



Working together  
www.rcis.ro

## **Revista de Cercetare și Interventie Sociala**

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

---

### **A CASE STUDY OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION ON COMMUNITIES: NORTH AND SOUTH CYPRUS SAMPLE**

*Tijen ZEYBEK, Ayşe Gözde KARAATMACA*

---

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2023, vol. 83, pp. 138-154

<https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.83.10>

Published by:  
Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:  
„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,  
Department of Sociology and Social Work  
and  
HoltIS Association

# A Case Study of the Consequences of Political Participation on Communities: North and South Cyprus Sample

Tijen ZEYBEK<sup>1</sup>, Ayşe Gözde KARAATMACA<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

As is known, the Cyprus Peace Negotiation have been continuing for more than fifty years. For more than forty years, people in Cyprus have been spending a conflict-free and peaceful life. In this study, the fifty-year process of Cyprus Peace Negotiation will be summarized and explained at large within the framework of public policy analysis, analysis phases, policy preparation/implementation methods and the role of institutions in the process. The voting of the 2004 Annan Plan between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots during this process and the effect of the voting outcome on the negotiation process will be discussed. With the opening of the border gates that provided controlled passage to northern and southern Cyprus shortly before the Annan Plan was put to a vote, the effects of the new conditions created by the collective and free contact of two populations on the negotiation process and the future apprehension of Turkish Cypriots will be analysed. Since the study involved theoretical approaches, indirect research method was adopted as a method and domestic and foreign sources were scanned within this framework. In parallel with this method, content analysis technique was used. According to the findings, such multilateral conflicts Generals and 22 UN Special Representative behind, there is the danger of the means to turn into a goal. This possibility should not be ignored and the content of the talks and the subject of negotiation in question must be preoccupied on. It is also cumbersome to maintain the peace and the human duty to endure this hardship. It is only possible to conclude the negotiations by agreeing on the acceptance and ingestion of these facts, and perhaps by agreeing on a number of boundary regulations and similar requirements. This means that all parties agree that the actual situation is the best solution.

*Keywords:* Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus; Cyprus peace negotiation; negotiation process; self-determination; international negotiations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Near East University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Nicosia, CYPRUS. E-mail: tijen.zeybek@neu.edu.tr

<sup>2</sup> Near East University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Nicosia, CYPRUS. E-mail: aysegozde.karaatmaca@neu.edu.tr

## Introduction

The saying “A bad peace is better than a good war”, which is attributed to the famous Russian writer Pushkin, undoubtedly expresses a very scorching fact. Presence of peace indicates the possibility that a number of things can be resolved without dying and killing. The peaceful settlement of any dispute that is the subject of conflict and which has the potential for conflict is discussion and negotiation. In order to do this, even if it is relative there is a need for a peaceful environment. Only after this environment is created, the parties can start the negotiation process in order to resolve the existing disputes without resorting to violence. As long as the atmosphere allows for the negotiations, there is the possibility to solve the problems and to establish the peace environment on a sound and permanent ground. Therefore, this study is unique as it presents an analysis of the negotiations ten place in a country which has preserved peace for a long time.

## Literature Review

The history of the Cyprus problem dates back to the remote past. However, the problem was not brought to the agenda of the international community until 1954, which is the year when it was brought up to the United Nations (UN). After it had been understood that Britain could not hold the island as a colony any more, the question of ruling of the island emerged. The effectiveness of the two dominant societies, of the Turks and the Greeks are in question. The Greeks want the annexation of the island and thus to take a step towards the realization of the “Megali Idea”, in other words, the great design, which dates back to the very old ages in the history (Mütercimler, 1990). The establishment of the Greece no doubt delighted them. So much so that they sent a memorandum to the governor Kapodistra, who was accepted as the first prime minister of the Modern Helen State on August 19, 1828, and asked the annexation of Cyprus into Greece (Kizilyürek, 2005). On 16 August 1954, with reference to the idea that they had finally come up with a new opportunity to finally fulfil this historic mission, Greece applied to the UN with a request for the recognition of the right to “Self-determination”, which is “the right to determine one’s future”. With a referendum that would be held by taking the opportunity of Greeks being the larger population on the island, they had the idea of preparing a legal basis for the annexation of the island to Greece. This idea is based on the fact that the Greek Cypriots gathered in 500 churches on March 25, 1921, making the first plebiscite for Enosis and appealing to the British Administration after they made the decision for the annexation (Ismail, 1992a). In the following years, Enosis plebiscites of the Greeks would continue. For example, in December 1949, the Greeks announced to the colonial government that they would hold a plebiscite on January 15, 1950. The Governor of Cyprus stated that the annexation was absolutely impossible and that the plebiscite would not be

valid. Despite this, the Greeks held a plebiscite. 96% of Greek Cypriots who voted on this plebiscite said yes to the island's annexation to Greece (Birinci, 1999).

On December 17, 1954, the UN General Assembly decided not to negotiate the Cyprus issue for the time being. Thus, the Greece's application for the annexation of Cyprus on behalf of the Greek Cypriots remained unanswered. In Cyprus, violence has increased since then (Mütercimler, 1990). When Greece and the Greek Cypriots realized that they would not be able to carry out Enosis with referenda, demonstrations and memorandums, they established an armed underground organization called EOKA (Ethniki Organasos Kypriou Agoniston- National Organization of Cypriot Struggle). This organization started its actions on 1 April, 1955 with its president, General Grivas (Grivas, 2012). First, the terrorist acts targeting the British were later directed towards the Turks. The Turks were forced to migrate from 33 villages where Turks and Greeks lived together in 1955-58 period. Turks intensively continued to request help from Turkey, that they regard as the motherland, since their lives and property safety were in danger. Remaining silent until August 1955 and apparently not wanting to interfere in Cyprus issue, Turkey began to be concerned with Cyprus. Turkey sends a note to Britain and draws attention to the dangers faced by the Turkish Cypriots. The Prime Minister of the period, Adnan Menderes, in a statement, explained the reason of Turkey's silence on the Cyprus issue until that day as the importance given to Turkish-Greek friendship; and opposed Greece's claims about the Greek Cypriot population to make a demand that will open the way for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece with these words; "... (Greeks) On the basis of the majority of the population themselves came to Ankara yesterday. What were they doing in İzmir, Aydın, Denizli and Eskişehir? I wonder if they had a divine rule to reveal that the superiority of the principle of self-determination (nations' right to self-determination of their future) is true..." (Gazioglu, 1960). Speaking on December 29, 1956 at the Grand National Assembly of Turkey Speaking, Menderes says that the best solution under the present circumstances is the island's division (Akçura, 2009). It can be said that in this way, Turkish Cypriots and Turkey developed the thesis of division in the face of Greek Cypriots' and Greeks' struggle for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece. Turkish Cypriots established the Turkish Resistance Organization in Cyprus in order to counteract the attacks of EOKA and to prevent the annexation of the island to Greece, and joined a solidarity with Turkey. Now, the Cyprus issue will gain a new dimension as a question which closely concerns Greece, Turkey, Britain and the US due to their NATO memberships. In this process, a mutual state was decided to be established by excluding the Enosis and Division Theses with "the secret diplomacy" carried between these states.

The establishment of the Cyprus state has the characteristics which do not conform to the establishment model of other nation states. According to Bernard Lewis, the word 'nation' comes from Aramaic word "Milla" and describes the people who accept and unite around a holy book (Karyelioğlu, 2012). This definition explains the nation with an emphasis on religious belonging. In the second half of

the 1960s, Cyprus was an island inhabited by two dominant ruling nations with different religions, languages, cultures and future imaginations, and other nations with smaller population rates. The attempt to bring Greek Cypriots, of whom 60 Treaties are relatively principal in terms of population compared to others and who are connected to Greece with the sense of belonging, and Turkish Cypriots, who are connected to Turkey with the sense of belonging, into the process of becoming a nation under one nation state can be considered as “an experiment” in this context. As a matter of fact, Archbishop Makarios, who signed the Treaties of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960 on behalf of the Greek Cypriots and who was appointed as the first President of the Republic said “Any Greek Cypriot who knows me knows very well that I will not try to create a Cyprus Nation. Agreements have created a state, but not a nation” (Ismail, 1992). According to the Treaties establishing the Republic of Cyprus and the constitution written in accordance with these treaties, the distribution of authority and position in the state bodies were regulated as follows: Greeks would use 70% because of their higher population and Turks would use 30%. In addition, it was agreed that the President would be Greek, Vice President would be Turkish and the Vice President would have the right to veto the decisions. Thus, it was thought that sovereignty was shared among the two public in the fairest manner.

The answer to the question of who were the thinkers could be simply answered as Turks and Greeks. However, there was another important feature that differentiated the Republic of Cyprus from other nation states, which was that the state was established as a result of international negotiations, with the approval of many countries, and with the guarantee of three of them. Guarantor States were Turkey on behalf of Turkish Cypriots, Cyprus on behalf of Greek Cypriots, and England as the one who had ruled the island as its colony for many years. Thanks to these agreements and even though there is no longer its state, the UK still owns some land and has a military base in the island.

The Republic of Cyprus (RoC) established with the texts called as 1960 Cyprus Agreements (London-Zurich Agreements) which were made as a result of the negotiations between the intervening states (Turkey, Greece and the UK) has been further strengthened with the Guarantee and Alliance Agreements of related states. According to IVth Article of the Guarantee Agreement, intervening states have right to take action “in response to a situation that would threaten the order of the treaty. This right includes the authority to carry out all kinds of actions and affairs “aimed at re-establishing the order created by the treaty” (Toluner, 1977). The words of Rauf R. Denktaş, the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, are of importance in this context which stated that there is the Turkish-Greek equilibrium on the basis of this agreement as foreseen by the Lausanne Treaty in 1923 (Erol, 2016). However, the Greeks had other plans for the partnership they had agreed on its establishment in 1960. Makarios explains the reason for signing the agreement in a letter he wrote to EOKA’s leader Grivas; “To put an end to British sovereignty and to create a small Greece at the end of the Mediterranean” (Grivas, 2012).

Republic of Cyprus, which could only survive 3 years amongst the great tensions and disagreements, collapsed in 1963 with the exclusion of Turks from the state.

Even in 1960, President and Archbishop Makarios asked for the amendment of Article 13 in the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriot side and Ankara opposed this amendment. Thereupon, Makarios did not refrain from declaring unilaterally that the constitution had been terminated. Obviously, the Greeks pre-designed the struggle to become the sole sovereign of the island after independence, which they could not acquire in the period before independence, by maintaining the power of the independent state (Mütercimler, 1990). Thus, a period of tense and bloody conflict on the island began. The Akritas Plan, which was put into effect by the Greek Cypriots and Greece, starts to give its outcomes. Massacres which were recorded as Bloody Christmas in history happened on the night of 21st December, 1963. In this process, Turkish Cypriots were forced to leave 103 villages. The number of these people were reported as 18.677. According to official records, 364 Turkish Cypriots were killed until the year of 1964 (Gibbons, 1997).

On December 27, 1963, the soldiers of the three guarantor states; Turkey, Greece and the UK came into office at the command of a British general under the name "Peacekeeping Force". On the 30th of December, the border, which is known as the Green Line and divides Nicosia into two, was drawn by the British general. Thus, the capital was divided into two parts as the Turkish side and the Greek side. Only with this caution, the attacks and the massacres against the Turks could be stopped and bloodshed was prevented.

On January 1, 1964, Makarios announced that he had unilaterally terminated the 1960 Treaties. Thereupon, attacks were carried out on Turks in Paphos, Limassol, Arpalik, Famagusta and Poli. Turkey appealed to the UN Security Council on 13 February, 1964. On 4 March, 1964, the Security Council adopted a resolution on this issue, which included the elimination of any actions that would worsen the situation in Cyprus, and to this aim the creation of a UN Peace Force and the appointment of a mediator and asked for all kinds of precautions for the prevention of violence and bloodshed from the "Cyprus Government". The expression of "Cyprus Government" pointed out the Greek as the owner of the state and the whole world accepted this illegitimate situation which was completely contrary to the establishment agreements (Toluner, 1977).

According to the decision of the Council, Sakari Tuomioja was appointed as a mediator on 24 March and on 27 March UN Peacekeeping started to work in Cyprus. However, these developments could not prevent the conflicts on the island. During the month of April, intense attacks were carried out in the Turkish regions (Erenköy, Nicosia, Boğaz) and tens of thousands of Turks were forced to emigrate, besides there were hundreds of dead people. In this process during which the state was ruled by the Greeks alone, Turks formed their own administration organizations and tried to maintain their existence under severe conditions and this situation continued until the year 1974. On the morning of July 15, 1974,

the world woke up to an important news. Actually, a long-awaited event had happened. Makarios was overthrown by a coup d'état carried by the officers of the Greek junta in Cyprus. Under the presidency of Nikos Sampson, a former EOKA, "Hellenic Republic of Cyprus" was about to be proclaimed (Mütercimler, 1990). In this case, Turkey would call the UK for making intervention based upon the provisions of Treaty of Guarantee, however whereas Athens maintains its silence, Turkey has received calls for sobriety from the countries such as the UK and the US (Mütercimler, 2007). However, on July 20, 1974 Turkey took the risk of intervention separately with the concern of new massacres on the island and in terms of the safety of country's borders. After the war, on August 2, 1975, a population exchange agreement was made in the negotiations in Vienna between the Turks and the Greeks<sup>3</sup>. As a result of this agreement, the entire Turkish Cypriot population was allowed to cross to the North and the majority of the Greek Cypriot community was allowed to cross to the South (Gürel, 2012).

Indeed, this is the problem which started in 1878 when the Ottoman Empire rented the island of Cyprus to the UK, however it was called as the "Cyprus Problem" in the international arena and has got a long history after it was escalated to the United Nations. After the coup in 1974 and the war that happened with Turkey's intervention, the actual state which still continues today was reached with Third Vienna Agreement and population exchange. In the next 45 years, there was no conflict on the island and no bloodshed. A resolution that we have always seen throughout the history was achieved, which was the division of the land, a point where those who could not establish an associate state inevitably reached.

## Methodology

Many researchers find the analysis process complex due to issues such as the fact that the process of creating public policies has many aspects, the factors affecting the process are dynamic, and the process operation is complex. From this point on, the necessity of a systematic approach to understand this complex process has been emphasized and theories explaining the process of creating public policies have been put forward (Kapti, 2013). In this sense, the analysis of public policies can be seen as a method to understand and examine public actions.

In this study, descriptive content analysis method which means in-depth examination and organization of qualitative and quantitative studies conducted independently of each other on a specific subject or field was used. Thus, general trends in that subject or field were determined. The main purpose of this study is to eliminate questions about how to sustain the peace between the communities which

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.prio-cyprus-displacement.net/images/users/1/1974\\_Geneva\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.prio-cyprus-displacement.net/images/users/1/1974_Geneva_Declaration.pdf)

had conflict in the past. It is also aimed that the study will guide academicians who want to use this study as a guide and a basic resource for peace negotiations.

In this descriptive content analysis, in accordance with qualitative analysis approaches, especially in the analysis of the purposes, justifications, results and suggestions of the studies were examined, and by using the thematic/categorization method appropriate to these were used ensuring that descriptive content analysis study enriched in terms of quality.

Policy analysis is a scientific study conducted to better understand the policy-making process and to obtain reliable information about socio-economic conditions that have significant effects on the actors who create policies. Policy analysis deals with who will gain what from the policies created and, more importantly, what difference these gains will make. It is a study about which policies governments follow, why they follow them, and what kind of effects the results of these policies will have (Demir, 2011)

In scientific management, it may not be sufficient to carry out analysis studies by adhering to only one theory. In this regard, it would be more useful to use different theories in public policy analysis. For this reason, public policy analysis theories are included in the following subheadings. Among the theories discussed within the framework of the study, the stages that need to be covered in the process approach in the process approach are; individuals and groups in the network governance approach; In the cognitive management approach, ideas, beliefs and ideologies are considered.

Public policy analysis approaches have undergone many evolutions that complement each other. In this study, the most important of these approaches are discussed. In this sense, the study consists of sections explaining important theories and perspectives emerging in the field of public policy analysis.

The results obtained in this method are expected to guide future studies planned on the targeted institutions.

## Results

### *Peace as a Utopia*

Tacitus (Tacitus, Germania-Ana Britannica) said, "Peace is a dangerous dream between the neighbours who are strong and peace opponents." When we have a quick look at the world history, the history of humanity and the history of states, we can immediately grasp that even the dream of peace can be dangerous. Because whether we speak of peace between two people or between peoples and states, it is indisputable that we owe the need for 'peace' to its counterpart. Namely the "war".

Where and how should the peace happen? The most obvious answer to this question can be found in Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's sentences. Mustafa Kemal's



words “Peace at home, peace in the world” is more inclusive than any sentence said about the virtue and value of peace. The reason of this inclusiveness actually comes from showing us how peace should be. This necessity is to ensure peace both at home and in the world.

As for many conceptual terms, it is highly difficult to define ‘peace’. In its lexical meaning, peace is the state of absence of war. In world politics, there are three general cases mentioned in the most inclusive sense; War, absence of war and peace (Evans & Newnham, 2007). Departing from this definition, should we explain the situation that has been lasting for 45 year in Cyprus with the absence of war or the state of peace? For us, the expression of 45 years of “absence of war” are quite long. Furthermore, Greeks who continue living under the roof of the Turks living under the roof of the Republic of Cyprus in the South and the Turks who continue living under the roof of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus have led to a significant development. As a result of the continuous demands of both parties, border gates were opened, allowing the peoples of the two regions to move freely to each other’s territory and to establish a free relationship. This process, which started as one gate, has now increased to 9 with the effort of both sides. 16 years have passed since the opening of the doors, and the peaceful atmosphere continues.

In this context, it is not the peace that is sought for in the ongoing negotiation process. What is sought is a text of agreement in which both parties can finally accept the conditions which create peace.

In these meetings, the texts signed by both parties, which are agreed on but never entered into force, and the leaders who signed them are as follows

*We agreed, but it is null.*

- 1977 Makarios-Denktaş Doruk Agreement
- 1979 Kiprianu-Denktaş Doruk Agreement
- Common Text of Talat Christofias-2008
- Eroglu- Anastasiades Common Text-11. February 2014
- Nowadays, Akinci and Anastasiades try to agree on the framework of all the above mentioned agreements. It has been seen again that after the common text was written and signed, and when it comes to interpreting the text, deep differences of opinion arise between the parties and makes it impossible for the texts that were thought to be understood upon this fact become impossible to come in force.

*UN Secretary-Generals and UN Resolutions Advice Parade*

As a result of bilateral and multiple contacts, both directly and indirectly, after 1974, the parties have come up with solutions crystallized and proposed by the

UN Secretary-General. These are called the De Cuellar Certificate, Ghali's Set of Ideas and the Annan Plan.

*De Cuellar and 29 March Certificate:* It was accepted by Denktash, rejected by Kyprianu. UN Secretary-General Perez De Cuellar invited both leaders to the UN headquarters to sign this document. The document, which had been agreed on earlier, was submitted to the parties by De Cuellar on 29 March 1986. The Greek Cypriot leader Kyprian refused (Ismail, 1992).

*Ghali's Set of Ideas-1992:* Under the auspices of UN secretary general Butros Ghali; the first round of meetings were held between 18-23 June 1992 in New York. During these meetings, a map related to the land issue was shown to the President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Denktas (28.2%) and his opinion was requested. Guzelyurt and 37 Turkish villages were foreseen to be given to the Greeks, the formation of a canton in Karpaz and tens of thousands of Greek were expected to return to the North.

The President of the TRNC, Denktas, rejected this map and announced that he could only accept it at a rate of 29% (+) in the framework of a package deal and that the Guzelyurt region would not be left to the Greek side.

Starting on July 15, in the 2. round, the UN Secretary-General presented another solution plan. According to this plan, Cyprus is the common homeland of the Greek and Turkish communities and the relations between the two communities are not the minority-majority relations, but the relations between the two communities of the Federal Government of Cyprus.

The Ghali's Set of Ideas envisaged to ensure that Cyprus is the only state which has international identity, independence and territorial integrity and is based on bi-communal, bi-communal federation with a political equality, and that this state is partially or completely prohibited from merging or dividing with another country. Turkish side reported the "91 articles of these proposals" as acceptable, for the remaining 9 articles as "Negotiable", however Greeks rejected these proposals completely.

*Annan Plan-2002:* The Cyprus Resolution Plan was met with great enthusiasm, especially in the Turkish side of the island. As a result of the referendum, it was recorded that 65% of the Turks said "yes" in response to a "no" answer of 75% of the Greeks. This situation created a considerable disappointment and hopelessness among the Turks. In spite of this high rate of rejection of the Greek Cypriots, Greeks' acceptance to the EU on behalf of the whole Cyprus was perceived as a major insecurity towards the UN, the EU and the world public opinion (Hasgüler & Özkaleli, 2010).

*Peace Negotiation as a Political Activity*

In January of 1964, the negotiations that started with the aim of terminating the conflicts and returning to fifteen days ago unfortunately ended with a little more distance between the communities after each meeting. During the six years (1963-1969), while the Turks had to live in the enclaves and learned to live by themselves, in the same process, the Greeks discovered and took a fancy of the possibilities of occupying the state alone. These two different experiences has left so effective and lasting traits on societies that the two-and-a-half-year common state experience has wiped out without leaving any positive influence in the social memory.

At first, in the process of negotiations that were started to return soon to the constitutional order, the 1960 regime, whereas the aim evolved to the Federation from the perspective of the Turks; for the Greeks, it evolved into a unitary nation-state that included minority rights for the Turks

At this point, we should add that the attitude among Turks in the negotiation processes in particular has become the condition and reason for their political existence. Under the umbrella of a state where the UN prohibits recognition, the only way to maintain their presence in world politics is to continue to sit down at the negotiating table that is set up for them. This is a considerable pressure and puts the parties in a highly unequal position. On the other hand, the Greek Cypriots sit at the table as the sole owner of the Republic of Cyprus based on partnership with the Turks. Moreover, despite their rejection of the Annan Plan, which was submitted to a referendum in 2004, their participation in the European Union (EU) was ensured and their presence at the table was further strengthened.

In addition to these, we should indicate that working on the Cyprus problem has almost become a profession in the UN and EU circles. Working groups, offices, civil servants, experts, contact groups and similar formations both in the UN and EU circles, and especially in the United States have become the 'business' of a considerable number of people. The political parties in the TRNC only position themselves according to the negotiation process. In fact, the word "Peace" has become the most efficient election material of the Turkish Cypriot politician.

Since 1963, negotiations are underway to revive a structure where the partnership can only last three years and the established state dies. It is necessary to be a good tracker to understand the incredible effort, money and time spent to gather the Greek and Turkish communities under the same state, of the two communities who has lived completely under the roof of two separate states and in the regions where they see as their own for 45 years. It may be a good way to trace this from media news, headlines, interviews. However, it would be appropriate to take a brief look at the process, at least until 1968, when the issue was brought to the United Nations, because it would be a path tracing where the history of two main communities living in Cyprus crossed and separated.

*The transfer of the right of administration of the Cyprus island from the Ottoman State to Britain and the annexation of the island by Britain*

With the Treaty of Alliance signed between the Ottoman State and the United Kingdom on June 4, 1878, Britain's legal relationship with Cyprus began. In accordance with Article 1 of the aforementioned agreement, in the event that Britain holds Kars and Ardahan, and in the event that it would seek to seize and invade a part of the territory of the Ottoman State in violation of the borders to be determined by the peace treaty signed between the Ottoman State and Russia, Britain shouldered the obligation to defend the Ottoman State through the use of armed forces. On the other hand, the Ottoman State has given the consent for the necessary preparations for the fulfilment of this obligation in order to be able to make use of the island of Cyprus by Britain. Yet again, in the Article 6 of the same agreement it was foreseen that in the event that Russia would return the territories it captured in Kars and Armenia to the Ottoman State, the agreement of 4 June, 1878 would be terminated and the British would be expected to evacuate the island. However, at the beginning of World War I, Britain, claiming that they were in a state of war with the Ottoman State, declared that the 1878 Treaty as null. In November 1914, with an "Order in Council" and annexed the island. Turkey recognized the annexation of Cyprus by Britain with the Treaty of Lausanne signed on 24 July 1923 (Toluner, 1977).

*1954 Developments and 1960 Treaties - Establishing the Republic of Cyprus*

In 1950, the Greeks organized a plebiscite (referendum) and voted for Enosis. The result was not surprising. The Greek people wanted to be connected to Greece. The Church and the Greek leadership, in turn, persuaded Greece to take the issue to the United Nations in 1954. Their demands were the right to self-determination, in other words, the right of Cyprus to determine its own future, which could be expected at first glance as a rightful and respectable demand. Of course, this could be expected if it was not considered that two separate public lived in Cyprus, their perceived "homelands" were in different countries, and that their language and future expectations were completely separate.

Turkish Cypriots and Turkey reacted to this application of Greece. The issue was not taken into the agenda of the United Nations with the negative attitude of Britain. After this incident, since April 1, 1955, the Greek Cypriots started armed actions. In order to find a solution to the tension experienced after these developments, Britain held the London Conference on 29 August 1955. Along with no official outcome reached out of the meeting held between Britain, Turkey and Greece, Turkey was officially recognized as a political party of the problem.

As the conflicts continued, the idea of the Republic of Cyprus emerged as a middle way against the "Enosis" thesis of Greeks and "Taksim" thesis of the Turks.

With the adoption of this idea by Britain, Greece, Turkey and the US, London Agreements was signed on February 11, 1959 (Akçora, 2009).

### *Cyprus Documents*

The Zurich Agreement that was signed on 19 February 1959 in London and other documents form the basic documents of the Cyprus issue. Texts agreed on in Zurich on February 11, was signed on 19 February in London, by the British Prime Minister Mc. Millen, Greek Prime Minister Karamanlis and Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes. The agreements were signed by Makarios, on behalf of the Greek Cypriot community, and by Fazil Küçük on behalf of the Turkish Cypriot community. With the Zurich and London Agreements, an extraordinary state and a unique constitution for this state were written (Ali, 2002).

After the signing the Treaties of London, there was a preparatory process until August 1960. On December 13, 1959, the Archbishop Makarios was elected as president, and Dr. Fazil Kucuk was elected as the vice-president. The 199-article constitution, prepared by the provisional government, was adopted on 6 April, 1960. On August 16, 1960, the independence of the Republic of Cyprus was declared and on 24th August, the Republic of Cyprus became a member of the United Nations.

On August 16, when the Republic of Cyprus was proclaimed, London Agreements, which were signed by Turkey, Greece and Britain, however in which Turkish and Greek leaders could only attend with a notification since there was no state of Cyprus, was resigned by the Republic of Cyprus, Turkey, Greece and Britain and got the name of Nicosia Agreements as a whole.

Following the signing of the treaties, a provisional government was established with 7 Greek Cypriots, 3 Turkish Ministers on 2 April, 1959 according to the provisions of Cyprus Constitution comprised of 199 articles. According to the Constitution, the President would be Greek and his deputy would be Turkish. There were a council of ministers, consisting of 7 Greek and 5 Turkish, and a 50-member chamber of deputies to be elected by the vote of people according to the above-mentioned ratio in the general elections. According to the Guarantee and Alliance Agreements added to the Constitution, Turkey, Britain and Greece had the right to together or single-handedly intervene in the island in case of violation of the constitution. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, Turks were not a minority, but were recognized as a national entity "Entitee Nationale" with equal rights and conditions. According to the constitution, the Turks would hold position in state affairs less than Greeks with a ratio of 30/70 and of 40/60 in military units in balance. Under the deal, while Turkey, Greece and Britain were the privileged countries for the Republic of Cyprus, they were entitled to give financial assistance for their own communities. According to the agreements, Turkish and Greek soldiers were given the right to establish a base on the island as the guarantor state. According to this right, on August 16, 950 Greek and 650

Turkish soldiers came to the island. Archbishop Makarios was elected as president and on the same day Fazil Kucuk was elected as the vice president. The first general election for the Chamber of Deputies was held on July 31, 1961. The deputies consisting of 35 Greeks and 15 Turks filled the chairs that were allocated to them (Ismail, 1992b).

The Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, which was equipped with such detailed articles, provisions, and supported by guarantorship and alliance agreements, was accused of not being functional by the President in 1963, and a 13-items amendment was put before the Turks.

### *The 1960 Constitution*

The President Makarios did not wait too long to claim that the Zurich-London Agreements gave rights beyond the merits of the Turks and that the 1960 Constitution was invalid. On November 30, 1963, Makarios forwarded to the Vice President Fazil Küçük his proposals for amendments on various articles of the constitution, including the abolition of the veto power of the Turkish Vice President. These recommendations were rejected on December 16, 1963 by the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey.

Therewith, The Greek Cypriot side began to implement a policy of violence against the Turkish Cypriot community on 21 December 1963. This policy was the realization of a previously prepared plan, the Akritas Plan. Akritas Plan was published on April 21, 1966 in the Patris Newspaper. According to this plan, the Turkish people would be destroyed by a sudden attack and the island would be connected to Greece. The Patris newspaper, dated February 7, 1967, wrote about the Greek leaders who took part in the Akritas Plan: President: Polikarpos Yorgacis, Vice President: Minister of Labor Thassos Papadopoulos, Staff Officer: Deputy Nikos Kocis, Chief of Staff Department: The President of the Assembly Glafkos Klerides.

### *Akritas Plan with its Outlines*

Statements of Makarios have shown the direction of the national action. The main goal has not changed. (Annexation, Enosis) Internal and external tactics would be followed to achieve the goal.

In the last phase of EOKA struggle, Cyprus Problem was presented to the world public and diplomatic circles as the struggle of the Cyprus Community to gain the right to self-determination. Now, our first aim should be to internationally spread the opinion that the Cyprus problem have not been resolved and should be reconsidered. For this purpose, it should be noted that the solution has not been satisfactory, fair and that the two communities must be able to live together.

- The Cyprus leadership did not present the agreements to the public with referendum, and this situation has provided ammunition to our case.

- We have revealed that Cyprus has been governed by the Greek Cypriots so far, and that the Turks played only a negative role as a disincentive brake.
- Confidentiality will be maintained...” (Ismail, 1992: 72-75).

### **Results of Akritas Plan**

As a result of the prepared plan, thirty thousand Turkish Cypriots were forced to leave 103 villages. The entire Turkish Cypriot population sought refuge in small areas, which accounted for three percent of the island’s surface area and were under constant siege. They had to shelter in tents, movie theaters and schools.

Heavy economic pressure was applied against the Turkish Cypriots, they were isolated from the outside world, their communication, transportation and economic relations were completely cut off. With the abolition of articles of the 1960 Constitution relating to the fundamental rights of the Turkish Cypriots, the validity of the Foundation Agreement has disappeared since 1963. After the events of 1963, the “Peacekeeping Force” was formed on 27 December 1963, consisting of the soldiers of the three guarantor countries.

With a line drawn on the map by the British general with a green pen, Nicosia was divided into two on December 30, 1963. Since then, this line has been named as the “Green Line”.

### **Conclusion**

The Cyprus Problem, which was briefly summarized above, was largely resolved by the proclamation of the Turkish Cypriot Federal State in 1975. It is obvious that there has been no conflict in the last 45 years and both of the societies have developed and existed in the lands that they know and live on. In 2004, the opening of the doors with the initiative of the Turkish Cypriots that allowed the mass and free movement of the folks between the North and the South has strengthened this fact. It can be said that after the conflict and the war, which continued roughly from 1963 to 1974, the two communities had the opportunity to have such free contact for the first time and evaluated it in peace. On the first days when the door was opened, long queues were formed to cross the other side of the border on both sides in order to see the places where they lived before. And this happened. Nobody hurt anyone, on the contrary, warm, humane relationships have been established. The number of the ever-increasing gates is indicative of this situation. The fact that 65% of the Turkish Cypriots voted as ‘yes’ to the Annan Plan and 75% of the Greeks voted with ‘no’, confirmed that an administration based on partnership has not been adopted by the Greeks since 1960 and no change in this attitude has been noted. Likewise, it is a fact that the Turks have come to the fore in the various UN proposals mentioned above with more positive

and constructive attitude than Greeks, however that the Greeks Cypriots always rejected by dogmatizing the issue.

Since 2004, Turks and Greeks have been making purchases from each other, founding friendships, or some of those who had acquaintances before 1974, continued to eat, drink and enjoy together. Tensions between Turks and Greeks occur when the leaders of the parties sit at the table as a result of pressures from the UN, the EU and the United States, and when the issues of discussion (right or wrong) are fiercely debated in political focal points, trade unions, organizations and the press. Especially when the historical records of the past come to the agenda, it is seen that the dispute on these issues is deep even among Turkish/Greek friends. To understand our claim, it is necessary to look at the contradiction between the feast and mourning days adopted by both communities. As a matter of fact:

- The war of independence launched by the people of Hellene against the Ottoman State and the modern Greek State is a great holiday for the Greek Cypriots, but it is a cause of mourning for the Turkish Cypriots.
- Reclaiming of İzmir by Turkish Revolutionary armies from the Greeks on September 9, 1922, (the liberation of Izmir) is a great holiday for the Turkish people and a great mourning day for the Greeks.
- Even in the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus created in 1960, May 19, October 29, April 23 National Feast Days of the Republic of Turkey are stated as the official days of national holidays for Turkish Cypriots and Greece's national holidays are stated as the official days of national holidays for Greek Cypriots.

This shows us that the unity of the two important history streams, which are the most important condition of forming a nation, is not possible in the whole island of Cyprus. In the light of these facts, it would not be wrong to say that the future imagination of the two peoples never crossed at any point in history. Clerides, therefore, have declared the Cyprus flag as the best flag in the world. It is the best flag in the world because there is not a single person who will die for this flag (Kizilyürek, 2005).

In this context, it is only possible to conclude the negotiations by agreeing on the acceptance and ingestion of these facts, and perhaps by agreeing on a number of boundary regulations and similar requirements. This means that all parties agree that the actual situation is the best solution. This is the reality, because this is what is experienced in practice and this is peace. Our suggestion is to suspend the negotiations to be accepted by the Greek Cypriot and Greek leadership of the present situation which has already been internalized by the two communities. So much so that when the parties decide to sit at the table the next time, they must agree that the text of the agreement to be prepared will be for a two-state solution based on good neighbourly relations, including cooperation in situations where it is needed and not agreed on in partnership.



## Recommendations

As often expressed or intended by political figures, the desire to terminate the negotiations by an agreement should not be taken to so far as to jeopardize the peace and create an atmosphere for conflict or war. In the past period, it has been observed that some political authorities who have been working as interviewers were overwhelmed by the attractiveness of being the one to conclude the interview traffic which has been going on for years with an agreement. They can attempt to endanger the environment of peace with the desire to achieve international prestige and popularity that such a success will provide them. However, by signing the agreement, the desire to be the leader who ends the negotiation process should not be taken to a new period of conflict or risk of warfare. It should not be forgotten that the aim is to maintain the peace and the negotiations are the only peaceful means to be used to this end. In other words, the goal is the continuation of peace; the agreement is not the purpose itself.

This means that the appropriate atmosphere has been preserved for forty years, in an effort to create a letter of agreement that both sides will sign voluntarily. This is of utmost importance. It is necessary to grasp the reasons why this peaceful atmosphere has not been broken for forty years. The continuation of the de-conflict is of vital importance in order for the negotiations to continue and to ultimately end with an agreement.

## References

- Akçora, E. (2009) *Kıbrıs Türkünün Bağımsızlık Mücadelesi ve Rumların Türklere Uyguladıkları Katliam, Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 179, 35-62.
- Ali, Dr.I., (2002), *Hatıralarım*, Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları.
- Birinci, E. M. (1999). *M. Necati Özkan (1899-1970)*, III. Cilt, İstanbul: Umut Matbaası.
- Britannica (2011). <https://www.britannica.com/topic/historiography#ref523869>
- Demir, F. (2011). Demir, F. (2011). *Kamu Politikası Sürecinde Müzakerenin Rolü ve Sürecin Demokratikleştirilmesi, Kamu Politika Süreci*, Editör: Alican Kaptı, Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi (pp. 195 -224).
- Erol, H. (2016). Rauf Denktaş Sonrası Kıbrıs Sorunu, *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4, 223-238.
- Evans, G., & Newnham, J. (2007). *Uluslararası İlişkiler Sözlüğü*, çev. H. Ahsen Utku, İstanbul: Gökkuşbu Yayınları.
- Gazioğlu, A. (1960). İngiliz İdaresinde *Kıbrıs 1878-1960*, Cilt I, *Statü ve Anayasa Meseleleri*, İstanbul: Ekin Basımevi.
- Gibbons, H. S. (1997). *The Genocide Files*, London: Charles Broves Publishers.
- Grivas, G., (2012). *General Grivas - Hayatım*, Çev. Cumhuriyet Atay, İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Gürel, A., (2012). *Kıbrıs'ta Yerinden Olmak – Sivil ve Askeri Çatışmanın Sonuçları – Rapor 4*, Peace Oslo: Research Institute Oslo- Barış Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Oslo (PRIO).
- Hasgüler, M., & Özkaleli, M.F. (2010). *Kıbrıs'ta Metamorfoz ve Paradigma Değişimi-Her Şeyin Bir Sonu Var*, Ankara: USAK Yayınları.

- Ismail, S. (1992). *100 Soruda Kibris Sorunu*, Lefkoşa: Dilhan Offset.
- Ismail, S. (1992). *Kibris Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu (1960-1983)*, İstanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları.
- Kaptı, A. (2013). *Kamu Politika Süreci, Kamu Politikası Süreci*, Alican Kaptı (ed), Ankara: Seçkin, (pp.17- 25).
- Karyelioğlu, S. (2012). Ulus Devlet ve Milliyetçiliğin Tarihsel Dayanakları ve Küreselleşmenin Ulus Devlet ve Milliyetçilik Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Ethos Dergisi*, 5(1), 137-169.
- Kızılyürek, N. (2005). *Doğmamış Bir Devletin Tarihi – Birleşik Kibris Cumhuriyeti*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mütercimler, E. (1990). *Kibris Barış Harekatinin Bilinmeyen Yönleri*, İstanbul: Yaprak Yayınevi.
- Mütercimler, E. (2007). *Satılık Ada Kibris - Kibris Barış Harekatinin Bilinmeyen Yönleri*, İstanbul: Melisa Matbaacılık.
- Toluner, S., (1977). *Kibris Uyuşmazlığı ve Milletlerarası Hukuk*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları Hukuk Fakültesi.