.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Birand, Mehmet Ali *30 Hot Days*, 1985
- Bryant, Rebecca, Justice or respect? A comparative perspective on politics in Cyprus, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 24, Number 6 (November 1, 2001)
- Dodd, Clement, *Storm Clouds Over Cyprus*, a Briefing, Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 2001
- Dodd, Clement H., *The Cyprus Issue, A Current Perspective*, Eothen Press, 1995
- Ertekün, N.Münir, *The Cyprus Dispute and The Birth of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*, University Press, Oxford, 1984
- Kyle, Keith, *British Policy towards Cyprus*, The Cyprus Conflict and the Role of the United Nations, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 1988
- Mallinson, William, *Cyprus, A Modern History*, I.B.Tauris Publication, 2005
- Oberling, Pierre, *The Cyprus Tragedy*, Published by K.Rustem&Brother, 1989
- Oberling, Pierre, *The Road to Bellapais*, The Turkish Cypriot Exodus to Northern Cyprus, Columbia University Press, New York, 1982
- Rustow, Dankwart, *Turkey: America's Forgotten Ally* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1987)
- Sabahattin Ismail, *Kıbrıs'ta Yunan Sorunu (1821–2000)* (The Greek Question in Cyprus 1821–2000), Istanbul: Akdeniz Publications, 2000
- Sonyel, Salahi R., *Cyprus The Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath*, British Documents, 1960-1974, Cyrep Publications
- Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. II, Reform, Revolution and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

ARTICLES

- Adamson, Fiona B., Democratization and the Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Turkey in the 1974 Cyprus Crisis, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 2 (July 01, 2001)
- Adamson, Fiona B., Democratization and the Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Turkey in the 1974 Cyprus Crisis, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 2 (July 01, 2001)
- Bamanie, Nuray, Cyprus' Forgotten Turks, *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2002
- Costas M. Constantinou & Oliver P. Richmond, The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and Britain Bases in Cyprus, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 65–84, March 2005
- Criss, Nur Bilge (1997), Strategic Nuclear Missiles in Turkey: The Jupiter Affair, 1959-1963, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 20/3
- Diamond, Louise, Training in Conflict-Habituated Systems: Lessons from Cyprus, *International Negotiation*, 1997, Vol. 2 Issue 3
- Eva Østergaard-Nielsen, The democratic deficit of diaspora politics: Turkish–Cypriots in Britain and the Cyprus issue, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Volume 29, Number 4 (July 2003)
- Krebs, Ronald, Perverse Institutionalism: NATO and the Greco-Turkish Conflict, *International Organization*, 53 (Spring 1999)
- Moran, Michael, 'Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism', *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* (Ankara), Vol. VI, No. 2, 2001
- Olgun, Ergun, Confederation, the Last Chance for Establishing Peace, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001
- Olgun, Ergun, Cyprus: A New and Realistic Approach, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1999
- Stavridis, Stelios, The international relations of the Cypriot Parliament, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Volume 5, Number 3, December 2003
- Stephen, Michael, How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible, *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 2001
- Suvarierol, Semin, The Cyprus Obstacle on Turkey's Road to Membership in the European Union, Turkey and the European Union, *Turkish Studies*, Volume 4, Number 1 (Spring 2003)

Tsakaloyannis, Panos, *The European Community and the Greek-Turkish Dispute*,
Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol.19, No.1 (1980)

INTERNET SOURCES

The 1931 Uprising, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,
http://www.trncgov.com/history_8.htm

Accession Negotiations for the First Six Applicants, European Union and
Enlargement, Australian National University, 8 December 2000, p. 9,
<http://www.anu.edu.au/NEC/A%20conference%20on%20European%20Union%20enlargement.pdf>

The Acheson Plan, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/acheson_plan.htm

Analysis of the Treaties of 1959, The Cyprus Conflict,
http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/analysis_of_treaties.htm

The Annan Plan: A Model of Governance in Multiethnic Society (September 11,
2004), Fifth Pan-European International Relations Conference,
<http://www.sgir.org/conference2004/papers/Sozen%20-%20The%20Annan%20plan.pdf>

Annex to the letter dated 22 November 2000 from the Permanent Representative of
Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, UN
General Assembly Security Council, Fifty-fifth session, Fifty-fifth year,
Agenda item 64, Question of Cyprus, p.3,
<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/55/a55646.pdf>

Athanasiadis, Iason, US Seeks Major Military Base on United Cyprus, Asia Times
Online, (10 April 2004),
http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/FD10Ak04.html

Azerbaijan Hints at Recognition of Northern Cyprus, Financial Mirror,
http://www.financialmirror.com/more_news.php?id=1833

Background Note: Cyprus, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs December
2004,p.127,
<http://www.er.cna.it/biblioteca/files/200505140135212005051401357337Pae si Lettera C pdf7351.pdf>

Brey, Hansjörg, Cyprus as an issue of Turkish domestic policy, Turkey and the
Cyprus Question, *The International Spectator* Volume XXXIV No. 1
(January-March 1999), http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/iai/iai_99brh01.html

Brief Overview of the Cyprus Problem,
http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/overview.html

Bryce, Susan, Silent Partners: The UKUSA Agreement,
http://www.mindcontrolforums.com/pro-freedom.co.uk/silent_partners.html

- Campbell, Duncan (15 July, 2000), Inside Echelon, http://eridu.net/_echn.html
- Cooper, Tom, Cyprus, 1955-1973, Europe & Cold War Database, Oct 26, 2003, http://www.acig.org/artman/publish/article_454.shtml
- The Cyprus Conflict, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/narrative%20-%20part%204.htm>
- Cyprus History, British Take Over, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/h7.html>
- The Cyprus Problem, Turkish Embassy, <http://www.turkishembassy.org.au/makale/cyprusproblem.htm>
- Cyprus Prologue, (Sunday, 08 May 2005), p.6, http://www.atcanews.org/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=68
- Cyprus Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus History, <http://www.cypnet.co.uk/ncyprus/history/republic/try-guarantee.html>
- Cyprus, 1980-1986, The Cyprus Conflict, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- Cyprus, Historical Overview, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MainIssues/Cyprus/Cyprus_HistoricalOverview.htm
- Cyprus, The World Fact Book, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cy.html>
- Cyprus, U.S. Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18360.htm>
- Cyprus, United Kingdom Army, <http://www.army.mod.uk/aroundtheworld/cyp/>
- Cyprus-Historical Overview in http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MainIssues/Cyprus/Cyprus_HistoricalOverview.htm
- The Demonstrations of 11 August 1996, United Nations Report, <http://www.hri.org/MFA/foreign/cyprus/UN2.htm>
- Denktaş, Rauf, The Crux of The Cyprus Problem, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/denktash%20-%201999%20art.htm>
- Documents Relating to The Founding Of Cyprus, Including the Treaty Of Guarantee, 1959, from, Documents on International Affairs 1959 edited by Gillian King Oxford University Press, London, 1963, http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/treaty.html#B

- Documents Relating to The Founding Of Cyprus, Including the Treaty Of Guarantee, 1959, from, Documents on International Affairs 1959 edited by Gillian King Oxford University Press, London, 1963,
http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/treaty.html#D
- Dodd, Clement, UN Cyprus Plan: Solution or Delusion?, Assembly of Turkish American Associations, http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/cyprus_plan.html
- The Draft Framework Agreement, International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986,
<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- First Years (1878 - 1879) of the English Administration,
http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/beginproblem/beginproblem_ sover_rent01.html
- Foreign Policy, Defense and Representation Abroad, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, <http://www.trncwashdc.org/g006.html>
- Geneva Declaration of July 1974 On Cyprus,
<http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/ENGLISH/DOCUMENTS/5a.htm>
- Greece, Lecture 22: Balkan politics in the Cold War years, Twenty-Five Lectures on Modern Balkan History, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>
- The Greek-Cypriot attitude to the Interim Agreement proposal, International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986,
<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- Greek-Cypriots attack British military base (5 July 2001), Dawn Group of Newspapers: The Internet Edition, March 2, 2005,
<http://www.dawn.com/2001/07/05/int4.htm>
- Historical Background of Cyprus, Touring Cyprus,
<http://www.touringcyprus.com/historical.html>
- History, Independence from, Britain,
http://www.countriesquest.com/middle_east/cyprus/history/independence_from_britain.htm
- International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986,
<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986,
<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- Introduction, Cyprus History, Retrieved February 28, 2005, from,
<http://www.cypnet.co.uk/ncyprus/history/cyproblem/ertekun/intro.html>

- Jung, Dietrich, The Sèvres Syndrome: Turkish Foreign Policy and its Historical Legacies, American Diplomacy Volume VIII, Number 2, 2003, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/ad/ad_v8_2/jud01.html
- Katsinaris, Stephen, Cyprus: Washington seeks new military base, Red Globe News, (07 June 2004), Retrieved March 05, 2005, from, <http://www.redglobe.de/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2226>
- Kirisci, Kemal (July 1997). Post Cold-War Turkish Security and the Middle East, Middle East Review of Internal Affairs, <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1997/issue2/jv1n2a6.html>
- London faces lockdown to thwart third terror strike, Intelligence, http://www.ladlass.com/intel/archives/cat_echelon.html
- The MacMillan Plan, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/macmillan_plan.htm
- Makarios III, <http://www.greece.org/cyprus/MakariosIII.htm>
- New York Times, Apr 25, 2004, Online Databases, Bilkent University Library, Full Text Databases, from, <http://proquest.umi.com/>
- O'Carolan, Tom (2004), Cyprus: A Recent History, Three Monkeys Online, http://www.threemonkeysonline.com/threemon_printable.php?id=33
- Proclamation of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (15 November 1983), <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/republicofnorthern/theproclamation.html>
- Proximity Talks, International Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1980-1986, <http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/int%271%20dip,%20%2780-86.htm>
- The Republic's Disintegration, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, http://www.trncgov.com/history_11.htm
- Resolution 155: Admission of new Members to the UN: Cyprus (23 Aug), Security Council Resolutions – 1960, <http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1974/scres74.htm>
- Resolution 186 (1964), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1102th meeting, on 4 March 1964, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr186.htm>
- Resolution 193 (1964), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1143th meeting, on 9 August 1964, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr193.htm>
- Resolution 353 (1974), Adopted by the Security Council at its 1771st meeting, on 20 July 1974, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr353.htm>
- Resolution 541: Cyprus (18 Nov), Security Council Resolutions – 1983, <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1983/scres83.htm>

- Resolution 789 (1992), Adopted by the Security Council on 25 November 1992, United Nations, <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr789.htm>
- Set of Ideas on an Overall Framework Agreement on Cyprus (1992), <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/photos/documents/agreement07.html>
- Smith, Helena (30 September 2002), Greek–Cypriots turned against British bases, Guardian Unlimited, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/military/story/0,11816,801544,00.html>
- Solsten, Eric, Cyprus The Emergency, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_emergency.html
- Solsten, Eric, Cyprus The Republic of Cyprus http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_republic_of_cyprus.html
- Solsten, Eric, Cyprus World War II and Postwar Nationalism, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_world_war_ii_and_post_war_nationalism.html
- Solsten, Eric, Cyprus, British Annexation, http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_british_annexation.html
- Solsten, Eric, Cyprus, The Republic of Cyprus http://workmall.com/wfb2001/cyprus/cyprus_history_the_republic_of_cyprus.html
- Sowards, Steven (14 April 2004), Balkan Politics in the Cold War Years, Michigan State University Library, Retrieved March 02, 2005, from, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect22.htm>
- Srebrenica: Appendix 6, Chapter 5, Section 3, http://213.222.3.5/srebrenica/toc/p6_c05_s003_b01.html
- The Thirteen Points: November 1963, The Cyprus Conflict, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm
- Treaty Concerning The Establishment of The Republic of Cyprus, Council of Europe, http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Legal_co-operation/Foreigners_and_citizens/Nationality/Documents/National_legislation/CyprusTreatyConcerningEstablishmentofRepublicofCyprus.asp#P126_7454
- Treaty of Alliance, Cyprus History, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks07.html>
- Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus History, <http://www.kibris.gen.tr/english/solution/peacetalks07.html>

Turkish Cypriot's Efforts to Get Organized, Turkish Northern Republic of Cyprus,
http://www.trncgov.com/history_9.htm

Turkish Press Review, Office of the Prime Minister, Directorate General of Press and
Information,
[http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2004/12/04x12x20.H
TM](http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2004/12/04x12x20.H
TM)

The U.N. and Cyprus - 1964, http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/13_points.htm

Ünal, Hasan, The Cyprus Question and The EU: The Annan Document and Latest
Developments, Stradigma, E-Journal of Strategy and Analysis,
http://www.stradigma.com/english/april2003/articles_06.html

Yiangou, George S., The Accession of Cyprus to the EU: Challenges and
Opportunities for the New European Regional Order, University of
Cambridge, UK, Issue 2/2002, p.3,
http://www.ecmi.de/jemie/download/Focus2-2002_Yiangou.pdf