

# **THE CYPRUS CONFLICT: National Identity and Statehood**

2nd edition 1999

by Zenon Stavrinides

## **I. A TRADITION OF CONFLICT**

'The Cypriots', wrote the humorist George Mikes, 'know that they cannot become a World Power; but they have succeeded in becoming a World Nuisance, which is almost as good'. Few Cypriots would find this witticism enjoyable; but the truth is that this small island of 3,572 square miles - roughly the same size as the Lebanon, or Puerto Rico, or the English counties of Norfolk and Suffolk combined - periodically hit the world's headlines because trouble, usually of a violent kind, broke out there.

Cyprus has a population of 650,000 which is made up of several ethnic groups. There is a Greek Orthodox community (about 80 per cent of the population), a Turkish Moslem community (about 18 per cent), and smaller Maronite, Latin and Armenian minorities. The two main communities have been in conflict with one another, and vowed allegiance to, and sought the help of, Greece and Turkey respectively - two allies in NATO. A third ally, Britain, ruled the island until 1960, and since then she has maintained important military bases there. Further, the close proximity of the island to the Middle East has made it a matter of keen interest, and occasionally concern, to several neighbouring countries, and also the United States and the Soviet Union. Thus, Cyprus came to signify to the world's politicians and journalists a place of trouble, and moreover trouble with international repercussions out of proportion to her size and population.

How is it that the Greek and Turkish communities have found it impossible to achieve permanent peace for themselves and their 'Mother Countries'? How is one to understand those ideological, political and other factors which have been at the root of so many tragedies, the latest of which is still continuing? These are grave questions which Cypriots, and other students of Cypriot affairs, will not find easy to answer. The sequence of events that started with the landing of Turkish mainland troops on the island on 20th July 1974 is not something that bears its own explanation, or even description, on its face for all intelligent observers to see. Greek Cypriots have called it a barbaric invasion of their island by a foreign country whose object was to impose a constitutional settlement under which the Turkish Cypriot minority would obtain possession of a large and rich part of territory. Turkish Cypriots have welcomed it as an operation (indeed, a 'peace operation') by Mother Turkey to establish a just solution to the long-standing intercommunal conflict, guaranteeing the legitimate rights of the Turkish Cypriot community that had been suppressed by the more powerful Greek community. The ways in which these two sides saw and described these events, the vocabulary and explanations each of them used, reflect something of their respective images of themselves and attitudes towards each other. This

study will try to show how the different, and opposing, self-images and attitudes of the two main communities of Cyprus have been part of the cause of so many tragedies.

In attempting to understand the nature and sources of the intercommunal conflict in Cyprus it is well to begin by setting out, in the form of a brief historical sketch, certain more or less undisputed facts concerning the relations between Greeks and Turks, especially since 1960, when the island became an independent Republic. Certain elements in this sketch will then be highlighted and a number of questions raised. The substance of this study consists of an attempt to answer these questions.

During her 4,000-year recorded history in which she was predominantly inhabited by Greek people, Cyprus was conquered, or otherwise acquired and ruled by several foreign powers in succession. In 1571 she became part of the Ottoman Empire and a limited Turkish settlement followed. In 1879, through the Congress of Berlin, Britain was given the administration of the island, in return for a guarantee to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russian aggression. In 1914 the Ottoman Empire entered the First War on the side of the Central Powers, and Britain annexed Cyprus. The Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 confirmed her new status, and in 1925 she was declared a Crown colony. Cyprus continued under British rule until 16th August 1960, when she achieved her independence under a Republican Constitution.

According to the Constitution, 'the State of Cyprus is an independent and sovereign Republic with a presidential regime, the President being Greek and the Vice-President being Turk elected by the Greek and Turkish Communities of Cyprus respectively. (Article 1). The President was to appoint seven Greek Government ministers, and the Vice-President three Turkish Government ministers. Of the 50 members of the House of Representatives - the legislative body - 70 per cent were to be Greeks, elected by Greek voters, and 30 per cent Turks, elected by Turkish voters. The President and Vice-President had separately and conjointly the power of final veto over legislation, and decisions of the House of Representatives and of the cabinet, on foreign affairs, defence and internal security. Further, all bills imposing duties or taxes required separate simple majorities from the Greek and Turkish Representatives before becoming law.

Two more provisions of the Constitution should be noted. First, all governmental, administrative and state posts, including the Police Force, were to be apportioned, at all levels, on the principle of 70 per cent for the Greeks and 30 per cent for the Turks - except for the 2,000-strong Army in which the ratio would be 60:40. Second, the five main towns of Cyprus would be split into Greek and Turkish municipalities, each empowered to raise its own taxes to finance its own public services.

These two provisions aroused great resentment among the Greeks, who put forward various arguments for refusing to implement them. The Turks retaliated by refusing to pay taxes and using their vote to block financial legislation. The Greeks demanded the removal of those elements in the Constitution which they regarded 'negative', 'unworkable', or 'unjust' - if not with Turkish consent, then unilaterally. In January 1963 Archbishop Makarios, the President of the Republic, abolished the separate municipalities which had existed de facto since 1958, and established unified 'improvement boards' under Government control. The

Turks retorted immediately by setting up municipal councils of their own. Both actions were declared illegal by the Supreme Constitutional Court.

Unrest was building up throughout the year: there were student demonstrations, mysterious bomb explosions, inflammatory speeches and newspaper articles, rumours concerning the formation of armed groups within both communities. Some Greeks demanded not merely changes in the Constitution, but the union of Cyprus with Greece. On the Turkish side there was resistance to Greek demands, and indeed some called for the partition of the island between Turkey and Greece. The Greek and Turkish members of the Government frequently met separately.

In August 1963, President Makarios announced his intention to seek the revision of the Constitution. He solicited international support, particularly among Afro-Asian countries, and it was rumoured that Britain herself would raise no objections to such a move. The Turkish leaders were alarmed, and toured the countryside warning their people to be ready to fight in defence of their rights.

On 30th November 1963 President Makarios put forward a set of 13 proposals for amending the Constitution. Among the proposed changes would be the ending of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential veto, the dropping of the separate majorities requirement in the House, the abandonment of the 70:30 principle in the Civil Service and Police in favour of a ratio which corresponds to the actual proportion of the Greek and Turkish populations, and the establishment of unified municipal councils.

On 16th December, the Government of Turkey rejected the Greek move, and soon after the Turkish Cypriot leadership did the same. Five days later, a small incident sparked off a flare-up and the two communities were fighting each other. The Turkish members of the Government, the House of Representatives, the Civil Service, Police and Army left their posts and withdrew into the Turkish quarters of Nicosia, Famagusta and certain other areas which they turned into armed enclaves. Soon afterwards, thousands of Turks left their homes in Greek or mixed areas and retreated into these enclaves.

In January 1964, Britain called a conference in London, in an attempt to bring about some kind of rapprochement between the Greek and Turkish sides. The Greeks offered the Turkish community a minority status within a unitary state, the Turks demanded the division of the island into a Turkish and a Greek part, and the conference ended in complete failure. In the following few months, violent clashes occurred in various parts of the island, in which armed 'policemen' and irregulars from both sides committed indescribable excesses.

In March 1964 the United Nations sent a Peace-keeping Force to act as observers and defusers of tension. Nevertheless, major and minor fighting continued intermittently until the end of 1967, when Greece and Turkey came to the brink of war. At the beginning of 1968 Archbishop Makarios proclaimed new Presidential elections and asked for a mandate to negotiate with the Turkish side a new constitutional settlement on the basis of an independent, unitary State. He received more than 95 per cent of the Greek votes, and for the next six years talks were being held between representatives of the two communities. Although substantial progress was made, the talks eventually got bogged down on the

question of the relation between the Central Government and the local, community-based administrations. This was the situation on the eve of the coup by the Greek Cypriot National Guard which on 15th July 1974 overthrew (temporarily) President Makarios, and which was followed five days later by the landing of Turkish troops in the island.

These facts would be acknowledged by both the Greek and Turkish sides, although each would put a different interpretation or colouring on many of these. Three points in particular should be highlighted and amplified a little, because they raise important questions concerning the attitudes of the Greeks and Turks towards each other, and the Cypriot State.

(i) An implication of the Constitution, which became disconcertingly clear during the first three years of independence, was that the Greek and Turkish members of the Government and the Legislature were, generally speaking, people who represented the interests of, and were principally responsible to, their own particular communities. Although they were all, in a sense, Cypriot leaders, the very constitutional arrangements under which they reached public office were such that their Greekness or Turkishness were of fundamental importance. In the Civil Service and Police, again, recruitment had to be made partly on criteria of the ethnic identity of the applicants. The Constitution of the independent, integral and unitary Republic of Cyprus was, in effect, the Constitution of a Greek-Cypriot-cum-Turkish-Cypriot State. The two communities were seen as the two sharers of the power, resources and wealth of the State.

(ii) Given the spirit of bicomunal sharing which informs the Constitution it is important to understand the nature and consequences of (a) the 'mechanics' of sharing – the different institutions, structures and other arrangements which aimed at regulating the sharing; and (b) the sheer arithmetic of the share-up. Both these points will need to be looked at later. There is just one simple demographic fact that may as well be stated now. According to the last official census, which was carried out in December 1960, Greek Orthodox made up about 80 per cent of the population, Turks 18.4 per cent, and the tiny Maronite, Armenian, Latin and other communities the rest. For the purposes of elections, job apportionment etc, these tiny minorities are included in the Greek community. In this extended sense, then, the Greek community comprised all the non-Turkish portion of the population of Cyprus, i.e. 81.6 per cent of the total. According to the Demographic Report for 1970, prepared for the Government of Cyprus, despite a continuous population increase the proportion of the Greek and the Turkish communities remained 81.6:18.4.

(iii) Violent intercommunal conflict, with the consequent separation, began when, towards the end of 1963, the Greeks tried to change certain elements in the Constitution which dealt with Greek - Turkish sharing. The Turks resisted the changes in the belief that these constituted an attack on their rights and interests as a community. Within their armed enclaves the Turks eventually set up their own mini-'State', leaving the 'official' State, the one which enjoyed recognition from foreign countries, entirely in the hands of the Greeks. Despite long years of negotiations, the Greek and Turkish sides failed to reach a final agreement on a new Constitution for Cyprus, and so the two communities remained in a state of (imperfect) de facto separation.

These points raise several questions which are crucial to our understanding of the Cyprus conflict. In the following pages, I shall discuss three questions which are variously related to the preceding remarks, and which provide some clues as to the sources of the conflict. My three questions are the following:

(i) Why was the 1960 Constitution framed on the principle that the Cypriot State was the joint property not of all its citizens, but of its two main communities, which were consequently conceived of as the two sharers or partners in the exercise of political power and responsibility, and the distribution of resources and wealth?

(ii) Why did the Greek and Turkish communities not co-operate within the various institutions of the Republic, with the consequence of bringing about the collapse of the constitutional order in December 1963?

(iii) Why was there no settlement achieved between the Greek and Turkish sides, despite arduous negotiations from 1968 to 1974?

To answer these questions it is necessary to make clear how the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus have each conceived of their own national identity: what it means (as a rule, at least) to a Greek Cypriot to be Greek, and to a Turkish Cypriot to be Turkish. It is often inevitable to speak generally of 'Cypriots', or 'the people of Cyprus', but such expressions may be a bit misleading if they suggest 650,000 souls now living in Cyprus form one people, a nation characterized by a sameness of language, culture, religion or political loyalty. If these commonly accepted criteria of nationhood are applied to the people inhabiting Cyprus, they will have to be divided into different national or ethnic groups. The crucial point, however, is that the two main ethnic groups which are to be found in the island are thought of by their members as being not 'self-contained' Cyprus-based nations, but integral parts of larger nations. Traditionally at least, the 80 per cent of the Cypriots have been very conscious of their Greek language, Greek culture and history, and Greek Orthodox religion, and these things make them not Cypriots who just happened to have had Greek origins, but Greeks living in Cyprus, and as such members of the larger Greek nation. Analogously, the 18 per cent have thought of themselves as Turks living in Cyprus, and members of the larger Turkish nation. Thus, although Andreas and Ali may be natives and residents of Cyprus, and regard the island as their common homeland, they do not normally regard themselves as compatriots, but rather as neighbours.

The last sentence should not be misunderstood. Greeks and Turks have many things in common, including a love and pride for their Cypriot homeland. Again, Greeks and Turks may be members of the same local community - until July 1974 there were as many as 48 mixed villages in Cyprus - or professional organizations, or other groups. After all, common loyalties do not have to be based on membership of the same nation, and people cherish friendship and other kinds of relationship even though they may not be compatriots. The point remains, however, that Greekness and Turkishness, even when these characterize people born and bred in Cyprus, constitute different national identities. National consciousness among Cypriots has traditionally been either Greek or Turkish; and the assertion of national consciousness and pride, in other words nationalism, has traditionally been either Greece-orientated or Turkey-orientated. To see why this is so, we must first

understand the character of Greek nationalism itself, as it has developed in Greece; and to gain understanding it is necessary to acquire some minimal familiarity with modern Greek history.

## II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALISM IN CYPRUS UNTIL 1960

### 1. The Growth of the Greek Nation-State and the Great Idea

In 1453 the Ottoman Turks conquered Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, and by 1460 the whole of the Greek mainland had been brought under Ottoman rule. Once the Greek Orthodox Christians had submitted to the Turkish Sultan and agreed to pay tribute, they were recognized, in accordance with Islamic tradition, as a millet or nation. This meant that they were allowed the freedom to retain their ethnic, cultural and religious identity in its manifold manifestations, under the administration of the Greek Orthodox Church. Within the old Byzantine Empire the Church had developed into an official institution of the State; and now, within the Ottoman Empire, it remained the unified institutional structure of the Greek national community. The Oecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople was entrusted with the collection of taxes, and was given detailed jurisdiction, exercised locally through bishops and the lower clergy, over matters relating to marriage, divorce, dowry and inheritance - matters which affected most intimately the daily lives of ordinary people. Thus, the Greeks developed a conception of their own nationhood – in contrast to that of the Turkish soldiers, officials and settlers in their midst - in terms of their language, social institutions and values, customs and traditions, and their Orthodox Christian religion. When in 1571 the Turks conquered Cyprus from her Venetian rulers, they recognised the Archbishop of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church as the head of the Greek Cypriot millet .

In 1821 the Greeks of the Peloponnese, Sterea Hellas and the Aegean Islands revolted against their Ottoman masters. After six years of fighting, and under the protection of Britain, France and Russia, an independent State of Greece was established. The `Greece' of 1827 was roughly half the size of the country we now know, and comprised 700,000 out of 3 million Greeks, the majority of which still living under Ottoman rule. As long as there were Greek lands under foreign domination the struggle of the nation was not over: all `unredeemed' Greeks must be liberated. So, Greeks organized more revolts against their Ottoman rulers, notably in 1880 and 1897.

In the meanwhile, the urban-based Greek establishment developed a cultural orientation towards Greek antiquity. They thought of themselves as direct descendants of Plato, Sophocles, Pheidias, Pericles and Alexander the Great, and heirs to their splendid intellectual, artistic, political and military tradition. The cultivation of the `Hellenic values' - which meant in practice the study of the ancient Greek language and literature, and the history of the nation with a stress put on hero-worship - and the more recent Christian tradition of the Byzantines, formed the content of Greek education; and this, in turn, helped to create a more unified national consciousness.

In 1864 Britain handed the Ionian Islands back to Greece, and in 1881 Thessaly and a part of Epirus were detached from the Ottoman Empire and united with the Greek State. Growing national pride and self-confidence took the form of `the Great Idea', i.e., a belief in the necessity of building up a Greater Greek State `of the two continents and the five seas', to

cover all the Greek-speaking, Christian Orthodox part of the old Byzantine Empire, which was still under the domination of 'the ancestral enemy', the Turks.

Following the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, Greece won from the Ottoman Empire the rest of Epirus, Crete, most of Macedonia and all the Aegean Islands except Imbros and Tenedos which commanded access to the Dardanelles. In 1915 Britain promised Cyprus to Greece if the latter entered the Great War on the side of the Allies, but the pro-German King Constantine I refused, so the offer lapsed. In 1916 the King was forced to abdicate and Greece, under Premier Venizelos, joined the War. After the War and under the Treaty of Sèvres (1920) Greece gained Western and Eastern Thrace, the strategic islands of Imbros and Tenedos, and was entrusted with the administration of Smyrna and a chunk of the Anatolian hinterland. The Turkish General Mustafa Kemal refused to recognize the Treaty and went on to organize an Army to fight the Greeks. In August 1922 the Greek Army was destroyed, and a new Treaty was signed in Lausanne in 1923. Under this Treaty Greece lost Eastern Thrace, Imbros, Tenedos and Anatolia. Further, 1.5 million Greeks living in Asia Minor were forced to leave their homes and go to live in the Greek mainland, whereas 1 million Turks inhabiting Greece were taken to Turkey. The Great Idea, which implied a national struggle against the Turkish oppressors, was crushed by the force of the Turkish national resistance.

During the heyday of the Great Idea the Greeks developed a conception of their national identity which included the following features:

(a) The Greek nation are a people who lived for millenia in their Mediterranean territory. Present-day Greeks are the descendants of the Hellenic heroes Plato, Sophocles, Alexander and the Greek-speaking Christians of Byzantium. They are to be identified not by reference to citizenship of the existing Greek state, but by reference to a distinguished civilisation and language to which they are all the rightful heirs.

(b) The Greek nation is much larger than the modern Greek State. The latter is that part of the Hellenic and Christian Orthodox world which has been liberated from (mostly Ottoman) domination by the sacrifice and heroism of Greek people.

(c) It is the patriotic duty of all 'true' Greeks, to work for the liberation of all historically Greek lands, now inhabited by Greeks under foreign rule. And it is a 'prescription of history' (a meaningless phrase which has enjoyed wide currency among history-conscious Greeks) that all foreign-dominated Greek territory will eventually become united with the free Greek State.

Thus to be a 'true' Greek, one would have to conceive of oneself as a member of a great nation only a part of which having, as yet, been redeemed and organized as a free national State; and further, to believe that this national state must grow steadily until it encompasses the whole of the ancient and Byzantian Hellenic world. Greek children at school were taught extensively their history (or an official version of it), ancient, medieval and modern; and modern history was taught as a record of the gradual fulfilment of national aspirations, mainly by fighting against Ottoman Turkish conquerors. So, by a combination of various historical factors, state-controlled education, propaganda and



political demagogy, Greek nationalism and patriotism came to mean by the 1860s: pride in being a member of a Superior nation, belief in the necessity of extending the boundaries of the Greek State to include all historically Greek lands, and consequently the assertion of the duty to support a just struggle against the Turkish conquerors who have for long held by force sacred national territory.

## **2. The Origins of Greek and Turkish Cypriot Nationalism**

When the British came to Cyprus in July 1878, they found a majority of the population who regarded themselves as Greeks and Christians, and thus different from the minority of about 25 per cent who were Turkish Moslems. The first British High Commissioner, Sir Garnet Wolseley, was welcomed on the Cyprus shores by the Greek leadership, with the 'Ethnarch' Archbishop Sophronios at its head. '... We accept the change of Administration', Sophronios told him 'particularly as we believe that Great Britain will help Cyprus, as she helped the Ionian Islands, to become united with her Mother Greece, with whom she is ethnically linked'. The following day the High Commissioner issued a proclamation in which he assured the Cypriot people of Her Majesty's concern for their economic prosperity and wish to endow them with the benefits of liberty, justice and security.

Under a modernizing, secular British regime, the Church had to make sure that its leadership and spiritual authority was not diminished. It continually reminded its flock that they were of the Greek Orthodox faith, and thus brothers of the mainland liberated Greeks. There was a spiritual union between all Greeks - of which the Greek Orthodox Church was but an expression - and Greek Cypriots would, in justice, have to become united politically too, with their redeemed brothers. The economic reforms which the British promised were not to be allowed to affect the direction of national aspirations.

The call for the union of Cyprus with Greece, 'enosis', was taken up by some members of the educated urban elite. To do so was, in the words of Dr Peter Loizos,

to claim membership in a larger political unit, a nation which had only recently and gloriously fought its way (with European help) to freedom from the very same Ottoman rule which had dominated Cyprus... For Greek Cypriots to have stood alone would have been to stand politically and culturally defenceless; to assert identity with the Greek nation was to invoke a compelling and attractive defence.

The emergent conception of the 'Hellenic-Christian ideals' became the guiding force of Greek education in Cyprus, as it had been in Greece herself.

Under the British, education received a major impetus... The numbers of teachers rose to meet the demand for new schools. In these schools much time was devoted to the teaching of Greek history and language, to the celebration of Greek heroism in 1821, and so inevitably, to the creation of a national identity for Greek Cypriot children. They were socialized by the schools to see themselves as members of the nation of the Greek mainland. Every word of 'proper' Greek they learned to read or write taught them that their own dialect was inferior to educated Greek, and made the new identity more definite. This task also identified the teachers with Greek culture; it was after all their bread and butter.

They were gate-keepers at a point which the rural masses were reaching in ever-increasing numbers. At the gate were a number of signs pointing to 'modernity', 'literacy', 'new jobs', and 'higher status'; 'national identity' was one more such sign acquired through education.

It is impossible in this study to trace the development of Greek education in Cyprus, important as it is for our understanding of Greek Cypriot nationalism. Suffice it to note that from the very beginning Greek education in Cyprus followed faithfully the organization and curricula of the education system in Greece, which concentrated heavily on Greek literature, historical and cultural tradition, and the Orthodox religion. This fact has had a definite formative influence on the kind of language with which Greek Cypriots came later to express their political ideas and discuss the situation of their island. During the intellectually uncomplicated days of British rule there was no other way in which Andreas could answer the question 'What are you?' than by saying, 'I am a Greek - a Greek Orthodox'. To be a Greek Orthodox means to be the same as all the other Greeks living inside or outside the Greek State. His motherland is Greece, the whole of Greece, and (as he was taught) his patriotic duty is to serve the cause of the total liberation and glory of the Greek nation. If this means fighting any occupying force, so it will have to be. Cyprus is one of those lands which, from the dawn of history, have belonged to the Greek people. To be a Greek, aware of one's Greekness, and not to support the union of Cyprus with the free Greek State, is more than just paradoxical; it is an impossibility. A 'true' Greek of Cyprus is, by definition, a supporter of enosis .

This was, at any rate, the official Greek nationalist position, shaped and vigorously asserted by the teachers, the clergy and the educated urban ,lite in speeches, sermons and newspaper articles. The average Greek Cypriot was considered to be politically aware and sophisticated to the extent to which he could assert and defend the case for enosis .

The Greek Orthodox Church maintained its authority and influence throughout the British period, and every parish or village priest, and every lay preacher, became a transmitter of the nationalist message. Further, the establishment of a Legislative Council in 1882 enabled the Greek urban ,lite to make its own contribution to the nationalist leadership, and thus to the organization and articulation of the enosist campaign. The political history of Cyprus during the British period is a record of continual activity - by and large peaceful - on the part of the Greek leadership to promote the cause of enosis , with the much weaker Turkish leadership expressing its opposition.

In May 1889 Archbishop Sophronios and a Greek Cypriot 'parliamentary' deputation went to London to submit a memorandum requesting the end of the œ93,000 annual tribute which Cypriots had to pay, and indicating that 'the population of the island does not forget its origin and traditions, and dares look forward to a national future'. Both issues were politely ignored, but the British Government arranged for Oxford University to grant the Archbishop an honorary Doctorate of Divinity! This, however, was only the beginning of a long and regular sequence of pro- enosis deputations and memoranda.

In the 1900s, the then Bishop of Kition campaigned for the office of Archbishop and Ethnarch on an enosist platform. He called traitors those who collaborated with the British, and promised to get the latter out of Cyprus soon after winning the election . This may be

regarded as the prototype of all future Greek Cypriot electoral campaigns: each candidate claiming to be a genuine and effective supporter of enosis , and the one who can bring about its realization; and making insinuations concerning the honour, dignity and national credentials of his opponents. The demagogical character of Cypriot politics, and the deep emotional appeal of the Greek ideal, made `enosis ' the most abused of all political symbols and an obstacle to a true understanding of political affairs.

In 1903, during the first session of the the Legislative Council, the Greek members tabled a resolution expressing `the will of the Greek Cypriot people to unite with Mother Greece'. Further, they submitted yet another memorandum to the British Government in which they declared: `... If the authorities wished to put to the test the genuineness of the enosis desire, they only had to ask the opinion of the Cypriot people, and would receive as many affirmative answers as there are Greek Cypriots in the island... The Cypriot people are neither dazzled by the riches of the Protecting Power, nor daunted by the poverty of Greece. Their only desire, their only dream, is their union with Mother Greece'.

From the very beginning the Turkish Cypriots, or at least the more sophisticated among them, strongly opposed the idea of enosis . Having lost in 1878 their special privileges, they were now anxious that Cyprus should not be incorporated into the Greek State, whose official ideology, even after 1923, was implicitly anti-Turkish. A series of disturbances between Greek and Turkish groups in 1912, in which 5 people died and 134 were wounded, could not but have increased Turkish fears that as a minority in a Greek State, they would be unable to protect themselves . The Greeks, to their discredit, never made any effort to approach the Turks, to understand their fears and reassure them accordingly. Indeed, they consistently ignored the wishes and views of the Turkish community, and generally looked upon them as a foreign element, the descendants of the Turkish mainlanders who settled in Cyprus after 1571. For the history-conscious Greeks, the presence of the Turks was the result, and a reminder, of a barbaric military conquest and occupation, a sad accident of history, an aberration .

The Turkish leaders failed to make their case widely felt because they lacked the numbers, the sophistication, and the organizing ability of their opponents. There was no institution, for example, among the Turkish Cypriot community corresponding to the Greek Orthodox Church. There were the Turkish members of the Legislative Council whose extra-`parliamentary' activities were mainly confined to watching the Greeks sending their deputations and memoranda to London, and then submitting their own position. Until the early 1950s, the Turkish nationalist position was that should Britain decide to leave Cyprus, then according to the Convention negotiated in 1878 in Berlin, the island should revert to Turkish sovereignty.

The form which the antagonism between Greek and Turkish leaders took before World War II may be illustrated by the functioning of the Legislative Council, established in Cyprus in 1882. The Council - which the Greeks referred to contemptuously as `the Toy Parliament' - consisted of six British colonial officials and twelve elected Cypriot members, three `Moslems' and nine `non-Moslems'. In theory, then, the collective will of the Cypriot people, through their elected representatives, could prevail over the proposals and plans of the colonial Government. In actual practice, however, what tended to happen was that the

Greek members (a curious mixture of lawyers, merchants, money-lenders and bishops) used the Council as a platform for making pro- enosis demands, and this drove the Turkish members to side with the British on all controversial issues. The arithmetic of the situation meant that, as there was frequently an equality of votes for and against given proposals, the High Commissioner or Governor, in his capacity as the President of the Council, used his casting vote for (what was in effect) the British-Turkish bloc. The Greeks demanded on a number of occasions a stronger representation in the Council, in proportion to their numbers. In 1925 the Legislative Council was reconstituted, to comprise 12 elected Greek members, only 3 Turkish members, and 9 British appointees. Once again, the arithmetic was calculated to result in tied votes on all issues involving constitutional changes. This system of half-hearted parliamentary control tended to foster rather than allay ethnic mistrust, and create a feeling that the task of Greek and Turkish politicians was to promote the interests of different and opposing groups of people.

A significant incident happened in October 1931 when, against the background of mounting nationalist demands, a Turkish member of the Legislative Council voted with the Greek members against a taxation proposal made by the Government. The Governor, thereupon, invoked his prerogative to overrule the decision of the Council. This event raised a storm of protest within the Greek community. The Greek members met in secret and one of them, the Bishop of Kition, Nikodemos Mylonas, presented a manifesto which was adopted on 17th October. It is worth quoting an extract from this document because it constitutes a succinct statement of what was to remain (with due alterations) for more than 40 years the enosist position. The dramatic and assertive tone of the manifesto, and its semi-mystical appeal to the Helleno-Christian ideals, were to become characteristic of the speeches with which, a generation later, Archbishop Makarios and his associates rallied the Greek people to the cause of enosis :

... We are determined to follow the only road which is open to us; the road that leads to our salvation. We shall raise the flag of enosis and under its guidance we shall pursue our National Liberation, our Union with Greece. In the name of God, protector of Justice and Freedom; in the name of the Eternal Idea of our Hellenic heritage. Let us obey the voice that guides us from the Sinai of our National Codes.

Spiritually we are all citizens of Free Greece, and we condemn those among us who obey faithfully the Laws of our foreign masters. Let us show our civil disobedience against our oppressors, and let us make every effort to eliminate from our land that which is called the British occupation of Cyprus. United let us struggle together and He, who made man to be free, not slave of others, shall guide our path.

The proclamation of the manifesto sparked off a series of riots throughout the island. Crowds cried out for enosis and burned down Government House and other public buildings. Troops drafted in from Egypt put down the 'October Uprising' within days, and its leaders were banished from Cyprus. A fine of £30,000 was imposed by the British on the 'non-Moslem' population, an event that further identified in Greek minds the Turkish community with the colonial rulers. The Legislative Council was abolished and the Greek nationalist movement came under the exclusive aegis of the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus.

The 1930s and 1940s saw the steady development of working class consciousness in Cyprus. The trade union movement was legalized in 1936, and the Church, keeping up with the times, encouraged the formation of nationalist workers' and farmers' associations to advance the enosis cause. These organizations, however, had to face stiff competition from left-wing trade unions - since 1941 controlled by the Communist Party AKEL - who demonstrated their ability to bargain for better wages and working conditions. For the first time there were, in Cyprus, well-led and effective popular organizations which were not informed with the enosis ideal.

At the end of World War II the British Government communicated its willingness to discuss the constitutional future of Cyprus. In 1946 Archbishop Leontios headed a nationalist deputation to London to seek self-determination leading to enosis ; and in 1947 AKEL sent its own delegation to ask for self-government. At the time when the British-backed Government in Greece was fighting against a communist insurrection, Greek Cypriot leftists were in no mood to become a part of the Greek State.

One might have expected AKEL to come into some sort of understanding with the Turkish Cypriot leaders who vehemently opposed enosis . AKEL did actually include some Turkish members. However, the bulk of Turkish workers and farmers belonged to Turkish trade unions - organized into a single Federation in 1943 - and these felt it to be their patriotic duty to oppose the Communist System which, in a period of Cold War, threatened Mother Turkey.

In May 1948 the British Governor of Cyprus proposed a constitutional plan for limited 'home rule'. The Left rejected it because it fell short of self-government. The Right first accepted it but then, on the instructions of the Church, rejected it. As a student of Cypriot affairs wrote:

The Church felt that the acceptance of the British plan might thwart the Greek Cypriot scheme for enosis. Hence, the Archbishop stated that he would oppose any Government policy which excluded the question of the union of Cyprus with Greece... The Church, refusing to compromise its differences with the Governor, was confident of achieving enosis by leaving no alternative to the British. The churchmen were the political dynamo behind the scheme for enosis and, through their sermons, imbedded the Greek Cypriot hatred towards the British, which became evident in later years.

With constitutional proposals in the air and the British Government appearing relatively flexible, the Turkish Cypriots knew that they had to organize their resistance to Greek demands. Dr Fazıl Küçük set up the Turkish Cypriot Popular Party which gave form and expression to the growing Turkish Cypriot nationalist sentiment. A series of meetings and rallies were organized in the main towns, and in one of these, which took place in Nicosia on 28th November 1948, it was decided to send a telegram to the President and Prime Minister of Turkey stating the following:

Fifteen thousand Turkish Cypriots decided unanimously to reject the Greek demand for the annexation of Cyprus by Greece and for autonomy. They believe that annexation and autonomy would result in the annihilation of the Turkish community.

This demonstration made a great impression, on the Turkish press and youth, who began taking an increasing interest in the affairs of the Turkish Cypriot community .

1948 was also the year in which the most brilliant star of the enosis movement, the youthful Bishop of Kition, Makarios, set up the Ethnarchy Bureau to campaign actively for 'enosis and only enosis'. Anybody who appeared willing to settle for less than complete national redemption was labelled as a traitor. In order to bring moral pressure to bear on the British Government, the Bureau organized an open plebiscite to determine the wishes of the Greek Cypriot people.

On 15th January 1950 - and to the protestations of the Turkish Cypriots and the Government of Turkey - the Greek Cypriot people went to their parish Churches to register their vote. The result was a staggering 95.7 per cent in favour of the union of Cyprus with Greece. Nevertheless, it is not easy to draw any definite conclusions from this event since the population was persistently urged by the nationalists to 'vote', and the 'voting' took the form of signing one's name under a petition in public. If a Greek was to 'vote' on this issue at all, it was as embarrassing and risky for him to 'vote' against enosis as to declare in public that he was not 'a true Greek'. It is certainly wrong to suppose that 95.7 per cent of the Greek population were terribly unhappy under British rule, much less that they were prepared to raise arms against it. The difference between an active and a non-active enosis supporter can be as real as that between a practising and a non-practising Christian. Still, Greek Cypriots in general must have felt that it was undignified for an intellectually and culturally advanced people like them to be colonial subjects, and shameful to accept this condition without protest. So they could not but look to the de facto leaders of the nationalist movement as their spokesmen, whose campaign cry of enosis they could not but reiterate.

Soon after the plebiscite of 1950, Makarios became Archbishop Makarios III and the Ethnarch of the Greek Cypriot people. The year 1950 may be regarded as the ending of one chapter of Cypriot history and the beginning of another. Reviewing the period ending in 1950 the Greek political scientist Pantazis Terlexis wrote the following:

... Despite the multi-national composition of the Cypriot society, the English introduced and managed to apply a relatively tolerable administrative system in the island. Under this system both the Greek and the Turkish communities were able to retain and develop their peculiar cultural features, and also promote their nationalism. The Church, owing to its privileged position within the Greek community, succeeded in leading the nationalist movement. However, its desire for enosis led it to take an intransigent attitude towards every English offer for self-government. The Turkish Cypriots, provoked by the intensity of the enosis movement, eventually succeeded in organizing themselves effectively, and winning the support of Turkey. Thus, the Cyprus question, an intra-Cypriot, intra-state affair, was transformed into an international dispute, bringing into the scene Greece and Turkey - a development which complicated significantly its settlement.

By 1950, then, when the British Government was willing to introduce changes in the constitutional status of Cyprus, there already were two fully-fledged nationalist ideologies in the island: one based on the Greek community and orientated towards Greece, and another

based on the Turkish community and orientated towards Turkey. According to the former, it was a right of the Greek nation to achieve the redemption of the Greek Cypriots by means of enosis . According to the latter, it was a right of the Turkish nation to save the Turkish Cypriots from the consequences of enosis . The absence of any understanding and communication between the two nationalist leaderships was bound eventually to lead to a confrontation.

### **3. The Greek Armed Struggle and Turkish Militancy**

During the period 1950-1959 the Cyprus question developed a number of novel aspects which added to its complexity, and which came to have important consequences for the Zurich-London Agreements and the subsequent Constitution. These aspects will be indicated presently; but first, something must be said about certain traditional forces which continued to operate in this period.

Makarios assumed command of the enosis campaign in 1950 against the background of a long Greek nationalist tradition, a tradition with an organizational and an ideological side to it. (a) The Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus had been, since 1571, the 'national' organization of the Greek Cypriots. The continuous existence of the Church created, or at least maintained, a well-defined Greek Cypriot national community. (b) From the very beginning of the British administration of Cyprus, the Church had been concerned to propagate a Greek nationalist ideology, and on that basis advance the political objective of enosis . Thus, the incumbent of the office of Archbishop-Ethnarch, has for his 'constituency' the Greek Orthodox community of Cyprus; and this makes it extremely difficult for him to establish any positive relationship with the non-Greek, non-Christian people of the island.

As a leader of his people, Archbishop Makarios has always been both a Greek nationalist and a churchman. He controlled the Church, and through Church organizations and funds he extended his control over existing right-wing parties, trade unions, farmers' associations, village clubs, athletic clubs and the teaching community. In 1951 he formed a youth organization, PEON, with a view to spreading a militant kind of nationalism among young Greek Cypriots. The 'politicization', or 'nationalistification' of all forms of association in Cyprus is a phenomenon which continued until after 1959, and indeed, to a decreasing degree, continues to this day.

The novel aspects of the 1950s referred to above can be summarized as follows: the Greek Cypriot and Greek leaders succeeded in making Cyprus an international issue, and this brought Turkey on the scene; the Greek Cypriots began an armed struggle, and this provoked counter-action by the Turkish Cypriots. Thus, the earlier non-violent antagonism between Greek Cypriot enosists and Turkish Cypriot anti-enosists developed into an open dispute between Greece and Turkey in the international field, and a violent intercommunal conflict inside the island. Let us look at these two interconnected dimensions of the Cyprus conflict a little more closely.

From 1950 onwards Archbishop Makarios worked systematically to get the Greek Government directly involved in the enosis campaign, and to take the Cyprus question to the United Nations. The Greek Prime Minister Papagos, having failed to settle the question

peaceably with the British Government, had the Cypriot appeal for self-determination put before the 1954 session of General Assembly. It is worth noting that in the text of the Greek memorandum which was circulated as an official UN document, the expressions 'self-determination' and 'union with Greece' were used indifferently, as if they were synonyms. In fact Greece claimed that (in the words of Papagos) 'Cyprus is Greece herself' - an assertion which laid her open to Turkish accusations of pursuing a policy of annexation .

Following a brief debate in the General Assembly, the question of self-determination for Cyprus was shelved - but not before the Turkish representative expressed Turkey's interest in the island. On 14th December he said, inter alia:

Turkey is primarily concerned with the status of this island because of racial, historical and contractual reasons... Nothing can be deemed to be based on justice and equity unless the co-operation and consent of Turkey is unequivocally obtained; for otherwise... no decision can be lasting... Cyprus is important for the defence of southern Turkey and of the northern Mediterranean in general .

Cyprus, it should be remembered, is 40 miles away from the southern coast of Turkey, and 500 miles from the Greek mainland.

The question of Cyprus was placed by Greece on the UN agenda every year until 1958. An unwanted consequence of Greek diplomatic efforts was to spotlight internationally this question as a Greco-Turco-British dispute.

In Cyprus herself the most important new development was the collaboration of Archbishop Makarios with Colonel George Grivas, an ex-Greek Army officer born in Cyprus. The two men met in 1951 and discussed the possibility of an armed struggle in the island. At first Makarios was pessimistic about the prospects of a guerrilla war, but eventually came to accept Grivas's plans. In 1952 a secret Liberation Committee was formed in Athens, with the object of procuring weapons and explosives for the struggle. The Greek Government made a generous contribution in terms of arms, funds, propaganda work and diplomatic activity. The forthcoming armed struggle in Cyprus was to be the struggle of the whole Greek nation.

It was not until 1st April 1955 that the official launching of the armed struggle took place, with island-wide acts of sabotage against public buildings and installations. On the same day leaflets were distributed all over Cyprus, declaring that a secret organization calling itself EOKA (National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) had embarked on an armed struggle to throw off the English yoke. Despite the fact that nationalist activity had intensified in the previous years, most Greeks were psychologically unprepared for armed struggle and did not quite know how to react. The Communists, on learning that the EOKA leader was the well-known ex-communist baiter Grivas, denounced it. When, however, the British responded with the imposition of corporate fines, searches, arrests and detention, general harassment of the Greek population and the imprisonment and execution of EOKA men, the Greeks found themselves all in the same boat, united in suffering.

Soon this general suffering among them produced another bond: a strengthened conception of a common condition and a common destiny, expressed in terms of the



language already cultivated by nationalist activists. They felt as an as-yet-unredeemed section of the Greek nation which had, at long last, risen in armed struggle to throw off the yoke of the foreign tyrant. When a number of militants were killed or condemned to death by the British, the Greeks of Cyprus felt that they were making their own contribution to the Pantheon of the Greek heroes. They thought of themselves as living one of the finest hours of the Greek nation, to be compared with the national struggles against the Persians, the Turks, the Bulgarians, the Italians and Germans. Freedom from colonial rule, and the union of Cyprus with Greece, appeared to be two aspects of the very same national ideal. The test for true Greekness was definite and unequivocal support for 'enosis and only enosis'. (This point was finally established once a number of 'traitors', i.e. Greeks who failed to toe the nationalist line, were beaten up or assassinated by EOKA men.)

The British diplomatic response to the EOKA insurrection was to invite Greece and Turkey to a conference in London, to discuss 'political and defence questions affecting the Eastern Mediterranean, including Cyprus'. The strategy of the British Government was to change the character of the dispute so that instead of being one between Britain and her Cypriot subjects backed by Greece, it would become a dispute between Greece and Turkey, each championing the rights of her own national community in Cyprus - in which case the principle of self-determination would be rendered inapplicable. Both Turkey and - after much protestation - Greece accepted the invitation, and the conference started in London on 29th August 1955. As Britain had hoped, Greece demanded self-determination; Turkey objected to this on the grounds that it would result in enosis, which would bring Greece to her doorstep and endanger her security; and Britain, having expounded her own strategic interests in the Eastern Mediterranean, proposed a form of limited self-government for the Cypriots - which both Greece and Turkey rejected.

Before the conference ended, violent riots broke out in Istanbul and Smyrna against the Greek population and their properties. (These riots, it was learned some years later, were instigated by the Turkish Government.) Such demonstrations made a great impression on the two Cypriot communities, who began to look at each other with increased suspicion and hostility.

Greek Cypriot militants did not at first harm Turks, or even consider them as a possible obstacle to their struggle. They assumed that once enosis was achieved, the Turkish minority would still be a Turkish minority within a Greek Cyprus, enjoying security and all the other acknowledged minority rights. There were, after all, Turkish communities in other parts of Greece ° in Western Thrace alone there were no less than 120,000 Turks. The Turkish Cypriots, however, were traditionally opposed to enosis, and observing now the demonstrated capacity of the Greeks for violence, became increasingly horrified at the prospect of becoming a helpless minority within an unfriendly Greek State. There is no reason to suppose that Dr Küçük and the other Turkish leaders were willing slaves of the British, or even Anglophiles; but they would rather be under British domination than Greek, 'changing colonial masters for the worse'. So Dr Küçük re-organized his party under the amazing name 'Cyprus is Turkish' and, encouraged by the Turkish Government, he and his colleagues expressed their opposition to enosis through the news media, speeches, publications etc. The original Turkish position was that the British should stay in Cyprus; but if they should leave the island, they should hand it back to Turkey. Later, however, this

position was re-defined as a demand for the partitioning of the island, giving one part to Turkey and another to Greece.

As EOKA hit harder and harder on British military personnel and installations, more and more British jobs were taken away from Greeks and given to Turks. An Auxiliary Police Force was formed, manned entirely by Turks under British officers, whose task was to control Greek riots and help the British Army fight EOKA. British policy served to further polarize the two communities, and in 1957 and 1958 there were many incidents of intercommunal rioting. A Turkish clandestine organization was formed, first named Volkan and later re-named TMT (Turkish Defence Organization). TMT organized riots and assault teams against Greek people and property; and to this Greek Cypriots responded with predictable violence. The Turks later claimed that 100 of their people were killed, and houses in 33 Turkish villages were destroyed, by Greek hands.

In this emergent tangle of forces it is possible to discern certain elements which have had a permanent influence on subsequent political developments in Cyprus.

(a) The Greeks saw themselves as fighting not only for enosis , but against all those who opposed it, who were, once again, the Anglo-Turks. The old image of the Terrible Turk, representing the dark, crude forces which stand in the way of the realization of Greek national rights, was re-activated.

(b) The Turks saw themselves as fighting against Greek 'terrorists' who were trying to bring about enosis and so make the Turks an impotent and unprotected minority in a State dominated by an enemy people. If Greek Cypriots had a right to self-determination, so did the Turks, and what the latter wanted was to have their part of Cyprus incorporated into the Turkish national State. The Turkish slogan 'partition or death' can be seen as the precursor of the demand to have a definite share of the State, if not the territory, of Cyprus.

(c) Greece and Turkey got themselves into the act and soon became the protagonists, with the result that the whole situation changed dramatically. While at the beginning of the EOKA struggle the issue appeared to be the demand of the large majority of Cypriots that their island be united with Greece, soon afterwards it was the two Mother Countries which were laying conflicting claims concerning their national interests. Greece wanted to bring about enosis ; Turkey, after 1956, the partition of the island into a Greek and a Turkish sector. In the context of international conflict the numerical ratio between the Greek and the Turkish populations of Cyprus lost its significance.

#### **4. The Zürich-London Agreements**

As intercommunal conflict and casualties mounted in Cyprus, and as public opinion and passions were aroused in the two Mother Countries, in support of their kith and kin, the south-eastern flank of NATO increasingly lost its efficacy. NATO was seriously concerned with the possibility of a Greco-Turkish war breaking out, and American pressure was brought to bear. Greece and Turkey had to settle their differences in a spirit of conciliation and mutual compromise. Thus, at the NATO conference in Autumn 1958 Greece and Turkey had informal talks about the possibility of 'splitting the difference' between union of the

whole of the island with Greece and territorial partition. The idea of an independent, unitary and integral State of Cyprus, in which power and resources would be shared by the two Cypriot communities, commended itself. On 11th February 1959 a formal Agreement was concluded in Zürich between the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers. Eight days later, at Lancaster House in London, the Agreement was ratified and signed by the Prime Ministers of Britain, Greece and Turkey, and by Archbishop Makarios and Dr Küçük on behalf of the Cypriots. These Agreements formed the basis on which a team of lawyers, Greek, Turkish, and Swiss, later prepared a detailed and elaborate Constitution.

A very important aspect of the Zürich-London Agreements is that the constitutional arrangements under which the Republic of Cyprus would operate were guaranteed by a Treaty between Britain, Greece and Turkey. In the event that the Republic failed to maintain her independence, territorial integrity and security, as well as respect for her Constitution, the three guaranteeing Powers

... undertake to consult together with respect to the representations or measures necessary to ensure observance of those provisions. In so far as common or concerted action may not prove possible, each of the three guaranteeing Powers reserves the right to take action with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty (art. 4).

The existence of the Treaty of Guarantee was to play a decisive role in the relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and indeed between Greece and Turkey.

The precise circumstances under which Makarios came to place his signature on the Zürich-London Agreements are obscured by conflicting accounts. He himself claimed later that he was pressurized by the Greek Government, and was actually warned that in the event in which he refused to sign them he would have to go it alone and face diplomatic isolation. In any case he could hardly press for union with Greece against the advice of the Government of Mother Greece. Besides there were reports at the time that the British Army in Cyprus had tracked down Grivas's hide-out and EOKA was already considerably weakened - so would things be more favourable after, say, another year's armed struggle? However, members of Makarios's entourage, who later became his detractors, insisted that the pressure that the Greek Government had brought to bear on him was not nearly as strong as he later made out; and Mr Averoff, the then Greek Foreign Minister, later denied accusations that he had kept Makarios in the dark as regards the substance of Greco-Turkish negotiations and only at the last moment presented him with the accomplished fact of the Zürich Agreement.

Be that as it may, Makarios returned to Cyprus to declare to a delirious Greek people : 'We have won!' Amidst general jubilation 284 EOKA fighters came out from hiding - a surprisingly small number if one considers that the whole Greek Cypriot community was supposed to have been fighting for enosis - and in the widespread euphoria that immediately followed few people thought of examining the implications of the Constitution, whose broad shape had already been determined in Zürich.

Not long afterwards, however, criticism began to be voiced against the settlement from ardent supporters of enosis, who thought that had the Greeks held out a little longer the

will of the British would have been worn down entirely and they would simply hand Cyprus over to Greece. The resistance of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots was not thought to be a serious obstacle ° such Turkish objections and demonstrations as were observed were considered to have been stage-managed by `perfidious Albion' herself! Indeed, although Greeks ought to have known better, they believed that Turkish Cypriot nationalism was not as genuine and passionate as theirs, but rather the extreme policies of Küçük, Denктаş and a few other Turkish fanatics.

Makarios's position was certainly not helped by the fact that Grivas - now a much-honoured hero in Athens - issued critical statements of the Zürich-London Agreements. The ultra-nationalist right wing began to throw out accusations of a sell-out and Makarios in turn laid the blame for the Agreements at the door of the Greek Government. He was not prepared to defend the settlement as fulfilling the objective of the EOKA struggle, but given the pressure from the Government of Greece, and the threat of possible partition, he felt that the Agreements were the best that could be achieved under the circumstances.

Two things should be clearly noted here. First, those early criticisms came from people who objected to the idea of an independent Republic as such. The full realization that the Constitution of the Republic was a means by which the Government and the resources of the island would, in a very definite way, be shared with their arch-enemies had still to come. Secondly, Makarios displayed no pride or confidence in the new constitutional arrangements, thus suggesting that he regarded the principle of partnership with the Turks to be, at best, a necessary evil. From the Turkish point of view, this was hardly a re-assuring sign that the Greeks wished to co-operate with them in accordance with these arrangements.

At the first Presidential elections of November 1959, the ultra-nationalist Right and the communist Left decided that they disliked each other less than they disliked Makarios, so they combined forces and put forward their own candidate. Following a fierce campaign, in which the exchange of insults and bitter accusations became the characteristic style, Makarios was elected to office with 67 per cent of the vote. Interestingly, when Makarios was denounced by his opponents for having betrayed the cause of enosis , his supporters dared not declare that they themselves had ceased to be passionate believers in enosis . It seemed plain that if Makarios was to retain the leadership of his people he would have to stay a national leader, the Ethnarch, and so at the head of the nationalist movement. This meant that he could not identify himself too closely with the Constitution under which he became the Head of State, and could not allow his ultra-nationalist opponents - who now looked to Grivas for leadership ° to outdo him in the nationalist slogan-game. The President of the independent Republic had to retain the banner of enosis .

In the Turkish community the Zürich-London Agreements were initially greeted with some protest from people who had been enamoured of the partition-or-death line. Soon afterwards, however, a sense of satisfaction prevailed and Dr Küçük was elected Vice-President of the Republic.

## 5. The Greco-Turkish Republic

The setting up of the Republic of Cyprus in August 1960 meant, in practice at least, that a number of Greeks who had led the struggle for enosis, and a number of Turks who had led the resistance to enosis, would come together to collaborate in the running of the State. Such collaboration could not be easy to achieve in view of the recent enmity between EOKA and TMT, and more generally the relationship between the Greek and Turkish communities. Nevertheless, if these people, who were expected to operate the levers of power, had been prepared to throw away their old nationalist hats and think of themselves as Cypriot ministers, legislators or public servants, the chances of success appeared to be very good. Let us see, however, what actually did happen.

When the British left, many of the top jobs in the Civil Service and the Police fell vacant, and many more were created for the needs of the new State. These posts were actually filled by the appointment of people, Greeks and Turks, who had to be rewarded for their work in the Greek and Turkish nationalist movements, so that their loyalties to their respective leaderships could be retained. Thus, in the first years of the Republic there was a situation in which not only were state jobs filled with Cypriots qua members of one or other of the two communities, but also it was understood that many of the occupants of these posts owed their career to their contribution to one or other of the two opposing nationalist movements. It could be said, with little exaggeration, that the composition of the Government, Civil Service and Police Force, at least in the higher echelons, reflected not merely two different communities, but even more, two different nationalist movements. It was common knowledge, for example, that the powerful Minister of the Interior Yeorgadjis, an ex-EOKA leader, created within the Civil Service and Police a complicated network of old EOKA associates. This practice indicated that a successful public or professional career depended, to a greater or lesser extent, on a record of nationalist militancy.

Of course Yeorgadjis's system of patronage could not possibly cover all those who claimed direct or indirect participation in the EOKA struggle and who therefore expected to be rewarded. When the pie had been carved up, there were many who were left out, and who publicly asserted with indignation that their nationalist credentials were as high as, if not higher than, those of the people who now formed the new establishment. So the latter had to respond by publicly defending their militant record to justify the rewards which they were now enjoying.

In Public Service and in other walks of life it mattered tremendously in the early 1960s to be a person with an EOKA record or connections, and one might stand to lose by appearing less than a true nationalist. Thus, many people, especially people in positions of influence, did their best to publicize their nationalist background and convictions. And nationalism at the time meant taking pride in having been an EOKA supporter and identifying oneself passionately with the ideals and objectives of the struggle. Consequently, nobody appeared willing to defend the status of the new State in the Greek community – a fact that the Turks did not fail to notice.

It might have been expected that nationalist feeling would die down after the British left the island and the leaders of EOKA obtained posts in the new State. In actual fact nothing of the

sort happened. On the contrary, for the first time Greek nationalism received open, 'official' expression. On Sundays, and on 'national' occasions, memorial services were held in honour of the dead of the struggle, in which Makarios himself, his Greek ministers and other politicians made patriotic speeches. Streets and squares, social clubs and athletic games were named after EOKA heroes. The Radio and Television put out programmes extolling the heroic exploits of EOKA and the Greek people in general. Makarios and his associates, who now constituted the Greek side of the Cyprus Government were in competition with the Grivasite supporters of the enosis -and-only- enosis line for the position of the continuators to the work of EOKA. To take a typical example, on 1st April 1960, 5« months before assuming formally the office of the President under the Constitution, Makarios declared:

The epic grandeur and glory of EOKA's liberation struggle had laid the foundation-stone of national freedom. This freedom it is our sacred duty to safeguard and complete. National struggles never come to an end. They merely change their form, preserving deep down the same substance and the same content... The realization of our hopes and aspirations is not complete under the Zürich and London Agreements... The glorious liberation struggle, whose fifth anniversary we celebrate today, has secured us advanced bastions and impregnable strongholds for our independence. From these bastions we will continue the struggle to complete victory. There is nothing impossible for man when he works for something and believes in it. Let us therefore work with faith for the future of our country and let us be certain that the task we began five years ago will soon be completed and bear fruit.

Close textual criticism may be out of place as regards this kind of Grand Oratory which the peculiar character of the occasion - an address to commemorate the EOKA anniversary - seemed to demand. Still, it is impossible to avoid the impression that Makarios did not regard the constitutional settlement as final and permanent and that he was looking forward 'to complete victory'. Again, on 16th August, the very day the Republic was inaugurated, he 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... New bastions have been conquered and from these bastions the Greek Cypriots will march on to complete the final victory.

Statements like the above are characteristic of the declarations that the Greek leaders served to cheering Greek crowds, week after week - to the great apprehension of the Turks. It was not a mere matter of the Greek leaders recognizing the fact that they achieved less than what they had fought for. The military imagery of these speeches, their defiant tone and the unmistakable assertion that the struggle was not over, implied that the Greeks were prepared to sink the boat of the Republic in the belief that a more satisfactory Ship of State would take its place.

The general point, then, is that in response to ultra-nationalist criticisms of the constitutional settlement, Makarios and his associates put forward a certain view which carried the support of the vast majority of Greek Cypriots (the Left switched their support to Makarios after the Presidential election). This view was that :

(a) Greek Cypriots were, indeed, an integral part of the Greek nation and their heroic struggle to unite their island with Mother Greece has resulted in partial victory. Enosis is still to be considered by every 'true' Greek as the only 'desirable' end.

(b) Practical realities, however (e.g. foreign pressures), have rendered enosis 'not feasible' at present, and the setting up of an independent Republic was the second best settlement. It should not be forgotten that Turkey had been striving to partition the island and that would mean the permanent impossibility of enosis .

On this 'official' theory, then, there was a certain definite discrepancy between a Greek's conception of his national identity and his conception of the State which he was a citizen of. In fact, the idea of the Cyprus State was, for the passionate believers in enosis , the idea of a partly unsuccessful, or unfulfilled, or even betrayed, national struggle; and some felt uneasy when they saw the flag of the Republic flying over public buildings.

The Turkish Cypriots watched Greek 'internal' politics and political wranglings closely and were trying to maintain their unity in the face of their more powerful partners. They could very well see that the Greeks were far from satisfied with the constitutional settlement and that the desire for enosis was still in the air, encouraged by official Greek policy. Küçük, Denktaş and the other Turkish leaders could not be sure that the Greek side would be prepared to work with them under the rubric of the Constitution even for a period of time. It was a known fact that there were Greeks who had not surrendered their arms after the end of the EOKA struggle and who met regularly in training sessions. So the Turks, while hoping for the best, had to plan for the worst. On two occasions during the interim period between the Zürich-London Agreements and the birth of the Republic, British coastguard vessels had arrested Turkish boats attempting to smuggle into the island large amounts of arms and ammunition. Thus, intercommunal suspicion bred more suspicion, and the Greek and Turkish members of the Government were behaving as leaders of opposing sides.

Like the Greeks, the Turks drew a distinction between their being but an integral part of the Turkish nation, possessing a peculiar national identity and cultural heritage; and their being inhabitants and citizens of Cyprus. They had fought heroically against the attempts of the far larger Greek community to incorporate the whole of the island into the Greek State, and the Constitution was the fruit of their struggle. From the Turkish point of view, Cyprus contained two ethnic groups, each belonging to a different nation, with different languages, religions, cultural traditions and loyalties. These two communities had to work together, through their elected representatives, for their mutual benefit. That the Turkish community was smaller than the Greek community was inessential. What mattered was the binational composition of the population of Cyprus, which was rightly reflected in the bicomunal character of the Constitution. Why should they regard themselves as a Cypriot minority if their partners regarded themselves, not as a Cypriot majority, but quite simply as Greeks and moreover Greeks who refused to identify themselves too closely with the idea of an independent Cypriot State?!

Thus, the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus proudly cherished their different national consciousness; and neither was prepared to display any commitment to that legal

fiction called the Republic of Cyprus. Cyprus was not a nation to which anybody belonged; and the various institutions of the State were not perceived as instruments for ordering and advancing national life, but simply arrangements devised by constitutional experts to enable the Greek and Turkish communities to share power and responsibility for the management of their common affairs.

And so ministers, members of the House of Representatives and civil servants came together to share in the running of the State in accordance with the spirit and provisions of the Constitution (but then not all provisions had been put to effect). It should not be supposed that co-operation was not successful as far as it went . During this period the First Five-Year Plan was prepared and part of the necessary legislation was passed by the Greco-Turkish House of Representatives. Collaboration led in a number of cases to the formation of friendships between Greeks and Turks. But Cypriots in general were conscious of their Greekness or Turkishness - their nationalist leaders never stopped reminding them of that - and their first loyalties went to their own communities and leaderships. Had the State been allowed to operate a few more years it is possible that a deeper affinity and unity of purpose may have developed between Greek and Turkish officials. As it happened, however, Greek and Turkish politicians were leaders of their respective communities, accountable to them alone and responsive to the latter's expectations of them to be nationalistic and assertive. Cyprus in 1960 had two separate nationalities, and two opposing nationalisms. She had a Constitution which supposedly provided for a unitary, integrated State to be operated by Greeks and Turks. In fact the Constitution, or some of its provisions at any rate, gave the appearance of a system of bilateral agreements regulating the relations between the two communities, each with a different conception of its own identity and interests. And the single cabinet room, and the united House of Representatives, were to become shortly places in which the leaders of the two communities laid competing, and then antagonistic demands.



### III. ETHNIC CONFLICT WITHIN THE CYPRIOT STATE, 1960-1963

#### 1. The Sharing of the Civil Service

Soon after the setting up of the Republic, arguments developed between the Greek and Turkish leaders - now members of the same Government and legislative body. The Turks insisted on the speedy implementation of those constitutional provisions relating to job apportionment according to the principle of 70:30, and the establishment of separate Greek and Turkish municipalities and town councils. There was also a third point of dispute which, however, was not important in the long run (but it says something about Greek and Turkish attitudes). According to the Constitution there would have to be an Army of 1,200 Greeks and 800 Turks. By the time a few hundreds were recruited, Küçük claimed that the men ought to be organized into ethnic units, whereas Makarios insisted that they should all be integrated. Küçük vetoed legislation for the formation of mixed units, so recruitment came to a halt. The job-apportionment and the separate municipalities issues, together with the question of the Turkish veto, were the biggest bones of contention, and the manner in which they led to the disintegration of the Greco-Turkish State shows the specific forms which Turkish nationalism took during the period 1960-1963. It is, thus, important to reach some understanding of these controversial issues.

When the Zürich and London Agreements were made public, back in 1959, ordinary Cypriots found them so complicated that they could not grasp their full significance and consequences. It was plain, of course, to all Greeks that enosis was not to happen ° the Turks had made that impossible. Still Cyprus would no longer be a colony of the British - EOKA forced them to leave - and the Greeks could hardly imagine that it wasn't themselves who would be doing the running of what had always been, after all, a Greek island. Indeed, hadn't Makarios told them, on being President, that `for the first time in eight centuries the Government of the island passed into Greek hands'?

It was only gradually, and following the shouting of Makarios's ultra-nationalist opponents, that the Greek public began to realize what their relations to the Turks would have to be under the Constitution. Not only had the Turks cost them the loss of enosis, not only would they be an effective element in the exercise of power and the manning of the various state institutions, but their share of the cake would be disproportionately large in relation to their numerical strength. The Turkish community (or `minority') constituted 18.4 per cent of the total population, and the other 81.6 per cent made up the Greek community. The fact that there were 3 Turkish Ministers in a Council of 10, and 15 Turkish Representatives in a House of 50 means, quite simply, that the Turks were over-represented in the executive and legislative branches of Government.

Further, if the 70:30 ratio were to be applied in all departments and grades in the Civil Service and Police, it would mean that (even given the composition of these bodies which in 1960 contained 22-24 per cent Turks), by the Law of Averages a Turkish candidate for appointment or promotion would be almost bound to be preferred to a Greek. For the Turks to have a share in the exercise of power and influence within the state institutions was one thing; to have more than a fair share is a different, and a totally unacceptable, thing.

It thus came to be widely believed among Greek Cypriots that the Constitution favoured the Turkish minority at their expense. Given the fact that the Constitution was never put to the test of popular opinion, but was 'imposed' by foreign powers on Greek Cypriots, the latter felt that they could not be automatically bound to accept all its provisions, fair or unfair.

It appears the Greek leaders thought that once the British were out, the Turks could be made, by persuasion, bribery or the application of economic pressures, to relinquish their more offensive privileges. The Turks possessed considerably less than 18 per cent of the wealth in Cyprus, and their contribution to public expenditure was estimated to be about 7.6 per cent. Could this minority survive and prosper without the co-operation and the good will of the Greek majority? But the good will of the Greeks would have to be exchanged by the Turks recognizing the necessity for reasonable changes in the Constitution.

When the Turkish leaders demanded the implementation of the 70:30 principle in the Civil Service, the Greek leaders knew that they had to resist now. This was one of the more manifestly unfair and offensive provisions, and a start had to be made immediately in pressing for changes in certain parts of the Constitution before they were applied. So the Greek side publicly argued that:

(a) in the name of justice the Turks should agree to the abandonment of the 70:30 principle in job-apportionment, or at least accept its replacement by a 80:20 ratio.

(b) in any case, there just were not enough qualified Turkish candidates to fill 30 per cent of the state posts.

The latter point, no less than the former, was widely believed by Greeks, partly no doubt because their leaders said so, but also because it accorded with their unflattering view of the Turks. The latter were thought of as generally lacking in culture, intelligence and education - they were certainly not comparable to the Greeks in these respects - so how could they raise a sufficiently large number of qualified and competent men to fill 30 per cent of all posts? The Turks, on the other hand, denied Greek claims and asserted that Turkish candidates were passed over even when they were fully qualified; so the Greek motive was to deny them their constitutional rights.

The truth on this question is difficult to establish. The fact is that the Turkish community was, in 1960, a far from wealthy group of about 104,000 people, and it is easier to accept, than reject, the claim that they did not include enough people with secondary and higher education to fill 30 per cent of the middle and senior posts in the Civil Service and Police. On the other hand it must be said that in the years immediately following independence it is known that many Greeks got jobs and promotions in the Civil Service and Police with qualifications little better than an EOKA record or connections.

But what about the more fundamental question of whether the Turks ought not, in the name of justice, to agree to the replacement of the 70:30 principle by a fairer one. So the principle was contained in the Constitution - but are Constitutions sacrosanct or incorrigible? Indeed, if a Constitution is foisted on a people without testing it against the

opinions of those whose corporate life it would regulate, it is surely, from the point of view of its moral authority, suspect. Why did the Turks refuse to discuss amending the Constitution on those points which the Greeks regarded unjust?

One possible answer is that the Turks simply liked the Constitution the way it was; it suited them. Another is that they did not want to allow a precedent of constitutional amendment because then who knows what the Greeks will think of proposing next. Their minds were still set on enosis, and predictably they were resisting the implementation of the separate municipalities provision, concerning which (as will be explained in a moment) the Turks felt very strongly. Still, can it be denied that if the 18.4 per cent of a population are allotted 30 per cent of all posts in the Government, the Legislature, the Civil Service and Police, they get more than a fair share? The general line which the Turks adopted in publicly defending their privileges was that Cyprus was composed by two different communities or peoples, and it is this fact that mattered most and not the precise numerical ratio. The smaller community, precisely because it was smaller and more vulnerable, should have certain explicit constitutional guarantees that it will have a significant role to play in the running of the bicomunal State, and that it will not be ignored by the larger community.

This, of course, is not the sort of argument which was likely to remove from the Greek soul the conviction that they had been doubly wronged. They could hardly have missed the point that the Turks regarded themselves as forming a separate entity with its own peculiar interests and ambitions, and they were just trying to get as much as possible from that legal arrangement called the Republic of Cyprus. Of course, the relationship between the Greek and the Turkish communities had been, for a number of years, one of competition and antagonism; and even questions of justice were discussed by them against the background of entirely different assumptions ('Greek island with a Turkish minority' and 'two communities setting up a Republican State').

And so, since the Turkish community had obtained, through the Zürich-London Agreements and the subsequent Constitution, certain special privileges, they were simply unwilling to give them up. This point was stated with unusual bluntness by the Turkish leader Mr Denктаş (in, of all things, a Rotary Club luncheon in Nicosia) as follows

... As you cannot make a child grow smaller, once you give certain social and political rights to a community you can't take them away!... The Turkish community was accepted as a partner in the creation of the Republic of Cyprus. Its contribution to this Republic is 20 per cent, but its partnership right in protecting its sovereignty, its territorial integrity is on equal basis. In other words, it is our island, it is our Republic and we are 20 per cent in it and we have 20 per cent share in it. But it is ours and you can't take it from us, as we can't take your share away from you! These are the two equals; whatever we say on equality in this respect... what we mean is, 'please do not take my right away'. You may argue that this right is unjustified. But we say that this is past argument. We have created the Republic of Cyprus. That is a reality. It has to be accepted .

## 2. Separate Municipalities

It is possible that the Turks could be persuaded to change the 70:30 ratio to 80:20 in exchange for other benefits and safeguards of their interests. (At the intercommunal negotiations that began in June 1968 the Turks agreed to this change). The trouble is that this demand was put forward by the Greeks together with another demand which the Turks could not be expected to accept: to amend the constitutional provision relating to separate municipalities. In the five main towns of Cyprus there are Greek and Turkish inhabitants broadly concentrated in different areas. As was indicated earlier, the Constitution stipulated that these towns were to be split into Greek and Turkish municipalities, under 'ethnic' town councils, each with its own powers to raise taxes from its local community to finance refuse disposal, street lighting and some other public services. The Greek argument was that to implement this provision would mean to needlessly duplicate public services, the staff and the costs required to maintain them, and needlessly complicate local administration and the legislation which it would have to operate under. So there ought to be unified municipal councils (with a Greek majority).

There is considerable weight to this argument; but then its validity was not the main motive behind the Greek move for amending the Constitution. When it dawned on the Greeks that the Turks were given the power to control not only state functions, but parts of the territory of the island, the old fear of partition was aroused. After all, one of the main reasons put forward in justification of Makarios's signing the London Agreements was precisely that some settlement had to be made soon because American pressure was working towards the direction of territorial partition of Cyprus. To permit the partition of Cyprus was, to the Greek mind, to commit the worst possible national sin. It was imperative to maintain the whole of Cyprus as an integral unit, whatever the cost, so that one day even in the remote future, she could become incorporated into the Greek State. One of the clear implications of Greek nationalism, then, was to prevent the establishment of any Turkish-controlled areas on the island, especially as such areas could become, before long, the colonies of mainland Turkey.

Most probably the Greeks exaggerated the similarities between allowing separate Turkish municipalities and having the island actually partitioned. To have certain areas under weak Turkish local authorities, however unwise it may be on administrative, economic or legal grounds, does not imply the creation of a 'state within a state' even when these authorities are linked together under the umbrella of the Vice-President. However it is important to realize that the ultra-nationalist opponents of Makarios were shouting that the national struggle of EOKA aimed at nothing less than enosis and Makarios had betrayed the great cause; and Makarios and his supporters could only respond on the basis of the same nationalist premises and assert that the ultimate aim is still the same, but the Zürich-London Agreements had to be endorsed to forestall partition. So, how could it now be permitted to have the Turks controlling specific portions of Cypriot territory? On the Greek logic, Cyprus is a Greek island, and the Republic of Cyprus a Greek-dominated State; and any Turkish municipalities would amount to a Turkish 'state' within the official (and Greek-dominated) State. Of course, if it were accepted that the official Republic is a bicomunal, Greco-Turkish State, then the existence of Turkish-controlled municipalities would be no more of an aberration than the existence of Greek-controlled municipalities.

But the Greeks perceived the situation through Greek eyes and through the concepts that had evolved in the long course of their nationalist movement. And besides, in the years just after the EOKA struggle the Greek leaders were very proud of and confident in their ability to bring about the fulfillment of their nationalist aspirations. The struggle, as Makarios said repeatedly, was not over, and the Turks would not be allowed to close for good the door to enosis. Whatever the contents of the London Agreements or the Constitution, the fact remains (so the Greeks thought) that the Turkish leaders had no legitimate right to keep a Greek island away from her Mother Country. They were just a bunch of greedy and insolent men who were aroused into a nationalist frenzy by Britain and Turkey (the latter to divert the attention of her populace away from their internal problems); and at the end Messrs Küçük, Denktaş et al. would have to give in to Greek demands for constitutional amendments.

The tenacity of the Turks, and their passionate belief in what they regarded as their inalienable rights, were things that the Greeks never properly appreciated. Küçük and his colleagues could read the signs that the larger community and their leaders were not prepared to shed their Greek colours and their aspirations for enosis (even though enosis, together with partition, was ruled out by the Constitution). This meant that unless the Turkish community maintained an overwhelming control over the main Turkish areas, which in this case would have to be clearly marked out, they would remain perpetually an archipelago of neighbourhoods, townships and villages within a Greek sea; and, that would be tantamount to allowing themselves to lose their separate communal status and become dominated by the Greek community. And when that happened, the union of the whole of Cyprus with Greece would be only one step away. This the Turks would not have, and they were determined to stand by the separate municipalities and all the other provisions of the Constitution, which was guaranteed by Mother Turkey.

Makarios resisted Turkish separatist demands by continually emphasizing those aspects of the Constitution which assert the sovereign and unitary character of the Cypriot State. But the Turks knew that if the spirit and letter of the Constitution were to be fully applied, they would be able to develop a separate focus of power and loyalty for their community. It can hardly be denied that the Constitution makes some kind of 'separatism' a central feature of the Cypriot State, and this feature the Turks wanted to maintain at all costs. Clearly, what they wanted was not simply a generous share of the power and wealth of Cyprus, but also decisive control over certain areas of Cyprus. It would be an interesting hypothetical question to consider whether the Turks might have been prepared to compromise, to some extent at least, their separatism if the Greeks were prepared to abandon, or play down, their own unionist aspirations. One cannot know the answer to this question, but a sensible guess would be yes. It has been noted earlier that Turkish nationalism, in its separatist form, developed as a reaction to Greek demands for the union of the whole Cyprus with Greece.

### **3. Separate Majorities**

Be that as it may, the Greeks would not implement the separate municipalities provision of the Constitution, and in retaliation the Turks stopped paying rates and used their vote in the House of Representatives to reject all financial measures proposed by ministers. This

brought to the fore the whole question of the separate majorities provision - and the veto powers of the Vice-President. These two features of the mechanism of power-sharing were felt by Greeks to be the most infuriating and humiliating aspects of the Constitution. They felt that the framers of their Constitution had denied them the most fundamental element of any democratic machinery - majority rule. How can it be accepted, it was argued, that the 18.4 per cent of the population should have collectively such powers as to control and blackmail the 81.6 per cent majority? Why, it is possible under the Constitution for a bill to receive the approval of all 35 Greek members of the House and also of 7 out of 15 Turkish members, and yet for this bill to be rejected. Indeed, in this kind of situation a slim majority of the Representatives of the 18.4 per cent community has the power to frustrate the wishes of everybody else. And the Vice-President, who may be elected by a slim majority of Turkish votes, has the power of veto in foreign affairs, defence and security over decisions taken by the whole of the House or the cabinet. Is this democracy? If the Greek people of Cyprus in their vast majority are not to be the masters of their own house, what is to become of the universally accepted principle of self-determination? Is Cyprus not an independent and sovereign State and a member of the United Nations Organisation? Surely the whole world will acknowledge that Cyprus must gain 'unfettered self-determination'. And so, 'unfettered self-determination' became the newest Greek campaign-cry, and was given a prominent position in the Greek armoury of slogans.

It might be thought that this hopeless confusion of issues was the result of the confused and increasingly agitated atmosphere that developed in Cyprus in 1962-3. This was certainly part of the explanation, but there was another reason too. To put the matter crudely (but it will be elaborated later), the Greeks still wanted enosis, but were stuck with a Constitution which (a) expressly ruled enosis out; (b) gave the Turkish minority rights and privileges far in excess of those recognized by the UN Charter: an over-generous share of the State structure, plus powers to resist the wishes of the Greek majority; and (c) gave Turkey, as one of the Guarantor Powers, the right to intervene, should the constitutional order be destroyed. The Greek strategy was to express their demands for radically revising the Constitution in terms which the international community understood and approved of. So the Turkish privileges would be presented as contravening the principle of self-determination, and Turkey's threats to intervene would be denounced on the grounds that the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus must be respected.

The Turkish answer to the 'unfettered self-determination' argument starts from the premise that Cyprus is inhabited by two communities, each with its own distinctive national identity, culture and interests, and these communities are the joint founders and owners of the Republican State. From this point of view, then, Cyprus is not one united people whose 'general will' is to find expression in a united Government and Legislature. Cyprus has a population composed of two peoples, with two different general wills, which must somehow be accommodated to one system of political institutions. So, the principle of majority rule cannot be applied in the case of the Cypriot State in the same straightforward way in which it is applied in France, Sweden and other countries in which nationhood and statehood are co-extensive concepts. Cyprus extends over two national units, two ethnic 'selves' and so there should be two self-determinations: and this means either territorial partition, or a unified State in which executive and legislative power is vested in the democratically elected leaders and representatives of the two partner communities. Had

the smaller community no access to veto powers and other constitutional safeguards, the larger and stronger community would have unilaterally changed any article of the Constitution they did not fancy, and eventually the whole constitutional status of Cyprus itself. The Turks are not to be seen as a mere minority in a Greek Cypriot State, but one of the two constituents of a bicomunal Cypriot State. So they need to have enough power to maintain their partnership status.

It is not the purpose of this study to examine the logical merits and weakness of the Greek and Turkish positions, as these were put forward during the tense years of the Greco-Turkish State. The purpose is rather to show that the difficulties and eventual breakdown of this State was as much of a consequence of conflicting wishes and passions, as of conflicting systems of ideas and attitudes. Without nationalist ideas there is no nationalist feeling; and to understand the states of feeling within the Greek and Turkish communities at that period and after, it is necessary to understand those ideas, attitudes, values and ideological doctrines which formed the content of the rival Greek and Turkish nationalist traditions.

#### **4. Separatist Constitution**

It could be argued that the framers of the Constitution had unwisely accepted the separate existence of the two communities, with different nationalist and cultural traditions and competing interests, as a 'given' and 'immutable' factor, and proceeded to erect a constitutional edifice on the assumption that the two communities would have to develop in future as separate entities. In other words, it might be said, that the Constitution, far from attempting to bring the two communities together, perpetuated their separateness by setting up structures and institutions to represent two sets of interests - Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot - instead of a united Cypriot set. As was maintained by a recent critic,

the whole of the 1960 Constitution is permeated with the rather naive belief that communal suspicion can only disappear through the multiplication of structures and countless awkwardly interacting mechanisms. As a result, redundant structures were created simply for distribution between the two communities. The 1960 Constitution... is weighed down by checks and balances, procedural and substantive guarantees and prohibitions. Constitutionalism had, indeed, run riot in harness with communalism. It is hardly surprising that the application of the rigid provisions of these unique constitutional arrangements proved unworkable .

That the Constitution was 'unworkable' is a proposition which the Greek Cypriot public at large learned to regurgitate. Of course some of its 'unworkable' provisions were not given a chance to work. It may be noted, in passing, that Dr Ernst Forsthoff, the ex-Professor of Heidelberg University who became the 'neutral' President of the Constitutional Court of Cyprus, publicly stated that the Constitution was not by its nature unworkable:

Every constitution can have its peculiar problems. There is no constitution in the world which has not got its particular problems and difficulties. This is primarily a question of good will. If there is good will a constitution can be implemented, and the Constitution [of Cyprus] is capable of being implemented.

Another observer remarked that

Whatever its defects, the Constitution did correspond to the actual state of affairs on the island, where each ethnic community lived separately within the major towns, worked in separate enterprises, and conducted its daily life within the confines of its own group. A disinterested observer may find the Constitution excessively detailed and uncertain on such basic points as the protection of Turkish Cypriot rights; yet the Constitution might have worked, despite the limitations its drafting imposed, had the two communities shown a greater willingness to cooperate with each other .

It must be remembered that the Constitution was, in its origin and conception, a little like a peace treaty - and an attempt to bring about peace, and hopefully co-operation and good will, between two sides: Greece and the Greek community of Cyprus, and Turkey and the Turkish community of Cyprus. The Republic was established in 1960 against a background of fear, suspicion and ill feeling between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Those who led the State, the Greek and Turkish nationalist leaders, made no serious effort to change the traditional self-images of their respective peoples ('we are children of Greece struggling for our national liberation against all odds'; 'we are children of Turkey, fighting heroically against those who wish to subjugate us'). Indeed, frequently the leaders encouraged mistrust and aggressiveness and contempt towards the other side by speeches and practical example. It has been explained that the individuals who made up the Greek and Turkish components of the Government continued to perceive their role, task and objectives in terms of the ideologies that directed the pre-1960 Greek and Turkish nationalist movements. The Constitution represented a set of arrangements which fell short of enosis , and short of a Greek-dominated independent State. This fact alone was sufficient to make nationalist Greek leaders, and their obedient community, unwilling to make the Constitution work - it had to be changed. The reasons and motives behind Greek calls for constitutional changes were in themselves sufficient to make Turkish leaders, and their obedient community, to stand resolutely against changes. Whatever the particular virtues and weaknesses of the Cyprus Constitution, in the political climate that prevailed in the early 1960s it was bound to fail to work.



## **IV. CONFLICT BETWEEN THE STATES OF CYPRUS, 1963-1974**

### **1. The Greek State and the Turkish 'State' of Cyprus**

At the beginning of this study I have outlined the circumstances under which the intercommunal fighting broke out in December 1963, thus bringing about the collapse of the unitary Greco-Turkish State of Cyprus. Within the armed enclaves which the Turks created, a system of political, administrative, judicial, social and other institutions was set up, which eventually took almost all the organic characteristics of a small state. The Greeks, of course, refused to recognize it, and the Turks did not ask for recognition from other countries, if only because they knew they would not get it. But although it lacked the name of a state, what the Turkish Cypriots created was in essence a small national state, existing within defended borders, with its own Government (called after December 1967 the Turkish Cypriot Administration) public services, and even luxuries like a Football Federation and a Scouting Movement. Dr Küçük headed the Turkish Cypriot Administration until February 1973, when he was succeeded by Mr Rauf Denktaş.

The 'official' State of Cyprus was now left entirely in Greek hands and Makarios and his all-Greek Government continued to be recognized by foreign countries and international organizations as the Government of the Republic. The all-Greek House of Representatives continued to pass laws under the 1960 Constitution - with some of its provisions changed or ignored - laws which were enforced throughout the territory of the Republic except for the Turkish 'no go' areas.

The position of the Turkish population in Greek-controlled territory - and considerable numbers remained there until July 1974 - was rather ambiguous. They were subject to the jurisdiction of Greek Cypriot authorities and laws, but they also recognized the authority of, and gave allegiance to, those institutions that operated in the Turkish areas; for example all Turkish Cypriot young men, wherever they may have lived, served in the Turkish Cypriot conscript Army. Besides, these Turkish inhabitants of Greek-controlled areas could not vote in the elections for the Presidency and the 'Greek' House of Representatives, or apply for a post in the 'Greek' Civil Service or Police (but they had such rights with regard to similar institutions created in the Turkish-controlled areas). These people, then, did not have full citizenship rights in the official Greek-run State, so all Turkish Cypriots, in whatever part of Cyprus they may have lived, identified themselves with, and supported, the 'unofficial' Turkish-run quasi-State. From December 1963 onwards, the conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots must be understood in terms of the relationship between two independent systems of formal institutions which claimed to express the national identity, will and interests of the two Communities. Indeed, most of the actual fighting that occurred sporadically until November 1967 was carried out by regular armies belonging to the two national States of Cyprus, the 'official' and 'unofficial'.

In February 1968 - at the time when an uneasy peace prevailed under the worried eyes of UN observers and troops - Makarios obtained thorough new Presidential elections a (Greek) popular mandate to negotiate with 'the cohabitant element' a settlement for a new unitary State. Since June 1968, representatives of the two sides met regularly in an effort to arrive

at a new constitutional arrangement. As was said earlier, substantial progress was made on many issues, but the thorny question of the jurisdiction and powers of the local administrations was not finally resolved. So on the eve of the military coup which temporarily toppled President Makarios there were in Cyprus two power poles, representing two separate political and economic organizations, existing on separate territorial bases.

It is impossible in this limited study to give a comprehensive account of the relationship between the two Cypriot communities and States. What I wish to illuminate in this section are the different forms which Greek and Turkish nationalisms have taken in the last decade, under conditions of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot 'national' statehood.

After 21st December 1963, very much more than before then, Greek and Turkish nationalisms became matters of official policy and inspiration. The Greek and Turkish leaderships needed to arouse and rally their communities around them, and win the sympathy of foreign press and international public opinion. Thus, the Greek and Turkish radio stations, newspapers, politicians and speech-makers plunged into a passionate and vicious propaganda war, attributing evil motives and the worst faith to the opposite side, and especially the opposite side's leaders. The image of the Turks which the Greek side cultivated (consciously or unconsciously) was either that they were a minority of greedy people who, owing to an Anglo-Turkish conspiracy, obtained a Constitution that gave them super-privileges at the expense of the Greek majority and resorted to armed rebellion when the Greeks made a firm stand on their legitimate democratic rights; or alternatively (and a little more generously) that they were basically plain and sensible, if uncultivated, folk, who were the victims of an evil and self-seeking leadership that would send them to their own destruction.

On the Turkish side the Greeks were presented and viewed as an unscrupulous and violent people, a part of the Greek nation that had long been the opponents of the Turkish nation, and who, in their pursuit of enosis, used cunning and force to break up the established constitutional arrangements, and all that these implied in terms of co-operation - and peaceful co-existence.

From inside their armed enclaves the Turkish Cypriots developed a theory - the joint product of official policy and popular belief - that they could no longer entrust their safety to Greeks and it was therefore even more important that it had seemed earlier that they should live in separate areas, governed and policed by themselves. As if to prove their point the Turkish leadership exerted pressure on many Turks living in Greek areas to leave their homes and properties and come to the Turkish enclaves to live as refugees. The Greek side got hold of, and published, an official Turkish document which stated that 'a fine of £25 or other severe punishment, and one month's imprisonment or whipping' would be imposed on Turks residing in the enclaves who entered Greek areas without special permit, or who did so (permit or no permit) for the purpose of visiting Greek Courts, hospitals and other State institutions, or for business with Greeks, or friendly association with Greeks, or for promenade, or amusement. U Thant, in a report presented to the UN on 11th March 1965 stated that:

The Turkish Cypriot policy of self-isolation has led the community in the opposite direction from normality. The community leadership discourages the Turkish Cypriot population from engaging in personal, commercial or other contacts with their Greek Cypriot compatriots, from applying to Government offices in administrative matters or from resettling in their home villages if they are refugees.

So, whereas Turkish nationalist propaganda claimed that Turks cannot live in safety in the midst of the Greek community, Greek propaganda countered that by saying that Greeks and Turks had always lived together in peace and they would be doing so now if it was not for the separatist designs of the evil Turkish leadership. The Turkish leaders, however, and their propaganda machine got a godsend in the form of the publication in the Greek pro-Grivas newspaper *Patris* (issue of 21st April 1966) of a top secret document which in their view showed the Greek Cypriot leadership in their true light. This was the famous Akritas Plan, drawn up by the Greek Cypriot leaders and Greek Army officers in 1963. According to *Patris* - whose professed intention was to expose the mishandling of the Greek 'national cause' by Makarios and his associates - the Archbishop set up a secret organization and appointed the Minister of the Interior Yeorgadjis as its head, under the nom de guerre of Chief Akritas. The document itself states at the beginning that 'as the final objective [of our organization] remains unchanged, what must be dwelt upon is the method to be employed towards attaining that objective'. In fact the content of the Akritas Plan consists of the exposition of a method by which enosis is to be pursued. The rationale behind the chosen method is presented in the following words:

It is obvious that today international public opinion is against any form of oppression, especially of minorities. The Turks have so far been able to convince world public opinion that the union of Cyprus with Greece will amount to their enslavement. Under these circumstances we stand a good chance of success in influencing international public opinion if we base our struggle not on enosis but on self-determination. But in order to be able to exercise the right of self-determination fully and without hindrance we must first get rid of the Agreements (i.e. the Treaty of Guarantee, the Treaty of Alliance etc) and of those provisions of the Constitution which inhibit the free and unbridled expression of the will of the people and which carry dangers of external interference. For this reason our first target has been the Treaty of Guarantee, which is the first Agreement to be cited as not being recognized by the Greek Cypriots. When the Treaty of Guarantee is removed, no legal or moral force will remain to obstruct us in determining our future through a plebiscite.

The actual procedure to be followed is, briefly: First create the impression in the international field that the Cyprus problem has not been solved, and consequently the Zürich-London Agreements and Constitution will have to be reviewed. Then put forward proposals which seem reasonable and justified.

It is evident that for intervention [from Turkey] to be justified there must be more serious reason and more immediate danger than constitutional amendments... In case of a planned or unplanned attack by the Turks, whether this is staged or not, it is necessary to suppress this forcefully in the shortest possible time, since, if we manage to become the masters of the situation within a day or two, outside intervention would not be possible, probable or justifiable.

It should be noted that the Akritas Plan was never disclaimed by Makarios or the other Greek leaders. And although the Plan was abandoned after the first intercommunal fighting – when the Greeks failed to become masters of the situation ‘within a day or two’ - Makarios continued to proclaim that (to take for example the statement he made to the London ITN on 15th June 1966):

The demand for enosis is based on the democratic principle of self-determination... enosis is a right of the people.

Earlier, in April 1965, he rejected the recommendation of the UN Mediator in Cyprus that the exercise of self-determination should be short of enosis . After all, the point of relegating the Turkish community to the status of a minority and invoking the full application of the principle of self-determination was none other than achieving enosis .

## **2. The Turkish Cypriot Nationalist Position**

To understand the nature of the official Turkish Cypriot nationalist position after 1963 it is necessary to see what the Turkish leaders had learned, or thought they had learned, from their years of ‘partnership’ and their study of the Akritas Plan. First of all it is impossible to resist the conclusion that Makarios and the other Greek leaders never honestly intended to co-operate with the Turkish leaders under a bicomunal type of Constitution, let alone be satisfied with a mere 13 amendments of the 1960 Constitution. As the Akritas Plan makes it clear, the demand for ‘reasonable’ amendments would be only the first step of reducing the Turkish community to the status of a mere minority unable to effectively control the will of the Greek majority. Once this was achieved, and the Treaty of Guarantee nullified, there would be nothing stopping the Greek leadership from appealing to the principle of self-determination, which means in the context of Cyprus that a monolithic majority of Greeks can decide for a monolithic minority of Turks too, and proclaim enosis . Further (as the Turks saw it) the Greeks believed that the objective of enosis justified, if necessary, the use of violent means. These considerations have influenced the shape of the Turkish position in the following ways :

(i) Any new agreements that may be reached with the Greeks must definitely and unequivocally exclude enosis . Resistance to enosis , and any measure that may be a ‘first step’ to enosis , is an axiom of Turkish nationalism. Of course Makarios, inspired by Greek nationalism and not wishing to be branded a traitor for a second time by his ultra-nationalist opponents, would be unwilling to sign away enosis , or even to stop talking about it. This gives prominence to a second feature of the Turkish position.

(ii) A reconstituted Republic of Cyprus which the Turks can agree to become a part of, should be a bicomunal State, of which they must have a measure of effective control. As Mr Denktas put it (in his Rotary Club address):

The Greeks by themselves cannot be the masters of the destiny of a bicomunal independent Republic of Cyprus, because that would mean no protection at all for the Turks in Cyprus, and Cyprus would ultimately be united with Greece. We must realize that that

road must be kept closed if we are going to find the conditions of peaceful co-existence in Cyprus .

Thus, Turkish nationalism means, among other things, a perception of the Turkish community as one of the constituents of the Cypriot population, and a belief in the necessity for the community's representatives to be partners (albeit junior partners) in the Government of Cyprus. A mere minority they will not be.

(iii) A more specific doctrine of Turkish Cypriot nationalism is that, since the 'functional federation' of 1960-63 (i.e. the bicomunal control of state functions) was a failure, any new settlement must provide for a geographically-based federation. The Greek concept of a unitary State, under a Greek-dominated Government, was unacceptable. The Turks wanted to be in a position to govern and police certain areas which they could call their own, because (a) as they repeatedly claimed, they could not entrust their security in the hands of Greeks; (b) they needed to ensure that the Greeks could not repeat the 'experiment' of December 1963 and attempt to unite the island with Greece; and (c) Cyprus was their country too and they wanted to be the masters of their own land. The desire for self management can be as fundamental a motive for political action as the need for security.

(iv) The last point (c) may be clarified by highlighting another aspect of Turkish Cypriot nationalism which is not very easy to put into words. From the beginnings of the Greek Cypriot nationalist movement, the Greeks spoke of Cyprus as 'their island', and claimed that she belongs to the glorious Greek people and that the existence of the Turkish community is a regrettable aberration of history. The Turks could point out to many statements made by Greek leaders, even during the 'partnership' years, which implied that the Turkish presence mars the purity of the Greek island.

In response to such Greek attitudes, Turkish nationalism asserts the dignity of the Turkish community and the rights and values of the Turks of Cyprus. This sentiment has been expressed by Mr Denktaş in his Rotary Club address as follows:

We are part of Cyprus. You can't throw us out. So accommodate us. Let's accommodate ourselves. We don't want much. But we don't want to be 'not wanted'. That is the difficulty. For years we have been told by words and by action that we are not wanted in Cyprus, that Cyprus is not ours. And that... makes any community very angry, and makes any community entitled, at least in their own conscience, to take all steps in order to prove that a land where they have lived for centuries is theirs and they intend to keep it as such .

Turkish Cypriot separatism, then, can only be understood as a nationalist effort to resist the absorption of the Turkish community by a Greek State or a Greek-dominated Cypriot State.

3. The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Positions Let us now look at what happened in the Greek community of Cyprus from 1963 to 1974. This period exhibits two important trends that must be understood and accounted for: (a) the majority of Greek Cypriots gradually lost much of their fervour and concern for the struggle for enosis ; and (b) those who remained committed to the Greek 'national cause' were divided into two competing nationalist camps which I shall call, for obvious reasons, the Makariosites and the Grivasites. I shall develop the second point first.

Makarios never appeared to have regretted the fact that his 13 point proposals, made against the background of suspicion and tension, precipitated the break-up of the bicomunal State. Probably he thought that the ensuing state-within-the-State situation was preferable to what preceded it. At least the events of December 1963 got him off the Zürich-London hook, and now he felt free to lead his people in a new struggle towards a goal which would certainly not be a Greco-Turkish State. What was this new goal to be? The answer was given by him in scores of speeches and other public statements he made before and after December 1963. To take a quite typical example, on 3rd November 1963 at Paralimni Church he said:

What is our desire? We have proclaimed it many times: our union with the Motherland, eternal Greece. What will our reply be if such a solution is made difficult, and if some think compromises are required or that something be given in return? No is the reply, and the struggle will continue until complete fulfilment.

Again in interviews with Greek Cypriot newspapers he explained his position in these terms :

The real victory will be achieved when Cyprus will be annexed to Greece without any concessions whatever... I am for enosis , but it must be genuine enosis without curbs or strings. ( Ethniki newspaper, 1.10.67).

The same idea was expressed by the House of Representatives which , on 26th June 1967, passed unanimously the following resolution:

Interpreting the age-long aspirations of the Greeks of Cyprus, the House declares that despite any adverse circumstances it will not suspend the struggle conducted with the support of all Greeks, until this struggle succeeds in uniting the whole and undivided Cyprus with the Motherland, without any intermediary stages.

These statements represent the position which Makarios and the official Greek Cypriot leadership held since the time of the Zürich-London Agreements and which, more fully expressed, amounts to the following propositions :

(i) The ideal of enosis is proclaimed to be the fundamental principle which guides the aspirations and long-term policies of Greek Cypriots.

(ii) It is recognized that there are certain 'difficulties' standing in the way to enosis : Turkey is prepared to go to war to prevent its realization, unless she is given in exchange large military bases and/or other substantial territorial concessions. The Turkish condition - occasionally supported by the United States and NATO - is definitely unacceptable to the Greeks.

(iii) It is recognized (though rarely said in public) that Greece is unwilling to go to war with Turkey, because Turkey is militarily not weaker than Greece, and only 40 miles away from the island. A war between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus would result, at the most optimistic estimate, in the territorial partition of the island.

(iv) As long as enosis is 'not feasible' the duty of the Greeks is to keep Cyprus an independent and undivided Greek-dominated island - which means that the Turkish minority must not be allowed to control either the functions of the State or territory. Under changed circumstances, at some point in the unspecified future, Turkey may become unable to intervene in support of the Turkish Cypriots, and then Greek Cypriots should be ready and able to seize the opportunity to complete the union of the whole Cyprus with Motherland. Thus enosis is not to be excluded by any new (non-permanent) settlement which the Greek and Turkish sides may reach.

This, then, was Makarios's nationalist stand: commitment to the traditional enosis ideal is still definitive of the 'true' Greek, but this commitment is now qualified by a measure of understanding of political and military realities. On this nationalist platform Makarios was re-elected President in February 1968 with 95.45 per cent of the votes cast, and re-elected for a third term unopposed five years later. It might be inferred that the vast majority of Greek Cypriots were Makariosite nationalists; but the actual facts were, as will be explained, much more complicated: they were Makariosites, but not nearly as nationalist as their Ethnarch and his associates.

It was said earlier that Makarios was opposed by Grivas and a small number of ardent enosis supporters almost as soon as he signed the London Agreements. In the early years of the Republic, the Grivasites (who included in their numbers ex-EOKA fighters not accommodated by the Yeorgadjis patronage system) agitated in favour of removing Turkish 'super-privileges' and re-activating the diplomatic and military struggle for enosis . In 1969-1970 these ultranationalist elements joined, or supported a clandestine organisation called the National Front, which tried to overthrow the Government by a guerrilla campaign and very nearly succeeded in assassinating Makarios. The campaign of the National Front came to nothing, and in September 1971, Grivas himself came to Cyprus to organize a new version of EOKA, EOKA-B.

Grivas's supporters, although never very many, were a mixed bag of people from the point of view of their social background, political philosophy and motives. They all defined their position by reference to the ideal of enosis , which they did not regard as 'not feasible' and considered themselves as the 'pure' enosis supporters. Their declared views, however, amounted more to criticisms of Makarios himself, than to any coherent and thought-out nationalist doctrine. Typically, a Grivasite nationalist held all or most of the following beliefs:

(i) The Greeks should immediately stop negotiating with the Turks on the basis of an independent State, and begin a diplomatic, and if necessary military, struggle with the sole aim of achieving enosis .

(ii) Makarios must be removed from office because, despite his nationalist poses, he does not really want enosis . Having concentrated all political and ecclesiastical power, and much economic power, in his hands, he simply enjoys playing 'Pope-Caesar' in an independent State.

(iii) He maintains himself in power by means of his hold over the Church, the Police and also irregular armed bands; his control of the Radio, Television and a large section of the press; illiberal laws aimed at strangling the voice of the opposition; nepotism and bribery; systematic harassment of 'true' and 'pure' enosis fighters and supporters.

(iv) He is incompetent to conduct the internal and foreign policy of Cyprus, and (as the publication of the Akritas Plan was calculated to show) has made a mess of the Greek 'national cause'.

(v) He is responsible for the dilution of Greek nationalist feeling among the Greek Cypriot masses, who have gradually lost their earlier pride in their Hellenic heritage, and become complacent about their 'hermaphrodite' Cypriot State. Under the leadership of Makarios, the masses are now a spineless lot who are less concerned with their national destiny, and more with making money, buying houses, running in fast cars and generally aping West European decadent ways.

The last point is the most obscure, but the most interesting. It suggests that there is a connection between the watering-down of the nationalist sentiment of the Greek population at large and the economic prosperity which Cyprus experienced since the late 1960s; and it also blames Makarios for this. The Grivasite 'cultural criticism' is simple-minded, but it half-recognizes certain important facts about popular political attitudes among Greek Cypriots, which we must now turn our attention to.

During 1960-63 - when EOKA memories were still fresh ° Makarios and his associates, and also a number of ultra-nationalist personalities of the Grivasite opposition, found it possible to keep popular nationalist feeling astir, and public discussion concerned with the necessity to curb Turkish super-privileges. During the violent year of 1964, when the Greeks raised a conscript Army - the National Guard - to fight the Turks, and a military force of more than 10,000 men was clandestinely sent from Greece to resist a possible invasion from Turkey, there was little else that ordinary people could think and talk about than the 'national cause'. After 1964, however, when comparative calm returned to Cyprus - at least there were few incidents in population centres - Greek people increasingly concerned themselves with less heroic affairs, and more everyday life problems. Makarios continued to resist successfully any attempt from the Grivasite opposition to outbid him in the nationalist word-game with utterances such as (to take for example a speech he made on 26th May 1965):

Either the whole of Cyprus is to be united with Greece or become a holocaust... The road to the fulfillment of national aspirations may be full of difficulties, but we shall reach the goal ° which is enosis - alive or dead...

- but it must not be supposed that ordinary Greek people much fancied the idea of Cyprus becoming a holocaust. They kept on applauding the speeches of their leaders, Makariosites and Grivasites, not only because they dared not do otherwise, but also because they were genuinely moved by them. After all, if your idolized leader, Makarios, Grivas (who commanded the National Guard until he was recalled to Athens in December 1967) or anyone else tells you that you are a heroic people, you are unlikely to throw away the



compliment. The fact remains, however, that once popular anxiety eased - when fighting died down and certain 'abnormalities' were accepted - a host of other day-to-day problems demanded an increasing amount of the attention of ordinary people. There is the family income that must be secured, business to be transacted, the children's education to be looked after, and the daughter has reached marriageable age etc, etc. So, while on Sundays and special days the people participated in the ritual of celebrating the enosis ideal and the heroes who struggled for it, on ordinary week-days their thought turned to more mundane subjects. Their earlier apprehension and resentment, which had made them so aggressive, gradually disappeared. At least three factors brought about this change in the mind of the ordinary Greek Cypriot.

(i) The Greeks no longer had to hear of the Turks occupying 30 per cent of the posts of the state institutions. Indeed, many more Greeks were now the glad occupants of such posts. The Government, the House of Representatives, the Civil Service, the Radio and Television - all these were now in Greek hands. The official Cypriot State, under which all Greeks lived, was a Greek Cypriot State.

(ii) Again, the Greeks no longer had to fear the Vice-Presidential veto, or that the Turkish members of the House of Representatives may block financial legislation. The House was now free to rubber-stamp the bills sent there by the all-Greek Government.

(iii) And this is the most curious feature of the attitudes of Greek people: they were pleased that they had prevented the implementation of the separate municipalities and other 'unjust' provisions of the Constitution. The strong stand put up by their leaders paid off, and now they could live without the danger of the establishment of Turkish-controlled areas, which (as Makarios had repeatedly stated) would be the first step to the partitioning of the territory of Cyprus.

The obvious response to (iii) is that the Turks had established their own areas and created a system of institutional and administrative structures which carried the support of the Turkish population. So, wasn't Cyprus already partitioned? Wasn't there a Turkish 'State' within their own Greek State? According to the Greek view, the Turkish institutions - which were contemptuously referred to as 'the pseudo-mini-'State', 'the so-called Turkish Cypriot Administration', 'the pirate Radio', 'the illegal Police, Post Office etc' - were not permanent features of Cyprus, but elements of a temporary anomaly. They did not really enjoy the support of the Turkish Cypriot masses, but were maintained by the money and force of arms of mainland Turkey and her Turkish Cypriot puppets! This situation could not go on for ever, and sooner or later (and the sooner, the better for the Turks) the rebellious minority would have to come back to the official unitary and integrated State. The unity of 'their' island would eventually be restored - and certainly not under the unjust, unworkable and separatist 1960 Constitution.

But, it might be asked, if the separation of the Turkish community was only temporary, so was the Greek community's monopoly of the official state institutions. Did the Greeks think that the Turks would return to the fold of the State without a generous share of power and resources, and without various forms of checks and balances similar to those of the 1960 Constitution? And if the Greeks were intent on preventing the re-activation of that

Constitution or the drafting of a similar one, why did they suppose that the Turks would agree to come back - especially now that they had tasted self-government? Wasn't the re-integration of Cyprus contingent upon the re-establishment of bicomunal control of the State? Or could it seriously be supposed that Turkey would let her kith and kin go on their knees and beg from the Greeks admission to the fold of the State whatever the terms?

It is difficult to see how the average Greek Cypriot would answer these questions, or whether his political beliefs did actually amount to a coherent and rational view of the situation. In the new, much more relaxed atmosphere that developed within the Greek community after 1964, and particularly from 1968 onwards, the vast majority of Greeks thought less and less, and less and less seriously, about the Turks and the achievement of the union of Cyprus with Greece. Their adversaries were, after all, not to be seen in the Ministries or other Government Departments, or the House of Representatives, or the Police, or the Radio and Television, or any other area of the State - so the crisis was behind them and the Government would keep the situation under control. Indeed, as far as the majority of Greek Cypriots were concerned, the Turks were entirely out of sight. There were, true, the 48 mixed villages, in which Greeks and Turks lived in peace and friendship. But in the larger urban centres the Turks either lived in their own armed enclaves or in their own neighbourhoods, keeping themselves to themselves and only rarely appearing in Greek streets, shops or caf,s. And it is probably true to say that most Greeks and most Turks never knew personally any members of the other community.

The absence of direct contact between Greek and Turkish people at large meant that the nationalist speech-makers (many of them old EOKA and TMT hands) and the mass media which reported the speeches and supplemented them with propaganda of their own, had an unrivalled influence on the formation of popular attitudes with regard to the other community, and beliefs as to what the causes of the intercommunal conflict were and how it ought to be resolved. For example, if the average Greek were asked to explain why there was a state of conflict between the Greek and Turkish community, he would most probably trot out some stereotype answer about 'the Greek majority', and 'the unworkable and unjust Constitution externally imposed', and 'the Turkish super-privileges' and other elements of the official picture. If he were sincere, however, he would have to admit that personally he did not quite know why the Constitution was unworkable, and that he knew and cared little about the Turkish community. Again, if he were asked whether he still wished for Cyprus to be united with Greece, he would be most unlikely to give any answer other than Yes, for Cyprus is, after all, 'Greek from the dawn of history', and her 'destiny' is to be incorporated into 'the national trunk, mother Greece'. It is a matter of deep regret that, despite four years of glorious struggle, certain 'external factors' have made union 'not feasible'. But again, if our average Greek were sincere, he would have to admit that, as it happened, he had not been much concerned with enosis lately.

It is a well-known fact that many Greek Cypriots developed a positive dislike for mainland Greeks, whom they called 'kalamarades' (rather like 'Boche' is to 'German'). This was particularly true as regards Greek Army officers who were sent by the Athens Government to lead a National Guard of reluctant Greek Cypriot conscripts. After 21st April 1967, when an Army coup in Greece brought to power a military junta, many of these officers engaged in propaganda on behalf of the dictatorship and this made them even more dislikable in the

eyes of many Greek Cypriots. Indeed, many Greek Cypriots would not want, under the circumstances, enosis , even if it were offered them (which does not mean would dare say so in public).

The overwhelming mass support which Greek Cypriots gave Makarios, even after September 1971, when Grivas returned to Cyprus, thus offering his people an alternative focus of nationalist loyalty may be explained by at least three reasons.

(i) Makarios had been the Ethnarch since 1950, a national leader with a tremendous prestige in the Hellenic world. Supporting him meant, among other things, claiming membership (or appearing in public to claim membership) of a great and distinguished nationalist movement which had been glorified and sanctified by the EOKA heroes. To take up a position other than a nationalist one was unrepresentable, and possibly harmful.

(ii) Makariosite nationalism, as contrasted to Grivasite nationalism, meant advocating or supporting the idea of a Greek-dominated Cyprus for the foreseeable future. This idea accorded, in one way or another, with the thoughts and feelings of most Greek Cypriots. Many of these people did not really want to be ruled by the Athens Government, for economic, political, snobbish and other reasons; and many others, while wanting enosis if this were offered them, were unwilling to go out to fight for it. So they all repeated after Makarios (to take a typical example of slogan-throwing, taken from his speech at Yialousa village on 14th March 1971):

Cyprus is Greek. Cyprus was Greek since the dawn of her history, and will remain Greek; Greek and undivided we have taken her over; Greek and undivided we shall preserve her; Greek and undivided we shall deliver her to Greece...

- knowing full well that in practical effect, Makariosite nationalism boils down to a respectable form of Greek Cypriotism . As far as the majority of Greek Cypriots were concerned, their concept of which their country was and their concept of what people they were (the two traditionally distinct concepts of statehood and nationhood) had eventually become identified. They were Greek Cypriots, living in a Greek Cypriot State - so, no further national struggle was necessary.

(iii) Makarios, then, came to stand for the avoidance of war, and further, for political and economic stability. As material prosperity began to spread from the upper socio-economic classes downwards, eventually affecting the living standards and expectations of most sections of the Greek community, the prospect of a renewed struggle which Grivas advocated seemed more and more undesirable.

The last point is of great importance and must be pursued a little further. A brief digression on the development of the Cyprus economy could contribute to an understanding of the changes in the political attitudes of the Greek Cypriot people.

#### **4. Greek Prosperity and Public Attitudes**

In the early days of the Republic of Cyprus, the Greco-Turkish Government set their minds to dealing with the problems of a stagnant economy, unemployment of 3 per cent and considerable under-employment, and the flight of men and capital. The First Five-Year Plan (1962-1966) aimed to develop the economic potential of the island by mobilizing all unemployed resources; and secondly, to provide the necessary infra-structure and thus, eventually, to help the process of diversification of the economy with a view to removing the causes of pre-1960 economic instability.

Soon after the process of implementing the Plan began, the Greek and Turkish communities parted their ways - or, at any rate, their economies became, to a large extent, separated. By the time the Makarios Government obtained financial and technical assistance from various foreign Governments and international organizations to help lay the foundations of future prosperity - improved agriculture and mining, the setting up of small manufacturing and construction industries, the development of service industries and especially the boosting of tourism - the Turkish community were out of the Plan.

The First Five-Year Plan succeeded in getting the productive resources of the island going and restored internal and foreign confidence in her economy. The Second Five-Year Plan (1967-1971) was devised by the Greek Cypriot Government with a view to speeding up the process of growth by restructuring the economy, and through a strengthened power-base to develop policies of social welfare benefitting all sections of the population.

During the first decade of the life of the Republic the Gross National Product per capita increased from C£222.4 in 1961 to C£393.4 in 1971, or by an annual rate of 5.9%. During the same period private consumption expenditure per capita increased from C£157.5 to C£276.8, or 5.8% per annum. Just before the July 1974 coup the GNP per capita approached C£550 per annum, the second highest in the area, and, incidentally more than three times higher than that of Turkey.

These figures indicate that Cyprus, while not as wealthy as advanced western nations (Britain's GNP per capita in 1973 was C£1380), was much better off than most countries in the Third World. It should be immediately noted, however, that this increased prosperity was not shared by the Greek and Turkish communities in accordance with their population proportions. As will be explained shortly, the standard of living of Turkish Cypriots was, on average, considerably lower than that of Greek Cypriots, though it was not poor by Third World standards. Significantly, almost all financial and technical assistance from foreign countries and international bodies went to help the development of Greek industries, which in turn gave employment, and so purchasing power, to Greek people.

Although Makarios and his Ministers had no particularly socialist leanings, they did believe in making Cyprus a modern, efficient, prosperous and compassionate Welfare State of the West European type. During the course of the Second Five-Year Plan, a series of measures was initiated to help spread the benefits of economic growth among the various income groups and the different geographical regions. Subsidies to support agricultural prices were given to help peasants; social security benefits and pensions were increased; the conditions

of work in industry were improved by modern legislation; in the fields of public health, education and culture, increased expenditure brought about marked improvements. At the level of ordinary people it was felt that what went on in the areas of the economy and politics had tremendous influence on family incomes and living standards.

The following table presents a summary of the main social indicators which provide evidence for the raising of the general standards of living of the population of Cyprus . 1960 1966 1971

### **1. Health Conditions :**

- (a) Expectation of life at birth (No. of years) 66.2 70.5 72.8
- (b) Infant mortality rate (No. per 000 live births) 29.9 26.4 25.3
- (c) Crude annual death rate (No. per 000 population) 5.6 5.8 6.4
- (d) Population per doctor 1,467 1,317 1,179

### **2. Educational Standards:**

- (a) Elementary education enrolment ratio (% of children of school age enrolling) 88 93 94
- (b) Secondary education enrolment ratio (% of children of school age enrolling) 48 45 72
- (c) Number of third level students per 000 population - - 10.6 17.9

### **3. Housing Facilities :**

(a) Average number of persons per room -

- (i) Urban 1.21 - 0.84
- (h) Rural 1.36 - 1.02

#### **(b) Proportion of dwellings with inside or outside running water (% to total) °**

- (i) Urban 95.3 - 100.0
- (id) Rural 16.2 - 91.8

#### **(c) Proportion of dwellings with bathroom (% to total)**

- (i) Urban 53.1 - 76.0
- (ii) Rural 10.5 - 23.7

(d) Proportion of dwellings with flush toilet (% to total)-

(i) Urban 52.6 - 58.6

(ii) Rural 5.2 29.0

(e) Proportion of villages with electricity supply (% to total) 15.3 50.3 81.5

#### **4. Other Selected Indicators:**

(a) Number of persons per radio set 10.0 4.3 3.7

(b) Number of persons per T.V. set 625.0 28.7 11.0

(c) Number of persons per telephone set 52.6 19.8 13.1

(d) Number of persons per road vehicle 14.0 10.3 6.9

(e) Miles of road per square mile 1.13 1.25 1.37

Let us now return to the question of the relationship between growing prosperity within the Greek community of Cyprus, and their changing political attitudes.

The new wealth that derived from improved agriculture, increased export trade, and the development of construction, manufacturing and touristic industries was largely concentrated in the main urban centres. The urban-based Greek industrial, trading and professional classes grew in numbers and prosperity, and expressed their prosperity in terms of nice, comfortable houses, cars, telephones and TV sets, and a vast array of labour-saving appliances. The children of the upper and upper middle classes were sent abroad to pursue higher studies preferably in Britain and the United States, but also in Greece and came back to get better jobs in the Civil Service or enter business. Direct contact with Western Europe - for business, educational and holiday purposes - and a desire to identify with the 'civilised' western world, led the prosperous classes to adopt an 'ethic', a mentality, a style in their manners and appearance which is characteristic of West European middle classes.

As the standards of living steadily improved for the lower middle classes, they too perceived their own prospects and aspirations in those terms in which the life-style and ways of their admired wealthier compatriots were manifested. They too needed to have a pretty comfortable house, a car, money to spend on luxuries and entertainment, and the opportunity to educate their children abroad - if not in Britain, then in Greece where university education was cheaper. More and more people sought the benefits and prestige of higher education, and in 1970-71 no less than 11,450 Cypriots (mostly Greek, but also including a small proportion of Turks) followed degree and sub-degree courses in Britain, the United States, Greece, Turkey, and other countries of West and East Europe.

Incidentally, from UNESCO statistics it appears that Cyprus has the third largest proportion of graduates, after the United States and Canada.

The steady improvements in educational and general living standards had a number of important consequences for the Greek Cypriot outlook. First, Greece, especially after the military coup of April 1967, came to be looked upon by more and more people as a culturally and politically under-developed country. Secondly, the advancement of the upper and middle classes, which dominated Cypriot social and cultural life, led to the development among many sections of the population of a new conception of (to put it simply) the sort of life one should strive to achieve. People expected, and desired, and thought about higher living standards, which they conceived of in terms of increased income and material comfort.

And so, by degrees, a measure of sophistication was introduced into people's thinking about public affairs. People could see better now the connection between the function of Government and politics on the one hand, and personal living standards on the other. As the economy of Cyprus became more complex, various Government departments were extended or created, and public bodies were set up to devise and implement economic plans. Local and all-Cyprus organizations came into existence to put the employers' and traders' point of view to the Government, the House of Representatives and the public at large. Trade unions, which for decades were concerned to support the struggle for enosis, now concentrated in promoting the interests of workers, teachers, civil servants, farmers and other economic and professional classes. Periodically, all these bodies came out with reports, statements and counter-statements which made the news. The mass media gave increasingly greater prominence to economic news and arguments, and some newspapers established special financial sections. Gradually, people – first the educated, then the less educated, and finally just about everybody – acquired some grasp of the basic concepts of economics, and in time came to conceive of their interests and aspirations, and the means by which these could be pursued, in terms of these concepts.

And so, now people aimed to achieve 'security', which often meant the purchase of or 'development' of already owned, 'real property'. Business men had to study 'market trends' so as to be able to 'deploy their available capital resources' in ways which are likely to yield a satisfactory 'profit margin'. On the other side, employees had to ensure a fair return for their 'labour' now that 'inflationary tendencies' endangered 'living standards'. 'Industrial disputes' might lead to 'dynamic industrial action' unless the Government-sponsored 'Conciliation and Arbitration Service' could step in to help find a settlement etc, etc.

The development of this sort of sophisticated 'economics' language, in which questions about jobs and living standards were publicly and privately discussed, reflects a change in emphasis as regards peoples' perceptions of what constitutes their interests and welfare, but also as regards their conception of what political affairs consist of. For many decades, 'politics' in Cyprus was the sum total of all public activity connected, directly or indirectly, with the advancement of the 'national cause'. In the turbulent years of 1960-1964 it was impossible for Greek Cypriots to distinguish between their national leadership and their Government: Makarios, Yeorgadjis et al. were the leaders, and were in Governments to promote their 'national rights'. In the present changed circumstances, however, Makarios

was invested with two statuses or capacities - he was the Ethnarch, and he was the Head of State and of Government. As an Ethnarch he was in full and exclusive control of the 'national cause', which now meant the question of reaching a 'just' settlement with the Turkish minority. As a Head of Government his position was not that of Olympian Zeus. The Government or the individual ministers and those below them, were now thought of as the mortal and fallible men who draft and introduce legislation to the House of Representatives, draw up and implement plans of all types, take important economic and trade decisions, build roads and bridges, appoint civil servants and teachers, and issue building permits, trade and agricultural licences, directives, circulars, instructions, exemptions from military service etc, etc. Politics was now conceived of as the intricate complex of activities directed at exercising or influencing governmental power. The promotion of the 'national cause' was not (on the present view of things) politics: it was precisely the 'national cause' and should be left 'above politics'.

The vast majority of Greek Cypriots adopted a trusting, uncritical, leave-it-to-the-leader attitude towards the Ethnarch's handling of the relations with the Turks. In the sublunary region of day-to-day political and governmental decision-making, a more critical and earthly attitude was due. The Government which Makarios headed was just a fallible bureaucratic machine whose operations could make a great difference to the interests of various sections of the population, and for this reason it should be understood, watched, and if necessary and possible influenced by legitimate or other means. The mystique was taken out of Government and governmental actions, and it was these actions - actual, possible or imagined - that constituted in the popular mind the area of political affairs. Ministers, members of the House of Representatives and other politicians too accepted the distinction between the 'national cause' and everyday practical politics; and while they appeared to be in one mind when it came to declaring, in national orations, their devotion to the monolithic ideal of enosis, they displayed greater flexibility and humility and awareness of legitimate differences of opinion when it came to discussing economic and other mundane public affairs.

Corresponding to the gradual shift in the centre of gravity of political affairs, there was a transformation in the composition of the Civil Service itself. In the first short years after independence, former EOKA militants, as members of the official Government machine or of semi-official ex-fighters' organizations, exercised considerable influence on governmental decisions. Once the EOKA honeymoon was over, however, and the socio-economic organization of the State became more formalized, the educated urban elite increasingly asserted their own rights to run state affairs, based on their possession of specialized knowledge.

Some of them argued that technical qualifications, rather than a moustache and pistol, were needed for running a modern state. There were complaints about 'illiterates' being given important Government jobs, and people being given scholarships for 'chucking a few leaflets'... The people who stressed qualifications, bureaucratic processes, professional competence and the finality of examination results, were often members of the 'elite, already committed to legalistic, technocratic administration. The other side, usually not members of the educated elite, were emphasizing moral qualifications [sc. Active participation in the liberation struggle]. If Cyprus had not had an ethnic minority ° the Turks - to draw off the



structural tensions in the Greek community, then this issue between Greek militants and Greek elite might well have become the dominant cleavage of the society .

From the mid-1960s onwards, the Civil Service recruited 78 new members to the better posts mainly from among university graduates. Even so, string-pulling and a consideration of a candidate's political record or connections did not entirely disappear. There was a widespread belief that those civil servants, teachers and policemen who actively supported Makarios received special favours - e.g. promotions, scholarships, convenient postings - while known Grivasites found themselves discriminated against. Indeed, people in the higher echelons of Government Service were occasionally accused by Grivasite nationalists of supporting Makarios and his 'unfettered independence' line only because they had secure jobs with fat salaries which they were determined to keep. There may be something in this suggestion, but it only goes to show that these Government technocrats, and the professional classes in general - often possessors of a European higher education - judged that a renewed nationalist struggle which Grivas called for was not worth the risks in terms of loss of peace and prosperity. In any case, these people responded to their Grivasite critics by saying that they (the critics) hurled their accusations for no better reason than that they themselves had failed to get a good Government job, and so felt personal bitterness.

Interestingly, there was one section of public service which was predominantly composed of practising enosis supporters - though many Makariosites: the teachers, especially those in secondary education. Secondary education, long before the establishment of the Republic, was the almost exclusive territory of nationalists, Greeks and Turks. The majority of Greek secondary school teachers were, and still are, graduates of Greek universities, who came to Cyprus to discover that their qualifications are unfavourably compared to those from British universities, and their profession carries a lower middle class status. As it has been noted earlier, Greek education in Cyprus follows the organization and curricula of the education system of Greece, which concentrates heavily on Greek literature, history and traditions, and the Greek Orthodox religion. So, the Greek Cypriot teachers came to see themselves as the under-valued professional custodians of the Greek consciousness of young Cypriots, cultivating the ideals of Hellenism and an awareness of the historical fact that these ideals have been fulfilled to a large extent by the heroic struggle of the Greek nation, in many cases against the Turks.

When Grivas came secretly to Cyprus in September 1971 he was welcomed by a small and heterogeneous group of supporters, drawn from such diverse classes as the ex-EOKA fighters whom the technocratic Government Service did not accommodate; the teaching profession; the priesthood (though it should be said that this class also included strong Makarios supporters); the less prosperous lower middle and working classes (but note: a large section of the latter were Leftists, and very often vehement opponents of the Grivasites); and also the peasantry, whose aspirations were the least affected by the consumerist philosophy of the townsfolk. These people, the Grivasites, were united in their critical stance towards the social, political, economic and ecclesiastical establishment, which they regarded as corrupt, money - and prestige - orientated, and unmindful of their 'pure' Helleno-Christian heritage and duties. Grivas and his supporters could never accept the Greek Cypriot people's democratic right to be philistine and choose a Government for the purpose of promoting their material welfare.

## 5. Turkish Separation and Economic Stagnation

Let us briefly consider some of the economic consequences which the Turkish community's policy of separation brought on them. Precise information on the Turkish Cypriot economy is lacking, but it is known that it has been stagnating for years.

After December 1963 all Turkish Cypriots working for the Government of the Republic lost their employment; and only a fraction of these could be absorbed by the services of the newly-formed Turkish 'State'. Again, the majority of the Turkish Cypriots were farmers and about 20 per cent of all agricultural land is in Turkish ownership. However, after December 1963 large numbers of them retreated into the armed enclaves, thus (according to a report by Rudolf Noetel) abandoning 30-40 per cent of all Turkish-owned land to Greek Cypriots.

From 1964 to 1974 the Turkish Government gave the Turkish Cypriots an annual grant of £10 million. This appears a considerable sum - just under  $\text{œ}1,000$  per head. However, a large percentage of it was allocated to defence purposes, and another to immediate relief for 'refugees'. It was estimated that about one third of the Turkish Cypriot population was forced to live on relief, several thousands of whom in camps at Hamit Mandres and Gonyeli, under conditions of abject misery and semi-starvation.

The Turkish Cypriot Administration lacked the funds, or the ability, or both, to plan and implement any serious programme of public works, or develop an economic infra-structure. Thus unemployment, or under-employment, remained very high in the Turkish community at the time when the Greeks had achieved full employment. It was known, for example, that on the eve of the July 1974 coup as many as 10,000 Turks worked for Greek employers, presumably with the Turkish Cypriot Administration reluctantly granting the necessary 'permits'. Clearly, Mr Denktaş and his colleagues must have realized that improved relations between Greeks and Turks at the popular level before a settlement was reached would tend to weaken the Turkish position in the intercommunal negotiations. After all, the Turkish side had maintained that the Turks could not trust, and work under, the Greek Cypriot regime.

The Turks repeatedly argued that their stagnation was caused by economic blockades and other discriminatory measures mounted by the Greek side. They complained that although  $\text{œ}5$  million was collected annually by the Greek Cypriot State from the Turks, by way of indirect taxation, they received no grant from the budget of the (official, Greek-run) Republic. Moreover,

in spite of the fact that the Turkish and Greek components of the de jure Government of the Republic of Cyprus had, owing to the Greek Cypriot onslaught, split, each operating in areas under their respective control, the Greek Cypriot component was treated as if it were the de jure Government of the Republic of Cyprus, and all financial and technical aid by the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies continued to be channelled through it. The Greek Cypriot component had thus been given the opportunity to foster its hostile intentions towards the Turkish community and to use UN economic and technical aid as a medium to consolidate its de facto position illegally acquired through the use of force. The Greek Cypriot component seized this opportunity and indeed has successfully prevented the Turkish community from deriving any benefit whatsoever from such aid during the period

December 1963-March 1968. It was not until after March 1968 that the Turkish community was able to benefit from the UN economic and technical assistance to Cyprus; and even then, through manifold difficulties created by the Greek Cypriot component, such benefit has been very inadequate and far below our population ratio.

The Greek side retorted to this kind of accusation by pointing out that the Turkish community within the armed enclaves had been for many years supplied with electricity, water and telephone services even though they had refused to pay for these, knowing that the State and Police would be unable to prosecute. In any case, the Turks might think that they formed a separate 'State' of their own, but in fact there was just one Republic of Cyprus which, since the Turkish withdrawal, was run by the Greeks. As a result of Greek initiative, business acumen and entrepreneurship, good economic management, progressive legislation, the earning of foreign confidence, and sheer hard work, the Republic of Cyprus had become prosperous. The Turks were, of course, welcome to abandon their separatist nonsense and return to the fold of the State. But until that happened they were rebels, and had no right to complain that those who submitted to the State and helped to operate its economy and other institutions actually raised their living standards. This was, then, the Greek point of view.

It is not my intention to examine the validity of the two rival arguments, but to explain how the economic gap between the Greek and Turkish communities was interpreted by each of the opposing sides. It is not possible to establish the precise extent of the gap. The following table shows the percentage contribution of the two communities to various sectors of the economy, compiled in 1963 . It can safely be assumed that after 1963 the ratios have progressively shifted further in favour of the Greeks. Greeks etc Turks

1. Land ownership (other than state owned) 79.3 : 20.7
2. Agricultural production 87.4 : 12.6
3. Citrus Production 90.0 : 10.0
4. Livestock Income 86.0 : 14.0
5. Industrial Output 93.8 : 6.2
6. Imports 96.1 : 3.9
7. Exports 99.5 : 0.5
8. Income Tax Revenue 94.1 : 5.9
9. Electricity Consumption 93.9 : 6.1
10. Medical practitioners 86.1 : 13.9
11. Dentists 81.3 : 18.7

## 12. Pharmacists 91.6 : 8.4

Did the Turkish population think that the cause of their self-chosen separation was worth the consequent sacrifice in their living standards? It is difficult to know. They may have envied the Greeks; but they had one 'national' leadership, the leadership which controlled the press, the Radio and the Security Forces, and they could not but support them in their policies towards the Greeks. Makarios and his Government clearly thought that they could afford to play the waiting game until Turkish means and determination were exhausted. Greek observers were anxiously looking across the 'border' to detect any signs of crack in the Turkish people's solidarity behind their leadership, and occasionally thought they could see some. So, the Greek side appeared to be in no hurry to reach a settlement, and the Turkish side did its utmost to hold out, despite the difficulties, until after a negotiated solution had been achieved. When in July 1974 the Turkish Army landed in Cyprus, and occupied 40 per cent of the island, thus forcing 200,000 Greeks to abandon their homes and properties, the systematic, extensive and frequently official looting that the Turks engaged in may suggest that they felt they had some sort of right to the wealth which their opponent community had for so long enjoyed.

In this chapter I have tried to give an account of the fact that no settlement of the Cyprus conflict was reached by July 1974, a decade after the break-up of the Greco-Turkish State. I have explained that the Greeks, or at least the Greek leaders, wanted the entire Cyprus to be Greek-dominated; while the Turks wanted certain areas of Cyprus to be entirely Turkish. It may even be more accurate to say that the former claimed the whole of the island for the larger Greek nation, while the latter claimed a part of Cyprus for the Turkish nation. The nature of this antagonism, which after June 1968 expressed itself in opposing negotiating positions, is intelligible only against the background of two opposing nationalist traditions, one Greek and the other Turkish. I have also tried to explain the content of these traditions - the distinctive doctrines and values which each incorporated - as these were represented by Makarios and his associates, and Küçük, Denктаş and their associates.

In the last few years, the organization of the Turkish Cypriot state-like entity aroused grave concern and apprehension in Greek nationalists, and strengthened their determination to prevent at all costs this separateness from becoming a permanent feature of any reconstituted Cypriot State. Again, the increased living standards of the Greeks, and their apparent willingness to prolong the negotiations indefinitely, caused a resentment and envy of Greek prosperity and a deepened mistrust of Greek intentions and faith, to become added features of Turkish nationalism.

An important element in the picture is that the Greek population at large gradually abandoned their traditional zeal for enosis. It almost seemed as if Makarios's strong pro-enosis stand was stimulated more by Grivasite opposition than popular demands. A fuller study of the Cyprus conflict may be able to show that the personality of Archbishop Makarios, which commanded Greek Cypriot affairs for a quarter of century, was as much of a power-source of the Greek nationalist movement, as a representative of it. Had he left the Presidency in 1973, and a more 'moderate' leader such as Mr Glafkos Clerides taken over, it

is quite probable that the Greek and Turkish communities would have achieved reunification under a bicomunal Republican State.

## V. THE AFTERMATH OF THE TURKISH INVASION

### 1. The July-August War

The latest military conflagration of July-August 1974 is undoubtedly the most dramatic event of modern Cypriot history: thousands of Greek and Turkish people lost, as a result, their lives; thousands suffered grievous injury, imprisonment and indescribable agony and humiliation; thousands of families were forced to uproot themselves from their homes and properties; and the economy of the island - the product of years of planning, effort and hope - was largely destroyed. It is impossible to comprehend at this point in time the full significance of those events, and their full consequences in human, social, economic and political terms. After more than a year later, peace has yet to be firmly established, and negotiations for a new constitutional settlement have yet to begin in earnest. It is certain, that Cyprus will not be the same place again, and at least in the short term it will remain a much less happy and prosperous place than it was before. About the longer term, anything that is said is sheer speculation.

An attempt will be made in this chapter to clarify certain limited aspects of what is now called 'the war', viz, those connected with the opposing viewpoints of the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus. The immediate background to the war, at least in its broad, superficial outlines, is clear.

Grivas had died the previous January, but despite hopes for the contrary, EOKA-B continued its campaign of violence against the Makarios Government. It became known that EOKA-B was taken over, financed and directed by the Athens Junta. At the beginning of July Makarios wrote a blunt letter to the Greek President accusing him and his associates of being behind EOKA-B's attempts to overthrow him, and demanding the withdrawal of the 650 Greek officers who led the National Guard of Cyprus. The Junta's response came on 15th July, when the National Guard organized a coup d'etat which forced Makarios to flee the island and enabled a puppet Government to be installed. The Turkish Government had been making preparations for such an eventuality, and on 20th July (after some hasty consultations with the British Government) ordered a fully fledged military force to land in Cyprus. The Turkish Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit announced the Turkish invasion in these terms:

A coup d'etat has been carried out in Cyprus... Since the Forces involved... were military units under the direct control of a foreign State, the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus have been seriously endangered... The purpose of Turkey's peaceful action is to eliminate the threat to the very existence of the Republic of Cyprus and the rights of all Cypriots, and to restore the independence, territorial integrity and security of the island, and the order established by the basic articles of the Constitution... Turkey's purpose on Cyprus, which is a bicomunal State, is to get the intercommunal talks to start as rapidly as possible in order to restore Cyprus to legitimate order and the situation before the coup.

The landing of Turkish soldiers and paratroopers in Cyprus sparked off intercommunal hostilities in several parts of the island. By the time of the first cease-fire the Turkish Army

had established a bridgehead on the northern coast of Cyprus, and a corridor reaching Nicosia, making up 8 per cent of the island's territory. In August a conference was called in Geneva, attended by representatives of Britain, Greece, (who now had a new civilian Government), Turkey, the Greek Cypriots (who also had a change of Government) and the Turkish Cypriots . The conference ended in failure, and on 14th August, Prime Minister Ecevit ordered a second military offensive. As he explained to the world,

The objective of this operation is not to destroy the State of Cyprus but to contribute to the re-building, on a sounder basis, of the State which was destroyed and to ensure its territorial integrity... The objective of this operation is to end the long sufferings of the Turkish Cypriots and to enable them to live freely on their own soil , in a way befitting human dignity... Our objective is not against Greece or against the Greek Cypriot community. We intend to establish a balanced society in Cyprus , which will enable Greeks and Turks to co-operate and prosper under equal conditions...

These words announced an `Operation' which resulted in many more casualties, atrocities against prisoners and unarmed civilians, destruction of property and the fleeing of 200,000 terrified Greek Cypriots to the south. By the time of the second cease-fire the Turkish Army had extended its occupation to 40 per cent of the island's territory.

In the ensuing debate at the United Nations General Assembly, Archbishop Makarios put forward on 1st October the position of the Greek side. Among other things he said :

Turkey invaded Cyprus allegedly for the restoration of the constitutional order that is, the implementation of the Constitution of 1960... Although this Constitution gives many privileges to the Turkish Cypriot community in a way that some of its provisions impede the smooth functioning of the State, yet it is still acceptable to us as it stands. Any changes must be made with the consent of all concerned. What is peculiar is that Turkey is violating the very Constitution which, as she claims, has given her the right to intervene. It is obvious that the Turkish invasion was not intended for the restoration of the Constitution of 1960, but for enforcing her partitionist plans in violation of that Constitution... Turkey made it clear that her aim is federation based on geographical separation... The autonomy of the small Turkish Cypriot minority of 18 per cent can in no way justify a geographical federation which in practice will mean the partition of Cyprus.

It is not necessary to attempt a detailed critique of the above official statements, the formulation of which was affected (not unnaturally) by considerations of courting international support. Certain phrases have been set in bold type , which are suggestive of the poses, pretensions and desires of the Turkish and Greek sides, and which proceed from two different sets of principles that are part and parcel with the broader viewpoints of the two adversaries. It would be useful to make some of these principles explicit in order to clarify a little how the hostilities of July-August 1974 and their manifold consequences have been perceived and interpreted by two peoples who, for more than a generation, have thought and operated with different and opposing systems of ideas.

Let us begin with the Turkish side. The Government of Turkey wants, naturally, to appear the respecters and defenders of legality. They are bound by the Treaty of Guarantee to protect the independence of the Republic of Cyprus; so, because a foreign-controlled coup overthrew the legitimate Government on 15th July, they are fulfilling their Treaty

obligations by 'taking action' on 20th July to restore constitutional legality. But Turkish references to 'the order established by the basic articles of the Constitution... a bicomunal State' imply that they did not really regard the status quo ante - a Cypriot State run by Greeks, with a Turkish quasi-State in its midst – as the legitimate constitutional order that was to be restored. Indeed, the Turkish position had been for some time that the 'Makarios regime', and institutions such as the National Guard, were 'illegal' and 'unconstitutional'.

Ecevit's statement of 14th August is more revealing of Turkish intentions. References to the desire 'to contribute to the re-building, on a sounder basis' of the Cypriot State must be read in connection with the deeply-felt Turkish view that the Turkish Cypriot community had not been enjoying security, dignity and equality with their Greek Cypriot neighbours, and so their general condition ought, in the name of justice, to improve.

From the Turkish statements it is possible to extract certain principles that have for long been part of the Turkish official position. (a) The independent and sovereign Republic of Cyprus was, properly speaking, the State created by Britain, Turkey and Greece to operate under a bicomunal Constitution. This State ceased to exist following the Greek onslaught of December 1963 and consequently the 'Makarios regime' was unconstitutional. From this point of view, then, the action of the Turkish Armed Forces cannot be called an invasion of the Republic of Cyprus, since that State had long ceased to exist. (b) The Turkish component of the now defunct Republic of Cyprus had suffered oppression in the hands of the more powerful Greek component. That is why the Turkish section of the Cypriot population has warmly welcomed Turkey's operation as an effort to protect them and restore their moral and political rights.

The logic of the Turkish position may appear crooked to the point of absurdity, especially to someone unfamiliar with Cypriot complexities. On the other hand, the logic of the Greek position is straightforward to the point of simplism. The Greeks, of course, also wish to appear to be on the side of constitutional legality so that they can accuse Turkey of constitutional violation. Given their past record, they feel a little uneasy about declaring their faith in the Constitution, some of the provisions of which 'impede the smooth functioning of the State'. Still, the somewhat irregular position of 'the small Turkish minority of 18 per cent' does not affect the separate question of the illegality and immorality of the Turkish invasion. Although Makarios's statement contains a major shift in what had been his standing policy - 'any changes [in the Constitution] must be made with the consent of all concerned' – he does not budge from the fundamental position on which he has stood for more than a decade, viz (a) the Republic of Cyprus is the island-State which came into existence on 16th August 1960 and which has retained its identity, under a Presidential system of Government, ever since. The presence of organized Turkish armed enclaves does not affect the fact that the territory of the Republic is the whole of the island. (b) There has, indeed, been a dispute with the Turkish minority of Cyprus, and of necessity the Constitution of 1960 has had to be amended as a result. This dispute, however, is an entirely internal affair of a sovereign state, and it in no way justifies outside interferences, much less a bloody invasion.



The official Turkish and Greek statements with regard to the July-August war are but formalized and somewhat legalistic reflections of beliefs which are held by the Turkish and Greek populations of Cyprus (and also the Mother Countries) at large.

The Turkish Cypriots believe that Turkey was fully justified in acting as she did, and are not going to apologize for Greek losses. What the Greeks, and most foreign countries, have called 'the Turkish invasion' is to them a matter of Mother Turkey fulfilling her legal and moral responsibilities towards her children, and coming over to protect them and restore them to their rightful position in what is, after all, their island too. It is not entirely clear how this position is popularly conceived of, but Denktaş and the other Turkish Cypriot leaders have repeatedly declared their insistence on the formation of a new Federal Republic composed of two autonomous ethnic zones under a weak Central Government; and obtaining assistance and adequate resources to pursue a programme aiming at Turkish Cypriot economic and social advancement. If the Turks had, for more than a decade, stuck it out under virtual conditions of siege, insisting on self-government and independence from the larger Greek community, they are not going to be more moderate now that Jerusalem seems (or seems to their leaders) to be in sight. The fact that the realization of their aspirations means taking-over an area which had been predominantly inhabited by Greeks, forcing them out and seizing their homes, shops, factories, farms and other properties is not going to deter them, or make them feel guilty. They had suffered for far too long in Greek hands - most recently during the July-August hostilities - to have any sympathy for Greek losses. Besides, it is not always that they are supported by the presence of some 40,000 Turkish mainland troops, and are determined to 'solve' the Cyprus problem once for all now.

One hears occasionally that some Turkish Cypriots who went to the 'Turkish' north complain that they were put in poor houses, or houses which had been emptied of all furniture by looters. Or, again, that the employment situation is worse than ever. Or that the Turkish mainland soldiers tend to deal in a high-handed manner with the local population, or misbehave towards local girls. Some prominent Turkish Cypriot citizens, including ex-Vice-President Küçük, accuse the Turkish Cypriot leadership of incompetence, of insensitivity to public feeling, and of pursuing a policy of self-gain. It may be said, then, that the Turkish Cypriots have abandoned their scattered villages and not formed as yet a stable and prosperous State. This fact need give little consolation to Greek Cypriots. The Turkish leadership is as well-entrenched as ever, and the majority of their people stand behind them in demanding the establishment of a Turkish Cypriot territory, a land on which they can build their own national institutions and structures. In their view the future Republic of Cyprus will have to be not just a bicomunal State, reflecting the bicomunal population of Cyprus, but almost a 'composite' State, a union of two autonomous national entities.

Coming now to the Greek community there seems to be less unanimity of opinion and feeling among them, than among the smaller and more compact Turkish community. All Greeks, of course, feel that a great catastrophe has befallen them, one which they had done nothing or little to deserve; but then different groups of people have been personally affected in different ways and to different degrees. Besides, in the past quarter of a century there have been within the Greek community certain significant ideological, social and economic divisions which have now resulted in a certain (limited) diversity of viewpoint.

Despite all this, it is possible to attempt some general remarks by way of indicating certain broad and somewhat 'idealized' currents in Greek Cypriot thinking:

(i) If the Greek Cypriots have thought for centuries that it is they who are the 'real', the 'proper', the indigenous people of Cyprus, they are not going to change their point of view now. Indeed, now they are more self-consciously Greek Cypriot than before, and it is as Greek Cypriots that they shed bitter tears over the invasion and occupation of the northern part of 'their island' by a foreign power. There are some who are heard saying: 'Ah, if we only knew! Why did we not give the Turks a few more of the things they wanted? If they wished to govern themselves in their own areas, what would it matter?' This attitude, however, is not a concession to the Turkish point of view, but a recognition of the fact that Greek Cypriot policy had been unnecessarily inflexible. The bulk of the Greek Cypriots still regard Cyprus as basically 'theirs' and are still unsure as to the proper position of the Turkish Cypriot community.

(ii) Many Greek Cypriots were gravely disappointed by the inability or unwillingness of Greece to use her army against Turkey, when the latter invaded, and later extended her conquest of, Cyprus. Hardly a word is now heard about enosis (although EOKA men, now lying low, are still around, armed, and conspiring). The July-August war, and the subsequent displacement of 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes and means of livelihood, has intensified feelings of local Greek Cypriot identity. There is no question now of Cyprus being a mere geographical entity, an island which 'belongs' to another country, Greece, or the larger Greek nation. For the bulk of Greek Cypriots, Cyprus is their country, their independent politically self-contained island-State.

(iii) In accordance with a time-honoured tradition, the Greek Cypriots sought scapegoats to blame for the Turkish invasion. The most popular scapegoats are (a) 'American Imperialism', working through CIA and NATO, arming Turkey and encouraging her to invade the independent and non-aligned Republic of Cyprus; and (b) the former Greek military Government which was controlled by the Americans, and which in turn controlled the National Guard and EOKA-B in Cyprus. In identifying these two plausible scapegoats, Greek Cypriots are able to avoid having to revise their basic political convictions, or raise any deeper questions concerning their traditional relations to the Turks and President Makarios's policies since 1960.

(iv) The discrediting of the traditional Greek nationalist line (in its Grivasite, or vaguer Makariosite versions), has made it possible for a tiny, but growing section of Greek Cypriots to speak out publicly in favour of a 'Cyprus for the Cypriots'. The vision behind this slogan is one of a new independent Cypriot State which expresses the wishes and interests of the whole binational population of Cyprus, to the exclusion of outside people. What we now see is not so much a Cypriot nationalism ° for there is no Cypriot nation - but rather a slowly growing belief in the desirability of developing a Cypriot consciousness which will be acceptable and appealing to moderate Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike. This rather indeterminate Cypriotist movement is not well-organized, and has not as yet established any links with Turkish Cypriots or articulated a position concerning the constitutional future of Cyprus. Nevertheless, its appearance on the Cypriot scene seems the most promising development that has come out of the disaster of the July-August war.

## 2. Constitutional Negotiations

In December 1974 Archbishop Makarios returned to Cyprus to lead his people, amid general Greek jubilation. He declared a general amnesty for those who were involved in the July coup, and 'extended a hand of friendship' to the Turkish community. The Turks did not conceal their annoyance at his return, but they knew they would have to do business with him. Talks had already begun between Greek and Turkish representatives, but these were concerned solely with the exchange of prisoners and other humanitarian issues. On Makarios's return the Greek side made proposals for a new, federal constitution. What they had in mind was a multi-regional structure under which Greek and Turkish population centres (as these had existed before the July-August war) would be grouped together into several regions, some with a Greek and others with a Turkish majority – all controlled by a strong Central Government.

The Turks refused even to discuss the Greek proposals. As Mr Denktaş said in an interview (to the London Daily Telegraph, 31st January 1975):

The multi-regional plan would mean little pools of Turks spread over the whole island. It is unrealistic in the light of past action against the Turkish-Cypriot community... The Turkish bizonal plan may be a bitter pill for the Greeks, who always looked on the island as their own, and the Turks as intruders, but once swallowed I think it will bring to realism the Cyprus position, and the enosis adventure will have no following.

The only realistic solution, from the Turkish point of view, is a federation composed of two separate ethnic zones. This, the Turks insist, will have to be accepted in principle by the Greeks before constitutional negotiations can begin. 'Once this is accepted', said the Turkish Foreign Minister of the time, Mr Esenbel, 'Turkey will agree to discuss modifications of the present borders... The borders are negotiable, but first the bizonal system must be accepted'. In case the intercommunal talks fail, 'the present de facto situation, will continue and the Turkish sector will be consolidated. Therefore, the questions now discussed will become facts'.

The all-too-frequent Turkish appeals for 'realism' are seen by the Greek Cypriots as cheap attempts to gloss over their unprincipled opportunism and legitimate their Big Grab. The Greek leaders declared repeatedly that they do not accept the Turkish plans or any accomplished facts, and pledged themselves to a 'long-term struggle', to secure a just settlement. They had already started a vigorous diplomatic campaign - especially among the 'anti-imperialist' nations of the Soviet and non-aligned blocs, from which they gained considerable moral, but only moral, support. The Turks, in a plain attempt to prejudge the final form of the constitutional settlement, proclaimed on 13th February 1975, the Cyprus Turkish Federated State in the northern territory of the island; whereupon the Greeks broke off negotiations and appealed to the United Nations.

A few months later the Turkish Cypriots went to the polls, and by more than 95 per cent majority they ratified the Constitution of their State. An extract from the Introduction of this Constitution is quoted below, as an authoritative and succinct statement of Turkish Cypriot

nationalism, and an expression of the community's view of their place in Cyprus and their relationship to Turkey.

### ***Introduction***

*The Turkish Cypriot community which constitutes the inseparable part of the Great Turkish Nation which lived independently and fought for its rights and liberties; and*

*Which had been struggling and resisting against all attacks, moves and acts directed against its national existence since 1878, when it was separated from its Motherland, and in particular in the years 1958, 1963 and 1974 by the Greek Cypriots with the help and the assistance of Greeks, despite the fact that it was the co-founder of the independent Cyprus Republic;*

*By making use of the rights, liberties and means reinstated as a result of the victorious Peace Operations carried out by the heroic Turkish Armed Forces in accordance with the natural, historic and guarantor's rights of the Motherland: and with the aim :*

*To constitute the foundation for the establishment of the Independent Cyprus Federal Republic;*

*To secure fully safe conditions of living within the boundaries of its own State;*

*To secure the human rights and liberties, social justice and peace for the community and its members and the establishment of a democratic, secular and law-observing State:*

*It approves and proclaims this Constitution..., and,*

*It entrusts it to the vigilant sons of the community who believe in liberty, justice and virtue.*

Messrs Glafkos Clerides and Rauf Denктаş – who represented their communities in negotiations since 1968 - resumed talks in Vienna in April 1975, and met there again in July. The sad truth is that the real hard bargaining on the constitutional future of Cyprus has yet to begin. There are some indications that suggest that the Government of President Makarios will be prepared to accept - with great reluctance to be sure - a bizonal Federation, on condition that all of the 200,000 Greek refugees (or, it may be speculated, the large majority of them) are allowed to go back to their homes and properties to the north. Already Archbishop Makarios has said (in an interview to the Italian newspaper *Il Tempo* of 14th July 1975):

The Turkish Cypriots can, if they wish, live separately. They can move out of one area and settle in another. They have no right, however, to occupy Greek properties and homes, uprooting by force their Turkish Cypriot Community, but I do not oppose this 'divorce'.

The bizonal system is - as the Greeks have long realized - a kind of arrangement which in the event of a new conflict, could lead to the partitioning of the island between Greece and Turkey; and this would be, in Greek eyes, the ultimate national humiliation. However, the Greek Cypriot Government is in an extremely weak position and must try to make the best of a very bad job. At least three important factors may have forced the Greek side to accept the principle of a bizonal Federation: (a) The great bulk of the Turkish Cypriots were, by July, 1975, living in the north; and it was recognized that those who failed to go north could not be kept in the south by the force of Greek arms indefinitely. Thus it was accepted that the Turkish community will make their homes in the north and there is nothing that the Greeks can do about it. (b) There were extremely worrying reports in July that the Turkish Cypriot authorities had already moved 8,000 mainland Turks into the north of the island, and planned to bring in another 100,000 by the end of 1975, so as to alter the whole population balance of the island. Turkey is, after all, only 40 miles away, and with her population of 36 million, she could easily afford to send even several hundreds of thousands of impoverished peasants in a short time. Thus, the sooner a constitutional settlement is reached in Cyprus, the better the chances of the Greek Cypriots to stop 'Turkish colonialism'. (c) Although President Makarios is recognized internationally as the head of the Republic of Cyprus the kind of support which the Greek Cypriots have succeeded in obtaining from other countries is generally confined to sympathy, official statements, and votes in international organizations. Such support may have some weight, particularly in the longer term, but it is not going to dislodge 40,000 troops and 250 armed vehicles from the north of the island. The Turkish Army will not leave until after a satisfactory constitutional settlement is reached; and the Turks will not agree to discuss any settlement which is not based on the bizonal principle. Further, the United States - the only power which might be able to prevent the bizonal plan - actually approves of it.

So it seems that what the representatives of the Greek and Turkish communities will be fighting over, in the coming months, is not the principle of a bizonal Federation, but the precise form of a bizonal arrangement. Among the most important negotiable elements are: (a) the precise extent and definition of the Greek and Turkish zones; (b) the question of what proportion of the population of each zone will be members of the other community; and (c) the scope and powers of the Central Government, the Federal Legislature and other bicomunal institutions e.g. the Central Bank, the Planning Bureau etc.

A complex game of political chess is about to develop in and outside Cyprus, in which the two sides - the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots (or more accurately: the Turks) - will try to demonstrate their own, and assess their opponent's strength, stamina, and determination. Each side has been occasionally making some minor 'strategic' concessions with a view to appearing 'flexible', and eliciting bigger moves from the other side, while at the same time they have both been trying to organize their own State and economy. Greeks and Turks are, at present, so far apart as regards their ideas of what would be a just, or even a tolerable, settlement, that they will not even consider meeting each other halfway. Besides, a huge tangle of international issues surround the negotiations - the changing balance of power in the Middle East at the time of American Soviet détente, Turkey's claims on the Aegean Sea, NATO's apprehension at the prospect of a Greco-Turkish war, the question of the British military bases in Cyprus which serve NATO and CENTO interests, etc., etc. - that their impact on the future of Cyprus is simply unpredictable. Both sides are

looking out for any international developments which are likely to strengthen their own hand in the negotiations, or weaken that of their opponents. At present neither the Greeks nor the Turks really know just what concessions they may eventually have to make, under changed local and international conditions, in order to reach a negotiated settlement.

The strongest card that the Turkish side have is that they already hold 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus, and nobody is going to get them out against their will. This area contains the homes and properties of 200,000 Greeks, and also 70 to 80 per cent of all economic and agricultural productive resources of the island. The Turks would be prepared - for a price - to return to the Greeks a part of this territory. This would enable, say, half the number of refugees to go back to their homes and re-occupy their farms, factories, shops, hotels and other properties in the extended Greek zone, and a proportion of the other refugees might be admitted to the Turkish zone (though it is less easy to imagine them all re-occupying their homes and means of livelihood). The price for the Turkish 'concession' (if this is not an absurd use of the term) is that the Greek side agree to a constitutional settlement which will give the Turkish side a number of clear and definite benefits.

A settlement means to the Turkish Cypriots eventual peace and security, which would make it possible for Mother Turkey to withdraw all, or most, of her 40,000 troops and so relax her not-so-comfortable grip on them. A settlement should lead to political and economic stability which will encourage local and foreign investors to put money in Turkish Cypriot industries and businesses and attract tourists to their (Greek-built) hotels, restaurants and clubs. A settlement, again, means that the Turkish Cypriots gain representation in the Government of the Republic, through which their economy can obtain foreign technical and financial assistance, and their produce can be promoted to world markets. Possibly more important than all these is that, through a constitutional settlement, the Turkish Cypriots will achieve legitimation: they will no longer be regarded by the world as rebels, or maverick, but a constituent element of the Republic of Cyprus, who possess what they possess by constitutional right. Further, legitimation for the Turkish Cypriot position may be thought to imply a vindication of Turkey's 'peace operation'. When Turkey landed her troops on Cyprus she appeared determined to pursue what she conceived of as moral, legal and national rights, without much concern for international opinion. Still, despite self-confident and even self-righteous poses, Turkish leaders realize that Turkey needs friends in Europe and the rest of the world - at least it should not become too difficult for the United States Government to back her. Her long-term political, economic, defence and cultural interests demand that she be thought to be a Europeanized, civilized country, and a believer in peace, and international law and convention. Her actions in Cyprus - however she sought to describe and explain them - have tended to promote the traditional image of the Asiatic, semi-civilized nation of the Terrible Turk, and this is not a qualification for membership in NATO and the EEC. Thus, Turkey has an interest to obtain a constitutional settlement for the Turkish Cypriots which she regards as satisfactory, claim credit for her part in setting up a new Federal Republic, and withdraw backstage to work for the improvement of her tarnished image.

Now, the Greek Cypriots know that they cannot prevent the Turks from establishing themselves in the North, but only they can sign a settlement to normalize and legitimate the Turkish position in the eyes of the world. This, in fact, is just about the only strong card the

Greek Cypriot side have in the negotiations. And they will probably trade it in exchange for the greatest possible reduction of the Turkish-held area; the admission of the greatest possible number of Greek refugees to the Turkish zone; and the establishment of the strongest possible Central Government, Legislature and other bicomunal institutions, so as to ensure the greatest possible influence of the Greek majority over the whole State.

Constitutional negotiations are expected to begin in earnest against the background of intercommunal separation, bitterness and hostility. It seems inevitable that the historical circumstances under which the new Constitution originates will impress their mark on the content of the Constitution, and thus the structure of the new Cypriot State. The Federal Republic is to be conceived of on the principle that two separate and unfriendly communities, with different national identities and antagonistic interests and aspirations, must somehow be accommodated within a common constitutional scheme. The Turkish side will accept none but a bizonal 'solution', which means that the state of intercommunal separation and antagonism is to be institutionalized. Under the 1960 Republic, the Greek and Turkish communities created their separate and largely independent centres of gravity for their political, economic and cultural lives. After the 1963 break-up, these centres acquired their separate geographical bases, and the sense was created that there were Greek and Turkish areas which had to be defended from hostile forces. The ideas of patriotism, public duty, political activity and public interest were linked, in the minds of the Greek and Turkish people, with what went on in the Greek and Turkish spaces. A bizonal arrangement will carry this state of affairs one step further in the direction of permanent confrontation, because the Greek and Turkish areas will be divided by a clearly marked border which people will not cross lightly. And of course, the circumstances under which the border came to be drawn have created feelings of hostility and resentment which will feed on themselves as long as lack of contact between Greeks and the Turks is the norm.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

The discussion in the preceding chapters has the general form of a descriptive analysis of a sequence of events and situations leading up to the present tragic condition of Cyprus. Since 1878 the Cyprus conflict has gone through several transformations, brought about by changes in the character and interrelations of a variety of elements. The analysis given of the major phases of the conflict concentrated on some of these elements: the two antagonistic and occasionally hostile Cypriot communities themselves; their relationships to their respective Mother Countries; the opposing ideologies in terms of which they perceived their rights and interests in connection with the political status of Cyprus, and the methods and organizational structures which they used to promote their rights and interests, as these were perceived by them.

Crudely put, the conflict arose from the fact that the Greeks believed that they had the national right to determine the political status of the whole of the island, whereas the Turks believed that they had the national right to determine the political status, if not of the whole of the island, then of 'their' part of it. At different periods, however, each of the two communities arrived at different judgments as to the practical limits to their freedom to express their determination, and the tactics and compromises they had to adopt under prevailing local and international circumstances. Hence the continual modification of the form of the conflict. (This is a crude way of explaining the development of the conflict. For one thing, it is being assumed that the wishes, beliefs and judgments of the two communal leaderships were entirely shared by two cohesive communal populations; and this is not exactly true.)

The preceding discussion of the way the Cyprus conflict moved from one phase to the next, may have given the impression that there was some kind of inevitability about its development: the ethnic division between the two Cypriot communities remaining pronounced throughout the Ottoman occupation; taking at first an antagonistic and then a violent character under the British; continuing in a different form under the independent Republic; and after its break-up acquiring a limited geographical basis which was extended and clearly defined following the Turkish invasion. Nevertheless, it has to be noted that each one of the succeeding phases contained within it many practical possibilities for rapprochement, peace and co-operation between Greeks and Turks which remained unrealized.

Let us briefly review the major phases of the Cyprus conflict from the British period to the present, summarizing some main trends, emphasizing some aspects which in retrospect appear particularly significant, and adding a few further observations. By this exercise it is hoped to identify some errors, or missed opportunities for peace and co-operation between the communities. To point out mistakes ex post facto is sometimes supposed to be a facile, even an intellectually dishonest, thing to do: it is 'being wise after the event'! Yet, individuals and nations do not always learn from their mistakes and it is often far from easy to draw the right conclusions from a complex and protracted conflict. A close and honest study of the history of the Cyprus conflict may yield some useful lessons, and some clues as to what kind of constitutional settlement should not be sought.



## **British Occupation: Growing Nationalism (1878-1955)**

Under the Ottoman rule the Greeks of Cyprus were recognized as a millet , or nation, under the leadership of the Church of Cyprus and its Archbishop who was the millet bashi or 'Ethnarch'. When Cyprus came under British rule, the Church increased its importance and influence, both as a national organization embracing all Greek Orthodox Christians and as the principal advocate of the Greek national cause. To be a member of the true faith, and of the splendid Greek nation, were two sides of the same reality. As late as 1954 the Greek Cypriot anthropologist Dr J. G. Peristiany was able to ascertain that the Greek language and the Orthodox faith are so intimately interconnected that the Greek Cypriots find it difficult to differentiate between them... A Greek is a Greek insofar as he is an Orthodox... The priest is, therefore, always a firm believer in the enosis movement as enosis , to him, means the reunion of the temporal and spiritual which have been artificially disjoined. He is also a firm propagandist for the conservative party, which is identified with the enosis movement .

An organization which embraced, or professed to embrace, all the Greek Cypriots and only these, inevitably left out the Turkish Cypriots; and the latter progressively saw and organized themselves as a separate national and religious entity. Even when the Greek bourgeoisie produced their secular nationalist leaders, there was no attempt to approach, understand and reassure the nervous Turkish Cypriots. Hence the sad experience of the Legislative Council (see chapter 11, section 2), which formalized the Greek-Turkish ethnic distinction into a political opposition. P. G. Polyviou wrote of the Turkish Cypriots that:

they sought no extension of democratic rights, obediently supporting Britain in all the spheres of Government action. In return for this collaboration Britain rewarded the Turks; it never attempted to instruct them that as a minority they should come to terms with the inevitability of some sort of political evolution in Cyprus which would be likely to place them under the preponderant influence of the more numerous Greek community. Furthermore, by repeatedly justifying, particularly in later times, its stereotyped rejections of the Greek Cypriot demand of the union of Cyprus with Greece not on the real grounds of the potential strategic importance attached to the possession of Cyprus but on the grounds that the Turkish Cypriots needed protection from future Greek domination, Britain pre-empted any possibility for the achievement of a political understanding between Greeks and Turks .

There is considerable truth in this view, but not enough truth, as it contains a suppressio veri and a suggestio falsi . First, it must be remembered that the Greek Cypriots demanded nothing less than the union of Cyprus with Greece at the time when the relations between Greece and Turkey were hostile. The Turkish Cypriots can hardly be blamed for seeing lesser evil in being a community in a British Cyprus than in a Greek Cyprus. Secondly, it is hardly fair to blame the British for failing to 'instruct' the Turks on the proper place of minorities, when the Greeks themselves made no effort at all to come to an understanding with them. Especially in view of the hostility between Greece and Turkey even after 1923, it was surely the Greek Cypriots who should have approached the Turkish Cypriots and tried to persuade them that they had nothing to lose and much to gain from enosis . Instead, the Greeks went

on ignoring the Turkish Cypriot point of view until the late 1950s and even beyond, through the brief years of the Greco-Turkish Republic and in the subsequent decade which ended with the July-August war of 1974.

Naturally, if the Greek leadership ignored the Turkish views, and aspirations, the Turks were not going to plead for sympathy and understanding from the Greeks. Already the two communal education systems in Cyprus - the one which was imported from Greece and the other from Turkey - were cultivating a certain flattering image of one's own nation and a derogatory image of the other, and hence spread prejudices which are still very much alive. As Robert Stephens wrote:

Greeks tend to think of Turks as bullies and Turks tend to think of Greeks as cheats. Turks consider themselves as made of sterner stuff than Greeks and Greeks see themselves as more alert and energetic than Turks. The Turks suffer from physical arrogance and the Greeks from intellectual pride. Yet there are, of course, many brave Greeks and plenty of intelligent Turks who do not conform to the national stereotype .

These attitudes, which constitute the cruder elements of the Hellenic and the Islamic traditions, continued to exist during the brief life of the Greek-Turkish Republic and were certainly not entirely absent from the cabinet room. One can only speculate that if after World War II moderate and leftist Greeks and Turks had agreed to participate in a system of internal self-government which Britain would be prepared to grant, then certain common political and social aims and values might have evolved which would eventually develop into a peculiarly Cypriot political consciousness, capable of sustaining, on Britain's departure, an independent Cypriot State. As things turned out, however, the Greek community pursued steadfastly the line of ' enosis and only enosis ' and the Turkish community defined their objectives in opposition to them.

### **British Occupation: Militant Nationalism (1955-1959)**

Before EOKA began its struggle for enosis , the Turkish Cypriot leadership (or rather the leadership of the Turkish Cypriot political activists) had already established some loose sort of contact with the Turkish government. As was mentioned earlier (chapter 11, section 3), in the 1954 Cyprus debate in the United Nations the Greek representative was opposed by the Turkish representative. The London Conference of 1955 established Turkey as an interested party, and the subsequent anti-Greek riots, first in Istanbul and Smyrna, and later in Cyprus changed the original anti-colonial character of the Greek effort. The Turkish Cypriots were late starters in the political game, but they eventually caught up with the Greeks, and developed their own political and military organizations, their own propaganda machine and close relations with the Government and Press of their Mother Country.

In later years many intelligent Greeks were to regret the fact that their leaders had rejected a number of British offers for limited self-government. A timely acceptance of any such offer would have prevented Turkish embroilment and the consequent emergence of Turkish Cypriot militancy. Once Turkish Cypriots were recruited in the Auxiliary Police, and Volkan and TMT had been formed, the Turks were in a position to practise violence against Greek people and properties. A number of violent incidents between Greeks and Turks in 1957 and

1958 resulted in the permanent poisoning of relations between the nationalist activists of the two communities. Thenceforth, in times of violent intercommunal strife human life in the 'other' community became cheap.

### **The Zürich-London Agreements and the Greco-Turkish Republic (1959-1963)**

This phase of the Cyprus conflict has been extensively described earlier (chapter II, sections 4 and 5 and chapter III). It may be useful however to refer to three interconnected kinds of factors which have developed in previous phases and whose continued existence contributed to the destruction of the unitary and theoretically integral Greco-Turkish Republic.

(a) The population of Cyprus was already divided into two national communities with 'markedly different, if not antagonistic, ideologies, religious and cultural values. The heroes of one community were the villains of the other... Although they lived side by side and intermingled with each other, their fundamental values remained distinct'. Not only was no attempt made to educate the two communities into understanding and collaborating with each other, but two nationalist systems of academic and political education developed, which made it that much harder for Greeks and Turks to communicate and form a basis for political consensus. In the period beginning in 1959 the opposing nationalisms of the Greeks and the Turks acquired a semi-official semi-institutional status.

(b) The first Government of the Republic was formed by men who had led the Greek and Turkish nationalist movements. As Cyprus had no tradition of representative institutions to speak of, there was an aura of mystique as far as the communities were concerned attending their respective leaderships. The example and pronouncements of the leaders were accepted by their people as the standards of political correctness. One would expect, then, the Greek and Turkish members of the Government to show respect, trust and a willingness for co-operation with their colleagues from the other community. Harmonious co-operations between the two leaderships within a united Government would have gone a long way to dispel intercommunal prejudice and mistrust, and develop attitudes of co-operation between Greeks and Turks. A united Cypriot leadership could have contributed to a sense of unity and cohesion among the divided population of the island. In actual fact, the practices of the Greek and Turkish leaders gave the worse example to their people and tended to strengthen intercommunal suspicion and prejudice. In the words of Robert Stephens :

[Makarios did not] show great skill in handling the Turkish Cypriots after the establishment of the Republic, though part of the failure may be put down to the narrow-mindedness of the Greek Cypriots as a whole, as well as the short-sightedness of the Turkish Cypriots in over-playing their hand. Unavoidable differences of national temperament played their part. In cabinet meetings the Turkish ministers began to feel they were being by-passed by the Greeks who, they believed, settled every important question among themselves beforehand... It must also have been difficult for the Greek Cypriots, who had never ruled themselves before, to restrain the impulse to show off their new power and put the Turks in their place. Küçük complained that he was not consulted about important diplomatic appointments or about the general conduct of foreign policy.

From the viewpoint of the Turks, Archbishop Makarios was behaving not as the head of a bicomunal State but as the millet bashi of the Greeks who refused to accept their status as a separate community. From the viewpoint of the Greeks, Küçük and the other Turkish leaders clamoured for their full rights under the Constitution, even when these conflicted with the interests of the State as a whole, because they were aware of Turkish power behind them. Both the Greek and the Turkish leaders bear a great responsibility for their failure to work together for the good of all Cypriots and for permitting the break-up of the Greco-Turkish State in December 1963. A great opportunity to educate the two communities to accept, and co-operate with each other and create a well-run and democratic Cypriot State was irretrievably lost.

(c) The division between the Greek and Turkish national communities, and the Greek and Turkish Cypriot nationalist leaderships, was further accentuated by the fact that the Governments of Greece and Turkey had entered the Cypriot scene on a regular base. The various Treaties to which Greece and Turkey were parties were bad enough; but the Governments of these countries went on to make their presence felt in the island through their contacts with many organizations belonging to their respective national communities. Each of the two Governments gave guidance, moral and financial support, scholarships, free travel and other benefits to teachers' associations, athletic clubs, trade and farmers' unions, fighters' organizations etc. Naturally, the closer the connections between influential Greek and Turkish Cypriot organizations with their respective Mother Countries the less interested they were to establish contacts among themselves. One explanation for this excessive concern of the Governments of Greece and Turkey for their national communities in the island is that Cypriot affairs continued to figure prominently in Greek and Turkish politics. Thus no Government could afford to be charged that they were not doing enough for the welfare of their kith and kin in Cyprus.

Despite the deep cleavage between the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus - which was sustained to some extent by the communal leaderships and the Governments of the Mother Countries - there were some rare exceptions of people who spoke up for the need to develop sincere intercommunal friendship and collaboration. For example, two Turkish lawyers named Hikmet and Gürkan began in 1960 a newspaper in which they advocated a new, more positive and co-operative attitude towards the Greek community. In 1962 they were gunned down one night in their car by extreme Turkish nationalist elements.

In the Greek community there was the interesting case of a prominent citizen, Mr N. C. Lanitis, who in March 1963 published a series of articles in the English-language newspaper *The Cyprus Mail*. In these articles he argued for a moderate and conciliatory approach to the question of the relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. As a consequence he was attacked from many quarters as unpatriotic and a traitor. These articles were later expanded into a pamphlet entitled *Our Destiny*. A number of passages are quoted below, both because they contain much wisdom and a clear perception of the dangers of unchecked nationalism; and because it is instructive to see what kind of viewpoint was dubbed as unpatriotic and treasonable by people whose outlook and philosophy is very influential even one year after the disastrous July-August war of 1974.

The Zürich Agreement is as good as the men who want to apply it. In principle it has advantage in that it has made us masters of our own house. It has per contra one disadvantage in that it divides the country. The provisions pertaining to the rule of 70:30 as between Greeks and Turks in public departments (and 60:40 in the Cyprus army) are not as important as they look unless we view them... with sentimentalism. The rule 70:30 in an inverted way says that there will be so many more Greeks employed in private industry and trade than Turks, (if this was objectively expressed in the Agreement the Turks would probably be in revolt) [pp. 6-7] ... The Greeks are in the majority and the onus of responsibility falls on their shoulders. Holding responsibility means being in a position of leadership. It also means doing a tough job. So far we have not entirely been living up to that responsibility. The Greek press has been waging a tit for tat war against the Turkish press and on several occasions it has instigated friction. We have not applied any self restraint in our national expressions, especially on occasions of Greek national days. It is easy to indulge in these things but where are they leading us to? [pp. 7-8].

If we are passive towards or show lack of friendship to the Turks, they will of necessity have to rely more and more on Turkey and a most unfortunate situation will be created for everybody concerned, including Greece and Turkey. And for us, the Greeks in Cyprus, we shall prejudice our position of responsibility and leadership.. Basically we should be one country and one people. The Turks are, above all, Cypriots: and so are the Greeks. There is a greater unity in the outlook on life and social behaviour between Greeks and Turks than the ostensible differences of religion and language tend to indicate... Until unity is attained the Greek side has to be magnanimous and must give more than it can take. This is the basic rule of being in a responsible position [pp. 8-9].

On the other hand, the Turkish side must remember that they must apply self-restraint too. The victory they won over the Zürich Agreement is circumstantial, created from the friction between the Greeks and the British. It is not a true victory and if they rely too much on it, it may fail them one day. They should also co-operate with the Greeks, as a first stage, in civic activities, in the chamber of commerce, in boy scout and girl guide activities, in employers' associations, in labour unions, in games. In this way they could lay down the foundations for co-operation at a higher level. And the same goes for the Greeks. Turkish should be taught in Greek schools and Greek in Turkish schools. Both communities should look at each other as being members of the same country [p. 91].

Twelve years and thousands of unnecessary deaths later, these words of moderation and good will more than ever deserve serious study and reflection. Unfortunately, many of those Greek and Turkish nationalists who contributed to the break-up of the State in December 1963 are still in firm control of the affairs of their long-estranged communities.

### **The Divided Cyprus (1963-1974)**

It was seen earlier that after the bloody events of December 1963 the Turks of the Turkish quarters of Nicosia, Famagusta and certain other places barricaded themselves in their

areas and several thousands of Turks from other parts of the island flocked into the enclaves which were thus created. Hostilities between Greek 'security forces' and the Turkish 'fighters' defending these enclaves continued intermittently for eight or nine months, sometimes provoked by the latter who were trying to get Turkey to intervene militarily on their behalf. At the London Conference of January 1964 both communities showed a definite lack of desire to re-establish the unitary Greco-Turkish State. Only 45 days after Makarios's modest '13 points' the Greeks offered the Turks a minority status; and the Turks said 'no thank you' and called for partition. Both sides quickly persuaded themselves that they were now in a better position than under the old state of affairs and that the December events had demonstrated the dishonesty and treachery of the other side. The compromise Constitution of 1960 was destroyed and not a tear was shed; Greeks and Turks felt too proud and too confident of the justice of their respective causes. to even contemplate another compromise arrangement.

On the effective cessation of the hostilities the Greeks were in control of the whole of the island, minus the few Turkish armed enclaves. The Greeks, and the world at large, were satisfied that the pathetic Turkish Cypriot insurrection had failed, and things were almost back to normal. Few people could see at the time that a foreign country, Turkey, had established a presence in the island through the Turkish Cypriot mini-'State'. Three important characteristics of this unofficial 'State' should be stressed, because they highlight the extent of Turkish involvement in Cyprus:

(a) The Turkish Cypriot mini-'State' had some little territory under its complete control, which had to be defended from the Greek National Guard by Turkish Cypriot and Turkish mainland conscript soldiers, all under the command of regular officers of the Turkish Army. The creation of certain well-defined Turkish areas on the map of Cyprus made it possible, indeed inevitable, for the Government and High Command of Turkey to re-define their defence responsibilities so as to include these Cypriot areas too into their defence system. Thus, when Turkey ordered her troops to Cyprus there already were separate Turkish areas in the island which, from the point of view of the Turkish military establishment, were 'home territory'.

(b) As was explained earlier (chapter IV, section 5) the Turkish Cypriot 'State' far from being economically self-sufficient, was in receipt of an annual grant from the Turkish Government for defence, relief and other immediate purposes. It is a matter of simple logic - which however escaped the notice of many Greeks - that once economic pressures were put on Turkish Cypriots, their leaders would have no alternative but appeal to the Turkish Government for assistance, and the latter would become even more deeply involved in Turkish Cypriot affairs. The condition of the Turkish Cypriot economy was one of the chronic problems of the Turkish Ministry of Finance.

(c) The Turkish Cypriot 'State' had, in 1963, a population of some 115,000 which is about that of a midde-sized European town. Clearly, the human and material resources which the Turkish leadership could mobilize for propagating their cause, and for developing foreign relations and contacts, were negligible. The Greeks constituted the official, the internationally recognized State and maintained representation in several foreign capitals, in the United Nations, and in over 40 other international bodies. This being so, the cause of

the Turkish Cypriots was taken up and championed internationally by the diplomatic service of Turkey. Indeed, Turkish foreign-policy had been concerned to advance Turkish Cypriot interests too since the mid-1950s.

From the time the Turkish Cypriots separated themselves from the Greeks and placed themselves under the protection of Turkey the Cyprus question took a central position in Turkish national politics. All Turkish political parties had to have a 'stand' with regards to the rights and interests of their Cypriot brethren. Further, all Governments and parties insisted on the validity of the Treaty of Guarantee, as that was the legal expression of Turkey's responsibilities and obligations towards the Turkish Cypriot community. As they saw it, the Turkish Cypriot entity was Turkey herself.

It is difficult to estimate, even in retrospect, the full damage done to the two Cypriot communities by their separation and estrangement following the hostilities of December 1963. The cultural and ideological division of the earlier periods became deeper and assumed geographical and political aspects. Under conditions of separate statehood, opportunities for personal contacts between Greeks and Turks were few; and hardly any member of one community understood, let alone saw the justice, of the other community's point of view. The Greeks produced arguments by which they convinced themselves that all justice was on their side, and the Turks did exactly the same thing. Nobody seemed interested to get an intercommunal dialogue going – it was the other side which was always expected to come to their senses. The doyen of the Greek Cypriot legal thinkers, the Attorney-General Mr Criton Tornaritis, demonstrated incessantly (in a series of articles published by the Public Information Office of the Republic) that the 1960 Constitution and Treaties were inoperative; and in that task he was followed by many Greek lawyers who took a fancy to Constitutional Theory. On the other side the Turks produced their own argumentation which always led to the conclusion that the fundamental principle of *pacta sunt servanda* could not be abandoned, for any Greek reasons, in the case of the Constitution and the Treaty of Guarantee. Turkey never wavered from her conviction that she had a legal right and a moral obligation to take, if necessary, military action to protect and advance what she regarded as the interest of the Turkish Cypriot community. Archbishop Makarios may have been in no particular hurry to settle the Cyprus question; but he did make a consistent effort to prevent the creation of circumstances in which Turkey would find it necessary and justifiable to resort to violence.

Intercommunal talks began in 1968, after several wasted years, in an attempt to settle peaceably the constitutional dispute. The United Nations and the Governments of Greece and Turkey gave their support to this procedure, and both Cypriot sides made considerable concessions. As a result the area of agreement between the disputants progressively grew: it was eventually agreed, for example, that the new State would be unitary, with bicomunal participation to Government, the Legislature, the Civil Service and Police fixed at a 80:20 ratio, without veto rights or separate majorities, and with considerable local autonomy given to Greek and Turkish regions. In an interview published in the Greek Cypriot newspaper *Agon* of 14th August 1975 the Greek negotiator Mr Clerides said that 'had the coup not taken place, it would have been a matter of a mere two or three months of further elaboration and the discussion of certain details before a solution to the Cyprus question was reached' .

If the negotiations were going so well, and the Turkish Cypriots were within sight of a settlement which would be acceptable to them, why did Turkey find it necessary to order an invasion whose consequences were bound to be momentous and indeed unpredictable? After all, the Greek Cypriot Government which had been installed by the rebellious National Guard on 15th July had pledged themselves to continue the intercommunal talks. So the coup had nothing to do with the prospects of an intercommunal settlement - or did it? Mr Clerides said in the Agon interview some things that throw light on this question :

In my view [the coup ] was carried out because the [Greek] military Government, known as the Junta, believed that it would be possible, after the coup , to proclaim enosis , and that Turkey would be prevented by the allies of Greece from carrying out an invasion... One of the reasons we have failed [to reach a settlement with the Turkish Cypriots] was that the Greek Government-Junta was not sincere. While publicly declaring that they desired an agreement through the intercommunal talks, they in fact had other aims and objectives... The Junta and their leader Mr Ioannides were not sincere as regards their intentions concerning a settlement...

On the basis of this cryptic statement and certain other indications the following conjecture may be suggested. Whereas Colonel Papadopoulos, who ruled Greece from April 1967 to November 1973, was very keen to see some sort of a compromise settlement in Cyprus, his successor Brigadier Ioannides was bent on bringing about enosis . Turkey knew this, as she also knew that following Grivas's death EOKA-B was taken over by Ioannides. With this man in power no constitutional settlement would be possible in Cyprus. Hence Turkey's decision to invade when the opportunity arose in order to impose a settlement which favoured her prot,g,s. And the July coup , organized and directed from Athens, was the perfect opportunity.

It should be remembered that just as the Turkish Cypriot enclaves were part of the unified Turkish defence system, so the Greek controlled territory of Cyprus was, in effect, part of the Greek defence system. Once Archbishop Makarios made the mistake of setting up a National Guard led by regular officers of the Greek Army he could not reach a constitutional settlement with the Turkish Cypriots which was unacceptable to the Greek Government. More generally, once the Cypriots were divided into two separate state entities, each being incorporated into the defence system of another country, they were not entirely free to even settle their own differences.

### **The Partitioned Cyprus**

And so we come to the latest phase of the Cyprus conflict, the one which began with the Turkish invasion and which resulted in the partitioning of the island into a Greek and a Turkish zone. The `border' is now guarded by Greek and Turkish troops on either side, but most people expect that the next move will be not another war but a negotiated bizonal settlement to give constitutional expression to the de facto partition.

In retrospect, the present situation is seen as the logical outcome of a powerful, though not irresistible, process of intercommunal division whose origins lie beyond the British occupation. This division grew progressively deeper and more formalized, by feeding upon



itself, as there were no sufficiently long-sighted, influential and courageous people to work for intercommunal understanding and co-operation. In earlier sections of this study a number of factors have been identified which have contributed to the deepening rift.

These factors may now be briefly summarized under three related headings

**(a) Communalism.** Greeks and Turkish Cypriots have many characteristics and aspirations in common but they are two distinct ethnic groups, each with its own language, religion, cultural heritage and traditions. From the beginning of the British occupation all institutions through which moral, social, political and cultural beliefs and values are formed - religious institutions, schools, the press, political and quasi-political associations etc - were organized on a communal basis. In the Legislative Council and later in the House of Representatives the elected leaders represented members of the Greek or Turkish communities, and not just Cypriots. Indeed, communalism extended to areas in which bicomunal participation could be expected e.g. in professional and trade unions, co-operative societies, athletic clubs etc. It may be said, then, that all, or almost all, organized life in Cyprus was community-based. In December 1963 the Turks formed their own communal state-like entity, leaving the official Republic in the hands of the Greek community.

**(b) Nationalism.** The Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus had assumed the leadership of the Greek Cypriot community and propagated vigorously the Greek nationalist cause : Cyprus is the island of the Greek Cypriots and would therefore be unfree until she is united with Mother Greece. The Turkish Cypriots were opposed to any idea of enosis , and developed in opposition to this their own nationalist movement and ideology. When the Greek Cypriot nationalists looked to Greece for guidance, moral and diplomatic support, and later arms, the Turkish Cypriots looked to Turkey for similar assistance. Given the doctrines and objectives of Greek and Turkish Cypriot nationalism, the two communal leaderships were unwilling and unable to negotiate a common compromise position.

**(c) Involvement of the Mother Countries.** In the early 1950s Greece and Turkey extended their political and diplomatic support to their respective national communities in Cyprus and later helped them with their armed campaigns. On independence the Mother Countries developed links with many official quasi-official and unofficial organizations and thus continued to exercise an influence in Cypriot affairs. After December 1963, when communalism acquired fundamental geographical aspects, separation was maintained, on the Turkish side, by means of Turkish economic assistance and by an armed force of Turkish Cypriots and Turkish mainlanders. This force was confronted by the National Guard which was led by Greek mainland officers. The July-August war was fought between a united Greek and a united Turkish force. The post-war political and diplomatic confrontation is, once again, conducted by two united fronts: a Greek/Greek Cypriot and a Turkish/Turkish Cypriot.

It is seen, then, that communalism, nationalism and the involvement of the Mother Countries are the three main forces which strengthened one another and deepened the cleavage between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, while minimizing the significance of their common characteristics, those derived by their Cypriotness itself.

Yet Cypriots - Greeks and Turks and the rest - share many common characteristics values and aspirations. In many places in this study there are references to 'the rights and interests of the Greek Cypriots', and 'the rights and interests of the Turkish Cypriots', because these expressions have been used systematically in political arguments by Greeks, Turks and their respective backers. Indeed, the impression may have been given that what Greek Cypriots regard as their rights and interests are always different from, and even incompatible with, what Turkish Cypriots regard as their rights and interests. This impression was certainly cultivated, by the words and deeds of the two communal leaderships, even at the time when they were supposedly collaborating under the unitary Greco-Turkish State. Now that Cyprus is partitioned and awaits a constitutional settlement, it is of crucial importance to see if there may not be, after all, a large coincidence in the desires, values and demands of the members of the two communities which may be realized to a greater extent by more unity rather than by total separation between them.

In the first place, Greek and Turkish Cypriots in general have a broadly similar temperament and outlook on life, these being products of their common history and geography and similar social institutions. They are all strongly attached to their island - and even their part of the island - and they distinguish themselves from, and feel rather uneasy with, people from abroad, including mainland Greeks and Turks.

With both Greek and Turkish Cypriots, the family is the basic moral, social and economic unit. Cypriots in general are individualists, and they put themselves and their families first. As a family man, the Cypriot is greatly concerned to promote the dual aims of the honour and prestige, and the material prosperity, of his family. A large part of the thought, energy and income of the family goes to the purchase of a house and furniture, the education of the children, marrying them well, and helping the son to a good job.

Greek and Turkish Cypriots belonging to the same socio-economic stratum work for their living under similar working and market conditions. Their occupational problems and their economic interests are very similar - much more similar than those of people in different strata of the same community. Again, Greeks and Turks in the lower economic strata are equally vulnerable economically and frequently demand the same special protection from the State. Large sections of both communities feel that the State should adopt measures to promote a fairer distribution of wealth and, more generally, the benefits and burdens of citizenship.

Despite all this, since December 1963, Greek and Turkish Cypriots have had to work for the advancement of their similar economic and social rights and interests in two separate and hostile States. There is no doubt that the totality of Cypriot families ° both, Greek and Turkish - would have been much better off working under a single, unified economic system, rather than divided into two communal economies: a Greek one short of labour and a Turkish one short of capital and entrepreneurial expertise.

It may be taken as established that, regarded as individuals and families, both Greeks and Turks have desires, demands and aspirations which are similar and compatible. It is certainly true that in recent years down to July 1974 there was enough wealth in Cyprus to support -

under a system of welfare legislation - very satisfactory living standards for the whole population.

Among the deepest desires and needs of civilized human beings are peace, security and stability. These conditions people value for their own sake, as well as because they are prerequisites for moral, cultural, social and economic progress. War drives people to fanaticism and blunts their humanity. This is the universal experience, and it is also the experience of Cypriots. Greek and Turkish Cypriots do not lack a deep need and desire for peace - true peace, not just an armed truce – yet for more than a decade the two communities have raised their own armies of reluctant conscripts to confront, and occasionally to fight, each other. Each side is only too ready to point to the aggressive intentions of the other, and assert that, while peace is precious, national honour, liberty and dignity, must be defended, if need be, by force of arms.

It is unnecessary to go once again into the causes of the confrontation. It might be repeated, however, that the tension of 1962 and 1963, which resulted in the break-up of the unitary state, was the result of two incompatible nationalist ideologies espoused by the Greek and Turkish Cypriot activists. The Greek leaders would tell their people that they had been given a Constitution against their will which denied them fundamental political rights as a Greek community. The Turkish leaders would tell their people that the Greeks were cheating them of their political rights which they had earned as a Turkish community. Although Greeks and Turks conceive of their economic and social rights as individuals and families, they conceive of their political rights as national communities. Both communities tend to have a simple and uncritical faith in their respective leaderships (probably due to the absence of any worthwhile tradition of democratic institutions in the island) and this fact, coupled with the fact that both leaderships have been, for historical reasons, nationalist, led ordinary Cypriots to divide into two hostile groups for the sake of things that in fact hardly touched their daily lives as individuals or families.

It must be said, here, that both Greek and Turkish Cypriots are passionate and excitable people, and that, although they can be high-minded and generous, they can also be hot-tempered, irrationally angry and aggressive when they come to believe that their honour and rights as individuals or a community have been trampled on. The civilized ideals of peace and co-operation were sacrificed in Cyprus not because Cypriot men and women felt that their personal or family honour and interests demanded that they should take up arms, but because they were led by nationalist activists into thinking that certain political rights attaching to their communities had been, or were about to be, denied to them. It is important, here, to appreciate the qualification led by nationalist activists . Two groups of people do not fight each other simply because they speak different languages, worship different Gods, or cherish different traditions. They only fight when they believe that those elements which constitute their different national identities imply rights and interests which are mutually incompatible. Turkish Cypriots have been saying regularly for the past decade that they cannot live in peace with the Greek Cypriots. Of course Greeks and Turks and Armenians and Maronites and retired British army officers can live together in peace and friendship, intermingling among themselves in the island. What are incompatible, and operate as sources of conflict, are the traditional Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot nationalist ideologies.

The long and the short of the preceding analysis is that while Greek and Turkish Cypriots are in similar situations as individuals and families (particularly those belonging to the same socio-economic strata) they are on different sides of a deep and hostile divide as national communities, informed as they are with incompatible nationalist ideologies. With a little exaggeration it could be said that the ordinary Greek Cypriot and the ordinary Turkish Cypriot are just like each other - except that the former speaks Greek and is Christian and the latter speaks Turkish and is Moslem.

No attempt was made in the present study to judge the merits of the factual content and the political claims of the two rival ideologies because that would not add to our understanding of the nature and causes of the Cyprus conflict, nor help to bring the two communities together. No amount of dispassionate analytical argument will persuade, for example, the Greeks that it is not of crucial importance that they make up the four-fifths of the island's population, or the Turks to yield their claim to be one of the two equal partner communities of Cyprus. What is necessary for an intercommunal rapprochement is that both sides should make a sincere effort to understand and appreciate the other side's point of view, as it actually stands, rather than just try to sell that side their own. A multiplication of legal and pseudo-legal arguments for and against the validity of the Zürich-London Agreements will not improve intercommunal understanding.

The ideal condition under which the Cyprus conflict could be finally resolved would be one in which Greek and Turkish Cypriots have abandoned their nationalism and, as far as possible, their communalism, and proceeded to assimilate and develop into a coherent, integrated nation. All members of the Cypriot population would then be thinking and acting as citizens of an independent Cypriot nation state, maintaining special, but not exaggeratedly close, relations with Greece and Turkey. within a politically and psychologically integrated nation, differences in language and religion would have no explosive consequences. This would be true even if Greek-speaking Christians and Turkish-speaking Moslems are concentrated in different parts of the island. For example, in Belgium the Catholic Walloons and Protestant Flemish are concentrated in different parts of the country and have special cultural relations with France and Holland respectively. Yet, despite occasional language incidents and demonstrations, there is no question of the Belgians not forming one, united and cohesive nation - bi-ethnic, bi-linguist, bi-religionist, but still one nation - vowing allegiance to the same political and civil institutions.

The idea of Cyprus becoming a unified and integrated nation state may appear to be sheer moonshine: something which is so far removed from present realities that it is not worth thinking about seriously. One may point out impatiently that Cyprus is now geographically partitioned, ethnically segregated, with almost half her total population having been forced to flee their homes and properties, and more than 100,000 Greek and Turkish Cypriots and mainlanders under arms. In view of these realities, the urgency of revitalizing the economy, and the threat of colonization from Turkey, what is badly needed is a practical constitutional settlement sooner rather than later. Again, the whole Turkish Cypriot population is already in the north, and it will be foolish to imagine that they will ever decide (or that they would be allowed by their leaders) to return to their original towns and villages, where, in the words of Mr Denktaş, they would be 'little pools of Turks spread over the whole island'.

Thus, one may conclude, whatever the merits of the ideal of an integrated Cypriot nation-state, the present demographic reality in the island admits of no other solution than a form of bizonal federation.

A clear understanding of the present realities in Cyprus, and the ability to propose practical arrangements to bring the two sides together, are both very important; but it is important also to keep alive a vision of the kind of society Cyprus could some day become under the influence of men of good will, foresight and high ethnical principles. If there is a possibility of the Cypriots becoming a cohesive and integrated nation, expressing their wishes, values and aspirations through a united democratic state, then this possibility must not be barred by any immediate constitutional settlement. The actual Constitution which may be agreed upon between the Greek and Turkish sides should not close the door to the prospect of the Cypriot population gaining greater cohesion and unity and eventually, freely deciding to rewrite their Constitution on a more unified basis.

It may be said, then, that what is now needed in Cyprus is a Constitution that is suitable for the present and foreseeable future, and which will positively encourage the development of systematic collaboration and common interests between the two divided communities. If and when, at some future time, confidence and friendly relations are established between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, the Constitution could be revised by common consent so as to reflect a general need and desire for greater unity.

There is, of course, no guarantee that Greek and Turkish attitudes will ever shed their communal character and develop towards a broader Cypriotist direction. Nor is there any guarantee that the Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders will establish a more sincere and successful collaboration than that of the 1960-63 period. It may even be that the Greek and Turkish Cypriots will reject any suggestion that unity and collaboration will serve their common interests. Still, it has to be insisted upon that dispassionate consideration of the facts will convincingly show that the ideal of close intercommunal co-operation eventually developing into a Pan-Cypriot unity is the only ideal which provides the prospect of a permanent peace and stability, and moral, social and economic advancement for both Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

The Turkish Cypriots must bear in mind that even when they are all concentrated in a single, unified area, they are still the minority community in the island outnumbered by the Greeks by 4:1. Unless their relations with the Greek community become relations of friendship, trust and co-operation, the Turks will remain under physical threat by the larger and more powerful community. At present they are shielded behind 40,000 mainland Turkish troops and their armoury, roughly one soldier for every Turkish Cypriot household.

The Turkish Cypriot Federated State is, in effect, a huge military base of Turkey ruled by military commanders - an unsatisfactory state of affairs which the indigenous Turkish Cypriots cannot tolerate indefinitely. Nor is there much chance of foreign tourists and investors flocking into, say, the garrison town of Kyrenia. Earlier a reference was made to the possibility of Turkey carrying out a large-scale colonization scheme from the Turkish mainland in order to bring the population of the Turkish Cypriot zone up to the level of its Greek Cypriot counterpart. This would mean settling in the island at least 400,000 people,

which would considerably cut down the living standards and economic prospects of the Turkish Cypriots and actually reduce them to a minority in a sea of probably crude and uncouth Anatolian peasants. Neither continued militarization, nor colonization of the Turkish zone are appealing possibilities to the Turkish Cypriots. Besides it may be assumed that these possibilities will have to be excluded by any constitutional settlement with the Greek Cypriots.

It will be in the best interests of both communities to remove, as far as possible, and as soon as possible, the sources of hostility and mistrust between them. So far as the Greeks are concerned, nothing would go farther towards achieving this end than the return of the refugees to their homes and properties. The weakening of anti-Turkish militancy should increase the sense of security of the Turkish Cypriots. Admittedly there may always be a small but potentially disruptive force of Greek Cypriot nationalist diehards bent on destroying the Turkish Cypriot political entity. Even so the best chance of arresting and neutralizing this force lies in Turkish Cypriot co-operation with moderate Greek Cypriots who realize that a successor to EOKA-B may provoke a fresh Turkish military intervention and thus destroy the last chance for a unified Cyprus.

Finally, the establishment (if and when it comes) of close relations of trust and co-operation between the two communities cannot but advance the economic and social interests of the Turkish Cypriots no less than those of the Greek Cypriots. They will need the capital, the entrepreneurial skills and expertise, and the foreign contacts of Greek Cypriots; and the latter should be able to see that if they can help the Turkish Cypriots to advance themselves this will lessen their dependence on Turkey. There is little reason to doubt that the Turkish Cypriots and their leaders would be glad of such a result

From the Greek Cypriot point of view the departure of the Turkish Army and the gradual reduction of Turkey's influence on the Turkish Cypriot community, are matters of the first importance. Earlier in this chapter it was explained how Turkey came to be more involved in the affairs of the Turkish Cypriot mini-'State', until the latter became, to all intents and purposes, a province of Turkey. The future reduction of this involvement is contingent upon Turkish Cypriot economic, political and defensive autarky. The Greek Cypriots can do several things to bring about this condition:

(a) They could help the Turkish Cypriots in various ways to develop their own economy (preferably linked with the Greek Cypriot economy). This should blunt ultra-nationalist and separatist Turkish Cypriot feeling in the same way that the Greek Cypriot prosperity in the late 1960s toned down Greek Cypriots' nationalist feeling.

(b) They could vote to power moderate leaders who would be prepared to co-operate sincerely with Turkish Cypriot leaders, convince them that their views and wishes carry due weight in the Cypriot State and help them to advance the interests of their community. Nothing can increase the prestige of moderate Turkish Cypriot leaders and encourage them to rid themselves, if not wholly, at least to a considerable extent, of dependence on Turkey than the respect and co-operation of Greek Cypriot leaders. The less Turkish Cypriot leaders quarrel with their Greek Cypriot counterparts, and the less they turn to Turkey for moral

and economic support, the less prominent will Turkish Cypriot affairs become in Turkish national politics.

(c) Even after the Greek National Guard and the Turkish Cypriot Fighters are disbanded, and assuming that Greek and Turkish underground organizations are totally disarmed, there will be more Greek Cypriot than Turkish Cypriot policemen and potential gunmen. If the Turkish community is to feel secure, Greek Cypriot policemen must be kept away from Turkish areas. At least until Greek-Turkish Cypriot relations have vastly improved, the Turkish areas should be policed only by Turkish Cypriots. It is not enough that Greek Cypriots should not constitute a threat on Turkish Cypriots; they should be seen, and seen by all in Cyprus and Turkey, not to constitute such a threat.

The Greek Cypriot strategy, then, should be to reduce the dependence of Turkish Cypriots on Turkey and to simulate their sense of independence and pride in their competence to manage their own affairs, which should be closely interwoven with Greek Cypriot affairs. The chances are that the Turkish Cypriots will co-operate with the Greeks and even agree to make concessions if this is in their own general interests: if, for example, it means an accelerated rate of economic growth and higher living standards for themselves. If the prospect of economic and social advancement has brought nine independent European countries into the European Economic Community, which is now talking of political integration, it could also bring the two Cypriot communities closer together and lead them, some day, to seek ways to integrate their respective 'States'. It should be stressed (and this is the basic premise of the present argument) that although the Turkish Cypriots are able to prevent the creation of a unified, peaceful and prosperous Cypriot State, they cannot create one themselves; only the Greek majority can do this, and they must assume the leadership and initiative for the reconstitution of a united Republic of Cyprus.

The above considerations point to the necessity of devising a Constitution offering as many opportunities as possible for effective co-operation between the Greek and Turkish communities. Earlier, it was pointed out that the main causes of the cleavage between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots were nationalism, communalism and the involvement of their respective Mother Countries. Obviously a Constitution cannot of itself promote the emergence of moderate, non-nationalist, leaders, or reduce the involvement of Greece and Turkey in Cypriot affairs. What it can do is to establish the maximum number of strong institutional links between the two communities. The insistence of the Greek Cypriot side for a strong Central Government is surely justified. A strong Federal Executive and a Federal Legislature with wide competence, and also a unified Judiciary - all of course, with adequate participation of the two communities - are important elements in a bicomunal State which looks forward to a future of closer interdependence and unity. It seems far better to have a strong Executive with a Vice-Presidential veto and a legislature with wide competence and a separate majorities rule than a weak system of federal institutions in which the Turks are denied 'super-privileges'.

State institutions and other official bodies operating on a bi-communal basis will bring the representatives of the two communities into contact although, as was noted earlier, there is no guarantee that they will collaborate. 'Institutions', Karl Popper once wrote, 'are like fortresses. They must be well designed and manned'. At some stage the Greek and Turkish

Cypriot people should realize that their old nationalist leaders have led them into a blind alley and should henceforth, give their support to men whose political philosophy and temperament enables them to form an effective and sincere collaboration with representatives of the other community. Indeed, the two communities could see the matter in this way: if the Greeks elect to the Presidency a nationalist 'Ethnarch' it would be like asking the Turks to collaborate with a *millet bashi*, a man whose very capacity attracts Turkish mistrust; and if the Turks elect to the Vice-Presidency a nationalist who systematically seeks instructions from Ankara, it would be like asking the Greeks to accept into the cabinet an agent of the Turkish Government. The institutions of a bicomunal State must be manned by moderate men who accept the principle of bicomunal participation and responsibility. Once this principle is generally accepted, it will be easier to discover the moderate leaders and support them in their task of intercommunal collaboration. Just as nationalist antagonism feeds on itself, so does moderation.

Moderate men, desirous of intercommunal co-operation, will be needed not only in the higher political offices, but also in other official, semi-official and unofficial institutions, such as chambers of commerce, employers' federations, trade and farmers' unions, athletic clubs etc. Given the community of interests - between Greek and Turkish merchants, Greek and Turkish doctors, Greek and Turkish workers or farmers, it is natural that Greek and Turkish professional or trade associations should co-operate and eventually become linked. Football clubs and other athletic associations should be encouraged (by financial incentives from the Government if necessary) to develop a bicomunal character. Indeed, the idea of a sporting club which is open to Greeks but excludes Turks and vice versa seems to go against the noble spirit of sport. In any case, a football match may appear a purely unpolitical activity, but the sight of Ali sending a pass to Andreas can be a very impressive lesson to a public which for years and years believed that intercommunal friendship and co-operation were contrary to some high national or political principle.

Generally speaking, consistent and systematic efforts will have to be made - by people who are by outlook and temperament suited to make them - to re-organize as far as possible Cypriot public life from communal to bicomunal lines. Most probably, any bicomunal institutions or organizations that may be set up will have to be founded and run on certain fixed principles regarding the distribution of authority and responsibility among members of the two communities (e.g. Greek head, Turkish deputy head, so many Greek and Turkish officials etc); but this annoyance should be easily tolerated. The important task is to get moderate Greeks and Turks with common interests and objectives working together successfully, and so demonstrate to the more traditionally-minded population the feasibility and fruitfulness of intercommunal co-operation.

There will remain, of course, several areas of public life which will always and necessarily be organized on communal lines religious activity, the press, education etc. Religion, clearly, should become entirely separated from the State; and Christian and Moslem religious institutions should be prevented, as far as possible, from exercising even an indirect influence on political and educational institutions. Education, although retaining its communal basis, must be rid of its traditional communal nationalist spirit and ideology. One of the early tasks of a Government of moderate leaders will have to be a thorough examination of the contents of the Greek and Turkish education systems and the systematic



expurgation of all elements that encourage, not to say disseminate, extreme nationalist feelings. There is no sense in attempting to establish confidence and collaboration between the two communities while Greek and Turkish schoolchildren are taught, for example, that one's own nation gloriously fought for the true faith and for liberty against the barbaric hordes of the other nation. It must be remembered that most Cypriots under the age of, say, thirty never met and talked with members of the other community, and thus their attitudes are unduly influenced by what they have been taught by their teachers and the mass media propagated. It will be imperative to find ways to bring the youth of the two communities in direct contact with each other. If it is possible in other countries to organize scouting jamborees, sporting activities, art festivals etc with the participation of youth from different nations, it should not be impossible to attempt, some time beyond the immediate future, similar ventures in Cyprus with the object of showing the younger Greek and Turkish Cypriot generations that members of the other community are also human.

The vision of a more integrated Greek and Turkish Cypriot population, living in peace, unity and co-operation in an independent democratic State should be kept alive amid the hatred, the anxiety, the insecurity and the misery of the present and foreseeable future. However, there is no escaping the fact that there are now in the island two 'national' States which, more than a year after the war, have yet to begin serious negotiations for a constitutional settlement. In all probability it will be years rather than months before the two States have agreed to link up to form a Federal Republic of Cyprus; and it is only after such agreement has been reached that intercommunal rapprochement and co-operation will become a possibility. Whether this possibility will be realized will depend on a host of factors including, obviously, the question of how acceptable the settlement will be to the bulk of the two communities, and what kinds of leaders will be elected to collaborate in the running of the State. Cyprus badly needs what she has never had, viz. a supra-communal, Cypriot leadership. The present communal leaders appear ill-suited to govern a bicomunal State because (if their past record is anything to go by) they are not likely to put a sufficiently high premium on conciliation and compromise, the winning of the confidence of the other community, the development of a just and stable political order to embrace all Cypriots, and indeed intercommunal peace and co-operation. The idea of Archbishop Makarios becoming the President of all Cypriots appears as unreal as Mr Denktaş becoming the Vice-President of all Cypriots. These are unlikely to be the men to work together for the reconciliation and unification of the Greek and Turkish communities even when the opportunity arises.

The Cypriots should become a unified, integrated people and eventually develop into a cohesive nation. As a nation they would be able to consolidate an independent united State to which they would vow a common allegiance. Unless the Cypriots become a cohesive nation - bi-ethnic, bi-linguist, bi-religionist, but still a cohesive nation - they will remain two divided and hostile communities living in fear and distress, and in the eyes of an increasingly cynical, impatient and unsympathetic international community, a World Nuisance.

The present study has been mainly concerned to account for the centrifugal social and political forces which have operated in Cyprus and which made impossible the establishment of a united, cohesive and stable State. An attempt was made to trace the development of the Greek and Turkish nationalist movements and explain how these led to the setting up, and eventually the break-up of the unitary Greco-Turkish State. There were

frequent references to national ideologies, nationalist leaderships, political and militant organizational intercommunal mistrust, tension, hostility, division, the war, partition, and more tension and hostility. In view of the limited scope of this study there was no attempt at all to deal with a crucially important dimension of the conflict, viz. its huge cost in terms of human unhappiness and the general lowering of the quality of life in the island. Something was said, of course, about the violence, the destruction of lives and properties, and the forcible uprooting of masses of refugees; but these were talked of as particular aspects of broader social and political phenomena, rather than grave moral issues on their own right. How can one begin to analyse the fear, the despair, the emptiness, the pain and the indignity suffered by thousands upon thousands of human souls?

Still, at the close of this study some mention should be made in the form of a brief epilegomenon, of the plight of those thousands of Greek and Turkish Cypriots who, in 1958, in 1963-4, and more especially in 1974-5, were forced to abandon their homes and properties for reasons with which, as individuals, they had no connection at all. The condition of these people is an essential element of the meaning of the Cyprus conflict.

It will be remembered that the first chapter of this study opened with a remark by George Mikes. Mikes is not a political scientist, or even a political journalist. He paid a short visit to Cyprus some time after the hostilities of December 1963 and recorded some of his observations in his book *Eureka*. Now it sometimes happens that a casual observer of a conflict, precisely because he is not committed to a theoretical point of view, nor is he concerned to establish a political proposition, may be able to see and record things which could be ignored or played down by a more sophisticated observer. Mikes visited a Turkish refugee camp outside Nicosia, at the village of Hamit Mandres:

It used to be a village of two hundred souls; now it has become a tent-town of 3,500 inhabitants. They are all Turkish refugees from a nearby village called Omorphita, and they all live in tents in indescribable filth, without proper sanitation, without proper food. There is nothing they can – or will - do all day except sit around and gape at each other... The place is a sink of filth and squalor, poverty and hopelessness... Your political sympathies may be with the Greeks; your human sympathies are with the Turks; not because they are more virtuous; simply because they need it more. The Turks can actually see their former dwelling-places from here, but the Greeks will not let them go back to their looted and half-destroyed village three miles away because these people are not people but a means to put pressure on the Turks and teach them a lesson. They are 'traitors' and have only got their deserts. That, of course, includes the children under five. The Turks will not help these unhappy people either, because they are not people but a means to show the world how cruel, barbarous and heartless the Greeks really are. You thought, when you were young and innocent, that politics was about people. But you were very, very wrong. The Cyprus question is, in fact, heading towards a much-dreaded, successful solution, while people of Cyprus are rotting away in tents. You drive back to the bar of your luxury hotel on the Greek side, order a gin and tonic, discuss Russian pressure, or the rumoured rift between Makarios and Grivas, but you cannot forget that little Turkish boy of four who looked at you with his huge, black eyes and shouted an impish 'hallo' to you, and who, you know, will go to sleep tonight with ten other people in a dark stinking tent. But you are a fool. You ought to think in terms of diplomatic notes and bases and Communist pressure and NATO and not in terms of little children.

What has become of Mikes's little Turkish boy of four, one may wonder. If he was alive, he was fourteen when the victorious Turkish Army landed in Cyprus in order (as anybody would tell you!) to bring peace, and protect his rights and those of his family and compatriots. Did he spend all these years in the tent-town of Hamit Mandres trying to make some sense of the misery and bitterness around him? What has he been told about the causes of his condition and about his old home? Does he hate all Greeks - has he met any Greeks? One consequence of the July-August war is that Omorphita, along with 40 per cent of the island's territory, is now in Turkish hands. The Turkish boy and his family may have returned to their old home; or, again, they may have been sent to a nicer home somewhere else, perhaps in Kyrenia, which a Greek family has had to flee.

Now the balance of unhappiness and despair weighs heavily against the Greeks - 200,000 refugees, of whom some 18,000 have completed a whole year in tents in indescribable filth at refugee camps in Larnaca, Strovolos, the Achna forest and elsewhere. Now it is the person from Kyrenia who cries and longs for her lost home. A lost home is always remembered as the most beautiful home on God's Earth: the garden is always full of blooming roses; the bedroom window looks out to a magnificent vision of the violet mountains of the Pentadactylos range; and from the balcony there is a most amazing view of the vast expanse of the sea, bright blue in the sunlight, dark grey in the evening - which begins at the rocky shores just down the road and extends forty miles to the north where, on a clear day, you can see the Taurus Mountains of southern Turkey rising in mystery. The significance of the forty miles to the Taurus was not understood until it was too late.

Refugees live with visions of their lost homes and lands, and they are not likely to put their faith in a State which is partly based on the fact of their displacement. If not enough people felt pride and loyalty to the first Greco-Turkish Cypriot State, is it reasonable to expect that a bizonal arrangement, if it implies a forced movement of some section of the population, will command popular support? If a bizonal Federation with a strong centre is the only hope for a peaceful and prosperous Cyprus, and so many Greek Cypriots do not seem willing to support a bizonal Federation, is there a hope for Cyprus? Is there a hope for the beautiful island of Aphrodite, the unhappy island of conflict and hostility?

## NOTES

1. Peter Loizos, 'The Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus. 1878-1970' in J. Davis ed., *Choice and Change: Essays in Honour of Lucy Mair*, p. 117.
2. Ibid . p. 117-118.
3. Sir George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, Vol. IV. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 509.
4. Quoted in Andreas Gavrielides, *Ta Ethnarchika Dikeomata ke to Enotikon Demopsephisma* (2nd edition, Nicosia, 1972), p. 32.

5. Hill, op. cit ., p. 513. A Commission of Inquiry investigated the riots and concluded that the Turkish Cypriots were not responsible for causing them. Most of the accused and convicted were Greek Cypriots.
6. Some writers are prepared to argue that the present Turkish population of Cyprus are the descendants of Greeks who accepted Islam during the Ottoman occupation, to avoid certain discriminations against them. Such cases of change of religion may indeed have occurred, but there is no evidence that this was widespread. The most reliable sources take the view that the Turkish community have descended from the Turkish soldiers and officials who occupied Cyprus in 1571, and the Turkish peasants who settled in the island later. See Hill, op. cit . p. 18. Doros Alastos, *Cyprus: Past and Future* (London: H. Clarke, and Co., 1943), p. 258.
7. For a chronology of Greek Cypriot enosis demands, and Turkish Cypriot counter-demands, see Halil Imbrahim Salih, *Cyprus, An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord* (Brooklyn N.Y. : Theo. Gaus' Sons, Inc., 1968), chapters III and IV.
8. After the Kemalist Turks defeated the Greek Army in August 1922, the Turkish Cypriots, who were proud of the Turkish victory, sent a delegation in Ankara to press for the return of the island to Turkey. Mustafa Kemal did not support this claim. See Salih, op. cit . p. 38.
9. Ibid. p. 48.
10. Suat Bilge, *Le Conflict de Chypre et les Chypriotes Turcs* (Ankara: Ajans Matbaasi, 1961). Also see Pantazis Terlexis, *Diplomatik ke Politike tu Kypriakou* , (Athens: Rappa Editions, 1971), p. 64-65.
11. Terlexis, op. cit . p. 65.
12. Ibid . p. 180.
13. Quoted by Salih, op. cit . pp. 50-51.
14. Rauf Denктаş, *The Cyprus Problem* (Nicosia, 1974), pp. 57-58.
15. In the Greek parliamentary elections of November 1963, the Centre Union came to power on a platform that included the pledge to seek enosis . Such events could not have passed unnoticed in Cyprus and Turkey.
16. P. G. Polyviou, *The Problem of Cyprus: Constitutional and Political Aspects* (Nicosia, 1974), pp. 6-7.
17. Linda B. Miller, *Cyprus: The Law and Politics of Civil Strife* (Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968), p. 5.

18. When the UN peace-keeping force arrived in Cyprus in March 1964 the Greeks expected them to help them to put down the Turkish `insurgents'. On the other hand, the Turks regarded themselves as `belligerents', and demanded that the UN troops keep the Greek forces away from them. There is much more than mere propaganda in the use of these two legal terms. For UN policy on the matter, see Linda B. Miller, *op. cit.* . ch. 2 and *passim* .
19. Rauf Denктаş, *op. cit.* . p. 61.
20. *Ibid.* . p. 60.
21. *The Third Five-Year Plan (1972-1976)* (Nicosia: The Planning Bureau of the Republic of Cyprus), p. 17.
22. Peter Loizos *op. cit.* pp. 123-4.
23. Osman Orek, *Injustices in the Application of the UN Development Programme in Cyprus* (Nicosia, 1973), p. 7.
24. *Cyprus, A Handbook on the Island of Aphrodite* (Nicosia: Published by the Greek Communal Chamber of Cyprus, 1964), p. 7.
25. It was suggested to me (by Glafkos Constantinides in conversation) that I generally tend to imply that Archbishop Makarios was much freer from pressures than he actually was. He knew that if he was to retain the support of the ecclesiastical establishment he had to declare systematically and unequivocally his faith in the Greek ideal. If he was to resist the militant Grivasites he would have to avoid alienating his own militant nationalist supporters, and thus have to hold high the banner of enosis . Again, since April 1967, and more particularly since November 1973, he had to do business with an unpredictable and untrustworthy Greek military Government, whose members and supporters needed little excuse to accuse him of lust for power and of disloyalty to the national leadership of Athens. For all these reasons Makarios had to keep on talking about the ideal of enosis of (the whole) Cyprus with Greece, even though he must have known that he fostered suspicion in the minds of the Turkish Cypriot leaders with whom he was negotiating for an independent State. I think there is a lot of truth in this suggestion, but it in no way entails either that he was not a sincere enosist, or that he ought not to have tried to educate his people to accept the positive desirability of an independent Cypriot State.
26. A detailed discussion of the consequences of the Turkish invasion and the Geneva Conferences is to be found in *P. G. Polyviou, Cyprus, The Tragedy and the Challenge* (London, 1975), chapter III.
27. J. G. Peristiany (ed.), *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (The University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 176.

28. P. G. Polyviou, op. cit . p. 3.
29. Robert Stephens, Cyprus, A Place of Arms (London: Pall Mall Press 1966), p. 209.
30. Salih, op. cit . p. 174.
31. Stephens, op. cit . p. 172-3.
32. George Mikes, Eureka (London: Andre Deutsch, 1965), pp. 117-8. Mikes mistakenly refers to Hamit Mandres as `Mandres Hamit'.